

# Stratigraphy, Geochemistry, and Organic petrology data from the Esso Hatteras Light #1 and the Mobil State of North Carolina #3 and their effect on hydrocarbon prospectivity in coastal North Carolina

Basic organic chemistry (TOC, HI, and OI)





TOC versus remaining hydrocarbon generation potential (S2) for a etaceous samples from the Mobil State of North Carolina #3 (NC#3) and Esso Hatteras Light #1 (HL#1) wells analyzed in th rrent investigation. Insert graph shows enhanced view of samples which plot in the Organic Lean box.





**Note**: Basic organic chemistry, maturity, and geochemical plots from Weatherford Laboratories (WFT), 2017. The original Weatherford report is in Reid 2018b. Normalized oil content (NOC) = (S1/TOC) X 100.

Almy, C. C., Jr., 1987, Lithostratigraphic-seismic evaluation of hydrocarbon potential, North Carolina Coastal and Continental Margins: North Carolina Geological Survey, Open-File Report 87-03, 18p. Brown, Philip M.; Miller, James A., and Swain, Frederick M., 1972, Structural and stratigraphic framework, and spatial distribution of permeability of the Atlantic Coastal Plain, North Carolina to New York: U.S. Geological Survey, Professional Paper 796, 79p. Available on-line at URL https://pubs.er.usgs.gov/publication/pp796. Campbell, Bruce G., and Coes, Alissa L., eds., 2010, Groundwater availability in the Atlantic Coastal Plain of North and South Carolina: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1773, 241 p., 7 pls. Available on-line at URL https://pubs.usgs.gov/pp/1773/. Accessed June 15, 2018. Carolina Petroleum Company, 1919?, Details of its plans to develop oil fields along the Atlantic: Carolina Petroleum Co., Wall Street Publicity, Inc., 16p. Available on-line at URL https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=nc01.ark:/13960/t4zg7qd80; view=1up; seq=3. Accessed April 26, 2018. Carteret County News-Times (newspaper), March 25, 1960, Hope springs eternal for discovery of oil, natural gas in Coastal area (written by Wade Lucas). and R. F. Sunde, 2009 (posted 2010), Lithology-based, sequence stratigraphic framework of Lower Cretaceous-Jurassic, mixed carbonate-siliciclastic sediments, Atlantic Coastal Plain: analogs for offshore exploration along the eastern United States: AAPG Search and Discovery Article #50232, 2 p. and three posters; available on-line at http://www.searchanddiscovery.com/documents/2009/50232coffey/poster1.pdf, .../poster2.pdf, and .../poster3.pdf. Accessed April 24, 2018. Coleman, James L., Jr.; Reid, Jeffrey C., and Hall, Don L., 2014 (posted 2014), Confirmation of Hydrocarbon Shows in the Mobil #3 Offshore Hyde County Well, North Carolina: Search and Discovery.com/documents/2014/50992coleman/ndx\_coleman.pdf. Accessed April 24, 2018.

Coleman. James L., Jr., 2018. The U.S. Central Atlantic OCS Oil and Gas Potential: A look basinward from the beach: Coleman Geological Services, unpublished oral presentation at Missississippi State University. Gellici, Joseph A., and Lautier, Jeff C., 2010, Chapter B. Hydrogeologic Framework of the Atlantic Coastal Plain of North and South Carolina, U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1773, 241 p., 7 pls. Hairr. John. 2011. Nineteenth century oil exploration in North Carolina: Journal of the North Carolina Academy of Sciences, v. 127, No. 4, p. 264-274. Horton, J. Wright, Jr.; Drake, Avery A., Jr.; Rankin, Douglas W., and Dallmeyer, R. David, 1991, Preliminary Tectonostratigraphic Terrane Map of the Central and Southern Appalachians: U.S. Geological Survey Map I-2163, Scale 1:2,000,000 accompanied by text. Available on-line at URL https://pubs.er.usgs.gov/publication/i2163. Accessed April 26, 2018.

Hughes, W. B.; Holba, A. G., and L. I. P. Dzou, 1995, The ratios of dibenzothiophene to phenanthrene and lithology of petroleum source rocks: Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, v. 59, p. 3581–3598. Malinconico, MaryAnn. L., and Weems, R. W., 2010, Thermal maturity of the U. S. Atlantic Coastal Plain based on legacy exploration of Petroleum Geologists Annual Meeting Program, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 11-14, 2010. Mansfield, Wendell C., 1927, Oil-prospecting near Havelock North Carolina: North Carolina Geological Survey, Economic Paper 58, 19p. Post, Paul J.; Reid, Jeffrey C., and Coleman, James L. Jr., 2018, Petroleum systems of coastal North Carolina: What we know, what we think we know, what we think we know, and the range of uncertainty in the interpretation of geochemical data: Conjugate Margins Conference 2018, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Program & Abstracts (ISBN: 0-9810595-7), p. 119.

Reid, Jeffrey C.; Coleman, James L., Jr., and Post, Paul J., 2018a, Stratigraphy, Geochemistry, and Organic petrology data from the Esso Hatteras Light #1 and the Mobil State of North Carolina #3 and their effect on hydrocarbon prospectivity in coastal North Carolina: Conjugate Margins Conference 2018, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Dalhousie Univeristy, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Program & Abstracts (ISBN: 0-9810595-7), p. 136-137. Reid, Jeffrey C.; Coleman, James L., Jr., and Post, Paul J., 2018b, Stratigraphy, Geochemistry, and Organic petrology data from the Esso Hatteras Light #1 and their effect on hydrocarbon prospectivity in coastal North Carolina #3 and their effect on hydrocarbon prospectivity in coastal North Carolina: North Carolina Beological Survey, Open-File Report 2018-06 (three panel poster). Reid, Jeffrey C., 2018b, Release of report, "Geochemical evaluation of Lower Cretaceous sedimentary rocks in two wells, Atlantic Coastal Plain, North Carolina, USA, "Weatherford Laboratories Study Project No. BH-94252, November 20, 2017, Report contributors: Tim Ruble (Petroleum geochemistry), Wayne Knowles (Organic petrology), Elizabeth Roberts (Compiler), and Gabrie Rotberg (Isologica Data Processing): North Carolina Geological Survey, Open-File Report 2018-05, 4p. plus Appendix.

Richards, Horace G., 1947, Developments in Atlantic Coastal States between New Jersey and North Carolina in 1946: Bulletin of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, Vol. 31, No. 6, p. 1106-1108. Richards, Horace G., 1954, Developments in the Atlantic Coastal States between New Jersey and South Carolina in 1953: Bulletin of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists: Vol. 38, No. 6, p. 1252-1253. Richards, Horace G., 1967, Stratigraphy of Atlantic Coastal Plain Between Long Island and Georgia: Review: Bulletin of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, Vol. 51, No. 12, p. 2400-2429. Spangler, Walter B., 1950, Subsurface Geology of the Atlantic Coastal Plain of North Carolina: Bulletin of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, Vol. 34, No. 1, p. 100-132. The Enterprise (newspaper), September 29, 1924, "Very rich oil sand" reached at Havelock.

The Pilot (newspaper), November 4, 1931, Local concern engaged by New York interests to drill for oil in the State. Weatherford Laboratories, November 20, 2017, Geochemical evaluation of Lower Cretaceous sedimentary rocks in two wells, Atlantic Coastal Plain, North Carolina, USA, Study Project No. BH-94252, Report contributors: Ruble, Tim; Knowles, Wayne; Roberts, Elizabeth, and Rotberg, Gabriel, 35p. Weems, Robert E.; Seefelt, Ellen L.; Wrenge, Beth M.; Self-Trail, Jean M.; Prowell, David C.; Durand, Coleen; Cobbs III, Eugene F., and McKinney, Keven C., 2007, Preliminary physical data of the USGS Hope Plantation core (BE-110), Bertie County, North Carolina: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2007-1251, 163p. Available on-line at URL https://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2007/1251/. Accessed June 11, 2018.

Zarra, Larry, 1990, Sequence stratigraphy and foraminiferal biostratigraphy for selected wells in the Albemarle Embayment, North Carolina: North Carolina Geological Survey, Open-file report 89-05, 48p, 3 plates. Available on-line at URL https://deg.nc.gov/about/divisions/energy-mineral-land-resources/north-carolina-geological-survey/ncgs-maps/open-file-reports-maps-2004-to-1943. Accessed June 11, 2018.

## Acknowledgements

- The authors acknowledge and appreciate the spirit of collaboration between the staff of the North Carolina Geological Survey (NCGS) and Weatherford Laboratories in processing the samples for analysis. We particularly thank Wayne Knowles and Tim Ruble for their contributions to their report. - MaryAnn L. Malinconico allowed use of her Esso Hatteras Light #1 existing vitrinite plugs as part of this study. - We are grateful to GeoSpec, a CGG company, for allowing the publication of the seismic data that have been depth-converted and time-migrated. The assistance of J. Danford and M. Paton of GeoSpec is greatly appreciated. - Katherine J. Marciniak and Walter T. Haven assisted with field sample collection and retrieval of samples from the North Carolina Geological Survey's core repository. - Funding for the laboratory analyses was provided by the North Carolina General Assembly (FY 2014-15) as part of appropriations geological studies of the State's hydrocarbon potential. - Photographs of the Esso Hatteras Light #1 well being drilled are courtesy of the Standard Oil (New Jersey) Collection, University of Louisville Photographic Archives - URL http://digital.library.louisville.edu/cdm/description/collection/sonj. - Kenneth B. Taylor and Ryan A. Channell provided constructive review comments on drafts of this poster.

- Contact the State Geologist, North Carolina Geological Survey, Raleigh, NC, to arrange access to well records, logs, and core and cutting samples. The agency's repository is located in Raleigh, NC.



## Kerogen facies and Maturity



Hydrogen Index (HI) versus Tmax plot of the Lower Cretaceous samples from the two wells examined in the current investigation. Samples with Tmax <435 °C are immature.



Production Index (PI) versus Tmax plot of the Lower Cretaceous samples from the two wells examined in the current investigation. Trend envelop shown by dashed li is based on WFT Labs analysis of over 5,000 shale samples.



Thermal maturation based on measured vitrinite reflectance (%VR) versus depth for the samples examined in this study l by Weatherford petrologist initials WRK) and pre-eixstin client vitrinite reflectance on samples from the Esso Hattera Light #1(HL#1) well (petrologist initials MLM). The dashed trend line incorporates WRK data for the Esso Hatteras Light #1 (HL#1) well, while the solid trend line is for the MLM data set. The two samples from the Mobil State of North Carolina #3 (NC#3) wel are shown against these trend lines and were not incorporat into the calculated results.





## Esso Hatteras Light #1 (HL#1) - History of reported oil staining



(Left) - Esso Hatters Light #1 well. Annotations below provide a historical perspective of the recognition of oil staining ranging from none in the original description (Spangler, 1950) to specific interals with oil staining noted by multiple contributors.

Plot shows available cored intervals, and formation tops.

Also shown are total organic carbon (TOC) analyses determined during this study. Over-all the TOC analyses are less than 1.0 wt. %. While a non-effective source, hydrocarbons can be generated but not effectively expelled.

The lithologic log for the Esso Hatteras Light #1well is from Brown *et al.*, 1972, Plate 30. Color and lithology key



Values from Esso #1 Hatteras Light Rock-Eval estimates the organic matter's hydrogen content with the S2 value, a quantification of the amount of hydrocarbons formed during the thermal decomposition of the kerogen measured in milligrams of hydrocarbons per gram of rock. By combining TOC and S2, you can get an idea of how much organic matter is present and how much hydrogen is associated with it, essentially how rich the source rock may be.



pristane/phytane allow the depositional environment of a source rock to be deduced (Hughes et al., 1995). Thi suggests a Marine Shale source facies for both wells.

# **INITIAL ESSO HATTERAS LIGHT #1 ANALYSES**

"No occurrences of oil or gas were found."

Spangler, AAPG v. 34, p. 100–132, 1950

# THEN OTHERS LOOKED AT THE WELL CUTTINGS & CORES, AND **REPORTED OIL STAINING**

Undated post-drill sample log Sinclair Oil Co. (pre-dates 2008)

Malinconico (unpublished 2008) organic petrology

6734' – 6744' oil stain 6909' – 6918' oil stain

@ ~7150' Questionable sl. oil stains in white fine xln. highly ool Is

\_\_\_\_\_ <u>\*\*\*</u>\_\_\_\_\_ <u>\*</u>\_\_\_\_\_ \*

(07) (0.0) MV 0 0 0 0000 20 0 00000 20

\_\_\_\_\_

7949' – 7951' oil stain

@~8500' White por consl ss tr lignite, spotty dead oil residue tr lignite "Greasy" app oil stained ss

8500' – 8510' oil stain

8917' – 8922' oil stain

Oil staining rept'd by Coffey & Sunde, 2009 8400 

\_\_\_\_\_

## North Carolina Geological Survey Open-File Report 2018-06

**Biomarker** 



A cross-plot of dibenzothiophene to phenanthrene and

## Mobil State of North Carolina #3 (NC#3) SATURATE GCMS Sample Type: Composit Geologic Age: Top Depth: 5930.00 Bottom Depth: 7309.00 Well Name: Mo/ Latitude: 0 \_ongitude: 0.34 M 0.55 (0 $+C_{22})/(C_{27}+C_{28}+C_{29})$ (217) 0.20 0.50 M/D 1.00 (1.4 0.31 M m/z 218: ββ Steranes M2170665.D H32 S/(R+S) Homohopanes 0.54 M 0.60 (0.6 4 Tetracyclic/C26 Tricyclics 1.52 D 24 Tricyclic terpanes 23 Tricyclic terpanes 6/C25 Tricyclic terpanes clic terpanes/Hopanes Definition and utility of the ratios can be found on our website www.brilabs.com =Source Age; D=Depositional environment; M= Maturity



**AROMATIC BIOMARKER** 

Veatherford

<sup>1</sup>Definition and utilit <sup>2</sup>A=Source Age; D<sup>2</sup> <sup>3</sup>Thermal equilibriur

lity of the ratios can be found on our w ebsite w w w .brilabs.com D=Depositional environment; M= Maturity um value of the biomarker ratio and in brackets the approximate VR value at w hich this value is reached		<sup>1</sup> Definition and utility of the ratios can be found on our w ebsite w w w .brilabs.com <sup>2</sup> A=Source Age; D=Depositional environment; M= Maturity <sup>3</sup> Thermal equilibrium value of the biomarker ratio and in brackets the approximate VR value at w hich this value is reached		
/ell	TOC %	%Ro	%Ro	<b>Onset Oil Generation</b>
	Range / Av.	Depth (ft)	Range	(%Ro 0.60*)
				Depth
				(ft)
so Hatteras Light #1	0.01 – 1.05 / 0.17	810 - 9,750	0.30 - 0.66	~9,200
obil St. of NC #3	$0.01 - 9.30 / 0.73^{(1)}$	5,985	0.47	Not Reached
	$0.01 - 1.91 / 0.50^{(2)}$	6,755	0.46	

\* "A logarithmic regression line based on all samples containing representative vitrinite produce a trend that suggests onset of oil generation window (0.6%Ro) occurs at approximately 9,200'."

(1) including the value of 9.3 @ 6,750'

(2) excluding the value of 9.3 @ 6,750'

Mobil State of North Carolina #3 (NC#3) and Esso Hatteras Light #1 (HL#1) geochemical study results summary.

# TOCs are low: Are the oils *in situ* or migrated?

TOC >1.0 TOC <1.0 Non-effective source rock, can generate source, can generate hydrocarbons, hydrocarbons, TOC must be >2.0 before but not effectively effective expel them



0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0 1.2 1.4 1.6 1.8 2.0 TOC*,* wt. %

## **Discussion and Conclusions**

- Drilling for oil/gas in coastal NC began in 1921. Thermogenic oil and/or gas shows have been reported in at least 19 wells, and oil occurrences were described in local, early 20<sup>th</sup> century newspapers. No reports of thermogenic oil/gas shows have been found in wells in similar settings in VA, SC, and GA. No onshore, or offshore commercial oil/gas fields have been found to date. Geological and geochemical data from this study indicate potential source rock sampled intervals in the studied wells are too thin, organically lean, and immature to source commercial volumes of oil and/or natural gas conventional or unconventional hydrocarbons in the onshore or state waters of NC. Regional subsurface correlations do not indicate thickening or better in any of these intervals.
- In conjunction with present-day and paleo heat flow and the shallow depth of "basement", the sedimentary stratigraphic column is too thin to have buried any potential source rocks if they had sufficient TOC (which they do not) deeply enough to achieve hydrocarbon maturation levels greater than the earliest onset of oil generation (~VR\_>0.6).
- Direct evidence from organic petrology and fluid inclusion stratigraphy with petrography confirm that oil and natural gas are found in microscopic (and possibly larger?) quantities in several intervals of the two study wells. Reports of thermogenic oil/gas shows appear to be restricted to the area associated with the "Carolina Ridge Complex".
- Fluid inclusion stratigraphy (Coleman et al., 2014) documented long chain heavy atomic unit molecules indicating oil in the lower portion of the State of North Carolina #3 (NC#3)well, and updip of the Esso Hatteras Light #1 (HL#1) well. Possible occurrences of mobile hydrocarbons were detected by organic petrology in Tertiary strata at a depth of ~810 ft in the Esso Hatteras Light #1(HL#1) well.
- Constraints on source rocks and thermal maturity are:
- To the west, the sedimentary section is thinner, and crops out, resulting in lower and thermal maturity, • Finding other sedimentary rocks deeper is precluded by the Esso Hatteras Light #1 (HL#1) well that terminated in "medium-
- coarse crystalline granite with pegmatitic texture and some schistosity" at a measured depth of 10,054 ft, • Along strike, wells in the adjacent states of VA, SC, and GA do not have thermogenic hydrocarbon shows, and • Sedimentary strata seaward and downdip are interpreted to have higher thermal maturity based on a thicker sedimentary
- column, and possibly a higher organic matter content. - Biomarkers in aggregated samples appear to originate from marine shale source rocks at immature/early maturity levels of
- thermal maturity. Oleanane suggests the hydrocarbons are Cretaceous or Jurassic age. This is in contrast to Coffey and Sunde (2009) who favored a carbonate-rich source rock. - Variably mature, marginal to good quality source rocks are known to be present downdip in the Federal Outer Continental Shelf
- (OCS) area at DSDP 603B, and to the north in the Baltimore Canyon Trough. - Hydrocarbon chimneys indicating vertical migration or leakage in the sedimentary column are visible on reflection seismic data in the U.S. Atlantic OCS area downdip from the NC study area.
- Anomalously high %R\_ values within the overall population of those identified in the Esso Hatteras Light #1 (HL#1) may be due to allochthonous kerogen. These values suggest that their provenance may be from nearby (to the west) exposed Triassic rift basins of the Piedmont. Analyses of these basins indicate  $\sim$ 3,300 ft. –  $\sim$ 10,000 ft of syn-rift strata were removed during their inversion, exhumation, and erosion. A heavy mineral provenance study will test this hypothesis.
- The *in situ* or migrated nature of the hydrocarbons remains problematic. Biomarkers suggest an *in situ* origin. However, in the HL#1, interpreted mobile hydrocarbons were detected at ~815 ft in Tertiary strata, and solid bitumen and migrabitumen sporadically were identified in Cretaceous rocks. These, the lack of viable source rocks, and low level of thermal maturity suggest their relation to a migration focus, the "Carolina Ridge Complex". Both interpretations suggest better hydrocarbon source rock potential and generation-expulsion-migration may exist farther offshore in deep water OCS Assessment Units interpreted by the U.S. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. Sea-surface hydrocarbon seepage slicks identified on satellite synthetic aperture radar images, and hydrocarbon-related diagenetic zones and "chimneys" interpreted on reflection seismic data suggest vertical hydrocarbon migration in this area (Post *et al.,* 2018). An analog for the Carolina Ridge Complex could be the plunging South Tano Nose offshore Ghana. This feature is a migration focus for Jubilee and its satellite fields that have discovered resources of >1 Billion barrels of oil equivalent, and the TEN field complex where 555 Million barrels of oil equivalent have been discovered.



