

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
List of Figures.....	3
List of Tables.....	8
Analysis of Petroleum Generation Potential.....	9
Analysis of Petroleum Generation Potential.....	9
1. Executive Summary.....	9
1.1 Approach.....	9
1.2 Primary Outcomes.....	10
1.3 Constraints, Concerns and Challenges.....	15
1.4 Recommendations.....	15
2. Overall Project Objectives.....	18
2.1 Phase I Objectives (Broad-Scale Basin Characterization).....	19
2.2 Phase II Objectives (Detailed Basin Delineation).....	19
3. Background Information.....	20
3.1 Physical Background.....	20
3.2 Resource and Economic Background.....	22
3.3 Geologic Framework and Background.....	26
3.4 Background on Petroleum System Models.....	28
3.4.1 Sedimentation and compaction.....	29
3.4.2 Subsidence and uplift.....	29
3.4.3 Thermal concept.....	30
3.4.3 Maturation concept.....	33
3.4.4 Petroleum generation kinetics.....	33
4. Seismic reflection data.....	36
4.1 Geophysical Preparation.....	36
4.2 Tectonic Interpretations.....	37
4.3 Seismic – Stratigraphic Correlation.....	42
5. Stratigraphy.....	43
6. Geochemistry.....	46
6.1. Amount of Organic Material.....	46
6.2. Type of Organic Material.....	48
6.3. Maturity of Organic Material.....	53
7. Basin Modeling.....	59
7.1 1-D models.....	59
7.2 Stratigraphy and burial history.....	60
7.2 Heat flow.....	65
8. Delineation of Maturity Zones by Petroleum Systems Models.....	81
8.1 Evolution of 1D- Modeling (Sockeye B-10).....	81
8.2 Basin-wide Maturation Systematics.....	83
8.3 Petroleum Generation Schneckle Plots.....	91
8.4 Basin Interpretation using Petroleum Generation Schneckle plot.....	93
9. Conclusions.....	101
10. Outlook for Phase II.....	103
11. References.....	104
A. Appendix A.....	114

B. Appendix B	116
Appendix C. Stratigraphy of Shell Canada Wells in Queen Charlotte Basin	125
C.1 Approach	125
C.2 Results of Review of Offshore Shell Canada Wells	126
C.2 .1 Cenozoic and Mesozoic volcanics and Mesozoic strata	126
C.2 .2 Skonun Formation	127
C.3 Summary and Discussion	129

List of Figures

Figure 1. Map of Queen Charlotte Basin region showing the present day maturity zones of the Neogene sediment package and the outlines of the offshore region and the Hecate + Queen Charlotte Basin. The structural information is from Rohr and Dietrich (1992).	14
Figure 2. Location map of Queen Charlotte Basin (Dixon Entrance, Hecate Strait and Queen Charlotte Sound) showing 18 previous drillholes (modified from Hannigan et al., 2001).	21
Figure 3. Basic hydrocarbon potential of QCB oil and gas based on estimated in-place oil and gas potential by Hannigan et al., (1998 and 2001). These numbers need adjusting for actual recoverable reserves and market values, once such information is available.	23
Figure 4. Comparison of B.C. onshore and offshore resource potentials.	23
Figure 5. B.C. onshore and offshore petroleum revenue history and projections.	24
Figure 6. Comparison of BC and Jeanne d’Arc (NFLD) offshore petroleum projections.	25
Figure 7. Generalized stratigraphy of Mesozoic (Triassic, Jurassic and Cretaceous) and Cenozoic (Tertiary) of QCB (after Dietrich, 1995).	27
Figure 8. Arrhenius plot showing the relationship between temperature and time on the maturation of kerogen (adapted from Snowdon, 2002)	34
Figure 9. Map of Queen Charlotte Basin, showing location of seismic reflection lines acquired by Geological Survey of Canada in 1988 (Rohr and Dietrich, 1989).	38
Figure 10. Comparison of multi-channel seismic reflection data) acquired by Geological Survey of Canada in 1988 (left) to seismic reflection data acquired during late 1960’s by Shell Canada (right). Although some of the apparent differences are due to the different plotting parameters used and could probably be improved by re-plotting the improved quality of the seismic data acquisition is obvious.	39
Figure 11. Detailed isopach map based on Rohr and Dietrich (1992). Most of the wells drilled offshore by Shell in late 1960’s did not penetrate areas with the greatest thickness of sediments. Fig 11a shows an enlarged plot of sediment thickness around the Tyee well in northern Hecate Strait, Figure 11b shows an enlarged plot of sediment thickness around the Osprey well in southern Queen Charlotte Sound. ...	40
Figure 12. Sediment thickness in Hecate Strait and Queen Charlotte Sound, as presented by Dehler et al. (1997). The Central Queen Charlotte Ridge, Moresby Ridge, and Principe Laredo High have prominent crustal horst-like features and show very thin sediment cover. Important for the hydrocarbon assessment are maxima in sediment	

thickness, located in the south western Queen Charlotte Sound and southern Hecate Strait.....	45
Figure 14. Depth plots of Hydrogen Index (HI) of the 8 offshore QCB wells (data from Bustin 1997).....	49
Figure 15. Source Rock quality plots of Hydrogen Index vs. Oxygen Index (modified van Krevelen) of the 8 offshore QCB wells (after Bustin 1997). Most of the Cenozoic source rocks offshore measured have a dominant Type III or humic character, with the exception of the Sockeye wells.....	50
Figure 16. Published data for the source rock intervals reported from the Queen Charlotte Islands (Macauley, 1983 and Snowdon et al., 2002) reveal that the Mesozoic Kunga and Maude source rocks contain marine, Type II-dominated kerogens.....	52
Figure 17. HI vs. Tmax plot for Queen Charlotte Islands (QCI) outcrop samples (modified after Snowdon et al., 2002). Based on the correlation of Tmax to maturation level for individual types of kerogen (Espitalité, 1986), this plot indicates that most of the samples from the Kunga and Maude groups are in the oil window.....	53
Figure 18. Depth plots of Vitrinite Reflectance of 8 offshore QCB wells (data from Bustin 1997). Lines are drawn at 0.5%Ro (top mature zone, oil window) and 1.2%Ro (base oil window and top gas window) for reference.....	56
Figure 19. Combined depth plots of Vitrinite Reflectance (VR) of 8 offshore QCB wells showing maturation zones (data from Bustin 1997).....	57
Figure 20. Schematic representation of present structural-stratigraphic cross section (NW – SW) connecting 8 offshore QCB wells (Dietrich, unpublished data); coloured stippled lines indicate isolines for vitrinite reflectance values (Ro) 0.3%, 0.5%, 0.8%; data derived from Bustin (1997).....	58
Figure 21. Burial and subsidence history of the South Coho well with an overlay of the modelled hydrocarbon zones (see text for a more detailed description).....	61
Figure 22. Burial and subsidence history of the Tyee well with an overlay of the modelled hydrocarbon zones. Colours explained in legend of Figure 21.....	61
Figure 23. Burial and subsidence history of the Sockeye B-10 well with an overlay of the modelled hydrocarbon zones. Colours as explained in Figure 21.....	62
Figure 24. Burial and subsidence history of the Sockeye E-66 well with an overlay of the modelled hydrocarbon zones Colours as explained in legend of Figure 21.....	62
Figure 25. Burial and subsidence history of the Murrelet K-15 well with an overlay of the modelled hydrocarbon zones. Colours as explained in legend of Figure 21.....	63
Figure 26. Burial and subsidence history of the Auklet well with an overlay of the modelled hydrocarbon zones. Colours as explained in legend of Figure 21.....	63
Figure 27. Burial and subsidence history of the Tyee well with an overlay of the modelled hydrocarbon zones. Colours as explained in legend of Figure 21.....	64
Figure 28. Burial and subsidence history of the Osprey well with an overlay of the modelled hydrocarbon zones. Colours as explained in legend of Figure 21.....	64
Figure 29. Present heat flow data for QCB compiled by Lewis et al. (1991) summarizes the available measurements of recent heat flow regarding the area under study. Heat flow values for the eight offshore wells, most probably calculated on the base of bottom hole show markedly lower heat flow measurements.....	66
Figure 30. Depth to Moho in Hecate Strait and Queen Charlotte Basin area as interpreted by Dehler et al, (1997). Two zones of extremely thinned crust are present in Queen	

- Charlotte Sound, the southernmost has crust less than 20 km thick and the second, in between Moresby ridge and Central Queen Charlotte Ridge, has crust only 24 km thick. Other areas, e.g. Central Queen Charlotte Ridge, are underlain by distinctly thicker crust..... 67
- Figure 31. The distribution of the extension observed in the Queen Charlotte Basin region (Dehler et al., 1997) favours a pronounced extension of the southern part (Queen Charlotte Sound) compared to the northern part (Hecate Strait). 68
- Figure 32. Similar to crustal stretching the predicted sub-crustal stretching (Dehler et al, 1997) also shows the focus of extension within the southern Queen Charlotte Sound area..... 69
- Figure 33. Crustal and mantle lithospheric extension has been strongly focussed onto the south western part of the Queen Charlotte Sound as shown above in Figures 30 to 32. Based on these observations Dehler et al. (1997) predict a maximum of more than 5 km of igneous (underplated) crust to occur under the QCS area. 71
- Figure 34. Map of predicted heat flow for Queen Charlotte Basin region (Dehler et al., 1997). 73
- Figure 35. Comparison of the calculated paleo-heat flow (Schuemann, 2002). The figure shows various pure shear rifting models according to McKenzie et al. (1978) and further lower plate simple shear models, calculated according to Royden (1986). The differences to the overlain heat flow model Hannigan et al. (2001) are obvious. The models used in this study reflect a McKenzie type scenario with an extension factor of approximately 3-4 (grey circles)..... 74
- Figure 36. Comparison of the paleo-heat flow model used by Hannigan et al. (2001) to the “Cold” and the “Hot” scenario of this study. As stated in the text the two earlier peaks in the Hannigan et al. (2001) model barely affect the Tertiary strata; these differences in the models are, therefore, of minor interest. Most important for the maturation of the Tertiary source rocks is the heat flow evolution related to the Tertiary rifting period. 75
- Figure 37. Calibration of the “Cold” and the “Hot” 1D maturation models for the three northernmost offshore wells in Hecate Strait. Although the calibration is necessarily rough due to the poorly constrained age assignments a generally consistent calibration of the preliminary “Cold” model could be achieved, while the “Hot” model seems to overestimate the thermal history..... 77
- Figure 38. Calibration of the “Cold” and the “Hot” 1D maturation models for the Sockeye E-66 and the Murrelet and the Auklet wells in central Hecate Strait. Less vitrinite reflectance data are available for these three wells; however, a fairly consistent calibration of the preliminary “Hot” model was achieved, while the “Cold” model definitely underestimates the thermal history of the Murrelet and Auklet wells in southern Hecate Strait..... 77
- Figure 39. Calibration of the “Cold” and the “Hot” 1D maturation models for the Harlequin and the Osprey well in Queen Charlotte Sound. Few calibration data are available for these wells and the calibration of these southernmost wells seems inconsistent, as maturation levels in the Harlequin well are clearly over estimated, even in the “Cold” model, while the measured maturation levels in the Osprey well are even higher than the ones predicted by the “Hot” model. Although a definite explanation for these observations cannot be given, a correlation to inhomogeneous

structures in the crust and/or the mantle lithosphere could be inferred (see also Figures 30, 32 and 33).	78
Figure 40. Burial and maturation history modelled for the Sockeye E-66 well. The left panel shows the model presented by Hannigan et al. (2001), which is compared to the “Cold” and the “Hot” model presented in this study. The grey shaded area reflects the oil-window modelled by Hannigan et al. (2001) for the marine source rocks of the Kunga and Maude groups, while the colours in the middle and the right panel refer to the modelled maturation zones for Type II source rocks. Colours as in Figure 21 (see text for further explanation).	79
Figure 41. Burial and maturation history modelled for the Sockeye B-10 well. The left panel shows the model presented by Hannigan et al. (2001), which is compared to the “Cold” model for Type II (middle panel) and Type III (right panel) kerogens presented in this study. The gray shaded area indicates the oil- and gas-windows, as modelled by Hannigan et al. (2001) for the Type II source rocks of the Kunga and Maude groups and the Type III source rocks of the Skonun Formation, respectively. The colours in the middle and the right panel refer to the modelled maturation zones according to the “Cold” scenario for Type II (middle panel) and Type III (right panel) source rocks. Colours as in Figure 21 (see text for further explanation).	80
Figure 42. Different models (cold scenario) for Sockeye B-10 for Type II kerogen; colours indicate immature, oil and gas window, and overmature strata; vertical lines indicate time for start of oil window (green), gas window (red), and overmature strata (yellow) Model a.) stratigraphy by Shell Canada (1968b,; b.) and c.) stratigraphy by Dietrich (unpublished data).	82
Figure 43. Comparative depth plots of oil and gas zones for offshore wells, based on modelled data – Type II kerogen “Cold” Scenario.	85
Figure 44. Comparative depth plots of oil and gas zones for offshore QCB wells, based on modelled data – Type II kerogen “Hot” Scenario.	86
Figure 45. Comparative depth plots of oil and gas zones for offshore QCB wells for various time slices (30 Ma to present), based on modelled data – Type II kerogen “Cold” Scenario.	87
Figure 46. Comparative depth plots of oil and gas zones for offshore QCB wells for various time slices (30 Ma to present), based on modelled data – Type II kerogen “Hot” Scenario.	88
Figure 47. Basin-wide depiction of depth plots for oil and gas windows of offshore QCB wells based on Type II Hot Scenario models.	89
Figure 48. Upper panel: schematic representation of present structural-stratigraphic cross section (NW – SW) connecting offshore QCB wells. Lower panel overlays the oil, gas and overmature zones for the Type II kerogen “Hot” Scenario.	90
Figure 49. Example of the evolution of a petroleum generation Schnecke plot, based on modelled data for the Sockeye B-10 well – Type II kerogen “Cold” Scenario. See text for description.	92
Figure 49. Comparative depth plots of oil and gas zones for offshore QCB wells for various time slices (30 Ma to present), based on modelled data – Type II kerogen “Cold” Scenario.	95

Figure 50. Comparative depth plots of oil and gas zones for offshore QCB wells for various time slices (30 Ma to present), based on modelled data – Type II kerogen “Hot” Scenario.....	96
Figure 51. Comparative depth plots of oil and gas zones for offshore QCB wells for various time slices (30 Ma to present), based on modelled data – Type III kerogen “Cold” Scenario	97
Figure 52. Comparative depth plots of oil and gas zones for offshore QCB wells for various time slices (30 Ma to present), based on modelled data – Type III kerogen “Hot” Scenario	98
Figure 53. Comparison of models calculated for Sockeye B-10 and South Coho (both kerogen Type II and “Hot” scenario) illustrating differences in total depth (TD) and uniform depths for tops of oil (green) and gas window (red) conditions; computed TD Sockeye B-10 5500 m, computed TD South Coho 3060 m.	99
Figure 54. Comparison of models calculated for Sockeye B-10 “Cold” scenario and Sockeye B-10 “Hot” scenario (both kerogen Type II) illustrating differences in depth, timing and presence of immature strata (blue), oil (green) and gas window (red) conditions and overmature strata (yellow) due to different heat flow histories.	99
Figure 55. Comparison of models calculated for Sockeye B-10 kerogen Type II and Sockeye B-10 kerogen Type III (both “Hot” scenario) illustrating differences in depth, timing and presence of immature strata (blue), oil (green) and gas window (red) conditions and overmature strata (yellow) due to different kerogen type.	100
Figure 56. Map of Queen Charlotte Basin region showing the present day maturity zones of the Neogene sediment package and the outlines of the offshore region and the Hecate + Queen Charlotte Basin. The structural information is from Rohr and Dietrich (1992).	102
Figure A1. Line 88-01 extends from the southern end of Hecate Strait through Queen Charlotte Sound almost to northern Vancouver Island.	114
Figure A2a) Line 88-03 spans the continental shelf out to the oceanic crust in the west.	115
Figure A2b) Line 88-04 is oriented sub-parallel to and in the western side of Hecate Strait.	115
Figure A3a) Line 88-05 crosses several sub-basins in Hecate Strait perpendicular to the strike of the QCB.	115
Figure A3b) Line 88-06 crosses Hecate Strait perpendicular to the strike of the QCB..	115
Figure A4. Line 88-07 extends from the northern end of Hecate Strait into Dixon Entrance, crossing the Principe Laredo Fault (PLF) into the Alexander terrane....	115
Figure B1. Comparative depth plots of oil and gas zones for 8 offshore QCB wells for various time slices (30 Ma to present), based on modelled data – Type II kerogen “Cold” Scenario/	121
Figure B2. Comparative depth plots of oil and gas zones for 8 offshore QCB wells for various time slices (30 Ma to present), based on modelled data – Type II kerogen “Hot” Scenario.	122
Figure B3. Comparative depth plots of oil and gas zones for 8 offshore QCB wells for various time slices (30 Ma to present), based on modelled data – Type III kerogen “Cold” Scenario.	123

Figure B4. Comparative depth plots of oil and gas zones for 8 offshore QCB wells for various time slices (30 Ma to present), based on modelled data – Type III kerogen “Hot” Scenario 124

List of Tables

Table 1 Summary of expected present day Cenozoic maturity zonation depths	12
Table 2. Comparison of maturation zone areas in Cenozoic source rocks of Queen Charlotte Basin.....	13
Table 3. List of wells drilled on and offshore QCB.....	20
Table 4. Comparison (Discovered Marketable Resources)	25
Table 5. Comparison (Ultimate Resources).....	25
Table 6 Values of parameters used in Eq. 5 (after McKenzie, 1978).....	33
Table 7. Generalized source rock maturity zones of the QCB as vitrinite reflectance equivalent (VR).....	54
Table 8. Heat flow histories used in this study.	74
Table B1. Maturity modelling output data “Cold” Type II kerogen.....	116
Table B2. Maturity modelling output data “Cold” Type III kerogen	116
Table B3. Maturity modelling output data “Hot” Type II kerogen	116
Table B4. Maturity modelling output data “Hot” Type III kerogen.....	116