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Introduction

Neural networks approaches can be used to correlate log responses with core descriptions of lithology and/or depositional environments. A series of training sessions are run over intervals where both core data and a complete log suite exists. Any bad-hole intervals should be excluded in the training process. The training can be over a single or multiple wells, and the separate wells do not necessarily need to have the same suites of rock types. However, they do need to have identical log suites.

Once the training has been established, applications can be run over intervals or wells where no core data exists. If rock types have changed from the intervals of training, the results will be unreliable, and the neural network output will indicate these levels of change.

Two examples of Rocky Mountain reservoirs are presented using Digital Formation’s Esteem program:

- Big Stick Mississippian carbonate reservoirs, Williston Basin, North Dakota

The techniques allow for a number of important reservoir interpretations:

- Field-wide recognition of changing depositional and/or rock type sequences
- Correlation of specific rock types with reservoir quality and recognition of flow units
- Recognition of transgressive/regressive sequences through the gross intervals, well-by-well
- Detailed field-wide mapping of each different rock type

Overview of Neural Network Application for Distinguishing Rock Facies

The neural network application used in this study involves the definition of quantified correlation between wireline log response and different rock facies as described by cores. It is not necessarily the case that the two sets of data can be correlated uniquely, although the cases presented have suggested that in excess of about 75% of the data analyzed there is sufficient correlation to allow reliable distinction.

The initial preparation of the data set involves:

For well(s) where core data exists, depth match cores to logs.

- Choose a suite of logs common to the cored wells, and all other wells to be examined, that should be some measure of lithologic variation. If the wells involve both hydrocarbon-bearing and wet intervals, it might be advantageous not to use resistivity logs.
- On all wells identity intervals of potentially unreliable data – for example, bad hole data.

The next stage is to perform training sessions on wells where both logs and cores exist. The training should only be applied where core descriptions and all logs (quality data only) exists. Training can involve a single well only or a combination of wells. Various cases can be run, involving different log combinations, to determine which log curves are needed to distinguish the different rock types.

Verification of how well the neural network has “learned” facies types can be made by comparing the neural network blocking of rock types with the original core descriptions. A poor result is indicated when the neural network blocking involves more than one rock type over any depth interval.

When training is complete, application can be made on any wells that have no core data. Intervals of bad hole or other reliable log data should be excluded from the application. Validity of the application can be verified as follows:
- Blocking that involves essentially only one rock type
- Summation of all rock types at any one level should be approximately one

**Hartzog Draw, Powder River Basin, Wyoming**

Source of the geologic data and well traces for three of the wells is:


**Figure 1** is a location map of the Hartzog Draw Field in the Powder River Basin. **Figure 2** shows well locations of the three training wells and the two application wells. **Figure 3** shows the general interpreted geologic setting of the shelf sand Shannon reservoirs, and **Figure 4** is a diagram of relations among five of the reservoir facies described in the cores. **Figure 5** gives details of lithology, sedimentary structures, burrowing, reservoir potential, and relative abundance of all nine reservoir facies recognized. **Figure 6, 7 and 8** gives details of core porosity, permeability and recognized facies for the Federal AE, Christiansen No. 2 and Federal AS-1 wells.

Training and application was performed using the following logs:

- Deep resistivity ILD
- Shallow resistivity SFL
- Density RhoB
- Neutron NPhi
- Gamma ray GR

The following figures apply to the appropriate well:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure Number</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Federal AE</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Christiansen No. 2</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Federal AS-1</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Heldt Draw</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Casada Federal 13-28</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of **Figures 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13** show mostly good distinction for each of the facies recognized:

- Shelf (Shale)
- Shelf (Silt/Sandstone)
- Inter Ridge
- Lo Energy Ridge
- High Energy Ridge
- Central Ridge
On each well, the following data are presented:

- **Track 1**: Porosity, shale, matrix
- **Track 2**: Interpreted bulk volumes; water, oil, gas, and core porosity (if applicable)
- **Track 3**: Stacked environments (sum should be between zero and one if data are reliable)
- **Track 4-9**: Individual environments, as marked, ranging from Shelf to Central Ridge
- **Track 10**: The stacked facies assuming the largest quantity is the sole winner at each depth

**Figure 14** is a cross plot of water saturation vs. porosity for well Federal AE. The plot indicates that the reservoir facies (Inter Ridge through Central Ridge) have very similar rock types, and can be expressed by

\[
\Phi^{1.7} \times Swi = 0.01
\]

**Figures 15, 16 and 17** show core descriptions for the Federal AE-1, Federal AS-1, and Christensen No. 2 wells. **Figure 18** is a cross section of the Christensen No. 2, Federal AE-1, Casada Federal 13-28 and Federal AS-1 wells.

**Big Stick, Willistont Basin, North Dakota**

All geologic data was taken from:


**Figure 19** is a location map of the Big Stick Field. Three wells were examined, one as the raining well, and two as application wells, shown in **Figure 20**. Producing reservoirs belong to the Mission Canyon Formation in **Figure 21** and were deposited in environments ranging from open marine to supratidal in **Figure 22**.

A description of a cored interval from a well in the Big Stick Field is shown in **Figure 23**.

Log response is very consistent, and the cored interval of the **Figure 23** well was correlated readily with the Stuart USA No. 1-19 well, used as a training well. For this well, additional training intervals were recognized for supratidal rocks (anhydrite) and salt (not seen in the cored intervals). Logs used for the training were:

- Gamma Ray (GR)
- Sonic (DT)
- Deep resistivity (LLD)
- Neutron (NPhi)
- Density (RhoB)

Neural net training and application results are shown on the following figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure Number</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Stuart No. 1-19</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kordon</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Anna Osadchuck</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of **Figures 24, 25 and 26** show mostly good distinction for each of the facies recognized:
• Open marine
• Restricted marine
• Intertidal
• Supratidal flat
• Supratidal
• Salt

On each well, the following data are presented:

Track 1 Porosity, shale, matrix
Track 2 Interpreted bulk volumes; water, oil, gas, and core porosity (if applicable)
Track 3 Stacked environments (sum should be between zero and one if data are reliable)
Track 4-9 Individual environments, as marked, ranging from Open Marine to Salt
Track 10 The stacked facies assuming the largest quantity is the sole winner at each depth

Also, each well shows a series of regressive/transgressive cycles that are readily correlated from one well to the next. Porosity development is restricted to mostly two of the six facies recognized – marine and restricted marine. Some porosity development is also seen in the intertidal and supratidal flat categories, but is mostly quite minor.

Figure 27 shows a density/neutron cross plot with the various facies. Some of the rock types are uniquely recognized – e.g. Salt and supratidal anhydrites – but others show lithologic overlap among limestones, dolomitic limestones, and dolomite.

Figure 28 is a porosity/water saturation comparison for the Stuart No. 1-19 well with the cored interval facies types.

Most of the porosity belongs to a single rock type with the relationship:

$$Phi^{1.2} \times Swi = 0.02$$

Figure 29 is a facies cross section of the Kordon, Stuart No. 1-19 and Anna Osadchuck wells.
Figure 1: Upper Cretaceous oil fields, Powder River Basin, Wyoming.

Note the parallelism and elongation of the fields. Among the larger fields are House Creek Dead Horse Creek fields that produce from the Sussex sandstones.
Figure 2: Well locations, Hartzog Draw field and Heldt Draw field, Wyoming.

Hartzog Draw field discovery well is marked by a star. Wells cored during primary producing phase are indicated by circles. Locations of the cored wells discussed in the text are shown. Wells marked with X are wells with core and logs used for training. Wells marked with O are wells with log only and are application wells.
Figure 3: Wide shelf on which Hartzog Draw and other Shannon shelf-ridge sandstones were deposited. NNW-SSE-trending subsurface shelf-ridge sandstones are superimposed on a model developed by Asquith (1970). Note that Hartzog Draw field is the largest Shannon shelf-ridge sandstone discovered to date.
Figure 4: Model of facies distributions, Shannon shelf-ridge sandstone complex.

This diagram has extreme vertical exaggeration, but the abrupt lateral changes indicated here are substantiated by detailed outcrop study (Tillman and Martinsen, 1984, Figs. 35-37).
### Shannon Facies Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lithology</strong></td>
<td>Fine to medium grained quartz sandstone, moderately glauconitic; rare siderite clasts and shale rip-up clasts.</td>
<td>Fine to medium grained quartz sandstone.</td>
<td>Predominately medium grained sandstone, abundant shale and limonite rip-up clasts and lenses, commonly very glauconitic.</td>
<td>Fine-grained sandstone with only rare shale inter-beds. Fewer clasts and lenses and less glauconitic than High-Energy Ridge-Margin Facies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sedimentary Structures</strong></td>
<td>Predominantly moderate angle trough and planar-lenticular cross bedding. Trough sets commonly horizontally truncated.</td>
<td>Mostly sub-horizontal plane-perpendicular laminated sandstone, 0.5-1.0 cm thick laminae. Minor shale and sandstone ripples.</td>
<td>Mostly moderate angle troughs, some current ripples, shale clasts rarely show preferred orientations.</td>
<td>Sequences of several beds of troughs inter-bedded with sequences of several rippled beds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burrowing</strong></td>
<td>Sparse</td>
<td>Sparse</td>
<td>Sparse</td>
<td>Sparse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reservoir Potential</strong></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Limited?</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Moderate to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subsurface Occurrences Hartzog Draw Field</strong></td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Very uncommon</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Common</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inter-Ridge Facies (Shale)</th>
<th>Inter-Ridge Sandstone Facies</th>
<th>Bioturbated Shelf-Sandstone Facies</th>
<th>Bioturbated Shelf-Siltstone Facies</th>
<th>Shelf Silty-Shale Facies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lithology</strong></td>
<td>thinly interbedded fine to very fine grained silty sandstone and silty shale, slightly glauconitic.</td>
<td>fine-grained sandstone. Virtual absence of silty shale. Slightly glauconitic.</td>
<td>Silty, fine-grained sandstone. Up to 15% shale, primarily associated with burrows. Slightly glauconitic.</td>
<td>Shaly, slightly sandy dark gray siltstone. Traces to moderate amounts of glauconite.</td>
<td>Silty dark gray shale; rare thin (1/8&quot; thick) silty sandstone lenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burrowing</strong></td>
<td>Moderate to locally high</td>
<td>Low to Moderate</td>
<td>Mottled to distinctly burrowed. More than 75% burrowed.</td>
<td>More than 75% Burrowed</td>
<td>Low to moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reservoir Potential</strong></td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subsurface Occurrences Hartzog Draw Field</strong></td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Uncommon</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Moderately Common</td>
<td>Common</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5:** Shannon facies summary.
Figure 6: Production characteristics of individual facies recognized in slabbed core – Cities Service Federal AE-1.

Semi-log plot of porosity, permeability and oil saturation for cored interval in Cities Service Federal AE-1. Note that porosities (open triangles) are similar throughout the Central Ridge and in most of the Ridge Margin Facies; however, both porosity and permeability (circles) are significantly less in the Inter-Ridge Facies (Shaley). Average values of porosity (ΔΦ) and permeability (Δκ) for each unit are also indicated.

Figure 7: Production characteristics of individual facies recognized in slabbed core – Bud Christensen No. 2.

Semi-log plot of porosity (open triangles), permeability (circles) and oil saturation (squares) in Southland Royalty Bud Christensen No. 2. Note that porosities are significantly higher in the Central Ridge Facies than any of the others. Average values of porosity (ΔΦ), permeability (Δκ), and oil saturation (Δ) are indicated for each unit.
Figure 8: Production characteristics of individual facies recognized in slabbed core –Cities Service Federal AS-1.

Semi-log plot of porosity (open triangles) and permeability (circles). Oil saturation values were not calculated. This is the only cored well studied which has as its main producing interval a High-Energy Ridge-Margin Facies. The absence of a Central Ridge Facies is this well may be responsible for lower primary production values.
Figure 9: Cities Service Federal AE-1 Sandstone (Hartzog) Deposition from Neural Networks.
Figure 10: Southland Royalty Bud Christensen No. 2 Sandstone (Hartzog) Deposition from Neural Networks.
Figure 11: Cities Service Federal AS-1 Sandstone (Hartzog) Deposition from Neural Networks.
Figure 12: Heldt Draw Sandstone (Hartzog) Deposition from Neural Networks.
Figure 13: Casada Federal 13-28 Sandstone (Hartzog) Deposition from Neural Networks.
Figure 14: Cities Service Federal AE-1 Porosity vs. Water Saturation cross plot.

\[ \Phi^{1.70} \times Swi = 0.01 \]
Figure 15: Core Description, Federal AE-1
Figure 16: Core Description, Federal AS-1

4945.0-4983.2' Sandstone (84%), 12% shale rip-up clasts, 5% laminated shale. 6% siderite clasts, trace of laminated siderite lenses. 1% glauconite, mostly disseminated. 94% physical structures, 5% burrowed. 52% trough cross bedded, plus 30% ripples on troughs. 12% current ripples, 1% reworked (shale and siderite clasts). Five burrow types, mostly horizontal and oblique, form 6% of unit. 3% dense calcite cemented. Lower contact very sharp.

HIGH-ENERGY RIDGE-MARGIN FACIES
4983.2-4997.1' - Sandstone (150%), maximum 250}. 8% glauconite (5% disseminated, 5% on laminae); 30% shale, mainly laminated (28%), 2% clasts, trace of siderite clasts. Physical structures: 15% trough cross bedded, 3% ripples on troughs, 65% rippled interbedded sandstone and shale; 1% burrowed (13 types - high diversity).

LOW-ENERGY RIDGE-MARGIN FACIES
4997.1-5003.5' Sandstone (150%), 5% glauconite, 2% siltstone, 25% shale, 63% current ripples, 2% wave ripples. 92% interbedded shale and sandstone). 5% horizontal laminations (storm deposits). 10% low angle planar laminations. 2% burrowed by 15 burrow types (highly diverse), mostly horizontal to oblique. Only 2% of unit greater than 75% burrowed (bioturbated). Lower contact very sharp; upper contact more gradational.

INTER-RIDGE FACIES (SHELLY) (95%)

9503.5-5021.3' - 90% very thinly laminated dark gray to black shale; 10% siltstone. Physical structures: (40%); subhorizontal laminations (5% discontinuous siltstone laminae, 35% very low amplitude ripple laminae). Stromatic, 60%; 54% bioturbated; 6% burrowed (5 burrow types - moderate diversity). SHELL Silty Shale (Type 1).
Figure 17: Core Description, Bud Christensen No. 2
Figure 18: Facies Cross Section, Hartzog Draw
Figure 19: Area map of the Big Stick Field
Figure 20: Billings Nose well base indicating locations of various fields.

Wells marked with X are wells with core and logs used for training. Wells marked with O are wells with log only and are application wells.
Figure 21: Stratigraphic column of the Central Williston Basin.
Main pay zones of the Billings Nose are form the Sherwood and Mohall beds of the mission Canyon (Harris, et al, 1966).

Figure 22: Diagram showing a geological model for the Mission Canyon.
Open marine skeletal packstones grade laterally to transitional and restricted marine wackestones and mudstones, peritidal algal laminated wackestones, and supratidal evaporites. Dolomitization of the restricted marine facies forms the reservoir rock. Nonporous limestones of the open marine and peritidal environments form stratigraphic traps.

**Figure 23:** Tenneco 1-35 David
Figure 24: Stuart USA No. 1-19 Carbonate Deposition
Figure 25: Kordon 10-6 Carbonate Deposition
Figure 26: Anna Osadchuck Carbonate Deposition
Figure 27: Stuart USA No. 1-19 Density vs. Comp. Neutron
Figure 28: Stuart USA No. 1-19 Porosity vs. Water Saturation Cross Plot.
Figure 29: Facies Cross Section, Big Stick and Tree Top Fields.
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