

Geological representivity of returned  
drill cuttings from coiled-tubing  
drilling in a hard rock environment.

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of the University of  
Adelaide for an Honours Degree in Geology

Jaydon Dietman  
November 2015



THE UNIVERSITY  
*of* ADELAIDE

## **GEOLOGICAL REPRESENTIVITY OF RETURNED DRILL CUTTINGS FROM COILED-TUBING DRILLING IN A HARD ROCK ENVIRONMENT.**

### **GEOLOGICAL REPRESENTIVITY OF CUTTINGS**

#### **ABSTRACT**

With the global discovery rate of mineral deposits decreasing and with near surface resources being gradually depleted, there is a need for new technologies to aid in the discovery of mineral deposits under deep cover. In order to increase the productivity of deep exploration, the Deep Exploration Technologies Cooperative Research Centre (DET CRC) is building a Coiled-tubing (CT) drill rig, which is accompanied by a top-of-hole Lab-at-Rig<sup>®</sup> system, allowing real time geochemical and mineralogical analysis. Rather than produce core, CT drilling returns cuttings to the surface within the drilling fluid. These cuttings are passed through a Solids Removal Unit (SRU) which separates cuttings from the drilling fluid, from which they can be prepared for analysis. Drill cuttings from the CT rig can have broad and heterogeneous particle size distributions (PSD). Enroute to the surface, these drill cuttings can be subjected to differential rate of return and mixing of particles from adjacent depths, which can cause smearing in the geochemical signal. A series of experiments were conducted at 100 m depth through simple, single-layered pseudostratigraphies using full-faced diamond and Wassara hammer drill bits, in order to quantify this smearing effect, and provide advice on how to mitigate against it. Samples were taken before and after the SRU, to assess the contributions of up-hole flow and the SRU to smearing. Pre-SRU samples were found to have consistently decreased smearing compared to post-SRU samples. The results indicate that limited smearing is occurring during up-hole flow, likely due to efficient cutting transport at the high flow rates (120-150 L/min) associated with CT drilling. Smearing within the SRU is most likely the result of particle separation and settling rates in the shaker tank. This smearing can be mitigated by simple modification in the design of the SRU, notably by reducing the water column.

#### **KEYWORDS:**

Geochemistry; coiled-tubing drilling; Solids Removal Unit (SRU); annulus; mineral exploration; pXRF; particle size distribution (PSD); depth fidelity

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Geological representivity of returned drill cuttings from coiled-tubing drilling in a hard rock environment.....	i
Geological representivity of cuttings.....	i
Abstract.....	i
Keywords:.....	i
List of Tables.....	2
List of Figures.....	2
Introduction.....	4
Background.....	8
Coiled-Tubing Drilling.....	8
Discovery using geochemistry.....	9
Drill cuttings are the new sample.....	10
Preliminary smearing and sample return experiment.....	11
Methodology.....	11
Experiment design.....	11
Drilling.....	14
Solids Removal Unit configuration.....	15
Sampling.....	17
Particle size analysis.....	18
Geochemical analysis.....	19
Results.....	20
Particle Size Analysis.....	20
Full-faced diamond.....	20
Wasarra hammer.....	24
Geochemistry.....	25
Discussion.....	26
Assessment of smearing.....	26
Lag 6.....	27
Lag 7.....	29
Lag 8.....	31
Lag 9.....	33
Influence of particle size distribution on geochemical smearing.....	35

Influence of SRU water tank on smearing .....	38
Influence of drilling rate on smearing.....	39
Approximation of calculated geochemisty .....	41
Smearing versus depth .....	43
Recommendations for collection of geologically representative sample from CT drilling.....	44
Conclusions .....	46
Acknowledgments .....	47
References .....	47
Appendix A: Particle size distrubtion upper size limit for Lag 6 and 7 pre-SRU samples .....	48
Appendix B: Whole rock analysis .....	60
Appendix C: Average geochemical data for cement types and Brukunga chips.....	78

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Parameters of 50 m and 100 m Lag experiments. Modified from Forbes et al. (2014a). \*Smearing considered over estimate due to inadequate collar capture device. 16

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Effect of geochemical smearing in returned drill cuttings. Dashed grey line represents natural crustal abundance. Solid grey line represents 10 times natural crustal abundance. The theoretical element concentration is shown by the solid black line, and can be seen to be significantly above 10 times natural crustal abundance where there is no smearing, and only slightly above natural crustal abundance where there is 10 m smearing. In the latter case, the geochemical anomaly would be missed. In the case of 5 m smearing, the geochemical anomaly would be seen, but the signal is significantly diluted due to the smearing in sample return, and may not be recognised as an anomaly. Modified from Forbes et al. (2014b). .....	6
Figure 2. (a) Experimental setup for Lag 6 and 7; (b) Experimental setup for Lag 8 and 9. ....	13
Figure 3. (a) Wassara hammer drill bit used in Lag 7 and Lag 9; (b) Solids Removal Unit (SRU) setup. ....	14
Figure 4. Schematic of drill hole and SRU: (a) Down-hole set up with velocity of different particle sizes; (b) Shaker table; (c) Shaker tank with velocity of different particle sizes and mixing; (d) Pathway to centrifuge via a pump; (e) Centrifuge and post-SRU sample. ....	15
Figure 5. Photographs showing (a) drill site set up and the Solids Removal Unit (SRU); (b) T-piece used for pre-SRU sample collection; (c) 10L pre-SRU sample collected into	

buckets; (d) Sample collection at SRU outlet; (e) Thick slurry sample collected post-SRU into drill core trays. .... 18

Figure 6. Particle-size distribution of upper size ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) vs % in interval for Lag 6 pre-SRU samples, indicating where the sample resides in reference to doped section. First sample of section is of lightest colour, and progressively darkens to represent deeper drilling. Samples before doped section: (a) P79851; (b) P79852; (c) P79853; (d) P79854; (e) P79855; Samples within doped section: (f) P79856; (g) P79857; Samples after the doped section: (h) P79858; (i) P79859; (j) P79860; (k) P79861; (l) P79862; (m) P79863; (n) P79864. .... 22

Figure 7. Particle-size distribution of upper size ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) vs % in interval for Lag 7 pre-SRU samples, indicating where the sample resides in reference to doped section. First sample of section is of lightest colour, and progressively darkens to represent deeper drilling. Samples before the doped section: (a) P79881; (b) P79882; (c) P79883; Samples within the doped section: (d) P79884; (e) P79885; (f) P79886; (g) P79887; Samples after the doped section: (h) P79888; (i) P79889; (j) P79890; (k) P79891; (l) P79892; (m) P79893; (n) P79894; (o) P79895; (p) P79896; (q) P79897; (r) P79898; (s) P79899. .... 23

Figure 8. Lag experiment 6: Drilling parameters (feed position (depth) and water pressure), S, Fe and Zn chemistry for pre- and post-SRU samples with maximum smear depth and cement type. .... 28

Figure 9. Lag experiment 7: Drilling parameters (feed position (depth) and water pressure), S, Fe and Zn chemistry for pre- and post-SRU samples with maximum smear depth and cement type. Final data from Lag experiment 6 were used to determine the initial background concentration of Lag 7. .... 30

Figure 10. Lag experiment 8: Drilling parameters (feed position (depth) and water pressure), S, Fe and Zn chemistry for pre- and post-SRU samples with maximum smear depth and cement type. .... 32

Figure 11. Lag experiment 9: Drilling parameters (feed position (depth) and water pressure), S, Fe and Zn chemistry for pre- and post-SRU samples with maximum smear depth and cement type. .... 34

Figure 12. Weight normalised particle size geochemistry of Lag 9 pre-SRU samples. (a) Sample L9007; (b) Sample L9008. .... 37

Figure 13. (a) Approximate sulphur concentration of Lag 8 post-SRU samples; (b) Cumulative sum plot to show area under curve. .... 42

Figure 14. Box and whisker plot for 10 repeat pXRF analyses of each cement type used in Lag 8. .... 43