Analysis of the role of fluids in causing fractures in the Spraberry Trend, Midland Basin
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ABSTRACT
The Spraberry Formation in west-central Texas is a highly fractured formation with both extension and shear fractures. At least two sets of natural fractures exist in two reservoir intervals. We have considered two possible origins for the fracturing: (i) high fluid pressure plus tectonic stress and (ii) tectonic stress at near-hydrostatic fluid pressure. Reconstruction of geologic, thermal and hydrodynamic histories suggests that high fluid pressures probably did not occur during the basin’s history. To explore the second hypothesis, we developed and applied a calibrated, discrete-element model of Spraberry strata to investigate whether weak Laramide compressional forces could cause fractures in the absence of high fluid pressures. Simulation results suggest that a mild compressional episode of geologically short duration may indeed have induced conjugate shear fractures.

Key words: basin analysis, fractures, over pressures, strain, stress, thermal histories

Received 11 July 2007; accepted 12 July 2007

Corresponding author: B. J. McPherson, Energy and Geosciences Institute and Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT 84112, USA.
Email: b.j.mcpherson@utah.edu. Tel: +1 801 581 5634. Fax: +1 801 585 3540.


INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION FOR STUDY
The hydrodynamic regimes of deep sedimentary basins are usually affected by and often controlled by fractures (McCaig 1989; Forster & Evans 1991; Nordqvist et al. 1992; Bai et al. 1993; Caine et al. 1996). Fractures form in the presence of fluids with fluid pressures at or above hydrostatic (e.g., Hubbert & Rubey 1959; Secor 1965; Atkinson 1984; Pollard & Aydin 1988; Boone & Ingraffea 1990; Lorenz et al. 1991; Cheng et al. 1993; Renshaw & Harvey 1994). Secor (1965) used the concept of effective stress outlined by Hubbert & Rubey (1959) to show that tensile fractures form under compressive stress if pore fluid pressures are great enough. Boone & Ingraffea (1990) and Renshaw & Harvey (1994) focused on poroelasticity and crack-tip modeling using sophisticated, coupled, finite-element and finite-difference models. This study builds on these earlier works; here, we examine whether elevated fluid pressures contributed to fracturing of the Spraberry Formation in west-central Texas (Fig. 1).

The Spraberry Formation in the Midland Basin, Texas, is a highly fractured formation and has been deemed the ‘largest uneconomic oil field in the world’ (Guevara 1988). Fractures in the Spraberry have been attributed to many different mechanisms. Changes in sediment volume caused by compaction, regional tension and local uplift were cited by Wann & Sidwell (1953) and Guevara (1988). Another hypothesis is that the fractures are due to a weak force sustained over a long period of time (Schmitt 1954). Winfree (1995) and Lorenz et al. (2002) suggested that compressional forces exerted during the Laramide orogeny are the primary cause of fracturing, while Sterling (2000) suggested that high fluid pressures during the basin’s history likely played an important role, consistent with results of previous studies of the coupling between fluid pressure and rock strain (e.g., Renshaw & Harvey 1994; McPherson & Garven 1999).

GEOLOGIC SETTING AND OBSERVED FRACTURES
The Midland Basin consists of shallow-marine shelf to shelf-margin carbonate and deep-basin deposits of
Pennsylvanian and Permian age (Galley 1958; Handford 1981; Guevara 1988). Figure 1 includes a structure-contour map of the upper Spraberry Formation (adapted from Barba 1989) for a 64 km by 31 km area within the basin, illustrating that it is generally homoclinal, with a gentle westward dip of less than 1° extending into the deepest part of the basin. Table 1 lists the formations of interest in the basin, including dominant lithologies. The Spraberry consists of interbedded sandstone and shale and ranges in thickness from 200 m at the basin margins to 400 m at its depositional center (Stanley et al. 1951; Guevara 1988). In recent literature, the Spraberry is divided into sub-units, primarily to distinguish between areas of high and low oil production (Guevara 1988; Lorenz et al. 2002). In particular, the 10- to 15-feet-thick ‘1U’ and ‘5U’ sands of the Spraberry are designated as the most productive reservoir units in the trend (Lorenz et al. 2002).

Extensive natural fractures are observed in the Spraberry, despite its stable geologic setting with minimal folding and faulting (Lorenz et al. 2002). Analysis of horizontal core from the E. T. O’Daniel no. 28 well indicated a minimum of three sets of fractures in the upper Spraberry (Fig. 2). The three sets differ with respect to orientation, location, spacing, type and mineralization. The first set consists of extension fractures with a northeast strike (average 43°; Fig. 2). These fractures are limited to the 1U sand and silt reservoir facies, and have a low variability in strike (Lorenz et al. 2002). The second set consists of right-lateral shear fractures in sand and silt layers in the 5U that strike north–northeast (average 32°). The last fracture set strikes east–northeast (average 70°), and also includes extension fractures. This set is observed within the 5U-reservoir sand and silt unit, as well as within the black shales that overlie both the 1U and 5U reservoirs.

**Hypothesis I: Elevated fluid pressures aided fracture formation**

The observed structure and inferred geologic history of the Midland Basin suggests that it was not subject to major tectonic compressive stresses, but continually subsided from the time of Spraberry deposition until the Laramide orogeny. The focus of Laramide compressional thrusting events was hundreds of kilometers distant to the west-northwest. Folding of the local strata is relatively weak, and fractures do not show a strong correlation with local folding. These observations suggest a possible role of high fluid pressures: did overpressures reduce effective stresses sufficiently that minor compressional forces could induce the observed fractures?

Pervasive extension fractures also suggest that fluid pressure could have played a role in fracturing. Extension fractures form under different stress conditions than shear fractures, but both can be induced by elevated fluid pressures.
pressure. Extension fractures lie in the $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$ plane, indicating that $\sigma_1$ was between vertical and horizontal and trended northeast to east-northeast at the time of failure. The fact that we do not know whether the maximum compressive stress that caused the extension fractures was vertical or horizontal complicates the task of determining when they formed. Two sources of stress that could have lead to post-Laramide extensional fractures are loading by overlying sediment and horizontal compressive stresses produced by subidence. Given the likelihood that both of these stresses were relatively weak, high fluid pressures could have been a critical factor. Luo (1992), Lee & Williams (2000) and Tuncay et al. (2000) all document overpressures in the Delaware Basin immediately to the west. Tuncay et al. (2000) evaluated the possible genetic relationship between observed high fluid pressures and fractures in the Delaware Basin.

Our primary objective was to determine the likelihood of overpressures and to elucidate whether such pressures are necessary for the genesis of observed Spraberry fractures in the Midland Basin. We tested two primary mechanisms for generating high fluid pressures: (i) sedimentary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer number</th>
<th>Formation name</th>
<th>Lithology</th>
<th>Thickness (m)</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Thermal conductivity</th>
<th>Average sedimentation rate (m Myr$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fredericksburg</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Paluxy</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unconformity</td>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>219.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chiricahua</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>219.5</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Shale</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>219.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unconformity</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dewey Lake</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>251.6</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rustler</td>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>253.3</td>
<td>251.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Salado</td>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>253.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tanfield</td>
<td>Anhydrite sandstone</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>255.8</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>255.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Seven Rivers</td>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>258.1</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Queen</td>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>258.1</td>
<td>258.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Grayburg</td>
<td>Dolomite Limestone</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>261.2</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>San Andres</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>264.8</td>
<td>261.2</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Word-Leonardian</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>264.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Spraberry</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Unnamed Shale</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Wolfcamp</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Unconformity</td>
<td></td>
<td>308</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Strawn</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bend</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Unconformity</td>
<td></td>
<td>330</td>
<td>325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Barnett</td>
<td>Shale</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Unconformity</td>
<td></td>
<td>345</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mississippian</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Unconformity</td>
<td></td>
<td>380</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Woodford</td>
<td>Shale</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Unconformity</td>
<td></td>
<td>390</td>
<td>387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Devonian</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Silurian</td>
<td>Shale</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Fusseman</td>
<td>Dolomite</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Unconformity</td>
<td></td>
<td>425</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Montoya</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ellenburger</td>
<td>Dolomite</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Sedimentary strata of the Midland Basin, showing grouping of stratigraphic units for individual layers of the basin-evolution model (left-most column); the thickness of those units at the center of the basin; the beginning and ending time of deposition of those units; thermal conductivity values assigned to each unit; and the average sedimentation rate for the Spraberry Formation and all units younger than the Spraberry. Data summarized from Sterling (2000).
compaction, such as observed in the Gulf Coast (Bethke 1986), and (ii) oil generation, as observed in the Uinta Basin of Utah (McPherson & Bredehoeft 2001). Lee & Williams (2000) suggested that these two mechanisms are responsible for overpressures in the Delaware Basin, although maintenance of overpressures from Permian (initiation of overpressure) to present day would require an extremely low-permeability (<10^{-20} m^2) top seal.

**Hypothesis II: Regional compression without elevated fluid pressures**

Observed fractures in the Spraberry Formation (Fig. 2) provide a number of clues about the forces and orientations of stresses that caused them. The geometry of observed shear fracture sets suggests that, at the time of failure, \( \sigma_1 \) was horizontal and trended northeast. Two sets of surface lineaments and fractures striking northeast and northwest were observed and described by Stanley et al. (1951) and Guevara (1988) and were linked genetically to Spraberry shear fractures by Stanley et al. (1951). This suggests that Spraberry fractures formed since the deposition of surface sediments in the early Cretaceous, consistent with timing of the Laramide orogeny, \( \sim 80-55 \) Ma. The northeastern orientation of \( \sigma_1 \) is consistent with the direction of weak regional compressive forcing imparted by the Laramide orogeny. Recent sonic-velocity-anisotropy orientation measurements of Spraberry core suggest that present-day stresses are also oriented in the northeastern direction (Lorenz et al. 2002). Additionally, Winfree (1995) suggested that subsequent Laramide extension has helped maintain or keep fractures open. In summary, this evidence suggests that fractures in the Spraberry are at least related to the stress state deemed to be present during the Laramide compression event, whether caused exclusively by compressional forces and maintained by extension, or by a combination of these forces with elevated fluid pressures, as discussed below.

**HYPOTHESIS TESTING AND RESULTS**

**Hypothesis I: Elevated fluid pressures aided fracture formation**

In contrast to the neighboring Delaware Basin, overpressures are relatively scarce in the present-day Midland Basin. We tested the hypothesis of overpressure-induced fractures by examining whether overpressures were likely to have occurred there in the geologic past. We selected a north-northeast cross-section (Jones 1953) for hydrodynamic analysis (location of profile shown on Fig. 1; cross-section model grid and associated stratigraphic definition depicted in Fig. 3). We selected this orientation on the basis of current horizontal-compressive-stress directions (Zoback & Zoback 1989) and the general north–northeast direction of many observed fractures. This two-dimensional representation of the basin is sufficient for testing the hypotheses in question and permits simulation of representative burial histories, thermal histories, petroleum generation and patterns of multiphase flow.

**Numerical model of basin evolution**

We simulated the geologic, thermal, hydrodynamic and petroleum-generation histories of the Midland Basin cross-section using the basin-evolution model developed and described by McPherson & Bredehoeft (2001). The TOUGH2-DYME model (McPherson & Bredehoeft 2001) simulates physical basin evolution and includes coupled heat and multiphase (oil/gas/water) fluid flow, and is based on the integrated-finite-difference method employed.

![Fig. 3. Top three panels show the model grid of the structural cross-section at selected times. The bottom panel shows the stratigraphy for the structural cross-section; patterns indicate different rock types, with details of the rock types provided in Table 1. ‘SF’ indicates Spraberry Formation. The top three panels employ the same axis scales as the bottom panel. Cross-section adapted from Jones (1953).](image-url)
in TOUGH2 (Pruess 1991). We assembled a two-dimensional integrated finite-difference grid of 65 columns by 14 rows, each cell 3200 feet wide and having a thickness equal to the stratigraphic thickness represented. The model builds and evolves the grid through geologic time. Sedimentation rates were estimated by conventional backstripping and are tabulated in Table 1. Figure 3 illustrates the basin model grid (cross-section A-A') at three selected stages of the basin's history.

Rock and fluid properties required to parameterize the basin-evolution model include porosity, permeability, thermal conductivity, petroleum-generation parameters, and oil density and viscosity. For simulating forward-in-time evolution of the basin, rock properties must be assigned some initial condition or value at the onset of deposition, and follow a specified trend as a function of location (e.g., depth) or physical condition (e.g., fluid pressure or effective stress). For forward simulation of porosity in all units, we used a simple consolidation law (Sclater and Christie, 1980) with porosity a function of stress:

$$\phi = \phi_0 \exp \left[ - \left( \frac{c}{(\rho_b - \rho_w) g} \right) \sigma \right],$$

(1)

where $\phi$ is porosity, $\phi_0$ is estimated initial (surface) porosity, $c$ is a coefficient associated with rock type, $\rho_b$ is bulk sediment density, $\rho_w$ is water density, $g$ is acceleration of gravity, and $\sigma$ is total stress; all of these variables are tracked in the simulator. In the absence of basin-specific parameter values for Eqn (1), we used estimated values based on the dominant lithology for each unit (Table 2).

For forward simulation of permeability in all units except the Spraberry, we implemented a Kozeny-Carman formula (adapted from Burrus et al. 1992; and Gonçalves et al. 2004):

$$k = \frac{0.2(1-\phi)^3}{\phi_0 \phi^2}$$

where $k$ is intrinsic permeability, $\phi$ is porosity, and $\phi_0$ is specific surface area (Table 2). For the Spraberry unit we assigned permeability as a function of pore pressure calculated by the model. We calibrated the model using measured values of pressure-sensitive permeability of unfractured Spraberry samples (Sterling 2000). The measured permeability trend as a function of confining pressure and pore pressure is illustrated in Fig. 4. This trend was evaluated by measuring permeability for 12 core samples taken from the Spraberry. Unfortunately, permeability of silty shale and shale samples were too low to perform tests within a reasonable amount of time, so the trend shown in Fig. 4 is biased toward higher permeability horizons of the Spraberry. These permeability tests were performed concurrently with some of the triaxial shear tests, and used the same test

![Fig. 4. Permeability as a function of pore pressure, based on measurements made during triaxial compression tests on 12 Spraberry Formation core samples. Testing methods and results described by Sterling (2000).](image-url)
configuration with the addition of Isopar H mineral oil pumped into the bottom of the samples at a rate of 4 ml h$^{-1}$. The pore pressure at the point of injection was measured using pressure transducer, while axial and lateral displacement was measured using linear variable displacement transducers because strain gauges had a tendency to separate slightly from the sample when internal fluid pressure was applied. Using the measured pore pressure and fluid injection rate, it was possible to calculate the permeability of each sample using Darcy’s law. During these tests, vertical load was applied for a period of time, and then stopped to permit the sample pressure to equilibrate, and then increases in load were resumed again. As illustrated by Fig. 4, permeability values dropped exponentially when increasing amounts of $\sigma_{11}$ were applied, despite a contemporaneous increase in fluid pore pressure, most likely due to net compaction of pore space.

We assumed the Spraberry Formation to be oil source rock as well as reservoir strata, dominated by Type II kerogen because of its marine origin. A first order Arrhenius equation for oil generation with kinetic parameters appropriate to generic Type II kerogen was applied (Sweeney 1990), and details of its implementation in the basin evolution model are provided by McPherson & Bredhoeft (2001). We assigned a reported maximum value of 3.6% total organic carbon (TOC) to Spraberry strata (Dutton 1980) to maximize the effect of oil generation on fluid pressures. Oil density as a function of temperature and pressure was assigned with a formulation outlined by Eremenko (1991), while viscosity of oil (as a function of temperature and pressure) was assigned based on correlations of Beal (1946). We applied relative-permeability and capillary-pressure formulations described by Parker et al. (1987). Thermal boundary conditions were consistent with conditions described by Negraru et al. (2004), including constant heat flow into the base of the basin at 46 mW m$^{-2}$, the average heat flow for the area of the Midland Basin. The sides of the basin model were assigned no-flow with respect to heat conduction. A constant head equal to a mean water elevation of 100 feet (30 m) was assigned at the surface of the domain consistent with local depth to water-table in the Midland area reported by Jackson et al. (2004). Basement rocks below the simulated stratigraphic section provide a low-permeability barrier that justifies a no-flow boundary along the bottom of the model domain. No-fluid-flow boundaries were assigned to the northeastern side (A') of the model domain on the basis of topographic symmetry. A specified fluid flow boundary was assigned along the northeastern side boundary, based on fluid flux rates, ranging from 19 m year$^{-1}$ in upper units to 0.06 m year$^{-1}$ in deeper units, inferred by simple Darcy’s law calculations using local head gradients reported by Jackson et al. (2004).

**Geologic history**

The geologic history of the basin is relatively simple. Figure 5A shows the complete burial history for the E.T. O’Daniel no. 28 well, located at the approximate center of the north–northeast cross-section. After backstripping and using the depositional parameters summarized in Table 1, we simulated the basin’s history and resulting temperature, oil generation, and fluid-pressure histories (Fig. 5B–D, respectively).

The basin began forming between 310 and 265 Ma (Hill 1995) and all basin simulations commence at 273 Ma (Fig. 5) when the Spraberry began to be deposited. From

---

**Fig. 5.** Model simulation results for Midland Basin strata at E.T. O’Daniel well, including (A) depth histories, (B) temperature histories, (C) oil-generation-rate histories, and (D) fluid-pressure histories.

250 to 230 Ma the basin subsided and was covered by a shallow sea that eventually receded, producing evaporite deposits (Hill 1995). An unconformity records the erosion of the uppermost Permian sediments, including any additional strata deposited around 250 Ma (Boggs 1995). In our basin model (Fig. 5A), deltaic and lacustrine sediments were deposited from 230 to 200 Ma. However, another unconformity in the stratigraphic column marks removal of all sediments deposited between 230 and 140 Ma. The youngest formations that remain today are shallow marine deposits ranging in age from 140 to 72 Ma (Fig. 5A).

**Thermal history**

The simulated temperature history for strata at the center of the basin cross-section is plotted in Fig. 5B. Temperatures track depth, with conduction the dominant mechanism. Advection of heat by fluid flow was negligible in all simulations.

**Oil-generation history**

Oil generated from kerogen in the Spraberry begins forming around 3 Myr into the basin history simulation, or ~270 Ma (Fig. 5C), with a peak in generation occurring about 74 Ma and continuing until present day. However, generation rates were not sufficiently high to affect fluid pressures. The maximum generation rate is relatively low, 0.4 × 10⁻⁹ kg sec⁻¹, primarily because temperature in the Spraberry remains very low in the oil window ≤70°C. Significantly higher generation rates can increase fluid pressures inasmuch as the conversion of solid kerogen to oil of lower density results in an increase in fluid volume (Bredehoeft et al. 1994; Burrus 1998; Lee & Williams 2000; McPherson & Bredehoeft 2001). Figure 5C illustrates the oil-generation rate history for the Spraberry corresponding to the base-case basin-evolution model. The model also produced oil-migration histories, and these simulated migration histories and resulting distributions of oil are at least qualitatively consistent with present-day production maps, but we do not present those here for the sake of brevity and because this aspect is beyond the hypothesis-testing scope of this study.

**Fluid pressure histories**

The main goal of the basin modeling was to determine whether very high fluid pressures were the cause of observed fractures. Extremely high overpressures may cause extension fractures by exceeding the least principal stress, whereas moderately high overpressures may contribute to shear fracturing by reducing effective stress. Our model results suggest that no significant overpressuring occurred. Pressures in the Spraberry correspond to the top-most line on Fig. 5D, and track close to hydrostatic conditions throughout the basin history, reaching a maximum of approximately 23 MPa at a depth of ~2300 m. No overpressures occur during any part of the simulated basin history, at least not for the model assembled and parameterized based on what we deem to be the most reasonable conceptual model.

We performed a sensitivity study to determine what conditions might create significant overpressures. Results suggested that sedimentation rates would need to be at least 10 times greater than backstripped rates to induce significant overpressures. Sensitivity analysis of permeability was similarly limiting: for significant overpressures to form, the Spraberry, San Andres, Word and Grayburg units all needed to have permeabilities of 10⁻¹⁸ m² or less, consistent with our previous studies of overpressuring (e.g., McPherson & Bredehoeft 2001).

**Testing Hypothesis II: Regional compression without elevated fluid pressures**

We turn our attention to whether or not inferred low strain rates associated with the Laramide orogeny could induce significant fracturing, unaided by high fluid pressures. This issue is addressed using a two-dimensional discrete-element-method (DEM) modeling approach.

**DEM model of Laramide compression**

The DEM entails simulating the mechanical behavior of rock by idealizing the system as a collection of structural units (springs, beams, etc.) or separate particles bonded together at their contact points, utilizing the breakage of individual structural units or bonds to represent damage (Cundall & Strack 1979; Cundall 1986). Each particle has unique properties and represents a collection of mechanical units. The particles do not represent grains, but are meant to discretize space much like cells or elements in continuum models. This method has an inherent ability to represent damage or fractures in a direct fashion as well as producing realistic nonlinear behavior using simple contact laws governed by Newtonian mechanics (Saltzer & Pollard 1992; Hazzard et al. 2000). Details of model input parameters and algorithms are provided by Boutt & McPherson (2002) and Potyondy et al. (1996).

Our DEM model was calibrated to the measured mechanical properties of the Spraberry Formation (Sterling 2000). The measured mechanical yield strengths from Sterling (2000) and Lorenz et al. (2002) indicated that portions of the Spraberry are weak relative to other units: the average yield strength of the lower 5U sandstone is ~150 MPa (Sterling 2000; Lorenz et al. 2002) and the average yield strength of the upper 1U sandstone is ~263 MPa. Lorenz et al. (2002) show that these differences in strength (which we assume to be representative of rock strength during fracturing) result from subtle differences in quartz and clay content. Details of the calibration process are described by Boutt & McPherson.
Rocks from each individual sub-unit of the Spraberry Formation were calibrated separately and the parameters recorded.

The DEM assemblies were built by generating particles with a uniform normal distribution to completely fill the domain of interest, then compacted until a low (~ 0.1 MPa) isotropic stress was achieved. The final step was assignment of parameters to the Spraberry model units. Boundary conditions assigned to the top and bottom of the model were constant stress (representing the minimum stress direction). This implies that the assembly can strain from the top and the bottom, but the overall stress will remain constant. This is justified because the assembly was loaded to emulate burial conditions imposed on the unit during the Laramide orogeny. The boundary conditions on the sides of the model were assigned as constant strain rate. Few strain or shortening rates for the Midland Basin exist, and therefore we used a strain rate typical of mildly compressive regions (Twiss & Moores 1992): a rate of $3 \times 10^{-17} \text{sec}^{-1}$ was applied for 5.4 Ma, inducing a cumulative strain of 0.0051 or 0.51% in the direction of compression. Lorenz et al. (2002) reported a strain of 0.1% for extension fractures parallel to the assumed maximum stress direction during the Laramide. Given that this strain is normal to the direction of compression and the small Poisson’s ratio reported for these rocks (0.03–0.11), our value of strain rate appears appropriate. Our value is also consistent with the lack of structures found within the Midland Basin (Winfree 1995).

Our DEM modeling results are limited by the two-dimensionality of the model. The fractures in the Spraberry Formation are three-dimensional structures. In this initial idealization, we chose to model 2-D horizontal sections parallel to the assumed shortening direction. We are not able to resolve the exact orientation of fractures observed in the Spraberry Formation. Instead, we are attempting to determine whether, for a given set of material properties, the assumed strain rates were large enough to cause deformation in the Spraberry Formation.

Plots of results are generated by first gridding the cumulative displacements for all particles in the DEM model for a timestep and then taking the spatial gradients of the resultant vectors [see Boutt & McPherson (2002) for an example]. This technique highlights differential movements in the assembly. A fracture or fault marks a discontinuity in an otherwise coherent medium and thus will show a strong gradient of overall movement (cumulative displacement) with respect to a fixed coordinate system. Figure 6 depicts results and boundary conditions for a homogeneous one-layer model of the 5U section of the Spraberry Formation (see Table 3 for mechanical properties). The deformation field is very heterogeneous, highlighted by distinct regions of high-magnitude displacement gradients (brighter regions). Large displacement gradients exist throughout the model and are coincident with bond breakages (black lines) between the individual discrete elements.

We interpret these patterns to represent areas of strain localization where adjacent regions are undergoing differential movement. These areas represent discontinuities, in this case shear fractures, consistent with the interpretations of Lorenz et al. (2002). Even for the relatively small strain rates applied, distinct deformation zones form in the model. The relatively weak compression rates associated with the Laramide orogeny appear sufficient to induce deformation, without the need for excessive fluid pressures to reduce effective stress.

**Analysis of stress amplifications via contrasts in rock mechanical properties**

We suspect that mechanical interactions (both inelastic and elastic) or stress amplifications (see Eshelby 1957; Lorenz et al. 1991) among the units of the Spraberry Formation may cause variability in induced fractures. The elastic and
inelastic behavior of any given rock unit may be influenced by the surrounding rock units. Thus the effective elastic and inelastic properties of a suite of units may be different from the properties of the individual units.

To evaluate this possibility, scaled DEM models of the Spraberry Formation stratigraphy were assembled using calibrated parameters. We assembled three-layer models in the vertical direction (Fig. 7), rather than a homogeneous model in the horizontal direction (Fig. 6), attempting to capture the physics of mechanical interactions between layers. The top and bottom boundary conditions were set to the overburden load as determined via the basin evolution model. We examined several different scenarios invoking material properties of the Spraberry Formation (Table 3). The model discussed here is a 5U reservoir sandstone sandwiched between two equally thick 1U shales. Heterogeneous units (mechanical stratigraphy) influence each other in terms of their abilities to transfer and deflect stresses.

Simulation results are depicted in Fig. 7. This model has two equally thick outer layers (50% of total thickness) with the properties of the Spraberry Formation unit 1U-3 and one middle layer of the 5U-6, unit which also makes up 50% of the thickness. The geometry is illustrated in Fig. 7B by the dashed lines. The 1U-3 unit is much stronger and stiffer than the 5U-6 unit. The strength of the bonds between layers was assigned as the average of the 1U-3 and 5U-6 layers. Results suggest that this heterogeneity has a strong influence on the behavior of the systems. Figure 7A depicts a gridded, filled contour plot of cumulative spatial displacement. The overall direction of displacement is horizontal and toward the center, indicative of compression. Spatial displacement gradients of this field (Fig. 7B) show heterogeneous deformation.

To isolate or highlight contrasts in behavior between the two units, we subtracted the 5U-6 displacement gradient results shown in Fig. 7B from those for a 1-layer (i.e., homogeneous) model with the properties of the 5U-6 unit (Fig. 7C). The organization of the displacement gradients of the 5U-6 layer suggests that this layer is undergoing strain localization differently than is observed for the homogeneous case.

Lastly we examined the effect of relative proportions of 1U and 5U on the overall failure behavior of an ensemble. Simulations with 0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, and 100% 1U units were generated. We loaded the layered system until bulk failure, as determined by a loss in strength of the assembly, and the time of failure was noted.

Figure 8 shows stress parallel to loading versus time to failure for assemblies composed of the different percentages of 1U and 5U units. The two end-members, 0% and 100% 1U, show very different magnitudes and the timing of peak stress. The 100% 1U simulation reaches peak stress first and attains the highest stress whereas the 0% 1U simulation shows the lowest peak stress reached after the longest amount of time. The more brittle 100% 1U simulation shows a pronounced failure peak whereas the 0% 1U simulation shows a more rounded and smoothed peak.

There is a nonlinear transition from 0% to 100% 1U behavior. The 25% 1U is much stronger than the 0% 1U and also fails much sooner. Its strain curve is more like that of the 100% 1U simulation than the 0% 1U simulation. Even small percentages of the stronger and more brittle 1U units influence the mechanical behavior of the package as a whole.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

We evaluated two competing hypotheses for the origin of fractures in the Spraberry Formation of the Midland Basin, Texas that invoke (i) significant subsurface fluid overpressures or (ii) tectonic compression with near-hydrostatic fluid pressures. Simulated geologic, thermal and hydrodynamic histories suggest that high fluid pressures probably did not occur during the basin’s history, and thus did not play a significant role in fracturing. To test the second hypothesis, we developed and applied a calibrated, discrete-element model of Spraberry strata. Simulation results suggest that a mild compressional episode may have induced conjugate shear fractures without excessive fluid pressures. We find that
significant overpressures likely did not form during the Midland Basin’s history, in contrast to its sister basin, the Delaware Basin;

(2) observed extension fractures are not hydraulic in nature;

(3) a mild compressional episode of geologically short duration may have induced Spraberry fractures, including observed types and orientations, without excessive fluid pressure; and

(4) mechanical interaction between the Spraberry Formation subunits can account for some observed differences in fracture patterns.
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**NOMENCLATURE**

ε empirical porosity coefficient associated with rock type

\( g \) acceleration of gravity

\( k \) intrinsic permeability

\( S_0 \) specific surface area

\( \phi \) porosity

\( \phi_0 \) estimated initial (surface) porosity

\( \rho_b \) bulk sediment density

\( \rho_w \) water density

\( \sigma \) total stress