

ANALYSIS OF CHEROKEE GROUP CUTTINGS SAMPLES FOR GAS CONTENT  
-- DART CHEROKEE BASIN OPERATING COMPANY  
#A4-35 STAIR;  
sec. 35-T.33S.-R.15E., MONTGOMERY COUNTY, KS

By

Stephen Schurger  
and  
K. David Newell



Kansas Geological Survey  
The University of Kansas  
1930 Constant Avenue  
Lawrence, KS 66047-3726

May 9, 2006  
(to be held proprietary to May 9, 2007)

*Disclaimer*

*The Kansas Geological Survey does not guarantee this document to be free from errors or inaccuracies and disclaims any responsibility or liability for interpretations based on data used in the production of this document or decisions based thereon. This report is intended to make results of research available at the earliest possible date, but it is not intended to constitute final or formal publication.*

## SUMMARY

Cuttings samples from the Pennsylvanian Cherokee Group were collected from the Dart Cherokee Basin #A4-35 Stair, NE NE 35-T.33S.-R.15E., Montgomery County, KS. The samples calculate as having the following gas contents:

- Little Osage Shale at 785'<sup>1</sup> (16 scf/ton)
- Excello Shale at 821' depth<sup>2</sup> (~55 scf/ton)
- Bevier coal at 868' depth<sup>3</sup> (--- scf/ton)
- Croweburg coal at 884' depth<sup>4</sup> (523 scf/ton)
- Weir-Pittsburg coal at 1013' depth<sup>5</sup> (--- scf/ton)

<sup>1</sup> no significant coal in sample, results are unclear due to small amount of sample

<sup>2</sup> no significant coal in sample

<sup>3</sup> no significant coal or dark shale in sample

<sup>4</sup> assuming accompanying dark shales in sample desorb 20 scf/ton; results difficult to interpret due to low percentage of coal in sample, and concomitant high gas content of associated shale

<sup>5</sup> small amount of coal in the sample and relatively high gas content of associated shale causes uncertainty in determining the gas content of the coal

## BACKGROUND

The Dart Cherokee Basin #A4-35 Stair, NE NE 35-T.33S.-R.15E., Montgomery County, KS, was selected for cuttings desorption tests in association with an on-going coalbed gas research project at the Kansas Geological Survey. The samples were gathered November 28, 2005 by personnel from Dart Cherokee Basin L.L.C., and soon turned over to LeaAnn Davidson of the Kansas Geological Survey. Samples were obtained during normal drilling of the well, with no cessation of drilling before zones of interest (i.e., coals and dark shales in the Cherokee Group) were penetrated.

The samples were canistered, with surface time and canistering times noted. These samples were collected in canisters that were supplied by Dart Cherokee Basin L.L.C. and the Kansas Geological Survey. Lag times for samples to reach the surface (important were determined by the wellsite geologist and driller.

The cuttings samples from the Pennsylvanian Cherokee Group were:

- Little Osage Shale at 785' (151 grams)
- Excello Shale at 821' depth (319 grams)
- Bevier coal at 868' depth (392 grams)
- Croweburg coal at 884' depth (673 grams)
- Weir-Pittsburg coal at 1013' depth (1098 grams)

If correct wellsite procedures were followed, the cuttings were caught in kitchen strainers as they exited the air-stream pipe emptying to the mud pit. The samples were then washed in water while in the kitchen strainers to rid them of as much drilling mud as

possible before the cuttings were placed in desorption canisters. Water with zephryn chloride biocide was then added to the canisters, with a headspace of 1 to 2 inches being preserved at the top of the canister.

Desorption measurements at the Kansas Geological Survey in Lawrence, KS were continued at approximately 70 °F. Desorption measurements were periodically made until the canisters produced negligible gas with daily testing for at least two successive days.

## DESORPTION MEASUREMENTS

The equipment and method for measuring desorption gas is that prescribed by McLennan and others (1995). The volumetric displacement apparatus is a set of connected dispensing burettes, one of which measures the gas evolved from the desorption canister. The other burette compensates for the compression that occurs when the desorbed gas displaces the water in the measuring burette. This compensation is performed by adjusting the cylinders so that their water levels are identical, then figuring the amount of gas that evolved by reading the difference in water level using the volumetric scale on the side of the burette.

The desorption canisters were obtained from SSD, Inc. in Grand Junction, CO. These canisters are 12.5 inches high (32 cm), 3 1/2 inches (9 cm) in diameter, and enclose a volume of approximately 150 cubic inches (2450 cm<sup>3</sup>). The desorbed gas that collected in the desorption canisters was periodically released into the volumetric displacement apparatus and measured as a function of time, temperature and atmospheric pressure.

The time and atmospheric pressure were measured in the field using a portable weather station (model BA928) marketed by Oregon Scientific (Tualatin, OR). The atmospheric pressure was displayed in millibars on this instrument, however, this measurement was not the actual barometric pressure, but rather an altitude-compensated barometric pressure automatically converted to a sea-level-equivalent pressure. In order to translate this measurement to actual atmospheric pressure, a regression correlation was determined over several weeks by comparing readings from the Oregon Scientific instrument to that from a pressure transducer in the Petrophysics Laboratory in the Kansas Geological Survey in Lawrence, Kansas (Figure 1). The regression equation shown graphically in Figure 1 was entered into a spreadsheet and was used to automatically convert the millibar measurement to barometric pressure in pounds per square inch (psi).

A spreadsheet program written by K.D. Newell (Kansas Geological Survey) was used to convert all gas volumes at standard temperature and pressure. Conversion of gas volumes to standard temperature and pressure was by application of the perfect-gas equation, obtainable from basic college chemistry texts:

$$n = PV/RT$$

where n is moles of gas, T is degrees Kelvin (i.e., absolute temperature), V is in liters, and R is the universal gas constant, which has a numerical value depending on the units in which it is measured (for example, in the metric system  $R = 0.0820$  liter atmosphere per degree mole). The number of moles of gas (i.e., the value n) is constant in a volumetric conversion, therefore the conversion equation, derived from the ideal gas equation, is:

$$(P_{\text{stp}} V_{\text{stp}})/(RT_{\text{stp}}) = (P_{\text{rig}} V_{\text{rig}})/(RT_{\text{rig}})$$

Customarily, standard temperature and pressure for gas volumetric measurements in the oil industry are 60 °F and 14.7 psi (see Dake, 1978, p. 13), therefore  $P_{\text{stp}}$ ,  $V_{\text{stp}}$ , and  $T_{\text{stp}}$ , respectively, are pressure, volume and temperature at standard temperature and pressure, where standard temperature is degrees Rankine ( $^{\circ}\text{R} = 460 + ^{\circ}\text{F}$ ).  $P_{\text{rig}}$ ,  $V_{\text{rig}}$ , and  $T_{\text{rig}}$ , respectively, are ambient pressure, volume and temperature measurements taken at the rig site or in the desorption laboratory.

The universal gas constant R drops out as this equation is simplified and the determination of  $V_{\text{stp}}$  becomes:

$$V_{\text{stp}} = (T_{\text{stp}}/T_{\text{rig}}) (P_{\text{rig}}/P_{\text{stp}}) V_{\text{rig}}$$

The conversion calculations in the spreadsheet were carried out in the English metric system, as this is the customary measure system used in American coal and oil industry. V is therefore converted to cubic feet; P is psia; T is °R.

The desorbed gas was summed over the time period for which the coal samples evolved all of their gas.

Lost gas for samples (i.e., the gas lost from the sample from the time it was drilled, brought to the surface, to the time it was canistered) are normally determined using the direct method (Kissel and others, 1975; also see McLennan and others, 1995, p. 6.1-6.14) in which the cumulative gas evolved is plotted against the square root of elapsed time. Time zero is assumed to be the moment that the rock is cut and its cuttings circulated off bottom. Lost gas, however, had to be inferred for the samples collected from this well because no desorption apparatus was on site when those samples were collected. The procedure used to infer lost gas for these samples is outlined in the section below on Lost Gas.

## LITHOLOGIC ANALYSIS

Upon removal from the canisters, the cuttings were washed of drilling mud, and dried in air for at least a week. After drying, the cuttings were weighed and then dry sieved into 5 size fractions:  $>0.0930''$ ,  $>0.0661''$ ,  $>0.0460''$ ,  $>0.0331''$ , and  $<0.0331''$ . For large sample sizes, the cuttings were ran through a sample splitter and a lesser portion (approximately

75 grams) were sieved and weighed, and the derived size-fraction ratios were applied to the entire sample.

The size fractions were then inspected and sorted by hand under a dissecting microscope. Three major lithologic categories were differentiated: coal, dark shales (generally Munsell rock colors N3 (dark gray), N2 (grayish black), and N1 (black) on dry surface), and lighter-colored lithologies and/or dark and light-colored carbonates. The lighter-colored lithologies are considered to be incapable of generating significant amounts of gas. After sorting, and for every size class, each of these three lithologic categories was weighed and the proportion of coal dark shale and light-colored lithologies were determined for the entire cuttings sample based on the weight percentages.

## DATA PRESENTATION

Data and analyses accompanying this report are presented in the following order: 1) data tables for the desorption analyses, 2) lost-gas graphs, 3) "lithologic component sensitivity analyses" showing the interdependence of gas evolved from dark shale versus coal in each sample, 4) a summary component analysis for all samples showing relative reliability of the data from all the samples.

### *Data Tables of the Desorption Analyses (Table 1)*

These are the basic data used for lost-gas analysis and determination of total gas desorbed from the cuttings samples. Basic temperature, volume, and barometric measurements are listed at left. Farther to the right, these are converted to standard temperature, pressure and volumes. The volumes are cumulatively summed, and converted to scf/ton based on the total weight of coal and dark shale in the sample. At the right of the table, the time of the measurements are listed and converted to hours (and square root of hours) since the sample was drilled.

### *Lost-Gas Graphs (Figure 2, 3)*

Surface and canistering times for each sample were noted by the wellsite geologist. Bottom hole time was inferred by subtracting lag time from surface time, with lag time determined from a depth-lag-time plot for a nearby well (Figure 2). To infer an approximate lost-gas value for each sample, a correlation of the total gas desorbed from a sample after it had been canistered to its rate of lost gas was developed using desorption data accumulated for 42 cuttings samples obtained from air-drilled wells in the Cherokee basin in southeastern Kansas (Figure 3). The rate of lost gas used in this correlation was that amount of gas lost by the square root of 0.6 hours (the square root of 0.36 hours). By knowing the total gas given up by the sample after canistering (i.e., the total gas desorbed) a hypothetical rate of lost-gas could be calculated using the a regression line:

$$\text{lost gas rate per square root of 0.36 hours} = 0.1241 X (\text{total gas desorbed in ccs}) + 48.14$$

Once the hypothetical lost-gas rate was calculated, the lost gas could be calculated by taking the square root of the bottom-hole to canister time (derived from subtracting the

lag time from the surface time), and multiplying it times the hypothetical lost-gas rate. Analysis of the lithology of the cuttings used in this correlation revealed no consistent relationship (see Figure 2), therefore further refinement of the relationship of the rate of lost gas to the total gas desorbed after canistering is not possible at this point in time.

*"Lithologic Component Sensitivity Analyses" (Figures 4-7)*

The rapidity of penetration of an air-drilled well makes collection of pure lithologies from relatively thin-bedded strata rather difficult. Mixed lithologies are more the norm rather than the exception. Some of this mixing is due to cavings from strata farther up hole. The mixing may also be due to collection of two or more successively drilled lithologies in the kitchen sieve at the exit line, or differential lifting of relatively less-dense coal compared to other lithologies, all of which are more dense than coal.

The total gas evolved from the sample is due to gas being desorbed from both the coal and dark shale. Both lithologies are capable of generating gas, albeit the coal will be richer in gas than the dark-colored shale. Even though dark-colored shale is less rich in sorbed gas than coal, if a sample has a large proportion of dark, organic-rich shale and only a minor amount of coal, the total volume of gas evolved from the dark-shale component may be considerable. The lighter-colored lithologies are considered to be incapable of generating significant amounts of gas.

The total amount of gas evolved from a cuttings sample can be expressed by the following equation:

$$\text{Total gas (cm}^3\text{)} = [\text{weight}_{\text{coal}} \text{ (grams)} \times \text{gas content}_{\text{coal}} \text{ (cm}^3\text{/gram)}] + [\text{weight}_{\text{dark shale}} \text{ (grams)} \times \text{gas content}_{\text{dark shale}} \text{ (cm}^3\text{/gram)}]$$

A unique solution for gas content<sub>coal</sub> in this equation is not possible because gas content<sub>dark shale</sub> is not known exactly. An answer can only be expressed as a linear solution to the above equation. The richer in gas the dark shales are, the poorer in gas the admixed coal has to be, and visa versa. If there is little dark shale in a sample, a relatively well constrained answer for gas content<sub>coal</sub> can be obtained. Conversely, if considerable dark shale is in a sample, the gas content of a coal will be hard to precisely determine.

The lithologic-component-sensitivity-analysis diagram therefore expresses the bivariant nature inherent in the determination of gas content in mixed cuttings. The gas content of dark shales in Kansas can vary greatly. Proprietary desorption analyses of dark shales in cores from southeastern Kansas have registered as much as 50 scf/ton, but can be as low as 2-4 scf/ton.

A value of 3 scf/ton for average dark shale is based on the assay of the gas content of cores of dark shales in nearby wells. However, high-gamma-ray shales (such as the Excello Shale), also colloquially known as "hot shales", typically have more organic matter and associated gas content than dark shales with no excessive gamma-ray level. Determination of gas content for a coal associated with a "hot" shale therefore carries

more uncertainty than if the coal were associated with a shale without a high gamma-ray value.

In general, shale gas content does not have to be very much greater than 10 scf/ton before the associated coal starts to have a gas content less than that of the dark shale. In all the lithologic-component-sensitivity-analysis diagrams, a “break-even” point is therefore noted where the gas content of the coal is equal to that of the dark shale. This “break-even” point corresponds to the minimum gas content assignable to the coal and maximum gas content assignable to the dark shale. It can also be thought of the scf/ton gas content of the cuttings sample minus the weight of any of the lighter-colored lithologies, which are assumed to have no inherent gas content. Conversely though, to assume that all the gas evolved from a cuttings sample is derived solely from the coal would result in an erroneously high gas content for the coal.

#### *Summary Component Analysis for all Samples (Figure 7)*

This diagram is a summary of the individual “lithologic component sensitivity analyses” for each sample, all set at a common scale. The steeper the angle of the line for a sample, the more uncertainty is attached to the results (i.e., *gas content<sub>coal</sub>*) for that sample. If the coal content is miniscule (i.e., < approximately 5%), the results are a better reflection of the *gas content<sub>dark shale</sub>*.

## RESULTS and DISCUSSION

Every one of the samples had some aspect that lent uncertainty to the interpretation of results. Small sample size imparts uncertainty in the results from the Little Osage Shale. The Excello Shale sample, with an assayed gas content of ~55 scf/ton is deemed a reasonable result for the gas content of the shale varies little over the range of gas contents that would be logical for an associated coal to have (i.e., 100 to 400 scf/ton).

The Bevier sample had insufficient quantities of gas generating lithologies in it to produce any meaningful results. The Croweburg sample was also lacking coal, but desorption tests indicate that this coal is possibly rich in gas. Exact gas content is dependent on what gas the associated gas-rich(?) V shale holds. The Rowe sample contains less than 1% coal, hence there is considerable uncertainty in its gas content.

## REFERENCES

- Dake, L.P., 1978, Fundamentals of Reservoir Engineering, Elsevier Scientific Publishing, New York, NY, 443 p.
- Kissel, F.N., McCulloch, C.M., and Elder, C.H., 1975, The direct method of determining methane content of coals for ventilation design: U.S. Bureau of Mines, Report of Investigations, RI7767.
- McLennan, J.D., Schafer, P.S., and Pratt, T.J., 1995, A guide to determining coalbed gas content: Gas Research Institute, Chicago, IL, Reference No. GRI-94/0396, 180 p.

FIGURES and TABLES

FIGURE 1. Correlation of field barometer to Petrophysics Lab pressure transducer.

TABLE 1. Desorption measurements for samples.

FIGURE 2. Lag time determination for samples

FIGURE 3. Correlation of the rate of lost gas to the total gas desorbed after canistering.

FIGURE 4. Sensitivity analysis for Little Osage Shale coal at 785' depth.

FIGURE 5. Sensitivity analysis for Excello Shale at 821' depth.

FIGURE 6. Sensitivity analysis for Croweburg coal at 884' depth.

FIGURE 7. Sensitivity analysis for Rowe coal at 1013' depth.

FIGURE 8. Lithologic component sensitivity analyses for all samples.  
all samples.

## Correlation of Field Barometer to KGS Petrophysics Lab Barometer




FIGURE 1.

TABLE 1 -- Desorption data for Dart Stair #A4-35 (NE NE 35-T.33S.-R.15E.), Montgomery County, KS

SAMPLE: 785'-792', Little Osage Shale, in canister 7

dry sample weight: lbs. 0.2136 grams 96.91

RIG/LAB MEASUREMENTS			CONVERSION OF RIG/LAB MEASUREMENTS TO STP (@60 deg F; 14.7 psi)				CUMULATIVE VOLUMES		SCF/TON	SCF/TON
measured cc	measured T (F)	measured P	cubic ft	absolute T (R)	psia	cubic ft (@STP)	cc (@STP)	without lost gas	with lost gas	
36	68	1062	0.0013	528	13.784	0.001174076	33.25	0.001174076	33.25	
-21	68	1086	-0.0007	528	14.096	-0.000700355	-19.83	0.000473721	13.41	
-6	68	1086	-0.0002	528	14.096	-0.000200102	-5.67	0.000273619	7.75	

Sample air dried for approximately one week

NOTE: lost gas is estimated by time interval between at surface and canister times, and total gas evolved est. lost gas (cc) = TIME OF: elapsed time (off bottom to canistering)

TIME OF MEASURE	off bottom	at surface	in canister	elapsed time (off bottom to canistering)
11/17/05 11:21	11/17/05 11:23	11/17/05 11:27	0.302765035	5.5 minutes 0.092 hours
11/28/05 15:14	11/28/05 15:18	11/28/05 15:18	0.3668873	16.3668873
12/5/05 15:18	12/5/05 15:18	12/5/05 15:18	20.87921614	20.87921614
12/12/05 16:19	12/12/05 16:19	12/12/05 16:19	24.59590074	24.59590074

SAMPLE: 821'-826', Excello/Mulky coal, in canister 5

dry sample weight: lbs. 0.0431 grams 19.57

RIG/LAB MEASUREMENTS			CONVERSION OF RIG/LAB MEASUREMENTS TO STP (@60 deg F; 14.7 psi)				CUMULATIVE VOLUMES		SCF/TON	SCF/TON
measured cc	measured T (F)	measured P	cubic ft	absolute T (R)	psia	cubic ft (@STP)	cc (@STP)	without lost gas	with lost gas	
20	68	1062	0.0007	528	13.784	0.000652265	18.47	0.000652265	18.47	
-9	68	1086	-0.0003	528	14.096	-0.000300152	-8.50	0.000352112	9.97	
-3	68	1086	-0.0001	528	14.096	-0.000100051	-2.83	0.000252062	7.14	

Sample air dried for approximately one week

NOTE: lost gas is estimated by time interval between at surface and canister times, and total gas evolved est. lost gas (cc) = TIME OF: elapsed time (off bottom to canistering)

TIME OF MEASURE	off bottom	at surface	in canister	elapsed time (off bottom to canistering)
11/17/05 11:39	11/17/05 11:41	11/17/05 11:47	0.355902608	7.6 minutes 0.127 hours
11/28/05 15:16	11/28/05 15:18	11/28/05 15:18	16.35878969	16.35878969
12/5/05 15:18	12/5/05 15:18	12/5/05 15:18	20.87207065	20.87207065
12/12/05 16:20	12/12/05 16:20	12/12/05 16:20	24.59017419	24.59017419

SAMPLE: 868'-869', Bevier coal, in canister 1

dry sample weight: lbs. 0.0287 grams 13.03

RIG/LAB MEASUREMENTS			CONVERSION OF RIG/LAB MEASUREMENTS TO STP (@60 deg F; 14.7 psi)				CUMULATIVE VOLUMES		SCF/TON	SCF/TON
measured cc	measured T (F)	measured P	cubic ft	absolute T (R)	psia	cubic ft (@STP)	cc (@STP)	without lost gas	with lost gas	
29	68	1062	0.001	528	13.784	0.000945784	26.78	0.000945784	26.78	
-9	68	1086	-0.0003	528	14.096	-0.000300152	-8.50	0.000645631	18.28	
-4	68	1086	-0.0001	528	14.096	-0.000133401	-3.78	0.00051223	14.50	

Sample air dried for approximately one week

NOTE: lost gas is estimated by time interval between at surface and canister times, and total gas evolved est. lost gas (cc) = TIME OF: elapsed time (off bottom to canistering)

TIME OF MEASURE	off bottom	at surface	in canister	elapsed time (off bottom to canistering)
11/17/05 12:11	11/17/05 12:13	11/17/05 12:19	0.357460177	7.7 minutes 0.128 hours
11/28/05 15:18	11/28/05 15:18	11/28/05 15:18	16.34353423	16.34353423
12/5/05 15:21	12/5/05 15:21	12/5/05 15:21	20.8605156	20.8605156
12/12/05 16:24	12/12/05 16:24	12/12/05 16:24	24.58070607	24.58070607

SAMPLE: 884'-885', Croweburg coal, in SSD canister H

dry sample weight: lbs. 0.1540 grams 69.83

RIG/LAB MEASUREMENTS			CONVERSION OF RIG/LAB MEASUREMENTS TO STP (@60 deg F; 14.7 psi)				CUMULATIVE VOLUMES		SCF/TON	SCF/TON
measured cc	measured T (F)	measured P	cubic ft	absolute T (R)	psia	cubic ft (@STP)	cc (@STP)	without lost gas	with lost gas	
142	68	1062	0.005	528	13.784	0.004631079	131.14	0.004631079	131.14	
-45	68	1086	-0.0016	528	14.096	-0.001500761	-42.50	0.003130317	88.64	
-12	68	1086	-0.0004	528	14.096	-0.000400203	-11.33	0.002730114	77.31	

Sample air dried for approximately one week

NOTE: lost gas is estimated by time interval between at surface and canister times, and total gas evolved est. lost gas (cc) = TIME OF: elapsed time (off bottom to canistering)

TIME OF MEASURE	off bottom	at surface	in canister	elapsed time (off bottom to canistering)
11/17/05 12:21	11/17/05 12:23	11/17/05 12:27	0.308220700	5.7 minutes 0.095 hours
11/28/05 15:19	11/28/05 15:19	11/28/05 15:19	16.33896162	16.33896162
12/5/05 15:23	12/5/05 15:23	12/5/05 15:23	20.85733284	20.85733284
12/12/05 16:27	12/12/05 16:27	12/12/05 16:27	24.57834413	24.57834413

SAMPLE: 1013'-1015', Wier coal, in canister CE 14

dry sample weight: lbs. 0.3684 grams 167.13

RIG/LAB MEASUREMENTS			CONVERSION OF RIG/LAB MEASUREMENTS TO STP (@60 deg F; 14.7 psi)				CUMULATIVE VOLUMES		SCF/TON	SCF/TON
measured cc	measured T (F)	measured P	cubic ft	absolute T (R)	psia	cubic ft (@STP)	cc (@STP)	without lost gas	with lost gas	
109	68	1062	0.0038	528	13.784	0.003554842	100.66	0.003554842	100.66	
-14	68	1086	-0.0005	528	14.096	-0.000466904	-13.22	0.003087938	87.44	
-4	68	1086	-0.0001	528	14.096	-0.000133401	-3.78	0.002954537	83.66	

Sample air dried for approximately one week

NOTE: lost gas is estimated by time interval between at surface and canister times, and total gas evolved est. lost gas (cc) = TIME OF: elapsed time (off bottom to canistering)

TIME OF MEASURE	off bottom	at surface	in canister	elapsed time (off bottom to canistering)
11/17/05 13:12	11/17/05 13:14	11/17/05 13:18	0.315348132	6.0 minutes 0.099 hours
11/28/05 15:16	11/28/05 15:16	11/28/05 15:16	16.31153307	16.31153307
12/5/05 15:18	12/5/05 15:18	12/5/05 15:18	20.83505326	20.83505326
12/12/05 16:20	12/12/05 16:20	12/12/05 16:20	24.55876173	24.55876173

Dart Cherokee Basin #A4-35 Stair, NE NE 35-T.33S.-R.15E., Montgomery County, KS  
 (based on lag times from Dart Cherokee Basin #CH-1 Holder; sec. 1-T.30S.-R.14E., Wilson County, KS)  
 lag-time to surface for well cuttings






FIGURE 2.

RELATIONSHIP of TOTAL GAS EVOLVED FROM a CUTTINGS SAMPLE to RATE of LOST-GAS  
 (from 42 cuttings samples from air-drilled wells, Cherokee basin, southeastern Kansas)



number of samples (n= 42)



LOST-GAS ALGORITHM

$$\text{ccs lost gas} = \sqrt{X} (Y)$$

where X = bottom-hole to canister time (in hours)

where Y = ccs lost gas at 0.36 hours

(i.e., value Y from regression equation)

FIGURE 3.

# Desorption Characteristics of Cuttings Samples

## Dart Cherokee Basin #A4-35 Stair, NE NE 35-T.33S.-R.15E., Montgomery County, KS

LITHOLOGIC COMPONENT SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS for calculation of Little Osage Shale at 785'

$$\text{GAS CONTENT}_{\text{coal}} = \frac{\text{total gas desorbed} - ((\text{gas content}_{\text{dark shale}}) * (\text{weight}_{\text{dark shale}}))}{\text{weight}_{\text{coal}}}$$

total gas desorbed  
(including estimated lost gas) = 46.3 ccs

TOTAL DRY WEIGHT OF SAMPLE = 151.27 grams

**weight<sub>light-colored lithologies</sub> = 54.36 grams (35.9%)**

**weight<sub>dark shale</sub> = 96.91 grams (64.1%)**

**weight<sub>coal</sub> = 0.00 grams (0.0%)**

sieve size	grams	% coal / % dark shale / % light-colored liths
>0.0930"	84.52	0.00% / 66.97% / 33.03%
>0.0661"	38.67	0.00% / 64.83% / 35.17%
>0.0460"	23.47	0.00% / 57.91% / 42.09%
>0.0331"	3.57	0.00% / 37.50% / 62.50%
<0.0331"	1.04	0.00% / 30.00% / 70.00%

**151.27 TOTAL**





FIGURE 4.

# Desorption Characteristics of Cuttings Samples

Dart Cherokee Basin #A4-35 Stair, NE NE 35-T.33S.-R.15E., Montgomery County, KS

LITHOLOGIC COMPONENT SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS for calculation of Excello Shale at 821'

$$\text{GAS CONTENT}_{\text{coal}} = \frac{\text{total gas desorbed} - ((\text{gas content}_{\text{dark shale}}) * (\text{weight}_{\text{dark shale}}))}{\text{weight}_{\text{coal}}}$$

total gas desorbed  
(including estimated lost gas) = 36.5 ccs

TOTAL DRY WEIGHT OF SAMPLE = 318.34 grams

weight<sub>light-colored lithologies</sub> = 298.77 grams (93.9%)

weight<sub>dark shale</sub> = 19.41 grams (6.1%)

weight<sub>coal</sub> = 0.16 grams (0.1%)

sieve size	grams	% coal / % dark shale / % light-colored liths
>0.0930"	179.53	0.09% / 4.83% / 95.08%
>0.0661"	98.56	0.00% / 6.73% / 93.27%
>0.0460"	36.38	0.00% / 8.46% / 91.54%
>0.0331"	2.45	0.00% / 25.81% / 74.19%
<0.0331"	1.42	0.00% / 28.00% / 72.00%
<b>318.34 TOTAL</b>		





FIGURE 5.

# Desorption Characteristics of Cuttings Samples

Dart Cherokee Basin #A4-35 Stair, NE NE 35-T.33S.-R.15E., Montgomery County, KS

LITHOLOGIC COMPONENT SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS for calculation of Croweburg coal at 884'

$$\text{GAS CONTENT}_{\text{coal}} = \frac{\text{total gas desorbed} - ((\text{gas content}_{\text{dark shale}}) * (\text{weight}_{\text{dark shale}}))}{\text{weight}_{\text{coal}}}$$

total gas desorbed  
(including estimated lost gas) = 151.1 ccs

TOTAL DRY WEIGHT OF SAMPLE = 672.89 grams

weight<sub>light-colored lithologies</sub> = 603.06 grams (89.7%)

weight<sub>dark shale</sub> = 62.98 grams (9.4%)

weight<sub>coal</sub> = 6.86 grams (1.0%)

sieve size	grams	% coal / % dark shale / % light-colored liths
>0.0930"	316.21	0.44% / 7.65% / 91.91%
>0.0661"	223.47	1.69% / 11.72% / 86.59%
>0.0460"	117.55	1.25% / 9.09% / 89.66%
>0.0331"	11.63	1.35% / 12.16% / 86.49%
<0.0331"	4.03	1.50% / 12.50% / 86.00%
<b>672.89 TOTAL</b>		





FIGURE 6.

# Desorption Characteristics of Cuttings Samples

Dart Cherokee Basin #A4-35 Stair, NE NE 35-T.33S.-R.15E., Montgomery County, KS

LITHOLOGIC COMPONENT SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS for calculation of Weir-Pittsburg coal at 1013'

$$\text{GAS CONTENT}_{\text{coal}} = \frac{\text{total gas desorbed} - ((\text{gas content}_{\text{dark shale}}) * (\text{weight}_{\text{dark shale}}))}{\text{weight}_{\text{coal}}}$$

total gas desorbed  
(including estimated lost gas) = 119.6 ccs

TOTAL DRY WEIGHT OF SAMPLE = 1097.69 grams

weight<sub>light-colored lithologies</sub> = 930.56 grams (84.8%)

weight<sub>dark shale</sub> = 62.98 grams (14.7%)

weight<sub>coal</sub> = 6.09 grams (0.6%)

sieve size	grams	% coal / % dark shale / % light-colored liths
>0.0930"	833.75	0.31% / 13.42% / 86.27%
>0.0661"	186.42	1.45% / 16.48% / 82.06%
>0.0460"	69.68	0.87% / 23.81% / 75.32%
>0.0331"	5.73	2.78% / 22.22% / 75.00%
<0.0331"	2.11	3.00% / 25.00% / 72.00%
<b>1097.69 TOTAL</b>		





FIGURE 7.

# Desorption Characteristics of Cuttings Samples

Dart Cherokee Basin #A4-35 Stair, NE NE 35-T.33S.-R.15E., Montgomery County, KS

surface

LITHOLOGIC COMPONENT SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS for all samples

100'

200'

300'

400'

500'

600'

700'

800'


900'

1000'

1100'

UNIT	coal in sample	dk sh in sample	scf/ton w/ shale @ 3 scf/ton	maximum scf/ton	minimum scf/ton
785' L.O.S.	0%	64%	----	----	16.3
821' Excello Sh	<1%	6%	----	----	~55
868' Bevier	<1%	<5%	no valid data		
884' Croweburg	1%	9%	522.6	706.3	69.3
1013' Weir-Pitt	<1%	15%	100.6	629.0	22.9

**scf/ton w/ shale @ 20 scf/ton**



○ 785' Little Osage Sh.

○ 821' Excello Sh.

○ 868' Bevier

○ 884' Croweburg

○ 1013' Weir-Pittsburg

FIGURE 8.