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Abstract

In unconventional gas and tight oil plays, knowledge of the in situ rock mechanical profiles of the reservoir interval is critical in planning horizontal well trajectories and landing zones, placement of perforation clusters along the lateral, and optimal hydraulic fracture stimulation design. In current practice, vertical pilot holes and/or the laterals are logged after drilling, and the sonic and neutron log results are interpreted along with mechanical rock properties measured in the laboratory on core material. However, coring, logging, and core analyses are expensive and time consuming. In addition, as they are typically only performed in a few wells that are assumed to be representative, there is considerable uncertainty in extrapolating results across wide areas with known variability in stratigraphy, faults, thicknesses, hydrocarbon saturations, etc.

This paper reports a method for estimating mechanical rock properties and in situ rock mechanical profiles in every well in a development, based on calibration from initial rock core analyses plus drilling data that is routinely acquired. Wellbore friction analysis was coupled with a torque and drag model to estimate in situ unconfined compressive strength (UCS) and Young’s modulus (YM) profiles. The key process steps include: a) Calculate the weight and wellbore friction force of each element of the drill string from bottom to the surface; b) Adjust the hook load (HL) by subtracting the weight of the hook and entire drill string; c) Iteratively compute the friction coefficient to match calculated and observed HL; d) Estimate downhole weight-on-bit (DWOB) by applying a stand pipe pressure correction to the calculated HL and considering potential sliding and abrasiveness; e) Use a rate of penetration (ROP) model developed for polycrystalline diamond compact (PDC) drill bits considering a force balance between a drill bit geometry and formation and a wear function depending upon the formation abrasiveness and bit hydraulics to compute confined compressive strength (CCS). The resulting CCS was correlated to UCS and YM using regression constants obtained from laboratory triaxial test data on whole core material.  Using example from horizontal wells in a siltstone play in Alberta, Canada, this manuscript demonstrates a workflow to estimate rock strength from drilling data. The predicted UCS and YM values were compared with log data and potential uncertainties arising out of drilling data are discussed.

Introduction

In conventional and unconventional plays alike, a typical way to characterize the subsurface is to make measurements of the formation penetrated by the wellbore with logging tools that are either carried behind the drill bit (logging while drilling) or else run in the well after the drill string is removed (wireline or drill pipe-conveyed logging). Because this adds cost and risk, for unconventional gas or tight oil (UGTO) projects that may have hundreds to even thousands of producers, typically only early appraisal wells plus later, areally scattered wells are designed with extensive logging and laboratory core characterization programs. The assumption is that lateral variability and local heterogeneities are not great and that these data-rich penetrations sufficiently constrain the reservoir properties in the areas between them. In UGTO projects, good representations of the in situ stress profile and geomechanical rock properties are required to optimize the well trajectories and landing zones, placement of perforation clusters along the lateral, and hydraulic fracture stimulation design.

Drilling operations have advanced with real-time monitoring, control, automation, data acquisition and data mining
(Rassenfoss, S., 2011). Such real-time data could be effectively used to understand downhole dynamics and formation characteristics. Real-time wellbore fluid dynamics and wellbore friction factors were shown to identify hole cleaning efficiency, stuck pipe, differential sticking, formation changes and mud lubrication issues (Falco..., 1989). Measurements of DWOB, downhole torque and surface weight-on-bit (SWOB) were demonstrated to be effective in assessing and optimizing the performance of a bit, mud motor and bottomhole assembly while drilling through sand/shale sequences or formations which are difficult to steer through (Belaskie et al., 1993). This approach was shown to reduce trial and error based approach, excessive drill bit wear, unnecessary trips and rig time. Eshkalak et al. (2013) demonstrated generating geomechanical logs from conventional logs (Gamma Ray, Density and Porosity) using artificial intelligence. Building on this foundation, valuable reservoir characteristics obtained from logging/coring programs from the pilot wells can be coupled with measurements while drilling. Drilling data signatures such as HL, ROP, drill bit revolutions per minute (RPM), well trajectory and drilling fluid dynamics may be utilized to understand geomechanical properties of formation and their variations from every well. Several previous studies were performed to develop ROP models based on drill bit specification, wellbore friction and DWOB calculations and combine ROP, wellbore friction and DWOB to calculate rock properties such CCS, UCS and YM. The following sections review previous work on drill bit models, wellbore friction, DWOB and ROP inversion to predict rock strength.

**Drill bit models**

Warren (1984) established a relationship between weight-on-bit (WOB) and the depth of tooth penetration for a roller cone bit. Burgess and Lesso (1985) evaluated a new versus a couple of worn milled-tooth roller cone bits on Pierre shale at constant mud flow rate, borehole pressure and isotropic stress conditions. The new drill bit followed a straight line correlation when the dimensionless torque was plotted against the dimensionless penetration rate defined as ROP/ (RPM.D_w). The intercept and slope values of the plots were found to be consistent with those for a similar new drill bit tested in shale and sand sequence in the Gulf Coast of the USA. The worn out bits deviated from the straight line correlation due to the lower torque. Winters et al. (1987) presented a bit model that related rock CCS and ductility. The bit design constants computed after regressing laboratory drilling data are applicable for all styles of roller cone bit designs. Kuru and Wojtanowicz (1988) derived a drilling model based on force balance at the PDC bit cutter and formation which combined the torque, drilling rate, cutter geometry and formation characteristics. A plot of dimensionless torque against dimensionless drilling rate was suggested as a diagnostic tool from early drilling where a new bit data followed a straight line and subsequent data showed scatter depending upon the bit wear.

**Wellbore friction and DWOB**

A large part of energy from the kelly/top-drive is spent to overcome friction during drilling. Several investigations were performed to estimate friction factors along the wellbore and DWOB. Lesage et al. (1988) used equations (Johancsik et al. 1984) that relate DWOB, SWOB and torque to estimate the wellbore friction factor for two field cases where both downhole and surface torque and WOB sensors were utilized. Most of the values of the friction factor ranged between 0.25 and 0.4, lost circulation in permeable zones probably due to reduced buoyancy and excessive WOB. Falconer et al. (1989) used real-time measurements of DWOB, SWOB and torque to compute rotating and sliding friction factors while drilling for 6 case studies which emphasized the use of friction factor in diagnosing drilling problems. The parameters such as filter cake thickness, differential sticking, and build up of cuttings in the annulus gradually increase wellbore friction, whereas hanging stabilizers contribute in sharp increase in frictional forces. In the cases presented, friction factor during normal rotary drilling ranged between 0.18 and 0.22 and was observed to be relatively constant in the partially cased hole. Unsworth et al. (1990) introduced a method for accurate depth measurement which comprised of automated pipe tally listings, ROP, drill string tension based slipping criterion and continuous monitoring of the drill bit while tripping. Belaskie et al. (1993) measured DWOB and torque while slanted/horizontal drilling through shale, interbedded sand-shale and the Sadlerochit formations in Lisburne field on the North Slope of Alaska. The knowledge of real-time DWOB/SWOB and torque was found to be effective in understanding undergauged/locked cone bit, fractured motor shaft and packed-hole assembly problems and hence performing only necessary trips. The values of dimensionless torque (T_d) defined as T_d = 2T_c/f [ft-lb] / [DWOB.D_b] were found to be ~0.3 for shales. Luke and Juvkam-Wold (1993) derived equations for HL as a function of derrick load, dead-line tension, individual sheave efficiency and number of lines between blocks for the active and inactive dead-line sheaves while raising and lowering traveling block. Such HL dependence was verified with a block-and-tackle system involving a workover rig, crown block, traveling block and load acquisition devices. Reiber et al. (1999) calculated incremental and total wellbore friction factors with bottom-up drill string weight calculations performed on real-time well data and from offshore Norway, Denmark, and onshore Germany. The changes in friction factors were utilized in identifying stuck pipe/differential sticking, mud lubricity, hole cleaning, formation changes and effectiveness of torque reduction tools. Aadnoy and Andersen (2001) established analytical solutions to predict wellbore friction for different well geometries in vertical and horizontal planes with survey parameters such as inclination and azimuth. These solutions were further formulated in 3-dimensions and applied to a deviated well with additional parameters such as dogleg and dogleg severity (Aadnoy et al., 2010; Fazaelizadeh et al, 2011).
ROP models for rock strength

Rampersad et al. (1993) used ROP models derived for roller cone and PDC bits by Warren (1984) and Kuru and Wojtanowicz (1988) respectively, to compute drill bit and wear coefficients at optimum ROP. Such optimum ROP values were utilized to predict CCS and UCS to create a geological-drilling-log (GDL) for each drill bit and corresponding intervals. Hareland and Hoberock (1993) later introduced a wellbore cleaning efficiency function and applied it to ROP models of tricone rollercone drill bit performance to generate CCS and UCS profiles from drilling data of 3 wells in East Texas and one well from southwestern Wyoming drilled in Catoosa shale and Carthage limestone lithologies respectively for which good agreement was observed with field closure test data. Harel and Nygaard, (2007). A correlation between CCS and UCS was presented to account for both overbalanced and underbalanced drilling (Shirkavand et al., 2009). Hareland et al. (2010) observed indentation of a rollercone with a single row of inserts on different rock samples to develop a rock failure model for rollercone bits which predicted UCS trends consistent with those predicted from logs.

Case Study and Methodology

The extension of these concepts to unconventional gas/ tight oil plays requires further adaptation. Shale formations typically cover larger areas, exhibit natural fractures, may have drilling hazards and vary in hydrocarbon and water saturation. Drilling fluid characteristics, wellbore trajectory and drilling, completion and stimulation designs need to be tailored for optimal performance. Ajayi et al. (2013) reported that perforation clusters or fracture stages located in wellbore intervals of relatively low minimum principal stresses or similar geomechanical properties resulted in 33-40% higher gas flowback rates from two wells drilled in Marcellus Shale reservoirs in Pennsylvania and New York, USA. Therefore characterizing geomechanical properties such as UCS and YIM while drilling could be related to rock brittleness which would provide significant advantage in designing stimulations with optimized stage-sacing, fracture length and orientation.

In this study, drilling data were utilized to predict UCS and YIM in horizontal section of a wellbore. Horizontal wells drilled and completed in the Lower Triassic Montney Formation E lobe, Alberta, Canada were analyzed for rock strength prediction from drilling data. The well (Well A) orientation and geological layers encountered while drilling are shown in Figure 1. The Montney typically consists of dark grey siltstone with minor sandstone to dolomitic siltstone. It exhibits 131-170°F in situ temperature, 2-4.5 wt% total organic carbon and 3-10% porosity with 30-70% gas saturation (Nieta et al., 2009; Walsh et al., 2006). The Montney Formation is overlain by the middle Triassic Doig Formation (~150 m) which includes granular phosphate and phosphatic pebbles (Edwards et al., 2012). Drilling parameters collated under survey-, depth- and time-based data are listed in Figure 2. Depth- and time-based drilling data were acquired from the well’s drilling database. The depth-based data used was every 0.5 m whereas time-based data was every 20 seconds. Additional parameters such as pore pressure, mud weight, plastic viscosity and mud type (oil/water-based) were compiled from daily drilling reports (Table 1). Pore pressure was obtained from a post-drilling diagnostic fracture injection test (DFIT) as 14.58 kPa/m (2.11 psi/m; specific gravity: 1.49) which confirmed underbalanced drilling conditions in the lateral section of the wellbore. Drill string specifications (Table 2) such as number of joints, length of each joint, outer diameter, inner diameter and unit mass were obtained from a daily drilling reports at the bottom section of zone of interest (measured depth: 4490m). The horizontal section of the well (total depth: 2600-4490 m) was drilled with a PDC drill bit (MSF513M) manufactured by ReedHycal. Specifications of the drill bit (Table 3) were obtained from drill bit summary available in the drilling database. Drilling rig parameters such as weight of the hook, number of lines and sheave efficiency were assumed as 12 kDaN (27 klbs), 10 and 98% respectively.

The depth- and time-based data were filtered to eliminate erroneous data points (e.g. RPM, and ROP < 0) due to uncertainties while drilling, tripping and non-productive time. No other drilling parameter was adjusted to avoid errors due to individual bias. Figure 3 shows SWOB, HL, ROP and top-drive RPM from the depth-based file. The measured HL was adjusted for frictional losses in the sheaves of the hoisting system (Eq. 1-2) after subtracting the weight of the hook (Dangerfield, 1987).

\[ HL_{obs} = \frac{HL_{obs}}{n_{lines}} \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{1}{n_{lines}}} \right) \]  
raising block

\[ HL_{obs} = \frac{HL_{obs}}{n_{lines}} \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{1}{n_{lines}}} \right) \]  
lowering block

The resultant value of the HL was further corrected by subtracting the product of differential pressure and cross-sectional area of the drill pipe. This correction accounts for the stretch of the drill string. Using drill string specifications, the weight
of each element of the drill string was calculated from the drill string weight of that element times the buoyancy factor. Survey data was utilized to determine if the element was in tension or compression to use the appropriate force equation. These forces were added up from bottom to the surface (Fazaelizadeh, et al., 2011) to compute net HL. Time-based data were used to identify off-bottom (bit depth = total depth) calibration depths at which friction factors were determined iteratively to match surface HL and net HL within 0.5 kDaN tolerance using equation 3 or 4 (Dashevskiy et al., 2006). DWOB was subsequently adjusted by applying stand pipe pressure correction to the calculated HL. DWOB values could be further subjected to potential sliding criterion (Eq. 5) in build-up section of the wellbore and abrasiveness constants for different formations (Table 4).

\[
F_{\text{top}} = \beta w \Delta L \left( \cos \alpha \ or \ \frac{\sin \alpha_{\text{top}} - \sin \alpha_{\text{bottom}}}{\alpha_{\text{top}} - \alpha_{\text{bottom}}} \right) - \mu x \beta w \Delta L \left( \sin \alpha \ or \ \frac{\cos \alpha_{\text{top}} - \cos \alpha_{\text{bottom}}}{\alpha_{\text{top}} - \alpha_{\text{bottom}}} \right) + \left( F_{\text{bottom}} - \text{DWOB} \ or \ [F_{\text{bottom}} - \text{DWOB}] e^{-i[\theta]} \right)
\]

(3)

\[
F_{\text{top}} = \beta w \Delta L \left( \cos \alpha \ or \ \frac{\sin \alpha_{\text{top}} - \sin \alpha_{\text{bottom}}}{\alpha_{\text{top}} - \alpha_{\text{bottom}}} \right) - \mu x \beta w \Delta L \left( \sin \alpha \ or \ \frac{\cos \alpha_{\text{top}} - \cos \alpha_{\text{bottom}}}{\alpha_{\text{top}} - \alpha_{\text{bottom}}} \right) + \left( F_{\text{bottom}} \ or \ F_{\text{bottom}} \times e^{-i[\theta]} \right)
\]

(4)

If RPM > 14, no correction in WOB
If RPM < 14, \( W_{\text{slide}} = \text{constant} x \Delta p \)

where, constant = \( \frac{\left( \frac{\text{WOB}}{\Delta p} \right)_{i-2} + \left( \frac{\text{WOB}}{\Delta p} \right)_{i-3} + \left( \frac{\text{WOB}}{\Delta p} \right)_{i-4}}{3} \)

Upon selecting a percentage value of SWOB as DWOB, ROP model developed for PDC (Hareland, G. et al., 2011) drill bits as illustrated with Eq. 6 was used. The ROP model of PDC drill bit considers a force balance between one cutter and formation to derive an analytical solution for entire drill bit face with multiple cutters. Such analytical solution was empirically calibrated (constants: \( K_1, a_1, b_1, c_1 \)) with the laboratory data obtained with prototype drill bits tested on variety of formations (Warren and Armagost, 1988).

\[
\text{ROP} = \left[ \frac{K_1 \text{WOB}^a \cdot \text{RPM}^b \cdot \cos(SR)}{\text{CCS}^c \cdot D_B \cdot \tan(BR)} \right] W_f h(x) b(x)
\]

(6)

The empirical relation was further corrected for drill bit wear function (Eq. 7, 8) depending upon the formation abrasiveness, and wellbore cleaning efficiency based on bit hydraulics (Eq. 9 In addition to bit wear and hydraulic efficiency functions, the number of blades (\( N_b \)) of a PDC bit is considered to lower the drilling efficiency. This effect is applied using Eq. 11. The calculated ROP was iteratively matched to measured ROP and estimate CCS (Shirkavand, F. et al., 2009). The coefficients from hydraulic function (\( a_2, b_2, c_2 \)) were determined from laboratory tests performed under simulated borehole conditions (Holster and Kipp, 1984). The CCS is correlated to UCS and YM using regression constants obtained from laboratory triaxial tests performed on Montney Formation core samples (Eq. 12, 13).

\[
W_f = 1 - a_3 \left( \frac{\Delta B G}{8} \right)^{b_3}
\]

(7)

\[
\Delta B G = C a \sum_{i=2}^{n} \text{WOB}_i \cdot \text{RPM}_i \cdot \text{CCS}_i \cdot A B R_i
\]

(8)

\[
h(x) = a_2 \cdot \frac{(H S I \cdot \frac{J S A}{2 \cdot D_B})^{b_2}}{\text{ROP}^{c_2}}
\]

(9)

\[
H S I = \frac{H H P}{A_B} \left[ \frac{[Q \cdot P_B / 1714]}{[(\pi / 4)D_B^2]} \right]
\]

(10)
Wellbore friction was determined using time-based data and while drill string was lowered towards bottom with circulation and rotation. The selection of data points for depths were selected by four methods such off-bottom, 20 cm before off-bottom, 15 cm before off-bottom or sudden jump in stand-pipe pressure. The DWOB values computed by these four methods were compared and a constant percentage value of SWOB was selected as DWOB (83%) for subsequent ROP computations. Assumption of constant ratio of DWOB and SWOB in individual slanted or horizontal sections of the wellbore is consistent with real-time observations made by Belaskie et al. (1993). Figure 4 shows computed UCS and YM trends against measured depth in the horizontal section of the wellbore A. Clearly, uncertainties in drilling data points significantly affect the output trends. The average values of UCS and YM predicted with ROP models were found to be 99.57 MPa and 29.64 GPa respectively. Decreasing UCS profile in the later section of the wellbore (measured depth > 3500 m) indicates inaccurate drill bit wear evaluation on the rig. Figure 5 compares computed UCS trends for wellbore A with those obtained from sonic logs available on a part of the wellbore (measured depth: 2640-2790 m). Horsrud (2001) published correlations for predicting static mechanical properties such as UCS of shale using compressional velocity (Vp). UCS was computed with sonic log correlations by Horsrud (2001) (Eq. 14) and Onyia (1988) (Eq. 15). ROP models under predict UCS values than those derived from logs in this study and reported by Davey (2012) (UCS: 117-136 MPa) for the Montney Formation.

\[
b(x) = \frac{RPM^{(1.02-N_x+0.02)}}{RPM^{0.92}} \quad (11)
\]

\[
UCS = \frac{CCS}{1 + a_x Pe^{b_x}} \quad (12)
\]

\[
E = CCS.a_E.(1 + Pe)b_E \quad (13)
\]

### Results and Discussions

The discrepancy in prediction of ROP models with those derived from logs could be related to uncertainties in drilling data. The depth-based data utilized in this prediction was not corrected to minimize erroneous data points due to mechanical events, vibrations and instrument sensitivity. The weight of hook, HL calibration, number of lines, true sheave efficiency and frictional losses in the sheave could significantly affect wellbore friction coefficient. Underbalanced drilling and gas influx can erroneously change effective mud weight in the wellbore and hence buoyancy forces. This study presents an approach to estimate actual (downhole) weight on bit based on the PDC bit cutting model and surface measurements. These results could be validated using high quality surface and downhole measurements which would allow separating actual rock strength variations from other potential causes of variable drilling loads (e.g. bit dulling, vibration, stabilizer hang-up). Subsurface core and log data from the early exploration and appraisal wells could be correlated to drilling data. These correlation could be further extrapolated across the field using only drilling data to build more robust areal distributions of the parameters such as confined compressive strength, unconfined compressive strength and Young’s modulus which govern sweet-spotting of production well trajectories and stimulation designs.

### Nomenclature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A_B</td>
<td>bit face area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a_3,b_3</td>
<td>empirical constants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a_1,b_1,c_1</td>
<td>empirical constants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a_2,b_2,c_2</td>
<td>empirical constants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABR</td>
<td>abrasiveness constant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 1: Depth resolved pore pressure, drilling fluid characteristics of Well A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Pore Pressure (kPa/m)</th>
<th>Mud weight (g/cc)</th>
<th>Plastic viscosity (mPa-s)</th>
<th>Mud Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2740</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Oil-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3504</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Oil-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4237</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Oil-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4490</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>1.355</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Water-based</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Drill string specifications at total depth of Well A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Type</th>
<th>Joints</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>OD (mm)</th>
<th>ID (mm)</th>
<th>Specific mass (Kg/m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drill Pipe</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1836.34</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWDP</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>362.91</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drill pipe</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>2250.35</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossover</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Drill Collar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Drill Collar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulser sub</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWD Tool</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossover</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-mag Pony Collar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bent Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Length</td>
<td></td>
<td>4490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Design specifications of ReedHycalog MSF513M PDC drill bit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IADC Code</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diameter (mm)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of nozzles</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diameter of each nozzle (mm)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of cutters</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diameter of cutter (mm)</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back rake angle (deg.)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side rake angle (deg.)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutter thickness (mm)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junk slot area (mm²)</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of blades</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Typical gamma ray and abrasiveness constants for different rock types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formation</th>
<th>Specific gravity</th>
<th>Abrasiveness constant</th>
<th>Gamma ray API</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silts</td>
<td>2.67-2.7</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>50-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conglomite</td>
<td>2.4-2.9</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>10-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolomite</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>&lt;30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>&lt;20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shale</td>
<td>2.4-2.8</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>80-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal bituminous</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Formation intervals and plot of true vertical depth against measured depth for the horizontal well (Well A) completed in Montney Formation E lobe.
Figure 2: Summary of inputs used in DWOB-DROCK software calculations.

Figure 3: SWOB, HL, ROP and top-drive RPM from the depth-based file of Well A.
Figure 4: UCS (left) and YM (right) computed for Well A with raw and filtered drilling data as input.

Figure 5: Comparison of UCS profile obtained from ROP models for Well A with those obtained from sonic logs.
Figure 6: UCS (left) and YM (right) computed for Well B with raw drilling data as input.