

Advances in Oil and Gas Exploration & Production



Troyee Dasgupta
Soumyajit Mukherjee

Sediment Compaction and Applications in Petroleum Geoscience

 Springer

Advances in Oil and Gas Exploration & Production

Series Editor

Rudy Swennen, Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences,
K.U. Leuven, Heverlee, Belgium

The book series *Advances in Oil and Gas Exploration & Production* publishes scientific monographs on a broad range of topics concerning geophysical and geological research on conventional and unconventional oil and gas systems, and approaching those topics from both an exploration and a production standpoint. The series is intended to form a diverse library of reference works by describing the current state of research on selected themes, such as certain techniques used in the petroleum geoscience business or regional aspects. All books in the series are written and edited by leading experts actively engaged in the respective field.

The *Advances in Oil and Gas Exploration & Production* series includes both single and multi-authored books, as well as edited volumes. The Series Editor, Dr. Rudy Swennen (KU Leuven, Belgium), is currently accepting proposals and a proposal form can be obtained from our representative at Springer, Dr. Alexis Vizcaino (Alexis.Vizcaino@springer.com).

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/15228>

Troyee Dasgupta · Soumyajit Mukherjee

Sediment Compaction and Applications in Petroleum Geoscience

 Springer

Troyee Dasgupta
Department of Earth Sciences
Indian Institute of Technology Bombay
Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Soumyajit Mukherjee
Department of Earth Sciences
Indian Institute of Technology Bombay
Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

ISSN 2509-372X ISSN 2509-3738 (electronic)
Advances in Oil and Gas Exploration & Production
ISBN 978-3-030-13441-9 ISBN 978-3-030-13442-6 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-13442-6>

Library of Congress Control Number: 2019935486

© Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Troyee Dasgupta dedicates this book to her daughter “Rahini Dasgupta, born on 31-Jan-2017”.

Soumyajit Mukherjee dedicates this book to Profs. Joydip Mukhopadhyay and Prabir Dasgupta for teaching sedimentology and stratigraphy in great detail during his B.Sc. studies in the then Presidency College (Kolkata) during 1996–1999.

Acknowledgements

TDG wrote this book while in maternity leave (February to August 2017). SM co-authored while in research sabbatical in IIT Bombay in 2017. We acknowledge our spouses, Swagato Dasgupta and Payel Mukherjee, respectively, for their support. TDG is thankful to Dr. Lalaji Yadav for his fruitful mentorship in Petrophysics. Sandeep Gaikwad (IIT Bombay) drew few diagrams. Thanks to Helen Ranchner, Annett Beuttner and the proof-reading team (Springer).

Contents

1	Compaction of Sediments and Different Compaction Models	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Porosity Models	1
1.2.1	Athy's Model	2
1.2.2	Hedberg's Model.....	2
1.2.3	Weller's Model	3
1.2.4	Power's Model	3
1.2.5	Teodorovich and Chernov's Model.....	4
1.2.6	Burst's Model	4
1.2.7	Beall's Model	4
1.2.8	Overton and Zanier's Model.....	4
1.3	Normal Porosity Profiles for Clastics	4
1.3.1	General Points.....	4
1.3.2	Shales	5
1.3.3	Shaly Sandstones.....	6
1.3.4	Sandstones.....	6
1.4	Carbonates	6
	References.....	7
2	Porosity in Carbonates	9
2.1	Introduction	9
2.2	Origin of Carbonate Rocks.....	10
2.3	Carbonate Classification	11
2.4	Carbonate Factories	11
2.5	Porosity and Its Classification.....	14
2.6	Porosity Classification.....	15
2.6.1	Archie's Scheme	15
2.6.2	Choquette-Pray Classification	15
2.6.3	Lucia Classification.....	16
2.7	Permeability Classification	16
2.8	Diagenetic Processes and Porosity Development	16
	References.....	17
3	Pore Pressure Determination Methods	19
3.1	Introduction	19
3.2	Normal Pressure	19

3.3	Overpressure	20
3.4	Underpressure	21
3.5	Pore Pressure Estimation Methods	23
	References	29
4	Detection of Abnormal Pressures from Well Logs	31
4.1	Introduction	31
4.2	Wireline Log Responses	32
	References	48
5	Global Overpressure Scenario	51
5.1	Introduction	51
5.2	Global Scenario in Overpressure Zones	51
5.3	Specific Cases (Table 5.1)	54
5.3.1	Abnormal Pressure Occurrences in Middle East	54
5.3.2	Abnormal Pressure Occurrences in Europe	54
5.3.3	Abnormal Pressure Occurrences in Africa	57
5.3.4	Abnormal Pressure Occurrences in China	58
5.3.5	Abnormal Pressure Occurrences in and Around SE Asia, Australia and New Zealand	60
5.3.6	Abnormal Pressure Occurrences in Some Parts of Asia	62
	References	79
6	Investigation of Erosion Using Compaction Trend	
	Analysis on Sonic Data	83
6.1	Introduction	83
6.2	Exhumation Estimation from Porosity Logs	84
6.3	Transit Time and Shale Compaction	84
6.4	Methodology	85
	References	89
7	Pore Pressure in Different Settings	91
7.1	Introduction	91
7.2	Plate Margins	92
7.2.1	Convergent Margins	92
7.2.2	Extensional Margins	95
	References	98

Symbols

Φ	Porosity
Φ_0	Average surface porosity of the surface clays
c	A constant
z	Burial depth
ρ_h	Hydrostatic pressure
γ_w	Specific weight of water
h	Height of column of water
G_h	Hydrostatic pressure gradient
P	Pore pressure
σ_v	Overburden stress
σ_e	Effective stress
α	Biot's effective stress coefficient
R_n	Resistivity normal trend
R	Resistivity log
X	Normal compaction trend
Δt	Interval transit time
Δt_n	Interval transit time normal trend
Y	Pore pressure gradient
P_f	Formation fluid pressure
α_v	Normal overburden stress gradient
β	Normal fluid pressure gradient
Z	Depth
Δt	Sonic transit time
A, B	Parameters
P_B	Pore pressure
σ_A	Effective stress at A
P_{NA}	Hydrostatic normal pore pressure at point A
OB_B	Overburden pressure at point B
OB_A	Overburden pressure at point A
σ_M	Mean effective stress
σ	Vertical effective stress

σ_h	Minimum horizontal stress
σ_H	Maximum horizontal effective stress
V	Sonic velocity
V_{\min}	Minimum sonic velocity of the rock matrix
V_{\max}	Maximum sonic velocity of the rock matrix
Σ	Vertical effective stress
P	Pore pressure
ρ_{\max}	Maximum matrix density
ρ_f	Fluid density
Δt_f	Interval transit time of fluid
Δt_n	Interval transit time for the normal pressure in shales
Δt	Transit time of shale
V_p	Compressional wave velocity
V_{ml}	Mudline velocity
U	Parameter representing uplift of the sediments
σ_{\max}	Effective stress
v	Velocity
V_m	Sonic interval velocity with the shale matrix
a_m	Ratio of the loading and unloading velocities in the effective stress curves
V_{\max}	Velocity at the start of unloading
P_{ulo}	Pore pressure due to unloading
\emptyset_{RHOB}	Porosity from density log
ρ_{ma}	Matrix density
ρ_b	Bulk density measured by log
ρ_{fi}	Fluid density
Δt_{ma}	Interval transit time of the matrix
Δt_{fi}	Fluid transit time
Δt	Average interval transit time from log
\emptyset_{DT}	Porosity from sonic log
\emptyset_{RILD}	Porosity from resistivity log
R_w	Formation water resistivity
n	Saturation exponent
m	Cementation exponent
R_t	True resistivity of the formation
t_{ma}	Sonic transit time of the rock matrix
ϕ_z	Porosity at depth z
ϕ_0	Porosity at the surface
b	A constant
Δt	Transit time measured by the sonic log

Δt_0	Transit time at the present sedimentary surface
c	Compaction coefficient
z	Burial depth
Δt_0	Transit time near to the transit time of water

List of Figures

Fig. 1.1	Compaction models shown by porosity versus depth of burial. Inter-relationship for shales and argillaceous sediments: 1–9: Different curves. Modified after Fig. 17 of Rieke and Chilingarian (1974)	2
Fig. 1.2	a Bulk density versus depth relationship for shales from Oklahoma (U.S.A). b Porosity versus depth relationship for shales from Oklahoma (U.S.A) (Modified after Fig. 14 of Rieke and Chilingarian 1974)	2
Fig. 1.3	Comparison between Athy’s and Hedberg’s compaction curves. Modified after Chapman (1994)	3
Fig. 1.4	Different stages of compaction effect on clay diagenesis. a Clays consist of bound water at the time of deposition. b Free water increases with burial with the consequent release of boundwater. c Free water is squeezed out and the original volume reduces (Fig. 57 in Rieke and Chilingarian 1974)	3
Fig. 1.5	Comparison of normal depth profile curve. Athy’s original curve, shale compaction profile curve from Nagaoka basin, Gulf coast, and Beaufort Mackenzie delta. Porosity data derived from density log (Burrus 1998)	5
Fig. 1.6	Mechanical compaction in sands. Fine grained sands compact easily than core grained sand (Chuhan et al. 2002)	6
Fig. 1.7	Changes in sand compaction with burial (Bjørlykke et al. 2004)	7
Fig. 2.1	Latitude-wise distribution of organisms (Moore 2001)	10
Fig. 2.2	The dashed line represents the predicted growth and the open circles represent the actual growth of the corals (Moore 2001)	10

Fig. 2.3	Three carbonate factories with different mineralogical contents (Schlager 2005)	12
Fig. 2.4	Different modes of precipitation of carbonate factories (Schlager 2005)	12
Fig. 2.5	Depth of occurrence of carbonate factories along with production rate (Schlager 2005)	13
Fig. 2.6	Porosity classification incorporating the details about the depositional as well as the diagenetic changes and are as categorised as fabric selective, not fabric selective and fabric selective or not category (Scholle 1978)	15
Fig. 3.1	Typical hydrostatic pressure, pore pressure, overburden stress in a borehole well (Zhang 2011)	20
Fig. 3.2	Pressure versus depth plot showing “overpressure” zones when the pressure is more than hydrostatic. “Underpressure zones” develops when the pressure is less than the hydrostatic pressure (Swarbrick and Osborne 1998; Swarbrick et al. 2002)	21
Fig. 3.3	Maximum pressure generation due to hydrocarbon buoyancy in North Sea (Swarbrick and Osborne 1998)	23
Fig. 3.4	Vertical and horizontal methods of pore pressure estimation. Pore pressure indicator is used as the same value as the normal trend (point A) in vertical method of pore pressure estimation. Whereas, in horizontal method, the effective stress data is estimated from the normal trend (point B) (Bowers 2001)	24
Fig. 3.5	Pore pressure versus resistivity crossplot (Owolabi et al. 1990)	25
Fig. 3.6	Published pore pressure crossplots for sonic transit time (Owolabi et al. 1990)	25
Fig. 3.7	Vertical effective stress methods (Bowers 2001)	27
Fig. 3.8	Scenario where vertical effective stress method fails	27
Fig. 4.1	Log pattern of Not formation along with helium calculated porosities. Some parts of the Not formation are affected by poor hole conditions (3968–3993 m). Modified after Hermanrud et al. (1998)	33
Fig. 4.2	Log pattern of Ror formation along with helium calculated porosities. Some average porosities were calculated for all the shaly formations in the Upper and lower Ror formations. Modified after Hermanrud et al. (1998)	34
Fig. 4.3	Average porosities calculated in Not formation from a Sonic (DT) log, b Density (Rhob), c Resistivity (Rt) and d neutron log. Each of the pressure regimes are indicated by different symbols. Modified after Hermanrud et al. (1998)	35

Fig. 4.4	Average porosities calculated in Ror Formation from a Sonic (DT) log, b Density (Rho _b), c Resistivity (Rt) and d neutron log. Each of the pressure regimes are indicated by different symbols. Modified after Hermanrud et al. (1998)	35
Fig. 4.5	Pore structure model of a rock, constituting storage pores with high aspect ratio and connecting pores with low aspect ratio. Modified after Bowers and Katsube (2002)	36
Fig. 4.6	Cartoon depicting the wireline responses in a overpressure generated due to compaction disequilibrium process, b overpressure generated due to unloading process (Ramdhan et al. 2011)	37
Fig. 4.7	Well from Gulf of Mexico showing the typical response due to unloading. At the onset of overpressure zone the extent of response shown by sonic velocity and resistivity log is more than that of the density log. Modified after Bowers and Katsube (2002)	38
Fig. 4.8	Velocity versus density crossplot for identifying unloading behaviour. Modified after Bowers (2001)	38
Fig. 4.9	Detection of unloading behaviour a Velocity versus effective stress, velocity reversal along with reduction in effective stress. b Density versus effective stress, effective stress reduction but density remains constant (Bowers 2001)	39
Fig. 4.10	Cartoon showing the overpressure trends possibly due to unloading. a Fluid pressure versus depth trend; b shale porosity versus depth trend; c shale porosity versus effective stress, and d bulk density versus velocity trend.	39
Fig. 4.11	Map of Malay basin with well locations (Hoesni 2004)	40
Fig. 4.12	Sonic velocity-effective stress plot showing the normally pressured data following loading curve whereas Mildly overpressured (11.5–14 MPa km ⁻¹), Moderately Overpressured (14–17 MPa km ⁻¹) & Highly Overpressured (>17 MPa km ⁻¹) data falling off the loading curve. Overpressure in the formation following the unloading curve is because of the fluid expansion, load transfer or vertical transfer mechanism. Most of the data representing unloading curve (Tingay et al. 2013)	42
Fig. 4.13	Sonic velocity-effective stress plot of the three formations 2A, 2b and 2C. Dark grey dots with pressure >11.5 MPa km ⁻¹ (0.51 psi ft ⁻¹) represent the unloading curve and the normally pressured (hydrostatic pressure)	

	wireline formation tester data represent the loading curve (Tingay et al. 2013)	43
Fig. 4.14	Sonic velocity-effective stress plot of 49 data with excellent mobility (>10 mD/cp). Low mobility formation show inaccurate measurements (Tingay et al. 2013)	44
Fig. 4.15	Sonic velocity versus density to distinguish overpressure generated by fluid expansion mechanism (Adapted from Hoesni 2004; O'Conner et al. 2011; Tingay et al. 2013). Data of the formation in which overpressure is generated by compaction disequilibrium follow the loading curve. Mechanisms related to clay diagenesis and load transfer shows drastic increase in the density and little change in the sonic velocity. Overpressure generation due to gas generation shows severe drop in sonic velocity with little or no increase in density	44
Fig. 4.16	Cross plot between Sonic velocity versus density for four wells in Malay basin. The normally pressured sediments are represented by white squares and they follow the loading curve. The loading curve are the data of normally pressured formations and are shown by white squares. As discussed in the text, the part of the sequences within the overpressure transition zone is represented by gray squares, the center of the overpressured zone is represented by black squares (After Tingay et al. 2013)	45
Fig. 4.17	Porosity (sonic velocity) versus effective stress plot distinguishing the overpressure due to compaction disequilibrium (black dots) and fluid expansion mechanism (ash colored squares). The normal pressured data following the loading curve is defined by small grey colored dots (after Tingay et al. 2009)	46
Fig. 4.18	Velocity versus density crossplot from the onshore wells of Niger delt. Adapted after Nwozor et al. (2013).	46
Fig. 4.19	Velocity versus vertical effective stress crossplot from the onshore wells of Niger delt (Nwozor et al. 2013)	46
Fig. 4.20	a Sonic velocity versus effective stress crossplot for the wells in the northern part. 170 Wireline formation tester data were used to calculate the vertical effective stress. Pore pressure data >11.5 MPa km ⁻¹ fall off the loading curve and delineate the unloading zones, b Pore pressure from 140 wireline formation tester data were plotted in sonic velocity versus effective stress plot for southern NEC block, all the pore pressure >11.5 MPa km ⁻¹ follow the loading curve and signifies overpressure due to undercompaction (John et al. 2014).	47

Fig. 4.21	<p>a Sonic velocity versus density crossplot for the wells in the northern part. 170 Wireline formation tester data were used for the study. Pore pressure data $>11.5 \text{ MPa km}^{-1}$ fall off the loading curve and delineate the unloading zones representing sharp reduction in sonic velocity and constant density. b Pore pressure from 140 wireline formation tester data were plotted in sonic velocity versus density plot for southern NEC block, all the pore pressure $>11.5 \text{ MPa km}^{-1}$ follow the loading curve and signifies overpressure due to undercompaction (John et al. 2014)</p>	47
Fig. 5.1	<p>Global occurrence of overpressure zones taken from Bigelow (1994a, b) and physical world map of geology.com</p>	53
Fig. 5.2	<p>Abnormal formation pressure environments in Iran (Fertl 1976)</p>	54
Fig. 5.3	<p>Location map of the central graben and the quadrant is the licensing structure in the United Kingdom Continental of the area (Holm 1998)</p>	55
Fig. 5.4	<p>The Forties Montrose High divides the graben into eastern and western grabens. The oil and gas fields are from Devonian to early Eocene age and the major formations are Upper Jurassic Fulmar Sandstone, Upper Cretaceous Chalk Group and the Paleocene Forties Formation (Holm 1998)</p>	56
Fig. 5.5	<p>Pressure versus depth plots. The measured pressure data from the permeable zones have been used and in the impermeable zones the pressures have been estimated by indirect methods of pressure estimation (mud-weights, D-exponents, connection gases, etc.). a Pressure versus depth plot in the Central graben area which shows the normally pressured Paleocene sandstones and beneath that there is normally pressured chalk group. There is rapid change in the profile with increase in the pore pressure from f to g and the highest at the pre-Cretaceous structure in the h. b Pressure profile of Ekofisk Field. The chalk group (c, d) is moderately overpressured (Holm 1998)</p>	57
Fig. 5.6	<p>Pressure profiles of a Ekofisk area b North sea area's Zechstein evaporate section (Rehm 1972)</p>	58
Fig. 5.7	<p>Comparison of predrill and actual pore pressure prediction in north sea area (Herring 1973)</p>	59
Fig. 5.8	<p>Schematic diagram depicts the formation of overpressure and underpressure zones as the hydrocarbon migration takes place (Holm 1998)</p>	60

Fig. 5.9	a Tectonic map of the Italian Adriatic area. b Pressure profile of a well in the Italian Adriatic area. In the zones B & C the pressure values are far beyond the normal pressure values. c Plots showing overpressured environments in Adriatic sea (Rizzi 1973)	61
Fig. 5.10	Pore pressure plot of the North Sinai basin and the Nile delta. Abnormal increase in the pore pressure and leak off test is there (Nashaat 1998)	62
Fig. 5.11	Location of Yinggehai basin in the South China sea along with the location of wells along with structural features such as faults, diapir like structures	63
Fig. 5.12	Pressure and Pressure coefficient versus depth plot of the different stratigraphic units in the Dongying depression of the Bohai Bay basin where the Es3 and Es4 are overpressured. DST denotes drill stem testing . . .	64
Fig. 5.13	Depth versus sonic, resistivity, density, calliper profile of well log data of wells in Dongying depression	65
Fig. 5.14	Shows the relationship of the fluid pressure versus depth ratio with stratigraphic horizon. The stratigraphic zones in different wells are overpressured because of the presence of apparent low permeability zone	66
Fig. 5.15	Figures showing abnormal formation pressures in Australia and Papua New Guinea area. a Location of overpressured wells. b Pressure profile of overpressured wells of Australia. c Pressure profile of overpressured wells of Papua New Guinea. (Bigelow 1994a, b)	67
Fig. 5.16	Sedimentary basins of India showing overpressure area (Sahay 1999)	68
Fig. 5.17	Details of well W-32. Courtesy: Journal Geological Society of India, Volume 75	69
Fig. 5.18	Depth versus ΔT plot of the wells in Bengal basin, the deviation from the normal compaction trend is taken as the top of the overpressure and is also confirmed with the RFT results	70
Fig. 5.19	Relationship between shale acoustic parameter difference $\Delta_{ob}(sh) - \Delta_{tn}(sh)$ from drilled wells and reservoir fluid pressure gradient (modified Hottmans curve of Bengal Basin) (Roy et al. 2010)	71
Fig. 5.20	Relation between effective stress from well data and reservoir fluid type in which below 7.9 MPa km^{-1} cut off the chances of getting hydrocarbon is minimum (John et al. 2014).	71
Fig. 5.21	Tectonic map of Krishna–Godavari basin showing location of 10 wells (Chatterjee et al. 2015)	72

Fig. 5.22	Gamma ray and resistivity log responses of wells KD & KE. Location of wells and profile is shown in Fig. 5.21 (Singha and Chatterjee 2014)	73
Fig. 5.23	a DT versus depth and density porosity sonic porosity (\emptyset_s) versus depth plot for onshore well #7. The top of overpressured zone is indicated at 1919.16 m by deviation of sonic data from NCT and separation between (\emptyset_d) and (\emptyset_s). b DT versus depth and density porosity sonic porosity (\emptyset_s) versus depth plot for offshore well #13. The top of overpressured zone is indicated at 1600 m by deviation of sonic data from NCT and separation between (\emptyset_d) and (\emptyset_s) (Chatterjee et al. 2015).	74
Fig. 5.24	Pressure, salinity and Temperature data in the offshore well Kutch basin, India (Sahay 1999)	75
Fig. 5.25	Bombay/Mumbai offshore basin with the location of Saurashtra-Dahanu block (Nambiar et al. 2011).	76
Fig. 5.26	Interval velocities of different wells plotted and the different zones with lowering of interval velocities are marked with circles and denote overpressure zones (after Nambiar et al. 2011).	76
Fig. 5.27	Location of overpressured zones in Pakistan: Potwar Plateau (a) and Makran basin (b) Modified after Law et al. (1998) incorporating Google Earth imagery	77
Fig. 5.28	Pressure and Temperature gradient in Gulf oil, FimKhassar well (Law et al. 1998)	78
Fig. 5.29	Interval transit time versus depth in the Gulf oil, FimKassar well (Law et al. 1998)	79
Fig. 6.1	Erosion thickness calculation from compaction trend curve derived from sonic transit time (Magara 1976). a No erosion and the surface transit time is equal to that of water. b Upper surface is eroded and the thickness is the vertical distance between the present surface and the original surface	85
Fig. 6.2	Compaction trend and erosional thickness from a Emblem State1 and b Bridger Butte Unit 3 by Heasler and Kharitonova (1996).	86
Fig. 6.3	Porosity versus depth curve by Burns et al. (2005) for different lithology using volume of shale cut off. a Sand ($v_{shale} < 0.01$), b Siltstone ($0.49 < v_{shale} < 0.51$) and c shale ($v_{shale} > 0.51$) along with the curves by Rowan et al. (2003).	86
Fig. 6.4	Visual comparison of sonic porosity data and Rowan et al. (2003) curves for each lithology. The vertical offset is the erosional thickness implied.	87

Fig. 6.5	Sonic velocity data and porosity from sonic data. The porosity trend can be approximated as linear trend (Li et al. 2007)	87
Fig. 6.6	Linear porosity trend of 26 wells from Xihu depression area (Li et al. 2007).	88
Fig. 7.1	The occurrence of high overpressured zones is corresponding to the fault zones. The fluid pressure estimates from consolidation tests are derived from analysis of individual samples and is in agreement with the log derived fluid pressures (Moore et al. 1995)	92
Fig. 7.2	Spike at 505 and 515 m which shows increase in porosity and decrease in resistivity through decollement zone (Saffer 2003)	93
Fig. 7.3	Annular pressure while drilling for the sites C0002, C0004, C0006 and the shallower part of the C0001 and C0003 follows the standard gradient. There is divergence in the annular pressure while drilling data in the deeper section of C0001 and C0003 section (Moore et al. 2012)	94
Fig. 7.4	Annular pressure while drilling for the sites C0001A and C0001D. In the site C0001A the standard APWD is there up to 413 mbsf, beyond this depth up to 530 mbsf there is shift in the pressure gradient and at places crosses the lithostatic gradient and later follows the stable pressure gradient. In the hole C0001D the APWD pressure is stable up to 400 mbsf but is followed by fluctuations in pressures while drilling downhole and shoots above lithostatic above 522 mbsf and remains above till 690 mbsf and similar to hole C0001A the pressure falls back to normal gradient (Moore et al. 2012)	94
Fig. 7.5	Fluid pressure gradient as a function of depth (Chilingarian and Wolf 1988)	95
Fig. 7.6	Pore pressure plot of KG basin offshore with the example of well A (Chatterjee et al. 2012)	96
Fig. 7.7	Pore pressure plot of KG basin offshore with the example of well B (Chatterjee et al. 2012).	97

List of Tables

Table 3.1	Different overpressure generation mechanisms, tabulated in different categories. Modified after (Swarbrick and Osborne 1998)	22
Table 4.1	Average porosities calculated in the Ror Formation from (a) Sonic (DT) log, (b) Density (Rho _b), (c) Resistivity (R _t), and (d) neutron log (Hermanrud et al. 1998)	36
Table 4.2	Well list with dominant pressure mechanisms (denoted by symbols) on the basis of pore pressure profile and velocity-density crossplot	41
Table 5.1	Categorization of overpressure zones (Roy et al. 2010).	53

Compaction of Sediments and Different Compaction Models

1

Abstract

Various simple and advanced models exist for mechanisms of uniform and non-uniform sediment compaction that increases density and reduces porosity. While the classical Athy's relation on depth-wise exponential reduction of porosity is not divided into any distinct stages, the Hedberg's model involves four stages. Weller's model utilized Athy's and Hedberg's relations to deduce a sediment compaction model. Power's compaction model additionally considers clay mineralogy. Several other porosity/compaction models exist, e.g., those by Teodorovich and Chernov, Burst, Beall, and Overton and Zanier. The geometry of the depth-wise porosity profile depends on the sedimentation rate, compaction mechanism and pressure solution model. This chapter reviews porosity variation with depth for the following rock types: shales, shaly sandstones, sandstones and carbonates.

acceleration of the rate of compaction of sediments seem to be the only change at <200 °F. Compaction of sediments reduces porosity and increases density (Bjørlykke et al. 2009). The reduction of porosity is a convenient way of measuring the amount of sediments compacted since deposition took place, for practical purposes. Empirical compaction curves are the plots of porosity versus depth up to ~ 6 km. Mechanical compaction being the primary mechanism of compaction, clay minerals are often utilized in many models to visualise how grains rearrange with depth. The composition varies from proximal to distal part of the basin and the compaction pattern of each sediment type differs (Bjørlykke et al. 2009). Compaction models explain the major processes for the sediment compaction. This helps the interpreters to visualise the relationship of porosity loss with depth and the probable reason for anomalous zones. The evolution of compaction models and porosity reduction with depth from different parts of the world are presented in Fig. 1.1.

1.1 Introduction

The chemical and the physical properties of sediments and sedimentary rocks alter as the overburden pressure increases. These changes relate to burial depth, temperature and time. Experiments by Warner (1964) suggested that

1.2 Porosity Models

Sediment porosities undergo changes with burial. In the consecutive sections the different models are explained.