

genetic analogies, and by just not discerning what was available for viewing in the field or laboratory. Capitan remains a model "in flux" awaiting more critical field and laboratory research.

SCLATER, JOHN G., University of Texas, Austin, TX

#### Extensional Models for Formation of Sedimentary Basins and Continental Shelves

Two kilometers of sediment cover more than 70% of the continents. The major accumulations occur in sedimentary basins and at continental shelves. The areas of maximum subsidence are generally associated with thin crust and evidence of extension. Of the concepts advanced to explain this subsidence, uniform extension has proved the most useful.

Models based on uniform extension account for the gross features of the basins and shelves, and provide a quantitative method for examining the history of subsidence. Modifications, however, are needed to explain the detailed subsidence of most areas and to account for regions with early uplift. Problems associated with the sum of the heave on the faults underestimating the amount of extension appear resolved.

The problems and modifications lead to limitations in the use of the models. The advantage, however, that they require a quantitative evaluation of all the data more than offsets these limitations. Because of this requirement for quantitative evaluation, the models have great value as tools in the design of data-acquisition programs.

SCOTT, ALAN J., RPI International, Inc., Boulder, CO

#### A Spectrum of Late Paleozoic and Cretaceous Shelf Bars, Western United States

Shelf-bar sandstones of the Cretaceous Western interior seaway of North America form excellent stratigraphic traps for hydrocarbons. Modern shelf sands occur in a variety of settings and are affected by such processes as storms and tidal, longshore, and shelf currents. Case studies of several Cretaceous and late Paleozoic sandstones document a spectrum of ancient shelf-bar types analogous with modern shelf systems.

Several shelf bars deposited in nearshore environments (8-10 mi offshore) were associated with deltaic axes. Sands were reworked from these axes by currents moving along the shoreline that were diverted by a headland. Such shelf-plume sandstones were subsequently reworked by storms and other shelf processes. The relative effects of storm and shelf or coastal currents greatly influenced the geometry and characteristics of the nearshore shelf bars, of which several variations can be documented.

Tidal currents are an important factor in forming and modifying modern shelf bars in the North Sea. Examination of primary structures and directional features suggests tidal currents were relatively unimportant in nearshore shelf bars of the Cretaceous Interior seaway. Examples of Pennsylvanian shelf-bar sandstones from the Sacramento Mountains of New Mexico have features characteristic of both storm and tidal processes.

Detailed examinations of primary sedimentary structures and facies relationships are useful in recognizing the various shelf-bar types and predicting the occurrence and distribution of similar potential reservoirs.

SCOTT, ALAN J., RPI International, Inc., Boulder, CO

#### Depositional Systems and Cycles, Eocene Yegua Formation, Texas, Gulf Coastal Plain

Tertiary Gulf Coast stratigraphy is characterized by a series of large-scale progradational wedges. Fluvial-deltaic and deep-water sandstones in several progradational units have proven to be prolific hydrocarbon-bearing reservoirs. The Eocene Yegua Formation is considered a relatively minor wedge compared to the Wilcox, Vicksburg, and Frio progradations. Prior to the late 1970s, Yegua exploration, and thus stratigraphic control, were confined to areas overlying the relatively stable submerged Wilcox deltaic platform.

Basinward, the Yegua thickens significantly beyond the margin of the Wilcox platform. In the few wells penetrating this thickened Yegua section, thick sandstones were unexpectedly encountered several miles beyond presumed Yegua shorelines. The discovery of Black Owl and

Toro Grande fields in the early 1980s triggered an exploration play in the expanded Yegua. Several depositional models were proposed to explain the occurrence of sandstones in this down-dip setting. Deep water, shelf, and deltaic origins all had their proponents.

The Yegua has numerous thin, laterally persistent, high-resistivity shales. These shales, inferred to be deposited during transgressive (non-progradational) episodes, have been used to subdivide the Yegua Formation into 12 genetic units. Correlation of these marker beds in more than 4,000 wells has resulted in a series of detailed regional maps delineating and documenting Yegua depositional systems and cycles.

The Yegua in the central Texas coastal plain is characterized by a series of narrow (1-3 mi wide) dip-oriented depositional axes. These axes represent meanderbelt and distributary channel deposits associated with fluvial and deltaic systems. The scale of these features is comparable to modern Texas coastal plain systems. The distribution and direction of the narrow axes are strongly influenced by syndepositional growth faults. Reworking of sands by shoreline processes are only a minor factor influencing reservoir distribution in the Yegua.

Regional mapping also documents shifts in depositional axes and depocenters of the various Yegua genetic units. Several minor Yegua depositional cycles are the result of these shifts rather than eustatic sea level fluctuations. However, a eustatically controlled cycle within the Yegua has been documented, and provides a mechanism for deposition of sand in the down-dip Yegua trend. Several other sands in this trend are associated with dip-oriented fluvial and deltaic axes deposited during progradational episodes. As these axes extended beyond the margin of the subjacent Wilcox platform, they reactivated, or initiated, a series of growth faults. Sand deposition was thickened and confined to localized depocenters along these faults.

THOMASSON, M. RAY, Pendleton Exploration, Denver, CO

#### Seismic Prediction of Porosity and Hydrocarbon Traps in Carbonate Rocks

Seismic stratigraphy has been used in many areas to identify stratigraphic carbonate traps such as shelf margins, pinnacle reefs, mounds, and updip porosity pinch-outs. Many large oil fields are the result of oil entrapment in these types of stratigraphic traps. Examples include fields from the Gulf Coast, Permian basin, Mid-Continent, and Rocky Mountain provinces in the United States, as well as fields in the Middle East, Canada, North Sea, and the Far East.

Where the trap shows geomorphological relief, evidence such as draping, pull-ups, dim spots, data dispersion, and other criteria can be used. Stratigraphic carbonate traps can be localized with some precision using these criteria. However, the specific definition and measurement of porosity in carbonate rocks are much more difficult. With very careful integration of geologic (rock data from cores and petrophysical data from logs) and geophysical (high resolution seismic) data, it is possible to estimate both the thickness and, in a qualitative way, the amount of porosity in a potential carbonate reservoir.

During the Carboniferous in the Mid-Continent, a sequence of depositional and diagenetic events created irregular pods of porosity in otherwise tight limestones. The areal extent, thickness, and quality of this porosity are the primary factors that determine the location, geometry, and productivity of major oil fields in the area. A twenty-million-barrel oil field has been studied in detail, and the initial production rates and overall production richness correspond closely to measurable seismic phenomena. A seismic line shot through the producing interval at a depth of 4,000 ft, using 30-fold, broad band (20-120 hertz) data has allowed the recovery of frequencies over 100 hertz. These data confirm (1) the presence of porosity and (2) field limits that correspond to the field limits known from subsurface information.

The Geoquest System work station was used to model (1) the key porous interval as known from core and petrophysical data in the analog field and (2) evaluate similar phenomena in the surrounding play area and measure both porosity thickness and quality in prospective stratigraphic traps. Two specific trap types occur regionally. The first type evidences porosity that developed locally and has an acoustically recognizable event over it (and between it and an overlying shale). The second type shows evidence of local porosity extending vertically to the shale seal. In both types, the lateral limits can be mapped seismically. The trap types have very different characteristics; both trap types and variations of them can be modeled successfully.

The trap types discussed are very subtle and have historically been

discovered only by operators drilling for structure or by random drilling. Many areas within the onshore United States are underexplored for these subtle type traps. With the availability of very high frequency/high-resolution data, these type plays can now be made.

WOOD, CHARLES A., NASA Johnson Space Center, Houston, TX

#### Geologic Exploration of Solar System

During the past quarter century, manned and unmanned spacecraft have explored seven planets, nearly three dozen moons, and one comet. In the process, astronomical objects have been transformed into unique worlds exhibiting a diversity of geological processes and materials. A new science of comparative planetology has developed, in which field experience on the Earth and the Moon aid in interpreting less well-known worlds. The processes that must have operated on the early Earth have been deduced from evidence from ancient surfaces of the Moon and planets. In particular, such comparative studies have demonstrated that only two geologic processes have been widespread throughout the history of the solar system: impact cratering and volcanism. Impact craters have formed throughout solar system history, indeed the planets themselves were formed by the accumulation of millions of smaller planetesimals, each of which formed an impact crater. Earth could not have escaped the intense bombardment that churned the surfaces of Mars, Mercury, and the Moon. The impact cratering rate dramatically declined about 3.9 billion years ago, but craters 10 km across still form on the Earth on the average of one every 140,000 years, and the 1.5-km wide Meteor Crater in Arizona formed only about 25,000 years ago.

Volcanic flows and cones have been observed on nearly all planets and moons in the solar system; the variety and duration of volcanism are directly related to planet mass. Thus, a relatively large planet like the Earth has a wide range of volcanic morphologies and compositions, with activity continuing throughout Earth history. In contrast, the smaller Moon produced a narrow compositional range of basaltic lava flows, with most of the lavas having erupted about 3 billion years ago. Water and sulfur volcanism have also been discovered on the cold satellites of the outer solar system, thus expanding our terrestrial concept of volcanism.

Many other processes and materials exist in the solar system, but the Earth remains unique in its richness of resources to support humans. Discovery and exploitation of extraterrestrial resources are beginning and must be greatly increased to prepare for our future as a space-faring race.

### AAPG DELEGATIONS/REPRESENTATIVES AND CHAIRMEN OF STANDING COMMITTEES AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES/PROJECTS 1987-1988

#### AAPG Delegations/Representatives

Representative from the Association of American State Geologists—  
**William L. Fisher**  
Chairman, AAPG Commissioners on North American Commission on  
Stratigraphic Nomenclature—**Robert R. Jordan**  
Representative to International Union of Geological Sciences—  
**William L. Fisher**  
Representative to OTC Executive Committee—**Jack C. Threet**  
AGI Governing Board—**William L. Fisher**  
API General Committee on Exploration Affairs—  
**Lawrence W. Funkhouser**

#### AAPG Standing Committees

Committee on:

Academic Liaison—**Charles F. Dodge**  
Astrogeology—**William R. Muehlberger**  
Ballot—**Frederick V. Ballard**  
Computer Applications to Geology—**John W. Harbaugh**  
Conventions—**James A. Hartman**  
Development Geology—**Robert J. Finley**  
Distinguished Lecture—**A. T. (Toby) Carleton, Jr.**  
Education—**Gary D. Howell**  
Environmental Geology—**Richard F. Meyer**  
Geophysics—**Charles E. Edwards**  
Governmental Communications—**Charles B. Wheeler**  
Group Insurance—**Anthony Reso**  
Headquarters Operations—**Edward D. Pittman**  
Industry Liaison—**David S. Holland**  
Investments—**T. A. (Tom) Manhart**  
Marine Geology—**Bill St. John**  
Membership—**Louis C. Bortz**  
Preservation of Samples and Cores—**Sidney B. Anderson**  
Publications—**Gerard Demaison**  
Public Information—**Susan M. Landon**  
Research—**Edward McFarlan, Jr.**  
Statistics of Drilling—**Thomas H. Murray, Jr.**  
Stratigraphic Correlations—**Emily L. Stoudt**  
Student Chapters—**Richard C. Hager**  
Visiting Petroleum Geologists—**William A. Sax**  
Youth Activities—**Jack W. Shirley**

#### AAPG Special Committees/Projects

AAPG/OTC Technical Program Committee—**Sigmund Snelson**  
Convention Coordinating Committee—**Richard S. Bishop**  
Ad Hoc Committee on Opportunities in Water Resources and Waste  
Management—**Robert R. Jordan**  
Petroleum Geology Curriculum Project—**Lee C. Gerhard**  
Tectonic Map of North America Project—**William R. Muehlberger**  
COSUNA Project—**Orlo E. Childs**