

(19) World Intellectual Property Organization
International Bureau



(43) International Publication Date
22 June 2006 (22.06.2006)

PCT

(10) International Publication Number
WO 2006/065603 A2

(51) International Patent Classification:
E21B 47/026 (2006.01)

(21) International Application Number:
PCT/US2005/044301

(22) International Filing Date:
9 December 2005 (09.12.2005)

(25) Filing Language: English

(26) Publication Language: English

(30) Priority Data:
11/015,911 16 December 2004 (16.12.2004) US

(71) Applicant (for all designated States except US):
CHEVRON U.S.A. INC. [US/US]; 6001 Bollinger Canyon Road - 3rd Floor, San Ramon, CA 94583 (US).

(72) Inventors; and

(75) Inventors/Applicants (for US only): **CALHOUN, William, Malcolm** [US/US]; 1 Roundtop Place, The Woodlands, TX 77381 (US). **EWY, Russell, Thomas** [US/US]; 800 Springbrook Drive, San Ramon, CA (US).

(74) Agents: **SCHULTE, Richard, J.** et al.; Chevrontexaco Corporation, Law Dept., Post Office Box 6006, San Ramon, CA 94583-0806 (US).

(81) Designated States (unless otherwise indicated, for every kind of national protection available): AE, AG, AL, AM, AT, AU, AZ, BA, BB, BG, BR, BW, BY, BZ, CA, CH, CN, CO, CR, CU, CZ, DE, DK, DM, DZ, EC, EE, EG, ES, FI, GB, GD, GE, GH, GM, HR, HU, ID, IL, IN, IS, JP, KE, KG, KM, KN, KP, KR, KZ, LC, LK, LR, LS, LT, LU, LV, LY, MA, MD, MG, MK, MN, MW, MX, MZ, NA, NG, NI, NO, NZ, OM, PG, PH, PL, PT, RO, RU, SC, SD, SE, SG, SK, SL, SM, SY, TJ, TM, TN, TR, TT, TZ, UA, UG, US, UZ, VC, VN, YU, ZA, ZM, ZW.


(84) Designated States (unless otherwise indicated, for every kind of regional protection available): ARIPO (BW, GH, GM, KE, LS, MW, MZ, NA, SD, SL, SZ, TZ, UG, ZM, ZW), Eurasian (AM, AZ, BY, KG, KZ, MD, RU, TJ, TM), European (AT, BE, BG, CH, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, GB, GR, HU, IE, IS, IT, LT, LU, LV, MC, NL, PL, PT, RO, SE, SI, SK, TR), OAPI (BF, BJ, CF, CG, CI, CM, GA, GN, GQ, GW, ML, MR, NE, SN, TD, TG).

Published:

— without international search report and to be republished upon receipt of that report

For two-letter codes and other abbreviations, refer to the "Guidance Notes on Codes and Abbreviations" appearing at the beginning of each regular issue of the PCT Gazette.

(54) Title: METHOD FOR ESTIMATING CONFINED COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH FOR ROCK FORMATIONS UTILIZING SKEMPTON THEORY



(57) Abstract: A method for estimating the CCS for a rock in the depth of cut zone of a subterranean formation which is to be drilled using a drilling fluid is disclosed. An UCS is determined for a rock in the depth of cut zone. A change in the strength of the rock due to applied stresses imposed on the rock during drilling is calculated which includes estimating the ΔPP . The CCS for the rock in the depth of cut zone is calculated by adding the estimated change in strength to the UCS. The present invention calculates the ΔPP in accordance with Skempton theory where impermeable rock or soil has a change in pore volume due to applied loads or stresses while fluid flow into and out of the rock or soil is substantially non-existent. CCS may be calculated for deviated wellbores and to account for factors such as wellbore profile, stress raisers, bore diameter, and mud weight utilizing correction factors

derived using computer modeling and using a baseline formula for determining an uncorrected value for CCS.

1 **METHOD FOR ESTIMATING CONFINED COMPRESSIVE**
2 **STRENGTH FOR ROCK FORMATIONS**
3 **UTILIZING SKEMPTON THEORY**

4
5 CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATION
6

7 This application hereby incorporates by reference U.S. Patent Application
8 entitled "Method for Predicting and Optimizing the Rate of Penetration in
9 Drilling a Wellbore" by William Malcolm Calhoun, Hector Ulpiano Caicedo,
10 and Russell Thomas Ewy, filed concurrently with the present application.

11
12 TECHNICAL FIELD
13

14 The present invention relates generally to methods for estimating rock
15 strength, and more particularly, to methods for estimating the "confined"
16 compressive strength (CCS) of rock formations into which wellbores are to be
17 drilled.

18
19 BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION
20

21 It has become standard practice to plan wells and analyze bit performance
22 using log-based rock strength analysis. There are several methodologies in
23 use that characterize rock strength in terms of CCS, but the most widely used
24 standard by drill bit specialists is "unconfined" compressive strength (UCS).
25 UCS generally refers to the strength of the rock when the rock is under only
26 limited or uniaxial loading. The strength of the rock is typically increased when
27 the rock is supported by confining compressive pressures or stresses from all
28 directions. This strength is expressed in terms of CCS, which is force per unit
29 area, i.e., pounds per square inch (psi).

30
31 The use of UCS for bit selection and bit performance prediction/analysis is
32 somewhat problematic in that the "apparent" strength of the rock to a bit is
33 typically something different than UCS. There is an awareness of the problem,

as it is widely accepted and documented that bit performance is greatly influenced by drilling fluid pressure and the difference between drilling fluid pressure and the in situ pore pressure (PP) of the rock being drilled. The pressure provided by the drilling fluid is often referred to as the equivalent circulating density (ECD) pressure and may be expressed in terms of mud weight, i.e. pounds per gallon (ppg). For vertical wells, the drilling fluid pressure or ECD pressure replaces the overburden (OB) pressure as the overburden is drilled away from the rock.

One widely practiced and accepted "rock mechanics" method for calculating CCS is to use the following mathematical expression:

$$CCS = UCS + DP + 2DP\sin FA / (1 - \sin FA) \quad (1)$$

where: UCS = the unconfined compressive strength of the rock;
 DP = differential pressure (or confining stress on the rock); and
 FA = internal angle of friction of the rock or friction angle (a rock property).

Adapting equation (1) to the bottom hole drilling condition for highly permeable rock is often performed by defining the DP as the difference between the ECD pressure applied by a drilling fluid upon the rock being drilled and the in-situ PP of the rock before drilling.

This adaptation results in the following expression for the CCS for high permeability rock (CCS_{HP}):

$$CCS_{HP} = UCS + DP + 2DP\sin FA / (1 - \sin FA) \quad (2)$$

where: DP = ECD pressure – in situ pore pressure. (3)

In the case of rock which is very low in permeability, there is no industry wide standard or methodology to predict the apparent strength of the rock to the bit.

1 There have been various schemes proposed, but the only simple methods
2 that have gained limited acceptance assume the rock behaves as if
3 permeable or that the PP in the rock is zero. The latter assumption results in
4 the following mathematical expression for the CCS_{LP} for low permeability rock:

5

$$6 \quad CCS_{LP} = UCS + DP + 2DP \sin FA / (1 - \sin FA) \quad (4)$$

$$7 \quad \text{where: } DP = ECD \text{ pressure} - 0. \quad (5)$$

8

9 The assumption that PP is zero and that the differential pressure DP_{ECD} is
10 generally equal to the ECD pressure for low permeability rock often leads to
11 erroneous estimates for the apparent CCS_{LP} . Subsequent use of these CCS_{LP}
12 estimates for low permeability rock then leads to poor estimates when the
13 CCS_{LP} estimates are used for bit selection, drill bit rate of penetration
14 calculations, bit wear life predictions, and other like estimates based on the
15 strength of the rock.

16

17 Another drawback to the above method for calculating CCS is that it fails to
18 account for the change in the stress state of the rock for deviated or horizontal
19 wellbores relative to vertical wellbores. Wellbores drilled at deviated angles or
20 as horizontal wellbores can have a significantly different stress state in the
21 depth of cut zone due to pressure applied by overburden as compared to
22 vertical wellbores wherein the overburden has been drilled away.

23

24 Still yet another shortcoming is that CCS as calculated above is an average
25 strength value across the bottom hole profile of a wellbore assuming that the
26 profile is generally flat. In actuality, the bottom hole profiles of the wellbores
27 can be highly contoured depending on the configuration of the bits creating
28 the wellbore. Further, stress concentrations occur about the radial periphery
29 of the hole. Highly simplified methods of calculating CCS fail to take into
30 account these geometric factors which can significantly change the apparent
31 strength of the rock to a drill bit during a drilling operation under certain
32 conditions.

1 Accordingly, there is a need for a better way to calculate CCS for rocks
2 subject to drilling, and more particularly, for rocks which have low
3 permeability. The method should account for the relative change in pore
4 pressure (ΔPP) due to the drilling operation rather than assume the PP will
5 remain at the PP of the surrounding reservoir in the case of highly permeable
6 rock or assume there is no significant PP in the rock for the case of very low
7 permeability rock. The present invention addresses this need by providing
8 improved methods for estimating CCS for low permeability rocks and for rocks
9 that have limited permeability. Further, the present invention addresses the
10 need to accommodate the altered stress state in the depth of cut zone found
11 in deviated and horizontal wellbores as compared to those of vertical
12 wellbores. Additionally, the present invention provides a way to accommodate
13 geometric factors such as wellbore profiles and associated stress
14 concentrations that can significantly affect the apparent CCS of rock being
15 drilled away to create a wellbore.

16

17 SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

18

19 The present invention includes a method for estimating the CCS for a rock in
20 the depth of cut zone of a subterranean formation which is to be drilled using
21 a drill bit and a drilling fluid. First, an UCS is determined for the rock. Next, the
22 change in the strength of the rock is determined due to applied stresses which
23 will be imposed on the rock during drilling including the change in strength
24 due to the ΔPP in the rock due to drilling. The CCS for the rock in the depth of
25 cut zone is then calculated by adding the estimated change in strength to the
26 UCS. For the case of highly impermeable rock, the ΔPP is estimated
27 assuming that there will be no substantial movement of fluids into or out of the
28 rock during drilling. The present invention preferably calculates the ΔPP in
29 accordance with Skempton theory where impermeable rock or soil has a
30 change in pore volume due to applied loads or stresses while fluid flow into
31 and out of the rock or soil is substantially non-existent.

1 CCS may be calculated for deviated wellbores and to account for factors such
2 as wellbore profile, stress raisers, bore diameter, and mud weight utilizing
3 correction factors derived using computer modeling.

4

5 For the case of a highly deviated well ($>30^\circ$), well deviation, azimuth and earth
6 principal horizontal stresses may be utilized for improved accuracy.

7

8

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

9

10 FIG. 1 is a schematic illustration of a bottom hole environment for a vertical
11 wellbore in porous/permeable rock;

12

13 FIGS. 2A and 2B are graphs of CCS plotted against the confining or DP
14 applied across a rock in the depth of cut zone;

15

16 FIGS. 3A and 3B are schematic illustrations of stresses applied to stress
17 blocks of rock in the depth of cut zone for a) a vertical wellbore; b) a horizontal
18 wellbore; and c) a wellbore oriented at an angle α deviating from the vertical
19 and at an azimuthal angle β ;

20

21 FIG. 4 is a graph showing DP at the bottom of a hole for impermeable rock as
22 predicted in accordance with the present invention and as estimated by a
23 finite element computer model;

24

25 FIG. 5 is a table of calculated values of DP, CCS, and rate of penetration
26 ROP;

27

28 FIG. 6 is a graph of rate of penetration ROP for a drill bit versus CCS of a rock
29 being drilled;

30

31 FIG. 7 is a graph of rate of penetration ROP versus mud density;

32

33 FIG. 8 is a graph of rate of penetration ROP versus PP; and

1 FIG. 9 is a table of bit profile segments which can be combined to
2 characterize the profile of a drill bit.

3

4 DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION

5

6 **I. General CCS Calculation For Vertical Wellbores**

7

8 An important part of the strength of a rock to resist drilling depends upon the
9 compressive state under which the rock is subjected during drilling. This
10 ability by a rock to resist drilling by a drill bit under the confining conditions of
11 drilling shall be referred to as a rock's CCS. Prior to drilling, the compressive
12 state of a rock at a particular depth is largely dependent on the weight of the
13 overburden being supported by the rock. During a drilling operation the
14 bottom portion of the wellbore, i.e., the rock in the depth of cut zone, is
15 exposed to drilling fluids rather than to the overburden which has been
16 removed. However, rock to be removed in a deviated or horizontal wellbore is
17 still subject to components of the overburden load as well as to the drilling
18 fluid and is dependent upon the angle of deviation of the wellbore from the
19 vertical and also its azimuth angle.

20

21 Ideally, a realistic estimate of the in situ PP in a bit's depth of cut zone is
22 determined when calculating CCS for the rock to be drilled. This depth of cut
23 zone is typically on the order of zero to 15 mm, depending on the penetration
24 rate, bit characteristics, and bit operating parameters. The present invention
25 provides a novel way to calculate the altered PP at the bottom of the wellbore
26 (immediately below the bit in the depth of cut zone), for rocks of limited
27 permeability. It should be noted that the altered PP at the bottom of the hole,
28 as it influences CCS and bit performance, is a short time frame effect, the
29 longest time frame probably on the order of one second, but sometimes on an
30 order of magnitude less.

31

32 While not wishing to be held to a particular theory, the following describes the
33 general assumptions made in arriving at a method for calculating CCS for

1 rock being drilled using a drill bit and drilling fluid to create a generally vertical
2 wellbore with a flat bottom hole profile. Referring now to FIG. 1, a bottom hole
3 environment for a vertical well in a porous/permeable rock formation is shown.
4 A rock formation 20 is depicted with a vertical wellbore 22 being drilled
5 therein. The inner periphery of the wellbore 22 is filled with a drilling fluid 24
6 which creates a filter cake 26 lining wellbore 22. Arrows 28 indicate that pore
7 fluid in rock formation 20, i.e., the surrounding reservoir, can freely flow into
8 the pore space in the rock in the depth of cut zone. This is generally the case
9 when the rock is highly permeable. Also, the drilling fluid 24 applies pressure
10 to the wellbore as suggested by arrows 30.

11

12 The rock previously overlying the depth of cut zone, which exerted an
13 "OB stress or OB pressure" prior to the drilling of the wellbore, has been
14 replaced by the drilling fluid 24. Although there can be exceptions, the fluid
15 pressure exerted by the drilling fluid 24 is typically greater than the in situ PP
16 in the depth of cut zone and less than the OB pressure previously exerted by
17 the overburden. Under this common drilling condition, the rock in the depth of
18 cut zone expands slightly at the bottom of the hole or wellbore due to the
19 reduction of stress (pressure from drilling fluid is less than OB pressure
20 exerted by overburden). Similarly, it is assumed that the pore volume in the
21 rock also expands. The expansion of the rock and its pores will result in an
22 instantaneous PP decrease in the affected region if no fluid flows into the
23 pores of the expanded rock in the depth of cut zone.

24

25 If the rock is highly permeable, the PP reduction results in fluid movement
26 from the far field (reservoir) into the expanded region, as indicated by
27 arrows 28. The rate and degree to which pore fluid flows into the expanded
28 region, thus equalizing the PP of the expanded rock to that of the far field
29 (reservoir pressure), is dependent on a number of factors. Primary among
30 these factors is the rate of rock alteration which is correlative to rate of
31 penetration and the relative permeability of the rock to the pore fluid. This
32 assumes that the reservoir volume is relatively large compared to the depth of
33 cut zone, which is generally a reasonable assumption. At the same time, if

1 drilling fluid or ECD pressure is greater than in situ PP, filtrate from the drilling
2 fluid will attempt to enter the permeable pore space in the depth of cut zone.
3 The filter cake 26 built during the initial mud invasion (sometimes referred to
4 as spurt loss) acts as a barrier to further filtrate invasion. If the filter cake 26
5 build up is efficient, (very thin and quick, which is desirable and often
6 achieved) it is reasonable to assume that the impact of filtrate invasion on
7 altering the PP in the depth of cut region is negligible. It is also assumed that
8 the mud filter cake 26 acts as an impermeable membrane for the typical case
9 of drilling fluid pressure being greater than PP. Therefore, for highly
10 permeable rock drilled with drilling fluid, the PP in the depth of cut zone can
11 reasonably be assumed to be essentially the same as the in-situ PP of the
12 surrounding reservoir rock.

13

14 For substantially impermeable rock, such as shale and very tight non-shale, it
15 is assumed that there is no substantial amount of pore fluid movement or
16 filtrate invasion into the depth of cut zone. Therefore, the instantaneous PP in
17 the depth of cut zone is a function of the stress change on the rock in the
18 depth of cut zone, rock properties such as permeability and stiffness, and
19 in-situ pore fluid properties (primarily compressibility).

20

21 As described above in the background section, equation (1) represents a
22 widely practiced and accepted "rock mechanics" method for calculating CCS
23 of rock.

24

$$25 \quad \text{CCS} = \text{UCS} + \text{DP} + 2\text{DP}\sin\text{FA}/(1 - \sin\text{FA}) \quad (1)$$

26 where: UCS = rock unconfined compressive strength;
27 DP = differential pressure (or confining stress)
28 across the rock; and
29 FA = internal angle of friction of the rock.

30

31 In the preferred and exemplary embodiment of the present invention, the UCS
32 and internal angle of friction FA is calculated by the processing of acoustic
33 well log data or seismic data. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that other

1 methods of calculating UCS and internal angle of friction FA are known and
2 can be used with the present invention. By way of example, and not limitation,
3 these alternative methods of determining UCS and FA include alternative
4 methods of processing of well log data, and analysis and/or testing of core or
5 drill cuttings.

6

7 Details regarding the internal angle of friction can be found in U.S. Patent
8 No. 5,416,697, to Goodman, entitled "Method for Determining Rock
9 Mechanical Properties Using Electrical Log Data", which is hereby
10 incorporated by reference in its entirety. Goodman utilizes a method for
11 determining the angle of internal friction disclosed by Turk and Dearman in
12 1986 in "Estimation of Friction Properties of Rock From Deformation
13 Measurements", Chapter 14, Proceedings of the 27th U.S. Symposium on
14 Rock Mechanics, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, June 23-25, 1986. The method
15 predicts that as Poisson's ratio changes with changes in water saturation and
16 shaliness, the angle of internal friction changes. The angle of internal friction
17 is therefore also related to rock drillability and therefore to drill bit
18 performance. Adapting this methodology to the bottom hole drilling conditions
19 for permeable rock is accomplished by defining DP as ECD pressure minus
20 the in-situ PP of the rock before drilling or the PP of the surrounding reservoir
21 rock at the time of drilling. This results in the mathematical expressions for
22 CCS_{HP} and DP as described above with respect to equations (2) and (3).

23

24 ECD pressure is most preferably calculated by directly measuring pressure
25 with down hole tools. Alternatively, ECD pressure may be estimated by
26 adding a reasonable value to mud pressure or calculating with software.
27 FIGS. 2A and 2B depict exemplary graphs showing how CCS varies with the
28 DP applied across the rock in the depth of cut zone. With no DP applied
29 across the rock, the strength of the rock is essentially the UCS. However, as
30 the DP increases, the CCS also increases. In FIG. 2A, the increase is shown
31 as a linear function. In FIG. 2B, the increase is shown as a non-linear
32 function.

1 Rather than assuming the PP in low permeability rock is essentially zero, the
 2 present invention utilizes a soil mechanics methodology to determine the ΔPP
 3 and applies this approach to the drilling of rocks. For the case of impermeable
 4 rock, a relationship described by Skempton, A.W.: "Pore Pressure
 5 Coefficients A and B," *Geotechnique* (1954), Volume 4, pages 143-147 is
 6 adapted for use with equation (1). Skempton pore pressure may generally be
 7 described as the in-situ PP of a porous but generally non-permeable material
 8 before drilling modified by the PP change ΔPP due to the change in average
 9 stress on a volume of the material assuming that permeability is so low that
 10 no appreciable flow of fluids occurs into or out of the material. In the present
 11 application, the porous material under consideration is the rock in the depth of
 12 cut zone and it is assumed that that permeability is so low that no appreciable
 13 flow of fluids occurs into or out of the depth of cut zone. It is noted in FIG. 2A,
 14 that the change ΔPP in DP is a function of the PP change in the rock due to
 15 drilling).

16

17 This DP across the rock in the depth of cut zone may be mathematically
 18 expressed as:

19

$$20 \quad DP_{LP} = ECD - (PP + \Delta PP) \quad (6)$$

21 where: DP = differential pressure across the rock for a
 22 low permeability rock;

23 ECD = equivalent circulating density pressure of
 24 the drilling fluid;

25 (PP + ΔPP) = Skempton pore pressure;

26 PP = pore pressure in the rock prior to drilling;

27 and

28 ΔPP = change in pore pressure due to ECD
 29 pressure replacing earth stress.

30

31 FIG. 3A shows principal stresses applied to a stress block of rock from the
 32 depth of cut zone for a generally vertical wellbore. Note that ECD pressure
 33 replaces OB pressure as a consequence of the rock being drilled. FIG. 3B

1 illustrates a stress block of rock from a generally horizontally extending
 2 portion of a wellbore. In this case, OB pressure remains on the vertical
 3 surface of the stress block. FIG. 3C shows a stress block of rock obtained
 4 from a deviated wellbore having an angle α of deviation from the vertical and
 5 an azimuthal angle β projected on a horizontal plane. Mud or ECD pressure
 6 replaces the previous pressure or stress that existed prior to drilling in the
 7 direction of drilling (z direction).

8

9 Skempton describes two PP coefficients A and B, which determine the ΔPP
 10 caused by changes in applied total stress for a porous material under
 11 conditions of zero drainage. The ΔPP is given the general case by:

12

$$13 \quad \Delta PP = B[(\Delta\sigma_1 + \Delta\sigma_2 + \Delta\sigma_3)/3 +$$

$$14 \quad \sqrt{1/2[(\Delta\sigma_1 - \Delta\sigma_2)^2 + (\Delta\sigma_1 - \Delta\sigma_3)^2 + (\Delta\sigma_2 - \Delta\sigma_3)^2]} * (3A - 1)/3] \quad (7)$$

15 where: A = coefficient that describes change in pore
 16 pressure caused by change in shear stress;
 17 B = coefficient that describes change in pore
 18 pressure caused by change in mean stress;
 19 σ_1 = first principal stress;
 20 σ_2 = second principal stress;
 21 σ_3 = third principal stress; and
 22 Δ = operator describing the difference in a
 23 particular stress on the rock before drilling
 24 and during drilling.

25

26 For a generally vertical wellbore, the first principal stress σ_1 is the
 27 OB pressure prior to drilling which is replaced by the ECD pressure applied to
 28 the rock during drilling, and σ_2 and σ_3 are horizontal principal earth stresses
 29 applied to the rock. Also, $(\Delta\sigma_1 + \Delta\sigma_2 + \Delta\sigma_3)/3$ represents the change in
 30 average, or mean stress, and

1 $\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}[(\Delta\sigma_1 - \Delta\sigma_2)^2 + (\Delta\sigma_1 - \Delta\sigma_3)^2 + (\Delta\sigma_2 - \Delta\sigma_3)^2]}$ represents the change in
 2 shear stress on a volume of material.

3
 4 For an elastic material it can be shown that $A = 1/3$. This is because a change
 5 in shear stress causes no volume change for an elastic material. If there is no
 6 volume change then there is no PP change (the pore fluid neither expands
 7 nor compresses). If it is assumed that the rock near the bottom of the hole is
 8 deforming elastically, then the PP change equation (7) can be simplified to:

$$9 \quad \Delta PP = B(\Delta\sigma_1 + \Delta\sigma_2 + \Delta\sigma_3)/3. \quad (8)$$

11
 12 For the case where it is assumed that σ_2 is generally equal to σ_3 , then

$$14 \quad \Delta PP = B(\Delta\sigma_1 + 2\Delta\sigma_3)/3. \quad (9)$$

15
 16 Equation (8) describes that PP change ΔPP is equal to the constant B
 17 multiplied by the change in mean, or average, total stress on the rock. Note
 18 that mean stress is an *invariant* property. It is the same no matter what
 19 coordinate system is used. Thus the stresses do not need to be principal
 20 stresses. Equation (8) is accurate as long as the three stresses are mutually
 21 perpendicular. For convenience, σ_z will be defined as the stress acting in the
 22 direction of the wellbore and σ_x and σ_y as stresses acting in directions
 23 mutually orthogonal to the direction of the wellbore. Equation (8) can then be
 24 rewritten as:

25
 26 START HERE! FIX THE RIGHT MARGIN FOR (10) AND OTHER
 27 EQUATIONS

$$29 \quad \Delta PP = B(\Delta\sigma_z + \Delta\sigma_x + \Delta\sigma_y)/3. \quad (10)$$

30

1 There will be changes in σ_x and σ_y near the bottom of the hole. However,
 2 these changes are generally small when compared to $\Delta\sigma_z$ and can be
 3 neglected for a simplified approach. Equation (10) then simplifies to

$$4 \quad \Delta PP = B(\Delta\sigma_z)/3. \quad (11)$$

6 For most shales, B is between 0.8 and ~1.0. Young, soft shales have B values
 7 of 0.95 to 1.0, while older stiffer shales will be closer to 0.8. For a simplified
 8 approach that does not require rock properties, it is assumed that $B=1.0$.
 9 Since $\Delta\sigma_z$ is equal to $(ECD - \sigma_z)$ for a vertical wellbore, equation (11) can be
 10 rewritten as

$$12 \quad \Delta PP = (ECD - \sigma_z)/3. \quad (12)$$

14 Note that ΔPP is almost always negative. That is, there will be a PP decrease
 15 near the bottom of the hole due to the drilling operation. This is because ECD
 16 pressure is almost always less than the in situ stress parallel to the well (σ_z)
 17 prior to drilling.

19 The altered PP (Skempton pore pressure) near the bottom of the hole is equal
 20 to $PP + \Delta PP$, or $PP + (ECD - \sigma_z)/3$. This can also be expressed as:

$$22 \quad PP - (\sigma_z - ECD)/3. \quad (13)$$

24 For the case of a vertical well, σ_z is equal to the OB stress or OB pressure
 25 which is removed due to the drilling operation.

27 In the case of a vertical well and most shale (not unusually hard and stiff), the
 28 change in average stress can be approximated by the term " $(OB - ECD)/3$ ".

30 Utilizing this assumption, the following expression can be used for generally
 31 vertical wellbores wherein low permeability rock is being drilled:

$$33 \quad CCS_{LP} = UCS + DP + 2DP\sin FA/(1 - \sin FA) \quad (14)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{CCS}_{\text{MIX}} = \text{CCS}_{\text{LP}} \times (\varphi_{\text{HP}} - \varphi_e) / (\varphi_{\text{HP}} - \varphi_{\text{LP}}) + \text{CCS}_{\text{HP}} \times (\varphi_e - \varphi_{\text{LP}}) / (\varphi_{\text{HP}} - \varphi_{\text{LP}}) \\
 & \text{if } \varphi_{\text{LP}} \leq \varphi_e \leq \varphi_{\text{HP}}; \quad (19)
 \end{aligned}$$

where: φ_e = effective porosity;
 φ_{LP} = low permeability rock effective porosity threshold; and
 φ_{HP} = high permeability rock effective porosity threshold.

In this exemplary embodiment, a rock is considered to have low permeability if its effective porosity φ_e is less than or equal to .05 and to have a high permeability if its effective porosity φ_e is equal to or greater than 0.20. This results in the following values of CCS_{MIX} in this preferred embodiment:

$$\text{CCS}_{\text{MIX}} = \text{CCS}_{\text{HP}} \text{ if } \varphi_e \geq .20; \quad (20)$$

$$\text{CCS}_{\text{MIX}} = \text{CCS}_{\text{LP}} \text{ if } \varphi_e \leq .05; \quad (21)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{CCS}_{\text{MIX}} = \text{CCS}_{\text{LP}} \times (.20 - \varphi_e) / .15 + \text{CCS}_{\text{HP}} \times (\varphi_e - .05) / .15 \\
 & \text{if } .05 < \varphi_e < .20. \quad (22)
 \end{aligned}$$

As can be seen from the equations above, the assumption is made that the rock behaves as impermeable if φ_e is less than or equal to 0.05 and as permeable if φ_e is greater than or equal to 0.20. The endpoint φ_e values of 0.05 and 0.20 are assumed, and it is recognized that reasonable endpoints for this method are dependent upon a number of factors including the drilling rate. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that other endpoints may be used to define the endpoints for low and high permeability. Likewise, it will be appreciated that non-linear interpolation schemes can also be used to estimate CCS_{MIX} between the endpoints. Further, other schemes of calculating CCS_{MIX} for a range of permeabilities may be used which rely, in part, upon the Skempton approach described above for calculating PP change ΔPP which is generally mathematically described using equations (7) - (12).

Support for the methodology utilizing the Skempton approach for determining CCS_{LP} for low permeability rock is provided by computer models and from

1 experimental data. Warren, T.M., Smith, M.B.: "Bottomhole Stress Factors
2 Affecting Drilling Rate at Depth," *J. Pet. Tech.* (Aug. 1985) 1523-1533,
3 hereinafter referred to as Warren and Smith, describes results of finite
4 element or computer modeling of the bottom of a hole. This work supports the
5 concept that the effective stress on the bottom of the hole for permeable rock
6 is essentially equal to the difference between drilling fluid ECD pressure and
7 in-situ PP for the reasons described above, except for minor differences due
8 to the bottom hole profile and larger differences near the-diameter due to an
9 edge effect.

10

11 FIG. 4 illustrates the DP for a given set of conditions for impermeable rock.
12 Shown are DP curves determined by the finite element modeling of Warren
13 and Smith, as well as by using the simplified Skempton method of the present
14 invention, i.e. using equations (14) - (16). These results are for the cases
15 where OB pressure equals 10,000 psi, horizontal stresses σ_x, σ_y equals 7,000
16 psi, in situ PP equals 4,700 psi, and mud pressure (PWell) or ECD Pressure
17 equals 4,700, 5,700 and 6,700 psi, respectively. The Warren and Smith
18 results are provided for 0.11" below the bottom of the borehole surface and at
19 various radial positions R from the center of the hole of overall radius R_w .
20 Additional rock properties, pore fluid properties, and bottom hole profile were
21 required for Warren and Smith's finite element analysis. As can be seen, there
22 is fair agreement between Warren and Smith's more rigorous finite element
23 modeling and the simplified Skempton approvals presented herein. The
24 agreement would be even better for a more typical shale, as Warren and
25 Smith modeled a very hard, stiff shale. It is also noteworthy that the apparent
26 difference between the two methods decreases as mud or ECD pressure
27 increases above in-situ PP. Therefore the simplified method of the present
28 invention may be particularly-suitable and accurate for more over-balanced
29 conditions and then become less accurate as balanced conditions are
30 approached.

31

32 If a rock formation has a coefficient B of less than one, then the error due to
33 assuming $B=1$ will cause a slight over-prediction of the amount of PP

1 decrease ΔPP . This over-prediction is evident in FIG. 4 wherein results are
2 shown from the finite element model for a shale that is extremely hard and
3 stiff ($B = 0.57$). For a more typical shale B value the calculated DP values
4 would be about 500 psi higher, which would match extremely well with the
5 simplified Skempton calculations used in the present invention. A more robust
6 application of this Skempton based approach would include calculating values
7 of A and B coefficients based on log-derived rock properties, and also to
8 account for changes in σ_x , σ_y and σ_z if necessary.

9

10 For the case of a very stiff, but very low-permeability rock, such as a very tight
11 carbonate, B is likely to be much less than 1.0 and could easily be on the
12 order of 0.5. The actual value of B should therefore be taken into account for
13 tight non-shale lithologies. Extremely stiff shales may also require adjustment
14 of the B value.

15

16 If the stress change that occurs near the bottom of the hole is enough to
17 cause non-elastic behavior (due to increasing shear stress), this can be
18 accounted for by using the appropriate value of A , instead of assuming $A=1/3$.

19 In a more advanced approach, the A coefficient can even be used to
20 represent instantaneous PP changes ΔPP that occur in the rock as it is being
21 cut and failed by the bit. These PP changes ΔPP are a function of whether the
22 rock is failing in a dilatant or non-dilatant manner, and can also exhibit strain-
23 rate effects at high strain rates. See Cook, J.M., Sheppard, M.C., Houwen,
24 O.H.: "Effects of Strain Rate and Confining Pressure on the Deformation and
25 Failure of Shale," paper *IADC/SPE 19944*, presented at 1990 IADC/SPE
26 Drilling Conference, Feb. 27-Mar 2, 1990, Houston, Texas.

27 Cunningham, R.A., Eenink, J.G.: "Laboratory Study of Effect of Overburden,
28 Formation and Mud Column Pressures on Drilling Rate of Permeable
29 Formations," *J. Pet. Tech.* (Jan. 1959), pages 9-15 includes lab test data
30 describing the effect of mud confining pressure on the drill rate of rock
31 samples. If rock properties and confining stress are known, the CCS of the
32 rock can be calculated for each test condition. Rate of penetration ROP
33 versus CCS can then be plotted and the relationship between ROP and CCS

1 established. An example, using the lab test data of Cunningham et al., is
2 shown in FIG. 6.

3
4 The ROP verses CCS curve in FIG. 6 is typical, and data from numerous
5 drilling operations around the world suggests that a power function be used as
6 an optimal generalized function to describe the curve. For the specific test
7 data, a power law trend line is matched to the data and the resulting trend line
8 formula is indicated in FIG. 6, as:

9
10
$$\text{ROP} = 6 \times 10^6 \text{ CCS}^{-1.3284} \quad (23)$$

11
12 It should be noted that the ROP formula of equation (23), is specific to a lab
13 1.25" micro-bit and drilling parameters (weight on bit, rpm, flow rate, etc.)

14
15 Table 1 utilizes equation (23) and CCS values based upon 1) DP (CCS_{HP}); 2)
16 Skempton pore pressure (CCS_{LP}); and 3) ECD pressure (CCS_{ECD}). Some
17 results utilizing equation (23) are shown in Table 1, and also in FIGS. 7 and 8.
18 In FIG. 7, the example is for a well 10,000 feet deep, the rock having a PP of
19 9.0 ppg, an overburden load of 18.0 ppg, an UCS of 5,000 psi, and a friction
20 angle FA of 25°, and calculated ROP is shown as mud density is varied from
21 9.0 to 12.0 ppg. In FIG. 8, the same conditions are applied, but mud density is
22 assumed fixed at 12.0 ppg and the PP is varied from 9.0-11.0 ppg.

23
24 The data from Table 1 and FIGS. 7 and 8 indicate that using absolute ECD
25 pressure for calculating CCS yields unrealistically high values of CCS and
26 produces no or very little ROP response. This is inconsistent with actual field
27 experience. The ROP response based on CCS_{HP} calculated from straight DP
28 or Skempton based differential pressure DP_{LP} yield more realistic results. This
29 further validates the approach of using CCS based on straight differential
30 pressure DP_{HP} or Skempton differential pressure DP_{LP} rather than absolute
31 ECD pressure, as some have proposed as the preferred way to model low
32 permeability rock.

33

1 The angle of internal friction FA may also change as confining stress
2 changes. This is due to what is known in rock mechanics as a curved failure
3 envelope (see FIG. 2B). The net effect is that at high confining stress (for
4 example, >5,000 psi), some rocks exhibit less and less increase in confined
5 strength as confining stress increases, and some rocks reach a peak confined
6 strength which doesn't increase with further increase in confining stress. This
7 condition would obviously present error to the methodology presented by this
8 invention if friction angle FA is taken as a constant. The degree to which
9 friction angle FA changes as confining stress changes varies with rock type
10 and rock properties within a type. When the change in friction angle FA with
11 change in confining stress is significant, then the friction angle FA should be
12 modified to be a function of the confining stress.

13

14 The preferred and exemplary method of the present invention does not
15 require lithology. For bit selection or bit performance modeling, lithology is
16 commonly a required specification to those skilled in the art. The methodology
17 presented herein assumes that UCS and FA represent the dominant
18 influencing rock properties and, therefore, lithology specification is not
19 required.

20

21 Rock stiffness, porosity and pore fluid compressibility influence the amount of
22 PP change ΔPP that occurs when impermeable rock expands. The simplistic
23 Skempton model presented above for impermeable rock does not take these
24 factors directly into account. They can be accounted for by the Skempton "A"
25 and "B" coefficients. The error introduced by not accounting for these factors
26 is relatively small for most shales. The error will be relatively small whenever
27 rock compressibility is significantly greater than pore fluid compressibility.
28 This is the case for most shales which are not hard and stiff and which contain
29 water as the pore fluid. The error may become significant when shale is hard
30 and stiff. In this case the PP drop will be overpredicted and the DP will be
31 overpredicted. Over-prediction is also likely for very tight, stiff carbonates.
32 This error can be removed by adjusting the "B" coefficient to account for rock
33 stiffness, and if necessary, porosity and pore fluid compressibility.

1 II. Deviated and Horizontal Wellbores

In the case of a deviated well, the earth stress that existed normal to the bottom of the hole and prior to the existence of the hole is substituted for overburden in all the equations above. The earth stress that existed normal to the bottom of the hole is a component of overburden and horizontal stresses, σ_2 and σ_3 . Earth horizontal stress is typically characterized as two principal horizontal stresses. Earth principal horizontal stresses are typically less than overburden, except in the existence of tectonic force which can cause the maximum principal horizontal stress to be greater than overburden. For competent rock in a non-tectonic environments, horizontal effective stress is typically on the order of $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ of effective OB stress, but in very pliable and/or plastic rock the effective horizontal stress can approach or equal overburden. It should be noted that the stress blocks and stresses applied on these blocks are greatly simplified, ignoring factors like edge effects and the true 3D nature of bottom hole stresses. These effects shall be described in the next section.

19 A simplified Skempton approach to a deviated wellbore may be derived
20 assuming 1) rock is elastic ($A=1/3$) 2) $\Delta\sigma_x, \Delta\sigma_y$ are small; and $B \approx 1.0$.
21 Mathematically, CCS_{LP} for a deviated wellbore in a low permeability rock
22 formation may be calculated using the following formula:

$$24 \quad CCS_{LP} = UCS + DP + 2DP\sin FA / (1 - \sin FA); \quad (14)$$

25 where: DP = ECD pressure – Skempton Pore Pressure; (15)

26 Skempton Pore Pressure = $PP - (\sigma_z - ECD)/3$; (16)

27 where: σ_z = in situ stress parallel to well axis, before well is
28 drilled; and

29 PP = in situ pore pressure.

31 Alternatively, Skempton Pore Pressure can be calculated using change in
32 average stress in an orthogonal system.

33 Skempton Pore Pressure = $PP + B(ECD - \sigma_z + \Delta\sigma_x + \Delta\sigma_y)/3$; (24)

1 A more general equation corresponding to equation (7) can be utilized for the
 2 cases of deviated wellbores in which the stress parallel to the well is not a
 3 principal stress, and if A cannot be assumed to be equal to 1/3. More
 4 particularly, in an x, y, z reference frame where x, y and z are not principal
 5 directions of stress as seen in FIG. 3C:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta PP = B[(\Delta\sigma_x + \Delta\sigma_y + \Delta\sigma_z)/3 + \\ & (\sqrt{1/2}[(\Delta\sigma_x - \Delta\sigma_y)^2 + (\Delta\sigma_x - \Delta\sigma_z)^2 + (\Delta\sigma_y - \Delta\sigma_z)^2] + 3\Delta\tau_{xy}^2 + 3\Delta\tau_{yz}^2 + 3\Delta\tau_{xz}^2) * \\ & (3A - 1)/3]; \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

10

11 where A = Skempton coefficient that describes change in pore
 12 pressure caused by change in shear stress on the rock;
 13 B = Skempton coefficient that describes change in pore
 14 pressure caused by change in mean stress on the rock;
 15 Δ = operator describing the difference in a particular stress on
 16 the rock before drilling and during drilling.

17 σ_x = stress in the x-direction;

18 σ_y = stress in the y-direction; and

19 σ_z = stress in the z-direction;

20 τ_{xy} = shear stress in the x-y plane;

21 τ_{yz} = shear stress in the y-z plane; and

22 τ_{xz} = shear stress in the x-z plane.

23 The above stress values can be determined by transposing the in-situ stress
 24 tensor relative to a coordinate system with one axis parallel to the wellbore
 25 and another axis which lies in a plane perpendicular to axis of wellbore. Earth
 26 principal stresses σ_1 , overburden, may be obtained from density log data or
 27 other methods of estimation of subsurface rock density. σ_2 , intermediate earth
 28 principal stress or maximum principal horizontal stress, is typically calculated
 29 based on analysis of well breakouts from image logs, rock properties,
 30 wellbore orientation, and assumptions (or determination) of σ_1 and σ_3 . σ_3 ,

1 minimum earth stress or minimum principal horizontal stress, is typically
2 directly measured by fracturing wells at multiple depths or it can be calculated
3 from σ_1 , rock properties, and assumptions of earth stress history and present
4 day earth stresses. Principal stresses σ_1 , σ_2 , and σ_3 may be obtained from
5 various data sources including well log data, seismic data, drilling data and
6 well production data. Such methods are familiar to those skilled in the art.

7

8 A transpose may be used to convert principal stresses to another coordinate
9 system including normal stresses and shear stresses on a stress block. Such
10 transposes are well known by those skilled in the art. As an example, a
11 transpose may be used in the present invention which is described by M.R.
12 McLean and M.A. Addes, in "Wellbore Stability: The Effect of Strength Criteria
13 on Mud Weight Recommendations" *SPE 20405 (1990)*. FIG. 4 of this
14 publication shows the transpose of in-situ stress state in a stress block with
15 appropriately labeled normal and shear stresses and deviation angle α and
16 azimuthal angle β . Appendix A of McLean and Addes lists the equations
17 necessary to compute such a transformation between coordinate systems.
18 SPE paper 20405 is hereby incorporated by reference in its entirety.
19 Alternative transformation equations known to those skilled in rock mechanics
20 may also be use to convert between principal stresses and rotated non-
21 principal stress coordinate systems. Also, many commercial software
22 programs for wellbore stability, such as GeoMechanics International's SFIB™
23 software and Advanced Geotechnology STABView™ software, can be used
24 to transform principal stresses to alternative stresses and shear stresses in
25 other coordinate systems given a deviation angle α and azimuthal angle β .

26

27 **III. Edge Effects and Bottom Hole Stresses**

28

29 The most simplified Skempton approach to prediction of altered PP in
30 expanded impermeable rock in the depth of cut zone at the bottom of a bore
31 hole treats the depth of cut zone across the entire hole bottom as one element
32 in which one (σ_z) of three independent orthogonal stresses has been changed
33 and the other two have not. See equation (16). The one stress σ_z assumed to

1 be changed is acting normal to the bottom of the hole, and the change is
2 represented by the difference between the earth stress acting normal to
3 bottom of the hole and the mud or ECD pressure. An analogy or example is a
4 cube with three independent orthogonal stresses acting normal to the sides of
5 the cube, and then changing just one of those stresses while holding the other
6 two constant. The bottom of the borehole is not quite this simple, and this is
7 due primarily to two reasons. One is bottom hole profile created by a
8 particular drill bit configuration and the other is edge effect which creates a
9 stress concentration or stress riser. The most simplified approach of the
10 present invention described above does not take into account the effect of a
11 non-flat hole bottom nor the effect of stress concentrations which may occur
12 near the diameter of the hole.

13
14 For the sake of simplicity, the following discussion, except where noted, will
15 assume the case of a vertical well and normal earth stress environment,
16 where overburden is significantly greater than both earth principal horizontal
17 stresses and PP, and both earth principal horizontal stresses are
18 approximately equal to one another. Those skilled in the art will appreciate
19 that this case can be expanded to using all three orthogonal stresses and to
20 deviated wellbores if so desired.

21
22 The rock in the depth of cut zone will have slightly different stress states
23 throughout the leading profile of the wellbore, as will be described in greater
24 detail below. Accordingly, CCS is the average apparent CCS of rock to the
25 drill bit applied over the profile of the bottom of the wellbore. It is this value of
26 CCS which can then be utilized with various algorithms that rely upon an
27 accurate prediction of CCS.

28
29 A. Edge effect

30 Immediately inside the diameter of the borehole, earth stress acting on the
31 rock has been replaced by mud pressure. Immediately outside the diameter,
32 overburden is still acting as the vertical stress. So, at the vicinity of the
33 borehole diameter, the rock experiences an increase in vertical stress acting

1 on it over the distance from just inside to just outside the diameter. In the
2 classic example of a vertical well where mud pressure is significantly less than
3 overburden, the result is the transfer of some of the stress in the higher
4 stressed region (just outside the diameter) to the lower stressed region (just
5 inside the diameter). The result of this is less expansion of rock near the
6 diameter than near the center of the hole bottom, and the net result is less PP
7 decrease in the less expanded rock near the diameter. This result is depicted
8 in FIG. 4. The pressure differential curves decrease near the diameter as
9 R/R_w value increases. A representation of the error is indicated by the
10 difference in values of associated pairs of curves. Note that FIG. 4 should not
11 be used as an indication of the amount of error in general, as Warren and
12 Smith's curves are for rock that is relatively stiff - most shales are less stiff and
13 the error would be less.

14

15 B. Hole Profile

16 Again consider the case of a vertical well and normal earth stress
17 environment, where overburden is significantly greater than both earth
18 principal horizontal stresses and PP. A non-flat profile will result in altered
19 stresses and expansion that is different from the above described simplified
20 Skempton approach. This simplified Skempton approach assumes that
21 horizontal stresses acting on the bottom of the hole are essentially the same
22 as earth horizontal stresses. If the bottom of the hole is not flat, however, the
23 horizontal stress on the rock in the depth of cut zone will be influenced by
24 mud pressure. It is common for the center of the hole to be slightly raised with
25 the shape of a cone or dome. This is slight to non-existent with roller cone bits
26 and can be more pronounced with fixed cutter bits (PDC, Diamond, and
27 Impregnated bits). As the cone/dome increases in height (or more correctly,
28 as the side slopes or aspect ratio of the cone/dome increase), the dominant
29 confining stress will transition from earth horizontal stress (for a flat bottom) to
30 mud pressure. This would mean that all three terms ($\Delta\sigma_1$, $\Delta\sigma_2$ and $\Delta\sigma_3$) or
31 ($\Delta\sigma_x$, $\Delta\sigma_y$ and $\Delta\sigma_z$) of the Skempton formula are non-zero. As an extreme
32 example, a very pointed cone similar in shape to the point of a pencil may be
33 considered. Obviously, the influence of any earth stress at the tip is very small

1 – the tip will be under the stress of the mud pressure and very little else, and
2 the influence of earth stresses will be nonexistent to very low from the tip to
3 near the base of the cone, at which point earth stress would start to influence.
4
5 Finite element or computer modeling can be performed to better predict actual
6 net effective stress changes as a function of profile, rock properties, earth
7 stresses, and mud stresses. These results can be compared to the simplified
8 Skempton method utilized in the preferred exemplary embodiment of this
9 invention. Corrections may be determined which can be applied to the
10 simplified Skempton approach described above to arrive at a more accurate
11 average apparent CCS of rock to the drill bit applied over the profile of the
12 bottom of the wellbore. Of course, this assumes the finite element method
13 correctly models the real case in the rock's depth of cut zone.
14
15 An example of this type of comparison is depicted by FIG. 4 where the ΔPP of
16 the finite element result (reported by Warren and Smith) is compared to the
17 ΔPP of the simplified Skempton results using the present methodology of this
18 invention. This may represent one form of a very simple comparison,
19 analogous to the vertical hole example and in which earth horizontal stresses
20 are equal. In this case, the earth stresses acting parallel to the plane of the
21 bottom of the hole are equal and a 2D axisymmetric finite element model can
22 be used (as Warren and Smith reported). Assuming the finite element
23 approach represents the correct solution and to determine the correction
24 required to the simplified Skempton method, the ΔPP result of the finite
25 element model and the ΔPP result of the simplified Skempton method can be
26 integrated over the circular area to determine the net average ΔPP for the
27 entire area (the entire hole bottom) for each method. These integrated net
28 average ΔPP results are then used to quantitatively establish the difference
29 between the two sets of results. Subsequently, a correction factor can be
30 derived relating the results of the finite element modeling with the Skempton
31 approach of the present invention. For example, if the finite element ΔPP
32 function integrated over a circular area from 0 to R_w is 45 units and the

1 simplified Skempton ΔPP function integrated over the same area is 57 units,
2 then the correction factor CF would be 45/57 or 0.788. That is,

3
4
$$\Delta PP = CF \times \Delta PP = 0.788 \times \Delta PP. \quad (26)$$

5
6 For the case of a deviated well or where earth stresses acting parallel to the
7 plane of the bottom of the hole vary, a 3D finite element model may be
8 required for arrive at the appropriate correction factor. In this case, the
9 difference in ΔPP of a 3D finite element result and the simplified Skempton
10 method will be dependant upon radial distance from the center of the hole (i.e.
11 the R/R_w value as used by Warren and Smith) and the direction from center of
12 the hole. In lieu of a 3D finite element approach, it may be adequate to
13 average the stresses acting parallel to the plane of the bottom of the hole and
14 then apply the 2D correction factor methodology (described above). 3D
15 modeling may reveal that this approach is of sufficient accuracy.

16
17 In the approaches outlined above, the correction coefficients CF are for
18 average ΔPP for the area of the hole bottom. This approach simply multiplies
19 the average ΔPP result of the simplified Skempton method by the correction
20 coefficient CF. In order to develop correction factors CF for all bit types,
21 "standard" or "typical" profiles are established for the various bit types and
22 these profiles are used in finite element modeling, with the average ΔPP
23 result of the finite element method used to establish the "correct" answer and
24 correction coefficients CF are applied to the simplified Skempton method.
25 It may be that using an "average net ΔPP " for the hole bottom may present
26 another error. For example, bit experts generally agree that most of the work
27 in drilling the bore hole is done at the outer third of the diameter of the hole,
28 and that the rock in the center is relatively easy to destroy. As evidence of this
29 theory, bit designers typically focus priority on the outer half to two-thirds of
30 the bit profile, and the inner third is of secondary importance and typically is a
31 compromise that must adapt to the outer portion of the bit. It may be that this
32 is simply an "area" factor, and, if so, using an average net ΔPP may be
33 appropriate and approximately accurate. However, if it is due to other

1 phenomena not addressed by the various corrections suggested in this
2 specification, then it may be that particular regions of the bottom of the hole,
3 according to region diameter range, may have to be "weighted" to indicate
4 greater or lesser influence. Again, finite element models can be used to
5 establish weights associated with the appropriate diameter range. Further,
6 various hole sizes could be modeled to determine the effect of hole size, if
7 any, and how to scale results from one hole size to another.

8

9 Alternatively, a "suite" of profiles that spans the spectrum of the "typical"
10 profiles may be "built" and then modeled, and this provides a "catalog" of
11 results that could be referenced and an interpolation applied for any profile. In
12 order to reduce the number of possible profiles, breaking the hole bottom into
13 regions may be used. For example, regions may be inner radial third, middle
14 radial third, and outer radial third, but it is recognized that other divisions may
15 be warranted. If this approach is taken, regions can be defined by a radius
16 range (as opposed to area). From a catalog of profiles for each region, a
17 composite (complete) profile is assigned for each bit type. For example, for bit
18 type XYZ, the best representative profile might be ACB, where A, C, and B
19 represent profiles available from a catalog of profiles for inner, middle, and
20 outer thirds. An exemplary chart of such profile combinations for the various
21 radius segments is illustrated by Table 2 found in FIG. 9.

22

23 As indicated by the results of FIG. 4, rock properties and values of PP and
24 earth stresses influence the result and the difference in results between finite
25 element modeling and the simplified Skempton method. As such, a range of
26 PP and earth stresses can be modeled to develop another correction factor
27 for "environment". Likewise, a range of rock properties can be modeled to
28 develop a correction factor CF for "rock properties". Whether it is environment
29 or rock properties, the required data can be integrated into rock mechanics
30 software as these data are required for normal workflows.

31

32 In a preferred embodiment, the present modified Skempton approach may
33 include using one or more of several correction factors CF - one for profile,

1 one for hole size, one for rock properties, one for environment and so forth.
 2 The correction factor profile corrects for the difference between a flat bottom
 3 (the assumption for the simplified Skempton method) and the actual profile
 4 and edge effects at the diameter. The correction factor for hole size corrects
 5 for a hole size larger or smaller than a baseline size or model. The correction
 6 factor for rock properties corrects for the influence of stiffness, bulk
 7 compressibility, pore fluid compressibility, shear strength, Poisson's ratio,
 8 permeability, or whatever other factors are deemed to be pertinent. The
 9 correction factor for environment corrects for influence of stress magnitudes
 10 and differences between mud pressure, pore pressure, overburden, and earth
 11 stresses. This results in the following equation for a vertical well:

$$12 \quad \text{Skempton } PP_{\text{corrected}} = PP - [(OB-ECD)/3] * CF \quad (27)$$

13 where: $CF = (CF_{\text{profile}}) * (CF_{\text{hole size}}) * (CF_{\text{rock properties}}) * (CF_{\text{environment}})$
 14 and:
 15 $CF_{\text{profile}} = \text{function of bit type (steel tooth, Insert, 3-4 blade}$
 16 PDC, etc)
 17 $CF_{\text{hole size}} = \text{function of hole size}$
 18 $CF_{\text{rock properties}} = \text{function of rock properties, as required}$
 19 $CF_{\text{environment}} = \text{function of OB, PP, } \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \text{ mud}$
 20 $\text{pressure, deviation, and azimuth.}$
 21
 22

23 It may be that the approach of not accounting for edge effects and hole profile
 24 is the primary cause of apparent sources of errors with the exception of rock
 25 and pore fluid properties. If so a methodology to correct for bottom hole profile
 26 and edge effects, and rock and pore fluid properties, may be sufficiently
 27 accurate. Regarding correction factors for rock and pore fluid properties, a
 28 direct solution based on fundamental principles and using rock and fluid
 29 properties may be used. An appropriate PP algorithm would then be a
 30 function of one or more rock and fluid properties. This results in the following
 31 equation for a vertical well:

32

$$\begin{aligned}
 &1 \quad \text{Skempton } PP_{\text{corrected}} = PP - [(OB-ECD)/3] * (\text{function of rock} \\
 &2 \quad \text{properties, and} \\
 &3 \quad \text{fluid properties a, b, c, etc}) * CF \quad (28) \\
 &4 \quad \text{and:} \\
 &5 \quad CF = CF_{\text{profile}} = \text{function of bit type (steel} \\
 &6 \quad \text{tooth, Insert, 3-4 blade PDC,} \\
 &7 \quad \text{etc).}
 \end{aligned}$$

8

9 **Application of CCS to Drilling Problems**

10

11 The above values for CCS may be used in various algorithms to calculate drill
 12 bit related properties. By way of example and not limitation, CCS could be
 13 used for pre-drill bit selection, ROP prediction, and bit life prediction.
 14 Furthermore it is envisioned that CCS estimates using the above
 15 methodologies could further be used in other areas. Examples include
 16 inclusion of CCS in predicting drillstring dynamics and quantitative analysis of
 17 drilling equipment alternatives. CCS provides one of the fundamental and
 18 necessary inputs for both. Drillstring dynamics refers to the dynamic behavior
 19 of drillstrings. That is, how much does the drillstring compress, twist, etc., as
 20 bit weight is applied and bit torque is generated, as well as when the
 21 excitation forces transmitted through the drill bit coincide and/or induce natural
 22 resonating vibrational frequencies of the drillstring. These vibrational modes
 23 may be lateral, whirl, axial, or stick-slip (stick-slip refers to the condition of
 24 repeated cycles of torque and twist building and then releasing in a drillstring).
 25 In general, it is advantageous to avoid vibrational modes, so prediction of
 26 these can prove useful and valuable. Quantitative analysis of drilling
 27 equipment alternatives refers to prediction of ROP and bit life prediction for
 28 various bit types and for various drilling equipment capabilities. For example,
 29 the predicted time and cost to drill a well with various rig sizes/capabilities can
 30 be calculated and compared, and then the results of the comparison used to
 31 make more intelligent equipment selection for accomplishing desired business
 32 objectives. There is not presently a quantitative and robust way to make such
 33 predictions; however, using the CCS estimates as described above, such

1 predictive capability for various drill bits and equipment combinations may be
2 made.

3
4 While in the foregoing specification this invention has been described in
5 relation to certain preferred embodiments thereof, and many details have
6 been set forth for purposes of illustration, it will be apparent to those skilled in
7 the art that the invention is susceptible to alteration and that certain other
8 details described herein can vary considerably without departing from the
9 basic principles of the invention.

10

11 **Nomenclature**

12 $\Delta\sigma_1, \Delta\sigma_2, \Delta\sigma_3$ = changes in the three principal orthogonal stresses

13 $\Delta\sigma_x$ = change in bottom hole stress normal to axis of wellbore, psi

14 $\Delta\sigma_y$ = change in bottom hole stress normal to axis of wellbore, psi

15 $\Delta\sigma_z$ = change in bottom hole stress parallel to axis of wellbore, psi

16 ΔPP = change in pore pressure, psi or ppg equivalent

17 A = Skempton coefficient, dimensionless

18 B = Skempton coefficient, dimensionless

19 CCS_{HP} = Confined Compressive Strength, psi, based on DP_{HP}

20 CCS_{ECD} = Confined Compressive Strength, psi, based on DP_{ECD}

21 CCS_{LP} = Confined Compressive Strength, psi, based on DP_{LP}

22 DP = (ECD pressure – PP), psi

23 DP_{ECD} = ECD pressure, psi

24 $DP_{LP} = [ECD - \{PP - (OB - ECD)/3\}]$, psi

25 ECD = Equivalent Circulating Density, ppg

26 ECD Pressure = pressure in psi exerted by an ECD in ppg

27 FA = Rock Internal Angle of Friction, degrees

28 OB = Overburden, psi or ppg

29 ϕ_e = Effective Porosity (porosity of non-shale fraction of rock multiplied by the
30 fraction of non-shale rock), Volume per Volume, "fraction", or percent

31 PP = pore pressure, psi or ppg

32 ppg = pounds per gallon

33 ROP_{HP} = Rate of penetration, ft/hr, based on CCS_{HP}

- 1 ROP_{LP} = Rate of penetration, ft/hr, based on CCS_{LP}
- 2 ROP_{ECD} = Rate of penetration, ft/hr, based on CCS_{ECD}
- 3 UCS = Rock Unconfined Compressive Strength, psi

1 **WHAT IS CLAIMED IS:**

2

3 1. A method for estimating the CCS for a rock in the depth of cut zone of
4 a subterranean formation which is to be drilled using a drill bit and a drilling
5 fluid, the method comprising the steps of:

6

7 a) determining the UCS for a rock in a depth of cut zone of a
8 subterranean formation which is to be drilled using a drill bit and drilling fluid;

9

10 b) determining the change in the strength of the rock due to applied
11 stresses which will be imposed on the rock during drilling including the change
12 in strength due to the ΔPP in the rock due to drilling; and

13

14 c) determining the CCS for the rock in the depth of cut zone by
15 adding the estimated change in strength to the UCS.

16

17 2. The method of claim 1 wherein:

18 the ΔPP is estimated assuming that there will be no substantial
19 movement of fluids into or out of the rock during drilling.

20

21 3. The method of claim 2 wherein:

22 the rock has an effective porosity of less than a predetermined porosity
23 threshold such that there will be no substantial movement of fluids into or out
24 of the rock during drilling.

25

26 4. The method of claim 3 wherein:

27 the predetermined porosity threshold is 0.05 or less.

28

29 5. The method of claim 1 wherein:

30 the rock has an effective porosity of less than a predetermined
31 threshold.

32

33

1 6. The method of claim 1 wherein:

2 the ΔPP in the rock is calculated in accordance with the following
3 mathematical expression:

$$\begin{aligned} &4 \quad \Delta PP = B[(\Delta\sigma_x + \Delta\sigma_y + \Delta\sigma_z)/3 + \\ &5 \quad (\sqrt{1/2[(\Delta\sigma_x - \Delta\sigma_y)^2 + (\Delta\sigma_x - \Delta\sigma_z)^2 + (\Delta\sigma_y - \Delta\sigma_z)^2]} + 3\Delta\tau_{xy}^2 + 3\Delta\tau_{yz}^2 + 3\Delta\tau_{xz}^2)^*(3 \\ &6 \quad A - 1)/3]; \end{aligned}$$

7 where: A = Skempton coefficient that describes change in pore
8 pressure caused by change in shear stress on the rock;

9 B = Skempton coefficient that describes change in pore
10 pressure caused by change in mean stress on the rock;

11 Δ = operator describing the difference in a particular stress on
12 the rock before drilling and during drilling.

13 σ_x = stress in the x-direction;

14 σ_y = stress in the y-direction; and

15 σ_z = stress in the z-direction;

16 τ_{xy} = shear stress in the x-y plane;

17 τ_{yz} = shear stress in the y-z plane; and

18 τ_{xz} = shear stress in the x-z plane.

19
20
21 7. The method of claim 1 wherein:

22 the ΔPP in the rock is calculated in accordance with the following
23 mathematical expression:

$$\begin{aligned} &24 \quad \Delta PP = B[(\Delta\sigma_1 + \Delta\sigma_2 + \Delta\sigma_3)/3 + \\ &25 \quad (\sqrt{1/2[(\Delta\sigma_1 - \Delta\sigma_2)^2 + (\Delta\sigma_1 - \Delta\sigma_3)^2 + (\Delta\sigma_2 - \Delta\sigma_3)^2]} + 3A - 1)/3] \end{aligned}$$

26 where: A = coefficient that describes change in pore pressure caused
27 by change in shear stress on the rock;

1 B = coefficient that describes change in pore pressure caused
2 by change in mean stress on the rock;

3 Δ = operator describing the difference in a particular stress on
4 the rock before drilling and during drilling.

5 σ_1 = first principal stress on the rock;

6 σ_2 = second principal stress on the rock; and

7 σ_3 = third principal stress on the rock.

8

9 8. The method of claim 1 wherein:

10 the ΔPP in the rock is calculated in accordance with the following
11 mathematical expression:

$$12 \quad \Delta PP = B[(\Delta\sigma_1 + \Delta\sigma_2 + \Delta\sigma_3)/3 + (\Delta\sigma_1 - \Delta\sigma_3)(3A - 1)/3]$$

13 where: A = coefficient that describes change in pore pressure caused
14 by change in shear stress in the rock;

15 B = coefficient that describes change in pore pressure caused
16 by change in mean stress in the rock;

17 $\Delta\sigma_1$ = change in the first principal stress acting upon the rock
18 due to drilling;

19 $\Delta\sigma_2$ = change in the second principal stress acting on the rock
20 due to drilling; and

21 $\Delta\sigma_3$ = change in the third principal stress acting on the rock due
22 to drilling.

23

24 9. The method of claim 1 wherein:

25 the ΔPP in the rock is calculated in accordance with the following
26 mathematical expression:

$$27 \quad \Delta PP = B(\Delta\sigma_1 + \Delta\sigma_2 + \Delta\sigma_3)/3$$

28 where: B = coefficient that describes change in pore pressure caused
29 by change in mean stress in the rock;

30 $\Delta\sigma_1$ = change in the first principal stress acting upon the
31 rock due to drilling;

1 $\Delta\sigma_2$ = change in the second principal stress acting on the rock
 2 due to drilling; and

3 $\Delta\sigma_3$ = change in the third principal stress acting on the rock due
 4 to drilling.

5

6 10. The method of claim 1 wherein:

7 the ΔPP in the rock is calculated in accordance with the following
 8 mathematical expression:

$$9 \quad \Delta PP = B(\Delta\sigma_x + \Delta\sigma_y + \Delta\sigma_z)/3$$

10 where: B = coefficient that describes change in pore pressure caused
 11 by change in mean stress in the rock;

12 $\Delta\sigma_z$ = change in the stress acting in the direction of the wellbore
 13 due to drilling;

14 $\Delta\sigma_x$ = change in the stress acting in a first direction
 15 perpendicular to the wellbore due to drilling; and

16 $\Delta\sigma_y$ = change in the stress acting in a second direction
 17 orthogonal to both the wellbore and the first direction due to drilling.

18

19 11. The method of claim 1 wherein:

20 the ΔPP in the rock is calculated in accordance with the following
 21 mathematical expression:

$$22 \quad \Delta PP = B(\Delta\sigma_z)/3$$

23 where: B = coefficient that describes change in pore pressure caused
 24 by change in mean stress in the rock; and

25 $\Delta\sigma_z$ = change in the stress acting in the direction of the wellbore
 26 between before and during drilling.

27

28 12. The method of claim 1 wherein:

29 the ΔPP in the rock is calculated in accordance with the following
 30 mathematical expression:

$$31 \quad \Delta PP = (\Delta\sigma_z)/3$$

32 where: $\Delta\sigma_z$ = change in the stress acting in the direction of the
 33 wellbore due to drilling.

1 13. The method of claim 1 wherein:
 2 the CCS is calculated in accordance with the following mathematical
 3 expression:

4
$$CCS = UCS + f(DP);$$

5 where: UCS = the unconfined compressive strength of the rock;

6 DP = differential pressure acting upon the rock and is a
 7 function of the change in pore pressure ΔPP ; and

8 $f(DP)$ = a mathematical function of DP.
 9

10 14. The method of claim 1 wherein:
 11 the CCS is calculated in accordance with the following mathematical
 12 expression:

13
$$CCS = UCS + DP + 2DP \sin FA / (1 - \sin FA);$$

14 where: UCS = the unconfined compressive strength of the rock;

15 DP = differential pressure acting upon the rock and is a
 16 function of the change in pore pressure ΔPP ; and

17 FA = internal angle of friction of the rock.
 18

19 15. The method of claim 13 wherein:

20 the DP, is calculated according to:

21
$$DP = ECD \text{ pressure} - (PP + \Delta PP);$$

22 where: ECD pressure = pressure exerted by drilling fluid
 23 under circulating conditions in the
 24 direction of drilling;

25 PP = in situ pore pressure of the rock prior to drilling; and

26 ΔPP = change in pore pressure in the rock due to drilling.
 27

28 16. The method of claim 13 wherein:

29 the DP is estimated in accordance with the following mathematical
 30 expression:

31
$$DP = ECD - (PP - (\sigma_z - ECD)/3);$$

32 where: ECD = pressure exerted by drilling fluid
 33 under circulating conditions;

- 1 PP = in situ pore pressure of the rock prior to drilling;
2 and
3 σ_z = in situ stress in the direction of the wellbore which is
4 removed from the rock due to drilling.
5
- 6 17. The method of claim 13 wherein:
7 the DP is calculated in accordance with the following mathematical
8 expression:
9 $DP = ECD - (PP - (OB - ECD)/3);$
10 where: ECD = pressure exerted by the drilling fluid
11 under circulating conditions;
12 PP = in situ pore pressure of the rock prior to drilling; and
13 OB = in situ overburden (vertical) stress prior to drilling.
14
- 15 18. The method of claim 1 wherein:
16 the change in strength is estimated based upon removal of stress from
17 the rock due to removal of overburden, the pressure applied to the rock due to
18 the drilling fluid (ECD pressure), the in situ PP of the rock prior to drilling, and
19 of the internal angle of friction FA of the rock.
20
- 21 19. The method of claim 1 wherein:
22 the change in strength is calculated based at least partially on the
23 deviation angle α of the wellbore to be drilled.
24
- 25 20. The method of claim 19 wherein:
26 the ΔPP in the rock is calculated in accordance with the following
27 mathematical expression:
28 $\Delta PP = B(\Delta\sigma_x + \Delta\sigma_y + \Delta\sigma_z)/3$
29 where: B = coefficient that describes change in pore pressure caused
30 by change in mean stress in the rock;
31 $\Delta\sigma_z$ = change in the stress acting in the direction of the wellbore
32 due to drilling;

1 $\Delta\sigma_x$ = change in the stress acting in a first direction
2 perpendicular to the wellbore due to drilling; and
3 $\Delta\sigma_y$ = change in the stress acting in a second direction
4 orthogonal to both the wellbore and the first direction due
5 to drilling; and σ_x , σ_y , and σ_z are calculated by:
6 (i) determining the principal stresses σ_1 , σ_2 , and σ_3 acting on
7 the rock before and during drilling; and
8 (ii) transposing the principal stresses σ_1 , σ_2 , and σ_3 into
9 normal stresses σ_x , σ_y , and σ_z using transformation equations based on the
10 deviation angle α of the wellbore.

11

12 21. The method of claim 1 wherein:
13 the CCS is determined in part based upon the bottom hole profile of the
14 wellbore being drilled.

15

16 22. A method for estimating the CCS for a rock in the depth of cut zone of
17 a subterranean formation which is to be drilled using a drill bit and a drilling
18 fluid, the method comprising the steps of:

19

20 a) determining the UCS for a rock in a depth of cut zone of a
21 subterranean formation which is to be drilled using a drill bit and a drilling
22 fluid;

23

24 b) estimating the change in the strength of the rock based at least
25 in part upon the change in the pore pressure (ΔPP) of the rock resulting from
26 changes in the volume of the pores of the rock due to changes in confining
27 stresses applied upon the rock due to drilling and due to fluid movement into
28 and out of the pores of the rock in response to the drilling of the wellbore with
29 a drill bit and drilling fluid; and

30

31 c) estimating the CCS for the rock in the depth of cut zone by
32 adding the estimated change in strength to the UCS.

33

1 23. The method of claim 22 wherein:

2 it is estimated that there is no substantial movement of fluid into and
3 out of the pores of the rock.

4

5 24. The method of claim 23 wherein:

6 the estimation that there is no substantial movement of fluid into and
7 out of the pores of the rock is based upon the rock having an effective
8 porosity ϕ_e of less than a predetermined effective porosity threshold.

9

10 25. The method of claim 22 wherein:

11 it is estimated that there is there is limited movement of fluid into and of
12 the pores of the rock.

13

14 26. The method of claim 22 wherein:

15 estimates of CCS are made for high permeability rock, low permeability
16 rock and for rock having a permeability intermediate to the high and low
17 permeability rocks.

18

19 27. The method of claim 26 wherein:

20 the CCS of the rock in the depth of cut zone is calculated according to the
21 following mathematical expression:

22
$$CCS = UCS + f(DP)$$

23 where: UCS = Unconfined Compressive Strength of the rock in
24 the depth of cut zone;

25 DP = differential pressure acting upon the rock in the
26 depth of the cut zone; and

27 $f(DP)$ = a mathematical function of DP.

28

29 28. The method of claim 27 wherein:

30
$$DP = ECD - PP$$

31 where: ECD = equivalent circulating density of the drilling fluid; and
32 PP = the in situ pore pressure (PP) of rock prior to drilling.

33

1 29. The method of claim 28 wherein:

2 calculating the change in the strength is a function of the deviation
3 angle α of the wellbore.

4

5 30. A method for estimating the CCS for a rock in the depth of cut zone of
6 a subterranean formation which is to be drilled using a drilling fluid, the
7 method comprising the steps of:

8

9 (a) estimating the CCS for substantially permeable rock in
10 accordance with the following mathematical formula:

11 $CCS_{HP} = UCS + f(DP);$

12 where: UCS = the unconfined compressive strength of the rock;

13 DP = differential pressure acting upon the rock ; and

14 $f(DP)$ = a mathematical function of DP;

15

16 (b) estimating the CCS for substantially impermeable rock in
17 accordance with the following mathematical expression:

18 $CCS_{LP} = UCS + f(DP);$

19 where: UCS = the unconfined compressive strength of the rock;

20 DP = differential pressure acting upon the rock and is a

21 function of the change in pore pressure ΔPP ; and

22 $f(DP)$ = a mathematical function of DP

23

24 (c) calculating an intermediate CCS (CCS_{MIX}) for the rock based
25 upon the estimated permeability of the rock and the confined compressive
26 strengths CCS_{HP} , CCS_{LP} for substantially permeable and impermeable rocks.

27

28 31. The method of claim 30 wherein:

29 the estimated permeability of the rock is based upon the effective
30 porosity of the rock.

31

32

33

1 32. The method of claim 31 wherein:
 2 the intermediate CCS CCS_{MIX} is calculated in accordance with the
 3 followings mathematical expressions:
 4 $CCS = CCS_{HP}$ if $\varphi_e \geq \varphi_{HP}$,
 5 $CCS = CCS_{LP}$ if $\varphi_e \leq \varphi_{LP}$,
 6 $CCS_{MIX} = CCS_{LP} \times (\varphi_{HP} - \varphi_e) / (\varphi_{HP} - \varphi_{LP}) + CCS_{HP} \times (\varphi_e - \varphi_{LP}) / (\varphi_{HP} - \varphi_{LP})$
 7 if $\varphi_{LP} < \varphi_e < \varphi_{HP}$;
 8 where: φ_e = effective porosity;
 9 φ_{LP} = low effective porosity; and
 10 φ_{HP} = high effective porosity.

11
 12 33. A method for calculating ΔPP in a rock due to drilling, the method
 13 comprising:
 14
 15 calculating a baseline ΔPP using a baseline mathematical formula;
 16
 17 determining a ΔPP for the rock and drilling environment utilizing a
 18 computer model of the rock and drilling conditions based upon at least one
 19 characteristic of the rock, drilling conditions, and drill bit;
 20
 21 determining a correction factor CF relating baseline ΔPP of the
 22 baseline ΔPP and the ΔPP of the computer model (CCS); and
 23
 24 determining a ΔPP in another rock utilizing the baseline formula and
 25 the correction factor CF to enhance the estimate of the ΔPP .

26
 27 34. The method of claim 33 wherein:
 28 the correction factor CF is one of the characteristics selected from the
 29 group comprising:
 30 $CF_{profile}$ = function of bit type;
 31 $CF_{hole\ size}$ = function of hole size;
 32 $CF_{rock\ properties}$ = function of rock properties;

1 $CF_{\text{environment}}$ = function of one of OB, PP, hmin, hmax, ECD, angle of
2 deviation α , and azimuth β .

3

4 35. A method of calculating corrected differential pressures across a rock
5 in the depth of cut zone during drilling of a well bore in a subterranean
6 wellbore, the method comprising the steps of:

7

8 (a) calculating, utilizing a mathematical expression, a baseline DP
9 across a rock in a depth of cut zone for a drill bit having a baseline profile
10 under a baseline set of drilling conditions;

11

12 (b) computing, using a computer model, the DP across the rock in
13 the depth of cut zone for a drill bit having a first profile differing from that of the
14 baseline profile under the baseline set of drilling conditions;

15

16 (c) calculating a profile correction factor by comparing the baseline
17 DP with the DP determined from the computer model; and

18

19 (d) calculating a corrected DP, utilizing the mathematical expression
20 and the profile correction factor, for a drill bit with the first profile. baseline set
21 of drilling conditions.

22

23 36. The method of claim 35 wherein:

24 profile correction factors are calculated for a number of drill bits having
25 differing profile; and

26

27 a number of corrected differential pressures are calculated utilizing
28 respective profile correction factors corresponding to the drill bits.




FIG. 1

CONFINED COMPRESSIVE STRENGTHS (CCS) VERSUS DIFFERENTIAL PRESSURE






FIG. 2B

Vertical Well Bore

ECD or Mud
Pressure (replaces
OB)





FIG. 3A

Horizontal Well in direction of hmin.

Mud Pressure
(replaces far
field stress) σ_3





FIG. 3B


Deviated Well

α = Angle
from
vertical




β = Angle between well
azimuth and hmin

σ_3



Mud Pressure
(replaces far
field stress σ_z)

Well Azimuth (well direction
projected on horizontal
plane)



$\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z,$
= function of
 $\alpha, \beta, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3,$

FIG. 3C

FIG. 3




FIG. 4

Table 1. Calculated values of differential pressure, confined compressive strength, and rate of penetration.

Depth	PP	OB	ECD	UCS	FA	CCS _{HP}	CCS _{LP}	CCS _{ECD}	ROP _{HP}	ROP _{LP}	ROP _{ECD}	DP _{HP}	DP _{LP}	DP _{ECD}
10,000	9	18	9	5,000	25	5,000	8,839	16,518	73.2	34.3	15.0	0	1,558	4,675
10,000	9	18	10	5,000	25	6,280	9,692	17,798	54.1	30.4	13.6	519	1,904	5,194
10,000	9	18	11	5,000	25	7,560	10,546	19,077	42.3	27.2	12.4	1,039	2,251	5,713
10,000	9	18	12	5,000	25	8,839	11,399	20,357	34.3	24.5	11.3	1,558	2,597	6,233
10,000	9	18	12	5,000	25	8,839	11,399	20,357	34.3	24.5	11.3	1,558	2,597	6,233
10,000	9.5	18	12	5,000	25	8,199	10,759	20,357	37.9	26.4	11.3	1,299	2,337	6,233
10,000	10	18	12	5,000	25	7,560	10,119	20,357	42.3	28.7	11.3	1,039	2,078	6,233
10,000	10.5	18	12	5,000	25	6,920	9,479	20,357	47.5	31.3	11.3	779	1,818	6,233
10,000	11	18	12	5,000	25	6,280	8,839	20,357	54.1	34.3	11.3	519	1,558	6,233

Depth, feet

PP = pore pressure, ppg

OB = Overburden, ppg

ECD = Equivalent Circulating Density, ppg

UCS = Unconfined Compressive Strength, psi

FA = Friction Angle, degrees

CCS_{HP} = Confined Compressive Strength, psi, based on DP_{HP}CCS_{LP} = Confined Compressive Strength, psi, based on DP_{LP}CCS_{ECD} = Confined Compressive Strength, psi, based on DP_{ECD}ROP_{HP} = Rate of penetration, ft/hr, based on CCS_{HP}ROP_{LP} = Rate of penetration, ft/hr, based on CCS_{LP}ROP_{ECD} = Rate of penetration, ft/hr, based on CCS_{ECD}DP_{HP} = (ECD - pore pressure), psiDP_{LP} = [ECD - {PP-(OB-ECD)/3}], psiDP_{ECD} = ECD pressure, psi

FIG. 5




FIG. 6




FIG. 7




FIG. 8

TABLE 2
BIT PROFILE SEGMENTS

Inner third of bit radius	Middle third of bit radius	Outer third of bit radius
A 	A 	A 
B 	B 	B 
C 	C 	C 
D 		

FIG. 9