



GEOMECHANICAL APPLICATIONS TO OPTIMIZE THE DRILLING PERFORMANCE AT BELAYIM LAND OILFIELD, GULF OF SUEZ, EGYPT

By

Ali ElSayed Farag Farag Hammad

A thesis

Presented to Geophysics Department,
Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University
for the Ph.D. degree In
(Geomechanics)

Under Supervision of:

Prof. Dr. Ahmed S.A. Abu El-Ata

Geophysics Department, Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. Said Abd El- Maboud Ali

Geophysics Department, Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. Ashraf ElSayed Ghoneimi

Geology Department, Faculty of Science, Zagazig University

Cairo, Egypt,

2012

COMMITTEE APPROVAL SHEET

GEOMECHANICAL APPLICATIONS TO OPTIMIZE THE
DRILLING PERFORMANCE AT BELAYIM LAND OILFIELD,
GULF OF SUEZ, EGYPT

By

Ali ElSayed Farag Farag Hammad

A thesis

Presented to Geophysics Department,
Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University
for the Ph.D. degree

In

(Geomechanics)

Supervision committee

Prof. Dr. Ahmed S.A. Abu El-Ata

Geophysics Department, Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. Said Abd El- Maboud Ali

Geophysics Department, Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. Ashraf ElSayed Ghoneimi

Geology Department, Faculty of Science, Zagazig University

ABSTRACT

Due to the location of Belayim land oilfield, where it lies on the eastern bank of the Gulf of Suez, a majority of wells are being drilled deviated from shore line, as well as vertical and horizontal wells to maximize the production and hydrocarbon recovery in the mature reservoirs of the study area. It is of great challenge to drill a high angle well successfully through a such complex structure and tectonic setting, especially the area is affected by hydrocarbon depletion with time and fluid migration while production. The stratigraphic setting of the area possesses significant drilling challenges that vary widely from salt creep and reactive shale to stress-related problems.

The objective of this thesis is to investigate, focus and integrate drilling, geologic and petrophysical knowledge for a better understanding the geomechanics of the study area, in order to select the optimal mud weight and to study the impact of stress orientation and magnitude, on the wellbore stability for safe drilling.

Practically, the drilling events such as the stuck pipe, kick and tight hole associated with the mud weight profiles can be used for better understanding the geomechanical setting of the concerned area.

A novel performance model is established on finding the relationships between the drilling parameters and the rate of penetration based on trigonometry, have been discussed in this study to find the most influential conditions on the rate of penetration. A new equation and a workflow to estimate the rate of

penetration in the hard rocks have been constructed, based on the sonic measurements.

In absence of the core chips to test the rocks for the mechanical properties, a set of relationships between the static elastic constants and the dynamic elastic constants are derived from the measurements of elastic wave velocities in the rocks and sonic logging .These data, in conjunction with the bulk density measurement permit, the in-situ measurements and calculations of the mechanical properties of the rock.

For enhancement the drilling performance of Belayim land oilfield through mitigating the risks, while drilling and production, a 3D mechanical earth model have been constructed through maximizing the values of the data integration by 3D grid and upscaled the petrophysical properties and lithology. Also, understanding the main causes of rock failure through 3D MEM resulted in improved drilling efficiency and reduced drilling costs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My deep appreciation goes to Prof. Ahmed Sayed Ahmed Abu El-Ata, professor of applied Geophysics, Geophysics Department, Ain Shams University, for his constructive advices throughout this research and for tolerate hours of discussions and correcting the scientific route of this research work.

I wish to express my appreciation to prof. Said Abd El- Maboud Ali , Head of the Geophysics Department, Ain Shams University, and Prof. Ashraf Elsayed Ghonaimi, professor of applied geophysics, Zagazig University, for continuous support of this investigation.

I should like to express appreciation to the management of Petrobel and EGPC for providing the data to study the present area. Special thanks are granted to Schlumberger for using their software in my research.

I would like to thank my friend Victor Gonzles Veria for petrel support, and Jim C. Brannigan, Real time domain manager-Schlumberger, for his guidance and support during my research.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to

Soul of my father

To my mother

To my wife

Finally to my children Salma, Rafik and Ahmad

NOMENCLATURES

F_s	= The horizontal force component with respect to the rock surface.
F_n	= The vertical force component with respect to the rock surface
A	= Cross sectional area of cut
E	= Drilling specific energy
S	= drilling strength
Ω	= Axial velocity of the bit
T	= The total torque
T_c	= Torque cutting term acting on the cutting face
T_f	= Torque friction term at the wearflats/rock interface
W	= Weight-on-bit
W_c	= Weight-on-bit cutting term acting on the cutting face
W_f	= Weight-on-bit friction term at the wearflats/rock interface
HPP	= Hydraulic horsepower
P	= Circulation pressure, psi
Q	= Circulating rate, gpm
IF	= Impact force, lb, at bit
MW	= Mud weight, ppg
V_n	= Jet velocity, ft/sec
Θ_{wob}	= Drilling resistance inclination per WOB
Θ_{rpm}	= Drilling resistance inclination per RPM
T	= Bit Torque (ft-lbf)
Db	= Bit size (inches)
WOB	= Weight on bit (pounds)
μ	= Bit –specific coefficient of sliding friction (dimensionless)
ΔT_c	= the traveling time in $\mu s/ft$.
Δ_{ars}	= the apparent rock strength (ARS) in psi
ROP_m	= the rate of penetration - modeled in m/hr
ρ	= Density
ρ_b	= Bulk density of the formation (g/cm ³)
$DTCO$	= Compressional slowness of the bulk formation
$DTSM$	= Shear slowness of the bulk formation
$DTSM_C$	= Computed DTSM
MR	= Modulus ratio
PR_{DYN}	= Dynamic Poisson's ratio
$TSTR$	= Tensile strength
E_{dyn}	= Young's modulus dynamic
E_{sta}	= Young's modulus static
G_{dyn}	= Shear modulus dynamic
G_{sta}	= Shear modulus static
K_{dyn}	= Bulk modulus dynamic
K_{sta}	= Bulk modulus static
σ_z	= is overburden stress

σ'	= total normal stress,
σ	= Effective normal stresses
τ	= Shear stress and P is pore pressure
Pp	= Predicted (shale) pore pressure
Pobs	= Overburden pressure (rocks and fluids)
Phyd	= Hydrostatic pressure (fluids)
Vo	= Interval velocity (ft/sec)
Vn	= normally compacted shale velocity (ft/sec)
Δt_n	= Normal travel time (μ sec)
Δt_o	= Observed travel time (μ sec)
Cn	= Normal conductivity
CO	= Observed conductivity
Rn	= Normal resistivity
RO	= Observed resistivity
SH	= Maximum horizontal stress
Sv	= Vertical stress
Sh	= minimum horizontal stress
σ_1	= The major field stress
σ_2	= The intermediate Field stress
σ_3	= The minor field stress
FG	= The fracture gradient
CSO	= Calibrated sonic in us/ft
RLA3	= Borehole Corrected Resistivity 3
RLA5	= Borehole Corrected Resistivity 5
GR	= Gamma Ray
DT4P	= Δ -T Compressional - Monopole P&S
DT4S	= Δ -T Shear - Monopole P&S
SPR4	= STC Slowness Projection, Receiver Array - Monopole P&S
HCAL	= HRCC Cal. Caliper
HCGR	= HNGS Computed Gamma Ray
HDRA	= HRDD Density Correction
HFK	= HNGS Formation Potassium Concentration
HSGR	= HNGS Standard Gamma Ray
HTHO	= HNGS Formation Thorium Concentration
HURA	= HNGS Formation Uranium Concentration
NPHI	= Thermal Neutron Porosity (Ratio Method)
PEFZ	= Standard Resolution Formation Photoelectric Factor
RHOZ G/C3	= HRDD Standard Resolution Formation Density
VPVS	= Compressional to Shear Velocity Ratio
HFK	= HNGS Formation Potassium Concentration
HSGR	= HNGS Standard Gamma-Ray
HTHO	= HNGS Formation Thorium Concentration
HURA	= HNGS Formation Uranium Concentration
UCS	= Unconfined compressive strength (psi)

CONVERSION FACTORS

Ft x 3.048*E-01	= m
Mpa	= 145 psi
Gpa	=103 MPa
Gpa	=106 kPa

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COMMITTEE APPROVAL SHEET	I
ABSTRACT	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	IV
DEDICATION	V
NOMENCLATURES	VI
TABLE OF CONTENTS	IX
LIST OF FIGURES	XII
LIST OF TABLES	XIX
CHAPTER 1	1
GEOLOGIC SETTING	1
1.1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.2 SURFACE GEOLOGY	3
1.3 SUBSURFACE STRATIGRAPHY	5
1.3.1 Post-Rift Sequences	8
1.3.2 Syn-Rift Sequences	17
1.3.3 Pre-Rift Sequences	21
1.4 STRUCTURAL AND TECTONIC SETTING	26
CHAPTER 2	41
DATA INTEGRATION AND QUALITY CONTROL	41
2.1 INTRODUCTION	41
2.2 REVIEWING WELL REPORTS OBJECTIVES	41
2.3 MAXIMIZE THE VALUES OF THE DATA	43
2.3.1 Geologic Data	43
2.3.2 Seismic Data	43

2.3.3 Formation Evaluation Data	48
2.3.4 Drilling Data	64
2.4 HAZARD IDENTIFICATION	75
2.4.1 Mud Losses	78
2.4.2 Drill Pipe Sticking	78
2.4.3 Drilling Risks Overview	79
CHAPTER 3	88
TRIGONOMETRIC DRILLING PERFORMANCE MODEL	88
3.1 INTRODUCTION	88
3.2 STATE OF ART	88
3.3 BIT- ROCK INTERACTION	91
3.4 DESCRIPTION OF THE MODEL	93
3.4.1 Operations Considerations	103
3.4.2 Applications and Interpretation.....	104
3.4.3 Inclination per Weight on Bit - Rate of Penetration Relation	107
3.4.4 Inclination per Revolutions per Minutes - Rate of Penetration Relation	111
3.5 RATE OF PENETRATION MODEL IN THE HARD ROCKS	112
3.5.1 Rock Strength from Sonic Log Travel Time and Drilling Data	112
3.5.2 Hard Rock's ROP Estimation	117
CHAPTER 4	121
MECHANICAL EARTH MODEL.....	121
4.1 INTRODUCTION	121
4.2 ROCK PROPERTIES	123
4.3 ELASTIC PROPERTIES.....	139
4.3.1 Static and Dynamic Mechanical Properties	139
4.3.2 Modulus Ratio (MR).....	150
4.3.3 Poisson's Ratio -Modulus Ratio Correlation	155
4.4 ROCK STRENGTH.....	156

4.5 VERTICAL STRESS MAGNITUDE AND GRADIENT	167
4.6 PORE PRESSURE.....	169
CHAPTER 5	184
THE BOREHOLE INSTABILITY.....	184
5.1 INTRODUCTION	184
5.2 MINIMUM HORIZONTAL STRESS.....	184
5.3 FRACTURE PRESSURE AND SAFE MUD WEIGHT.....	187
5.4 STRESSES RELATED TO WELLS TRAJECTORIES	195
5.5 CUTTINGS AND CAVINGS ANALYSIS	195
5.5.1 Angular Cavings	195
5.5.2 Platy and Tabular Cavings	197
5.5.3 Splintered Cavings.....	197
5.6 DRILLING FLUID INTERACTIONS	198
5.7 CLAY EVALUATIONS.....	199
5.7.1 Thorium – Potassium Cross-Plot	202
5.7.2 Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM) Photographs.....	207
CHAPTER 6	213
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	213
REFERENCES	218
ARABIC SUMMARY.....	

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure (1):Study area.....	2
Figure (2):Simplified Surface Geologic Map, (Modified after Abu Shadi , 1995).....	6
Figure (3):Compiled Stratigraphic Sequence	7
Figure (4):Post-Zeit Stratigraphy	9
Figure (5):Zeit Formation Stratigraphy	11
Figure (6):South Gharib FormationStratigraphy	14
Figure (7):Belayim Formation Stratigraphy.....	16
Figure (8):Kareem Formation Stratigraphy.....	18
Figure (9):Rudeis Formation Stratigraphy	20
Figure (10): Eocene section Stratigraphy.....	21
Figure (11): Upper Senonian Stratigraphy	22
Figure (12): Lower Senonian Stratigraphy.....	24
Figure (13): Turonian, Cenomanian and Nubia-A Stratigraphy	25
Figure (14): Structure Contour Map on Top Rudeis Formation	28
Figure (15): Structure Contour Map on Top Kareem Formation.....	29
Figure (16): Structure Contour Map on Top Sidri Member.....	30
Figure (17): Structure Contour Map on Top Belayim Formation.....	31
Figure (18): Structure Contour Map on Top South Gharib formation	32
Figure (19): Structure Contour Map on Top Zeit Formation	33
Figure (20): Belayim Land Doubly Plunging Anticlinal Structure.....	34
Figure (21): Belayim Land Faults Layout.....	35
Figure (22): Structural Cross Section Along the Central Rift Segment...	38

Figure (23):Simplified Rift- Basin (After Dolson et al., 2001).....	38
Figure (24):Simplified Composite Stratigraphic Syn-rift Sequences	39
Figure (25):An Attempt to Re-Construct a Three-Dimensional Data through Two-Dimensional Data	46
Figure (26):Calibration of Sonic Data, Based on the 2D Seismic.....	47
Figure (27):Depth Vs Interval Velocity (Belayim Land Oilfield)	49
Figure (28):Depth Vs Average Velocity (Belayim Land Oilfield)	50
Figure (29):Interval Velocities Against the Formation Tops	51
Figure (30) Calibration of Sonic Data, based on VSP Data.....	52
Figure (31):Gamma Ray 3D Cube - View A	53
Figure (32):Gamma Ray 3D Cube - View B.....	54
Figure (33) RHOB 3D Cube - View A	55
Figure (34):RHOB 3D Cube - View B.....	56
Figure (35): Interval velocity 3D Cube - View A	57
Figure (36):Interval velocity 3D Cube - View B	58
Figure (37) NPHI 3D Cube - View A	59
Figure (38) NPHI 3D Cube - View B	60
Figure (39):Pressure Vs Depth 112-A-5 well, Belayim Land Oilfield	61
Figure (40):Examples of Drilling-Induced Tensile Wall Failure	63
Figure (41):Wellbore Breakouts Visible in an Acoustic Image,	63
Figure (42):Extended Leak-off Test (LOT), (Modified after Gaarenstroom et al., 1993).....	65
Figure .(43):Facies Cube- Belayim Land Oilfield - View A.....	67
Figure (44):Facies Cube- Belayim Land Oilfield- View B.....	68
Figure (45):Belayim Land Oilfield, Facies Breakdown.....	69

Figure (46):Anhydrit Vs Interval Velocity Cube	70
Figure (47):Salt Vs Interval Velocity Cube	70
Figure (48):Shale Vs Interval Velocity Cube.....	71
Figure (49):Sandstone Vs Interval Velocity Cube	71
Figure(50):Integration and filtering the discreet property and continuous properties, Belayim Land Oilfield.....	74
Figure (51):Common Drilling Problems (After Aldred et al.,1999)	76
Figure (52): Sketch of a Drag Bit, Showing the Weight-On-Bit w , Torque-On Bit, t and the Depth of Cut Per Revolution, d (After Detournay et al., 2008).....	89
Figure (53): Sketch of the Equivalent Two- Dimensional Cutter, Showing the Tangential Force t , the Normal Force w , and the Depth of Cut d , (After Detournay et al., 2008)	89
Figure (54): Theoretical E-S Digram (After Detournay and Defourny, 1992)	90
Figure (55): Positive and Negative Interactions (Modified after Lummus, 1970).....	96
Figure (56): Trigonometric Performance Model.....	98
Figure (57): Θ_{wob} -ROP Relationship.....	100
Figure (58): Θ_{RPM} - ROP Relation.....	101
Figure (59): Bit -Specific Coefficient of Sliding Friction (μ) Vs WOB	103
Figure (60): Θ_{WOB} - ROP Regressions	106
Figure (61): Hard and Soft Rock units in ROP - WOB Cross Plot	108
Figure (62): Well 112-113 H Composite Log (from 1205 md to 1735 md).	109