Characterization of deformation bands associated with normal and reverse stress states in the Navajo Sandstone, Utah

John G. Solum, J. P. Brandenburg, Stephen J. Naruk, Olga V. Kostenko, Scott J. Wilkins, and Richard A. Schultz

ABSTRACT

Deformation-band networks at Buckskin Gulch, Utah, and the Big Hole fault, Utah, both formed in the Navajo Sandstone with similar initial porosity and permeability, at similar burial depths, and result in similar reductions in effective permeability. However, the band networks at Buckskin Gulch, which formed in a contractional tectonic setting, appear to be much more areally extensive and are not associated with any discrete faults having displacements greater than at most a few meters and more likely only a few tens of centimeters. In contrast, the bands at Big Hole fault are generally limited to the damage zone of a about 25-m (82-ft) displacement normal fault formed in a locally extensional environment. These results suggest that deformation bands in well core from extensional settings may be indicative of discrete damage zones associated with normal faults, whereas deformation bands in well core from contractional settings may be indicative of much more areally extensive deformation-band networks. The band networks in both cases will affect similar reductions in reservoir effective permeability, but only in the latter case will the affected area be sufficiently large to affect well performance.

INTRODUCTION

Coarse, well-sorted sandstone with high porosity and quartz content is close to an optimal reservoir material. However, such sandstones may deform by unique mechanisms that make reservoir forecasting more challenging, that is, the formation of
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Deformation bands (Fossen et al., 2007; Schultz and Fossen, 2008). Deformation bands are essentially faults or shear zones in weakly consolidated to unconsolidated granular material. More specifically, deformation bands are zones of localized grain rearrangement (packing geometry, rotation, and sliding) and cataclasis (breaking, spalling, and crushing) developed to varying extents, typically on the order of a few host-rock grain diameters in thickness (e.g., Aydin, 1978; Pittman, 1981; Aydin and Johnson, 1983). Compaction bands are a type of deformation band that accommodates closing displacements, including porosity loss caused by grain reorganization and/or cracking, with no shearing within the band (Mollema and Antonellini, 1996; Sternlof et al., 2005; Schultz and Fossen, 2008). Deformation-band arrays are common as dense arrays in the damage zones of faults cutting sandstone but can also be distributed between fault zones and related to regional deformation. Regardless of their type, deformation bands typically have a lower permeability than their undeformed host rocks. Where present in small numbers, they have little or no effect on reservoir performance. However, where present in large numbers, they can significantly reduce reservoirs’ effective permeabilities and hence well performance (e.g., Myers, 1999; Shipton et al., 2002; Flodin et al., 2005).

Deformation bands are commonly observed in core, and when such observations are made in appraisal settings, predicting both their permeability and their distribution to forecast the effect, if any, on reservoir performance is critical. Specifically, modeling the spatial distribution of deformation bands and their permeabilities allows their effect on bulk permeability to be calculated. This article compares and contrasts two occurrences of deformation bands that formed in the same host-rock unit (Navajo Sandstone) and at similar burial depths and times. The geometric characteristics and permeability reductions of the bands are similar. However, in the first case, a contractional setting (East Kaibab monocline), the bands occur over a sufficiently large area to degrade well performance. In the second case, an extensional setting (Big Hole fault), the bands appear limited to the damage zone of a normal fault and do not occur over a sufficiently large area to adversely affect well performance. In the second case, the bands appear to have formed under significantly less mean effective stress than in the first case. We infer that this difference between tectonic environments and associated stresses is a primary criterion for identifying when deformation bands potentially occur in sufficient numbers to degrade reservoir performance.

Deformation bands have been documented in sandstones of virtually every provenance in both the field and subsurface.
For example, deformation bands have been described in fluvial sands (Parnell et al., 2004), deltaic sands (Gibson, 1994), and near-shore marine sands (Cashman and Cashman, 2000). Deformation bands are particularly common in deformed eolian sandstone and have been described in multiple locations in the southwestern United States in Utah (Aydin, 1978; Antonellini and Aydin, 1995; Fossen and Hesthammer, 1998; Davis et al., 1999; Shipton et al., 2002; Davatzes et al., 2003; Schulte and Balasko, 2003; Berg and Skar, 2005; Fossen et al., 2005) and Nevada (Myers, 1999; Taylor and Pollard, 2000; Flodin et al., 2003, 2005; Eichhubl et al., 2004). Similar surface exposures have also been documented in Scotland (Underhill and Woodcock, 1987; Parnell et al., 2004). For a more comprehensive discussion of deformation-band occurrences, see recent reviews by Aydin et al. (2006) or Fossen et al. (2007). The types of deformation bands observed at Buckskin Gulch and along the Big Hole fault are given in Table 1.

Deformation bands are commonly observed in reservoirs, and there are examples of fields in which deformation bands impact production as well as examples of fields in which deformation bands do not inhibit production. For example, the Gullfaks (Hesthammer et al., 2002) and Huldra (Fossen et al., 2003) fields in the North Sea Brent province contain deformation bands, but they have little effect on well communication. In contrast, the Gullfaks Sør field in the North Sea Brent province (Hesthammer et al., 2002) and the Ganymede field in the Rotliegendes (Leveille et al., 1997) contain faults and deformation bands that baffle flow and enhance fault seal. In the case of the Gullfaks Sør field, the actual production was only 15% of the anticipated production (Hesthammer et al., 2002). Although all of the abovementioned fields are lithologically similar, the Gullfaks Sør and Ganymede fields are hotter and experienced significant quartz cementation, which made the deformation bands in those fields relatively tight. Without that cementation, the deformation bands in the Gullfaks Sør and Ganymede likely would not have negatively impacted reservoir performance.

Examples of reservoirs with noncemented bands still baffle flow. The Arroyo Grande field in the marine Miocene–Pliocene Pismo Formation in California contains zone deformation bands that contain tar on one side but not on the other (Antonellini et al., 1999). Steam conductivity in that field was nine times higher parallel to the deformation bands than perpendicular to them, indicating that the band arrays and associated faults controlled the steam flood (Antonellini et al., 1999). The Anschutz Ranch East field in the Nugget Sandstone (equivalent to the Navajo) in Wyoming is a fault-related anticline that contains many deformation bands observed in the core (Lewis and Coupies, 1993). In places, these bands separate bitumen-stained and clean sandstones, similar to the Arroyo Grande field, providing an indication of baffling. The bands at the Anschutz Ranch East field are interpreted to occur over a large area in the hinge of the fold. This is an indication that deformation bands can degrade reservoir permeabilities over areas that are large enough to impair well performance.

Table 1. Definitions of Types of Deformation Bands Described in This Study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deformation band</th>
<th>Generic term covering any thin, tabular zone of deformation. Includes shear bands, noncataclastic shear bands, and compaction bands.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shear band</td>
<td>A deformation band that accommodates shear offset, dominantly through cataclasis. Observed at Buckskin Gulch and the Big Hole fault.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shear band fault</td>
<td>A fault composed of a coalescence or amalgamation of shear bands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncataclastic shear band</td>
<td>A shear band that accommodates offset with little observable cataclasis. Inferred to form early in burial history at shallow depths. Observed at the Big Hole fault.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compaction band</td>
<td>A deformation band without shear offset that accommodates negative elongation through grain packing and reorganization. Observed at Buckskin Gulch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dilational bands are reported in the literature but are not observed at either Buckskin Gulch or the Big Hole fault.
One major difference between the group of fields that were affected by deformation bands and the group that was not is the stress state. The Gullfaks and Huldra fields occur in a normal-faulting environment, whereas the Arroyo Grande and Anschutz Ranch East fields occur in a reverse-faulting environment. The goal of this report is to determine the function of stress state in the development of deformation-band networks because it appears that some aspect of a reverse-faulting environment (likely higher mean stress) promotes the formation of features that cause compartmentalization.

The preservation and exposure of these deformation-band networks in some outcrops are so complete that several workers have used spatial characteristics measured in these exposures as the quantitative basis for modeling deformation bands in the subsurface. Such research is ongoing and has yielded a wealth of information, particularly in terms of characterizing deformation bands in the damage zones of faults (Antonellini and Aydin, 1994, 1995; Fowles and Burley, 1994; Knott et al., 1996; Beach et al., 1999; Shipton and Cowie, 2001; Du Bernard et al., 2002; Shipton et al., 2002, 2005; Berg and Skar, 2005; Fossen et al., 2007). Here, we contribute to this effort by presenting a comparison of deformation bands at the Big Hole fault and Buckskin Gulch sites in southern Utah (Figure 1). Both sites contain exposures of extensive deformation-band networks developed in response to Laramide deformation of the Colorado Plateau. However, they differ in terms of mode of deformation. At the Big Hole fault, deformation bands occur primarily but not exclusively in the damage zone of a large normal fault with a throw of up to approximately 24 m (79 ft) (Shipton and Cowie, 2001; Shipton et al., 2002, 2005). Deformation bands at Buckskin Gulch are more areally extensive and related to thrusting associated with the development of the east Kaibab monocline (Mollema, 1994; Mollema and Antonellini, 1996; Davis, 1999; Schultz, 2009; Tindall and Davis, 1999).
GEOLOGIC SETTING

The two field sites represented in this study were chosen because of the commonality of stratigraphic unit (Navajo Sandstone) as well as the timing of driving forces for deformation-band formation (Laramide deformation of the Colorado Plateau). Figure 1 illustrates the relationship of both field sites to the principal uplifts and monoclines of the Colorado Plateau. Although debate about the causes of mechanisms of uplift in this region is ongoing, these monoclines are generally accepted as Laramide structures associated with the reactivation of high-angle Precambrian normal faults during the Cretaceous and Tertiary (e.g., Davis, 1978). Both the Buckskin Gulch and Big Hole fault field locations contain excellent exposure of the eolian Navajo Sandstone with extensive populations of deformation bands. The Navajo Formation is Jurassic in age, with somewhat uncertain age relationships to underlying strata (Marzolf, 1983). Overall sedimentary thickness increases, and the formation becomes increasingly sand rich from the northeast to the southwest (Marzolf, 1983; Beitler et al., 2005). The Navajo Sandstone is stratigraphically equivalent to the Aztec Sandstone in Nevada (Marzolf, 1983), which also hosts numerous deformation bands in the Valley of Fire State Park (e.g., Taylor and Pollard, 2000; Flodin et al., 2003; Sternlof et al., 2005). The depositional history of the Navajo and related sandstones is summarized by Dickinson and Gehrels (2009).

Buckskin Gulch

Several authors have extensively characterized deformation bands in the Navajo Sandstone deformed in association with the formation of the East Kaibab monocline (Mollema and Antonellini, 1996; Davis, 1999; Davis et al., 1999; Tindall and Davis, 1999). Most of these studies focused on deformation bands to the north of Highway 89 where the hinge zone of the monocline is well exposed (e.g., Tindall and Davis, 1999). However, the Buckskin Gulch field location (Figure 2) is uniquely situated in approximately flat-lying strata to the east of the forelimb (Mollema and Antonellini, 1996). Because of the northward plunge of the anticline (Doelling and Davis, 1989), exposure of the Navajo Sandstone expands from north to south and is marked by extensive lateral exposure in the Buckskin Gulch proper. This location is marked by a distinctive topography of ridge tops capped by flat zones of coalesced shear bands (deformation-band faults) that are particularly resistant to weathering (similar to the flying pancakes of Davis, 1999). In addition to providing a unique view of deformed Navajo Sandstone, Buckskin Gulch is one of only two field locations (the other being Valley of Fire in Nevada) where compaction bands have been documented. Buckskin Gulch is located at the eastern edge of the Kaibab uplift. Although a pretertonic, noncataclastic population has been proposed (Davis, 1999), most of the deformation bands at this location are related to the growth of the East Kaibab monocline (Mollema and Antonellini, 1996). Tindall and Davis (1999) suggested that growth of the monocline may have involved a significant component of strike-slip motion. However, the deformation bands at Buckskin Gulch show predominantly reverse offsets. This kinematic sense is supported by the orientation of a conjugate set of deformation-band shear zones and compaction bands relative to the strike of the monocline (Mollema and Antonellini, 1996) indicating a thrust-faulting tectonic environment. Davis (1999) reported that structures associated with the East Kaibab monocline deform the Cretaceous Straight Cliffs Formation, and based on the mapping of Doelling and Davis (1989), strata as young as the Kaiparowits Formation are deformed. Based on palynology, the Straight Cliffs Formation is Turonian to Santonian (Nichols, 1997), whereas the Kaiparowits Formation is Campanian (Cifelli, 1990). These ages indicate that the monocline was active as young as 89–71 Ma. The deformation-band arrays at Buckskin Gulch are similar to an exposure in the Valley of Fire in southern Nevada that formed during the Sevier orogeny. Ash beds underlying synorogenic sediments at the Valley of Fire have been dated to about 98–102 Ma (Bohannon, 1983; Troyer et al., 2006), providing a lower limit on the age of band formation at that location. Assuming that the Buckskin Gulch and Valley of Fire band arrays formed coevally and adding in
the stratigraphic constraints on the age of the East Kaibab monocline, the deformation-band arrays at Buckskin Gulch formed between 71 and 102 Ma. Using the stratigraphic thicknesses given by Davis (1999), the Buckskin Gulch Band arrays formed at a depth of about 1.5–3 km (0.9–1.8 mi).

Big Hole Fault

The Big Hole fault field location is situated approximately 250 km (155 mi) to the north-northwest of Buckskin Gulch, near a prominent knob known as Chimney Rock (Figure 3), the namesake of the Chimney Rock fault array (Krantz, 1988). Here, the capping Carmel Formation has proven more resistant to weathering, exposing the Navajo Sandstone primarily along dry gullies (Witkind, 1988). The Chimney Rock fault network comprises a system of small normal faults. Deformation bands (shear bands) in the damage zone of the larger Blueberry fault and Big Hole fault have been the basis for prior spatial analysis (Shipton and Cowie, 2001; Shipton et al., 2002) and behind-outcrop

Figure 2. Buckskin Gulch field area and vicinity. The digital elevation map (DEM) was generated from a 5-m (16-ft) vertical resolution light detection and ranging (LIDAR) from the Utah State Geographic Information Database. The superimposed geologic map was redrawn from Mollema and Antonellini (1996). Panel A highlights structural features; panel B highlights the regional surface exposure of the Navajo Sandstone and the location where measurements were taken (Buckskin Gulch). The hinge of the monocline is drawn based on the inference of the authors. Thin lines are joints mapped in the original figure.
Figure 3. Big Hole fault field area and vicinity. The digital elevation map (DEM) was generated from a light detection and ranging (LIDAR) from the Utah State Geographic Information Database. The superimposed geologic map was redrawn from Witkind (1988). Panel A highlights structural features; panel B highlights the regional surface exposure of the Navajo Sandstone and the location where measurements were taken along the Big Hole fault. Thin lines and dashed lines are faults.

drill-core studies (Shipton et al., 2005). Although extensive deformation-band networks are readily spotted in outcrop, the deformation-band-controlled geomorphology that is so prominent at Buckskin Gulch is lacking in this area. No compaction bands have been observed in the vicinity of the Big Hole fault, although two types of shear bands are observed. The first is the cataclastic shear bands described above, whereas the second are darker, noncataclastic bands, which are similar to the subvariety DB2b bands that Davis (1999) reported in the Navajo Sandstone in the southern part of the Colorado Plateau in Utah.

In contrast to the marginal location of Buckskin Gulch, the Big Hole fault location is near the center of the San Rafael swell. Here, uplift-related deformation is expressed as a gentle folding of strata (Witkind, 1988) and by an associated set of small normal faults (the Chimney Rock fault array) in an approximately orthorhombic pattern (Krantz, 1988; Davatzes et al., 2003). Observations from both locations can be treated as different facets of deformation from the same larger scale tectonic event (i.e., Laramide deformation of the Colorado Plateau; Engebretson et al., 1984). Although a specific relationship has not been established, this fault array likely formed in response to flexure of the San Rafael swell at approximately 58–79 Ma (Shipton et al., 2002). Shipton and Cowie (2001) estimated that the Big Hole fault was active at a depth of 1.5–3 km.
(0.9–1.8 mi), which is similar to the depth estimates for Buckskin Gulch.

**BAND DATA**

One scan line oriented perpendicular to the strike of the deformation bands noting deformation-band thickness, orientation, and position was collected at each field site. Overview photographs of the scan lines are shown in Figures 4 and 5. The scan line at Buckskin Gulch crosses two deformation (shear)-band faults; defined by coalescences of shear bands, but lacking a thoroughgoing slip surface, and therefore accommodating little displacement using the model of deformation-band fault formation described by Aydin (1978). Similarly, the scan line at Big Hole crosses two normal faults, one with a 3-m (10-ft) throw, the other with 14 m (46 ft). The compaction and shear bands at Buckskin Gulch appear
to have formed contemporaneously as indicated by some compaction bands changing to shear bands at dune boundaries (Figure 4B) (Schultz, 2009). Both scan lines cross approximately the same number of bands (∼300). Scan-line trajectories were defined using a fiberglass measuring tape, and band thicknesses were measured using a set of calipers. Band orientations were measured when possible.

**Figure 5.** Outcrop photographs of deformation-band occurrences along the Big Hole fault. (A) Overview of the scan line. The general orientation of the deformation bands is given by the dashed line. Most of the lighter colored lineations in that image are deformation bands. (B) Closer view of shear bands along that scan line.

**Band Densities**

Band densities for both locations are shown in Figure 6 and listed in Table 2. The average density of bands is greater at Buckskin Gulch (25 bands/m) than at the Big Hole fault (5 bands/m). High band densities (20–25 bands/m or 6–8 bands/ft) at Big Hole are correlated with two normal faults, one with a 3-m (10-ft) throw, the other with a 14-m
**Figure 6.** Band densities along the scan lines from Buckskin Gulch and the Big Hole fault.

**Table 2.** Effective Permeability Calculations for Buckskin Gulch and Big Hole Fault

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Buckskin Gulch</th>
<th>Big Hole Fault</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total scan-line length (ft/m)</td>
<td>50.5/15.4</td>
<td>188.3/57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bands</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average band density (#/ft #/m)</td>
<td>7.5/24.6</td>
<td>1.6/5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative shear band thickness (ft/m)</td>
<td>0.63/0.19</td>
<td>1.30/0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative compaction band thickness (ft/m)</td>
<td>1.65/0.50</td>
<td>0.49/0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total band thickness (ft/m)</td>
<td>2.28/0.69</td>
<td>1.80/0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shear band permeability (low/mean/high) (md)</td>
<td>0.08/0.26/1.16</td>
<td>0.002/0.13/0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compaction band permeability (low/mean/high) (md)</td>
<td>3.3/39.1/75</td>
<td>75/164/285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host-rock permeability (low/mean/high) (md)</td>
<td>3300/5400/7500</td>
<td>660/880/1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{\text{eff}}$ using mean permeabilities (md)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean $K_{\text{eff}}$/mean host-rock permeability</td>
<td>20/5400 = 0.004</td>
<td>Mean $K_{\text{eff}}$/mean host-rock permeability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(46-ft) throw (Shipton et al., 2002), showing that the high density at that location is correlated with fault damage zones. The greatest band density observed at Big Hole (~25 bands/m or 8 bands/ft) occurs 13 m (43 ft) from the slip surface of a fault with a throw of 14 m (46 ft), although this could be considered part of the damage zone of the Big Hole fault. Bands at Big Hole include white cataclastic bands (268 of 294 bands) and darker non-cataclastic bands (26 of 294 bands). Beyond the ends of the scan line, the background density of deformation bands is less than 5/m.

The scan line at Buckskin Gulch crosses two deformation-band faults. The offset along these faults is not known because of the lack of visible offset markers, but because these faults lack through-going slip surfaces, they are most likely small displacement features (Aydin, 1978). Cross laminae can be traced across compaction bands, indicating that those features have no offset or at least offset that is below the size of one of the laminae. The band density at Buckskin Gulch shows no clear relationship to these deformation-band faults, indicating that they do not control the occurrence of the compaction bands. Twenty-five (of 315) bands were shear bands, whereas 290 of 315 were compaction bands. As mentioned above, both scan lines cross approximately the same total number of bands (315 at Buckskin Gulch vs. 294 at Big Hole).

**Band Thicknesses**

The mean grain size at Buckskin Gulch in undeformed protolith measured from thin sections is 0.36 mm (0.014 in.), ranging from 0.09 to 0.6 mm (0.004 to 0.024 in.). The mean grain size at the Big Hole fault measured from thin sections is 0.17 mm (0.006 in.), ranging from 0.06 to 0.3 mm (0.002 to 0.012 in.). The band thicknesses at Buckskin Gulch show a skewed normal distribution, with a maximum at 1–2 mm (0.03–0.07 in.) or approximately 3–6 times the mean grain size. Band thicknesses at the Big Hole fault exhibit an exponential distribution with a maximum at the smallest bin size, less than 1 mm (0.03 in.) (Figure 7). Plots of band thickness versus cumulative frequency for Buckskin Gulch and the Big Hole fault differ from one another. As seen on Figure 8, the thickness distributions generally follow a power law distribution, deviating as thickness decreases. The data from Buckskin Gulch deviate from a power law at thickness less than about 1 mm (0.03 in.), whereas the data from the Big Hole fault deviate at about 0.35 mm (0.013 in.). The exponents of the thickness distributions shown on Figure 8 are significantly different for Buckskin Gulch (~1.6) and for Big Hole (~1.0). This slope is a measure of the number of thin bands relative to thick bands. For example, at Buckskin Gulch, the cumulative frequency of 1-mm (0.03-in.)-thick bands is 40 times greater than the cumulative frequency of 10-mm (0.3-in.)-thick bands, whereas that difference is only 10 times at Big Hole.

**Spatial Analysis**

Scan-line data were also used to calculate the correlation integral (e.g., Du Bernard et al., 2002; Gomez and Marrett, 2007). The correlation integral, also called the correlation sum, is determined by calculating the spacing of every band with respect to every other band in the data set and so provides a more comprehensive determination of the spatial distribution of the bands. Using a slightly modified version of Du Bernard et al. (2002), the correlation sum is given by

\[
C_r = \frac{2}{N(N-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=i+1}^{N} \Theta[r - (x_j - x_i)]
\]  

where \(C_r\) is the correlation sum at a given length scale, \(r\); \(N\) is the total number of deformation bands; \(\Theta\) is the Heaviside step function (0 for \(r \leq \text{band spacing}\), and 1 for \(r > \text{band spacing}\)); and \(x_j - x_i\) is the spacing between the centers of the \(j\)th and \(i\)th bands.

As shown on Figure 9, the exponents of the spacing distributions are very similar at both sites, 0.95 at Big Hole and 0.92 at Buckskin Gulch. Despite this similarity, significant differences in the spatial distributions between the two sites are observed as indicated by the degree of deviation from a random spacing distribution (the red line on Figure 9). Following the method of Gomez and
Marrett (2007), the observed values are normalized against expected values for a random distribution, which would have a slope of 1 (Du Bernard et al., 2002) (Figure 9). This normalization helps to highlight length scales over which the distribution most deviates from a random distribution. The presence of clusters at both locations is indicated by the normalized data, which have maximum length scale values of about 0.1 m (0.3 ft), and decay exponentially at values greater than 0.1 m (0.3 ft). The point at which these distributions reach a normalized correlation sum of 1 gives the spacing of the clusters (Gomez and Marrett, 2007). The spatial distribution at Buckskin Gulch is close to random, with weakly defined clusters with a spacing of about 2.5 m (8.2 ft). The distribution at Big Hole is much more nonrandom because most of the normalized data have a value greater than 1, with the bands occurring in fractal clusters with a spacing of about 18 m (59 ft).
Band Permeabilities

Large hand samples (from ~25 to 2000 in.$^3$ [410 to 32774 cm$^3$]) of rocks containing deformation bands were collected and wrapped in newspaper and duct tape to preserve them. These hand samples were sent to Core Lab in Houston, Texas, where multiple 1-in. (2.54-cm)-diameter plugs were collected from each sample. The plugs were drilled perpendicular to the dominant deformation-band orientation. Following drilling, the plugs were photographed and CT scanned. Visual inspection of the plugs and the CT scans were used to identify plugs that were free of coring-induced fractures and that contained well-defined band arrays. This subset of the plugs was selected for permeability measurements. Undeformed host-rock permeability was measured using a probe permeameter.

Band permeabilities were calculated using a harmonic averaging approach based on bulk air permeabilities of 2.54-cm (1-in.) plugs. Band thicknesses for the harmonic-averaging calculations were measured from high-resolution CT scans. Permeability measurements are summarized in Figure 10 and Table 3. Permeabilities of undeformed host rock are approximately 3300–7500 md (3.2 × 10$^{-12}$ to 7.4 × 10$^{-12}$ m$^2$ [34.4 × 10$^{-12}$ to 79.6 × 10$^{-12}$ ft$^2$]) at Buckskin Gulch and 660–1100 md (6.5 × 10$^{-13}$ to 1.1 × 10$^{-12}$ m$^2$ [69.9 × 10$^{-13}$ to 11.8 × 10$^{-12}$ ft$^2$]) at Big Hole. Shear band permeabilities at Buckskin Gulch range from 0.08 to 1.16 md (0.08–1.14 × 10$^{-15}$ m$^2$ [0.86–12.27 × 10$^{-15}$ ft$^2$]) with a mean permeability of 0.26 md (2.6 × 10$^{-16}$ m$^2$ [27.9 × 10$^{-16}$ ft$^2$]) or 4–5 orders of magnitude lower than undeformed host rock. A population of bed-parallel shear bands has a mean permeability of 555 md (5.5 × 10$^{-15}$ m$^2$ [59.2 × 10$^{-15}$ ft$^2$]) or 1 order of magnitude lower than undeformed host rock.

Permeability measurements of compaction bands failed because of the relatively unconsolidated nature of the samples that made collection of intact plugs for permeability measurements difficult. Shear bands at Valley of Fire, which as discussed above is an area that is similar to Buckskin Gulch, have an image-analysis-based permeability that is 3–5.5 orders of magnitude lower than undeformed host rock (Myers, 1999), comparable to the reductions measured in Buckskin Gulch samples using the combination of permeameter probe.
image-based permeability measurements capture a wide range of heterogeneities that are not otherwise captured, and that on average, the image-based results are comparable to the other results. Consequently, because the reduction in permeability of the shear bands at Valley of Fire and Buckskin Gulch is similar, we assume that the reduction in permeability of the compaction bands is similar. Thus, we infer that the permeability of the compaction bands at Buckskin Gulch is 3.3–75 md (0.3–7.4 × 10^{-14} \text{ m}^2 [3.2–79.6 × 10^{-14} \text{ ft}^2]).

Shear bands at Big Hole have a median permeability of 0.13 md (1.3 × 10^{-16} \text{ m}^2 [13.9 × 10^{-16} \text{ ft}^2]), ranging from 0.002 to 10.6 md (0.0002–1 × 10^{-14} \text{ m}^2 [0.0021–10.7 × 10^{-14} \text{ ft}^2]). Note that median and not mean permeability is reported as one sample has a permeability of 10.6 md (1.04 × 10^{-14} \text{ m}^2 [11.1 × 10^{-14} \text{ ft}^2]), whereas the other four range from 0.002 to 0.16 md (2.0 × 10^{-18} to 1.6 × 10^{-16} \text{ m}^2 [21.5 × 10^{-18} to 17.2 × 10^{-16} \text{ ft}^2]). Therefore, the shear bands at Big Hole have a permeability reduction that is 3–5 times that of undeformed host rock. The median permeability is similar to the value of 0.4 md (3.9 × 10^{-16} \text{ m}^2 [41.9 × 10^{-16} \text{ ft}^2]) with a range of 0.4–1.3 md (3.9 × 10^{-16} to 1.3 × 10^{-15} \text{ m}^2 [41.9 × 10^{-16} to 13.9 × 10^{-15} \text{ ft}^2]) reported by Shipton et al. (2002). Darker, noncataclastic bands at Big Hole have a permeability ranging from 75 to 285 md (0.7–2.8 × 10^{-13} \text{ m}^2 [7.5–30.1 × 10^{-13} \text{ ft}^2]) with an average of 164 md (1.6 × 10^{-13} \text{ m}^2 [17.2 × 10^{-13} \text{ ft}^2]).

**Band Distributions and Effective Permeability**

In general, faults and fractures display a size distribution that is similar to the band thickness distributions at Buckskin Gulch and at Big Hole (e.g., Marrett and Allmendinger, 1990, 1991). In the case of faults and fractures, the deviation at small sizes is interpreted to be the result of the undersampling of the population caused by a lack of resolution. In the case of deformation bands, this deviation is not a sampling artifact. Instead, because deformation bands cannot be infinitely thin, the lower limit on their thickness will be controlled.
by grain size and failure mechanism. Individual band thickness should decrease with decreasing grain size and increasing cataclas. The range of grain sizes from both field areas is shown on Figure 8. More of the population plots below the maximum grain-size thickness at Big Hole than at Buckskin, suggesting that cataclas is a more important factor at Big Hole than at Buckskin. This is further supported by the observation that most of the bands from Buckskin Gulch are compaction bands with little cataclas seen on photomicrographs (Mollema and Antonellini, 1996), whereas all of the bands at Big Hole are shear bands. Representative photomicrographs from the Buckskin Gulch and Big Hole locations showing shear bands, noncataclastic shear bands, and compaction bands are given in Figure 11.

The thickness distributions can be used to refine characterizations of band densities. Densities calculated from raw scan-line data do not take variations in band thickness into account, and therefore, bands with a thickness of 1 cm are given the same weight as bands with a thickness of 1 mm (0.03 in.). Because thicker bands form through the amalgamation of thinner bands (Aydin and Johnson, 1983), it is appropriate to treat thick bands as being composed of multiple thin bands when density distributions are calculated. The band-thickness distribution for Buckskin Gulch deviates from a power law at a thickness of about 1.0 mm (0.03 in.), whereas the equivalent deviation for Big Hole occurs at a value of about 0.35 mm (0.013 in.) (Figure 8). Because these deviations denote the smallest thickness for a self-similar band population, we use them to divide thicker bands into their thinner constituents. As seen on Figure 6, the maximum density for the unsplited bands at Buckskin Gulch is about 40 bands/m (~12 bands/ft) and about 24 bands/m (~7 bands/ft) at Big Hole despite the presence of several very thick bands at Big Hole (Figures 7, 8). Splitting the bands yields a maximum density of 92 1.0-mm-thick bands per meter (28 0.03-in.-thick bands per foot) for Buckskin Gulch and 228 0.35-mm-thick bands per meter (69 0.013-in.-thick bands per foot) at Big Hole. Figure 12 shows a moving average (1-m [3-ft] window calculated every 0.2 m [0.6 ft]) of band densities for split and unsplited band populations for both Buckskin Gulch and the Big Hole fault. As seen on Figure 12, the splitting process highlights trends, making them easier to interpret. The bands from Buckskin Gulch appear to occur in semiregularly spaced clusters with a spacing of about 3 m (10 ft). This value is similar to the fractal cluster spacing of 2.5 m (8.2 ft) inferred for these bands (discussed above, see also Figure 9). The splitting procedure highlights two zones of very thick bands (at 38 and 56.5 m [125 and 185.3 ft]) in the Big Hole data, which are not visible on the conventionally plotted data shown in Figure 6. As seen on Figure 12, the fault with a throw of 14 m (46 ft) is bound by an 18-m (59-ft)-wide zone of intense deformation bands. This value is similar to the fractal cluster spacing of 18 m (59 ft) inferred for this band population (Figure 9). This highlights some of the utility of performing a spatial analysis through calculation of the correlation sum/integral for scan-line data. Such an analysis provides a statistically rigorous estimate of

### Table 3. Permeabilities of Protolith and Deformation Bands from Buckskin Gulch and the Big Hole Fault

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Permeability</th>
<th>Minimum Permeability</th>
<th>Maximum Permeability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buckskin Gulch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protolith</td>
<td>5400 md (5.3 × 10⁻¹² m²)</td>
<td>3300 md (3.2 × 10⁻¹² m²)</td>
<td>7500 md (7.4 × 10⁻¹² m²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shear bands</td>
<td>0.26 md (2.6 × 10⁻¹⁶ m²)</td>
<td>0.08 md (0.08 × 10⁻¹⁵ m²)</td>
<td>1.16 md (1.14 × 10⁻¹⁵ m²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compaction bands</td>
<td>39 md (3.9 × 10⁻¹⁴ m²)</td>
<td>3.3 md (0.3 × 10⁻¹⁴ m²)</td>
<td>75 md (7.4 × 10⁻¹⁴ m²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Big Hole Fault</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protolith</td>
<td>880 md (8.8 × 10⁻¹³ m²)</td>
<td>660 md (6.5 × 10⁻¹³ m²)</td>
<td>1100 md (1.1 × 10⁻¹² m²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shear bands</td>
<td>0.13 md (1.3 × 10⁻¹⁶ m²)</td>
<td>0.002 md (0.0002 × 10⁻¹⁴ m²)</td>
<td>10.6 md (1 × 10⁻¹⁴ m²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncataclastic shear bands</td>
<td>164 md (1.6 × 10⁻¹³ m²)</td>
<td>72 md (0.7 × 10⁻¹³ m²)</td>
<td>285 md (2.8 × 10⁻¹³ m²)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
band-cluster spacing and damage-zone width and moreover provides insight into spatial characteristics that are not readily apparent on conventionally plotted graphs of band density such as those shown in Figure 6.

The deformation bands at the Big Hole fault location are related to regional stresses because they occur primarily in the damage zone of the Big Hole fault. The deformation bands at Buckskin Gulch are related to the regional stress as indicated by the following observations: (1) the shear bands at Buckskin Gulch occur in conjugate sets, with one set parallel to the fault that formed the east Kaibab monocline (Brandenburg et al., unpublished work); (2) the offsets along the shear bands are reverse, as is the regional stress state; (3) the compaction bands form normal to the greatest principal stress inferred for the monocline (Mollema and Antonellini, 1996). Possible explanations for the difference in the spatial distributions between the two sites include (1) differences in stress state, (2) differences in throw along the faults at Buckskin Gulch and Big Hole fault, and (3) difference in average band densities. The difference in throw along the faults and the difference in band densities can be discarded as possible reasons through comparison with an existing data set. Du Bernard et al. (2002) characterized the spatial distribution of deformation bands in the damage zone of normal faults in the Nubian sandstones in Egypt. The band densities from all of the locations described in that study are greater than either Buckskin Gulch and Big Hole, and as seen on Figure 13, the normalized correlation sums define a range that includes both Buckskin Gulch and Big Hole fault. This means that the more random nature of the spatial distribution at Buckskin Gulch is not due to the greater band density at that location because there are distributions from the Nubian sandstones that have a greater band density and a more highly nonrandom distribution than at Buckskin Gulch. Similarly, the greater throws along the faults at Big Hole are not likely to be responsible for the more nonrandom distribution at that location as the larger faults from the Nubian sandstones tend to have more random distributions (although this relationship is not perfect).

Figure 11. Representative photomicrographs of shear bands (A), noncataclastic shear bands (B), and compaction bands (C). Shear bands are observed at both Buckskin Gulch and the Big Hole fault, noncataclastic shear bands are observed at the Big Hole fault locality, and compaction bands are observed at the Buckskin Gulch location. Note that although all bands exhibit reduced porosity, and as shown in Table 3, reduced permeability, the degree of cataclasis is less in the noncataclastic shear band and compaction band relative to the shear band. The shear bands have the greatest reduction in permeability relative to undeformed host rock.
Effective Permeability

Constraining the thicknesses and spatial distributions of deformation bands allows effective permeability perpendicular to the bands to be calculated using harmonic averaging. Effective permeability can be calculated as

\[ K_{\text{effective}} = \frac{T_{\text{total}}}{T_{\text{band}} + T_{\text{host}}} \]  

(2)

where \( K_{\text{effective}} \) is the effective permeability, \( T_{\text{total}} \) is the total thickness (scan-line length), \( T_{\text{band}} \) is the cumulative thickness of the bands measured along the scan line, \( T_{\text{host}} \) is the cumulative thickness of undeformed host rock along the scan line, \( K_{\text{band}} \) is the band permeability, and \( K_{\text{host}} \) is the host-rock permeability. Input data for effective permeability calculations are given in Table 2. Assuming average host-rock, shear-band, and compaction-band permeabilities (Table 1), the effective permeability along the Buckskin Gulch scan line is 20 md (2.0 \( \times \) 10\(^{-14} \) m\(^2\) [21.5 \( \times \) 10\(^{-14} \) m\(^2\)]), a reduction of 2.5 orders of magnitude with respect to undeformed host rock. Within the uncertainty of the input parameters, effective permeabilities for Buckskin Gulch range from 6 to 88 md (0.6–8.7 \( \times \) 10\(^{-14} \) m\(^2\) [6.4–93.6 \( \times \) 10\(^{-14} \) ft\(^2\)]. Assuming average host-rock, shear-band, and noncatastatic-band permeabilities (Table 1), the effective permeability at Big Hole is 18 md (1.8 \( \times \) 10\(^{-14} \) m\(^2\) [19.3 \( \times \) 10\(^{-14} \) ft\(^2\)], a reduction of 1.7 orders of magnitude with respect to undeformed host rock.
magnitude with respect to undeformed host rock. The range of values for Big Hole effective permeabilities is from 0.3 to 23 md \((0.03–2.3 \times 10^{-14} \text{ m}^2 [0.32–24.7 \times 10^{-14} \text{ ft}^2])\), which is similar to the value of 30–40 md \((3.0–3.9 \times 10^{-14} \text{ m}^2 [32.2–41.9 \times 10^{-14} \text{ ft}^2])\) reported by Shipton et al. (2002).

As discussed above, the deformation-band occurrence at Big Hole occurs in conjunction with a small but seismically resolvable fault (throw up to 24 m [79 ft]). In contrast, the band occurrence at Buckskin Gulch occurs in conjunction with faults that are too small to have developed a slip surface. Assuming that deformation-band arrays evolve from isolated bands to amalgamations of bands to amalgamations of bands bounded by a throughgoing slip surface (Aydin, 1978), this means that the band array at Buckskin Gulch is less developed than the array at the Big Hole fault. Presumably if the deformation-band network at Buckskin Gulch had continued to develop, then eventually faults with throughgoing slip surfaces would have developed. This means that the reduction in effective permeability to approximately 20-md effective permeability occurred at an earlier stage of band-network evolution at Buckskin Gulch than at the Big Hole fault.

The band networks at Buckskin Gulch are up to a few tens of meters wide and up to approximately 200 m (656 ft) long. Based on mapping by Mollema (1994), they occur over an area of approximately 4 km\(^2\) (1.5 mi\(^2\)). Whether networks of this size will cause compartmentalization will be controlled by whether it is possible for flow around the networks to occur. In structurally simple reservoirs with small numbers of distantly spaced deformation-band networks, the presence of Buckskin Gulch–style deformation-band networks is not likely to cause compartmentalization because flow pathways around the networks are possible. However, even in this simple case, the band arrays may reduce the recovery from the field because fluids will not be recovered from them. Moreover, in more structurally complex reservoirs with more and more closely spaced networks, the risk of compartmentalization increases as deformation-band networks may serve to bridge the gaps between networks, thereby preventing flow around them.

**DISCUSSION**

When the data concerning the spatial distributions of the bands are coupled with the effective permeability calculations, it appears that an effective
permeability-reducing array of deformation bands was more readily developed at Buckskin Gulch than along the Big Hole fault. The primary difference between the Buckskin Gulch and Big Hole fault localities is that the structures at Buckskin Gulch formed in a reverse-faulting environment at the edge of a Laramide fold (the East Kaibab monocline), whereas the structures at the Big Hole fault formed in a normal-faulting environment at the crest of a Laramide fold (the San Rafael swell). In terms of lithology, timing of deformation, and depth of deformation, the two locations are very similar. This is an indication that it is easier to form an effective permeability-reducing array of deformation bands in a reverse-faulting environment than it is in a normal-faulting environment.

Porosity, host-rock permeability, and grain size may also contribute to differences between the two sites, and so, placing Buckskin Gulch and the Big Hole fault in the context of the Navajo Sandstone as a whole is helpful. These parameters are given above but are summarized here. The mean grain size for undeformed host rock at Buckskin Gulch is 0.36 mm (0.013 in.) ranging from 0.09 to 0.6 mm (0.004 to 0.024 in.), a porosity of 20–23%, and an average permeability of 5400 md (5.3 \times 10^{-12} \text{ m}^2 \left[ {57 \times 10^{-12} \text{ ft}^2} \right]) with a range of 3300–7500 md (3.3–7.4 \times 10^{-12} \text{ m}^2 \left[ {35.5–79.6 \times 10^{-12} \text{ ft}^2} \right]). The mean grain size for undeformed host rock at the Big Hole fault is 0.17 mm (0.006 in.) ranging from 0.06 to 0.3 mm (0.002 to 0.01 in.), a porosity of 23–24% (Shipton et al., 2002), and an average permeability of 880 md (0.9 \times 10^{-12} \text{ m}^2 \left[ {9.6 \times 10^{-12} \text{ ft}^2} \right]) with a range of 660–1100 md (0.7–1.1 \times 10^{-12} \text{ m}^2 \left[ {7.5–11.8 \times 10^{-12} \text{ ft}^2} \right]). Compiling data from Hood and Patterson (1984) in the northern San Rafael swell, the mean grain size for the Navajo is 0.15 mm (0.006 in.) with a range of 0.06 to 0.321 mm (0.002 to 0.01 in.), a mean porosity of 20% ranging from 4 to 29%, and a mean permeability of 710 md (7.0 \times 10^{-13} \text{ m}^2 \left[ {75.3 \times 10^{-13} \text{ ft}^2} \right]) with a range of 13 to 3930 md (1.3 \times 10^{-14} to 3.9 \times 10^{-12} \text{ m}^2 \left[ {13.9 \times 10^{-14} to 41.9 \times 10^{-12} \text{ ft}^2} \right]), excluding two samples (out of 20) with permeabilities of 0.02 and 0.03 md (2–3 \times 10^{-17} \text{ m}^2 \left[ {21.5–32.2 \times 10^{-17} \text{ ft}^2} \right]). From these data, it appears that although Buckskin Gulch over-
most likely due to differences in stress state at Buckskin Gulch and at Big Hole. Because shear bands at both sites exist and because the shear bands and compaction bands at Buckskin Gulch appear to be contemporaneous (Schultz, 2009) (Figure 4B), using a Mohr-Coulomb failure criterion to crudely estimate the stress state at each of those sites is appropriate because the Navajo Sandstone at both sites was experiencing shear failure. Assuming a burial depth of 2 km (1.2 mi), compatible with the depth estimates for both Buckskin Gulch and Big Hole discussed above, a mean dry density of 2.4 g/cm³, and a hydrostatic fluid pressure, the effective vertical stress ($\sigma_v$ at Big Hole and $\sigma_v$ at Buckskin Gulch) would be approximately 28 MPa (4061 psi). Assuming a Byerlee’s Law coefficient of friction of 0.6 (Byerlee, 1978), the mean and differential stresses at Buckskin Gulch would be 57 and 59 MPa (8267 and 8557 psi), and 18 and 19 MPa (2611 and 2756 psi) at Big Hole. The stress states for the two sites are summarized in Figure 14. Figure 14 shows that the range of mean stresses for Big Hole is 14–28 MPa (2030–4061 psi) as opposed to 43–85 MPa (6237–12,328 psi) at Buckskin Gulch. Because the primary difference between the two sites is the stress state, a thrust-faulting stress state applied to the same host rock appears to result in the creation of a network of deformation bands (shear and compaction bands) that has a greater reduction in effective permeability than if a normal-faulting stress state were applied to that same material. Furthermore, because compaction bands occur at Buckskin Gulch but not at Big Hole, the formation of compaction bands likely requires a thrust-faulting environment and therefore a higher mean and/or differential stress than for the formation of shear bands, which is compatible with earlier studies (Wong et al., 2004; Schultz and Siddharthan, 2005).

CONCLUSIONS

Despite general lithologic similarity, the effect of deformation-band arrays at Buckskin Gulch and at Big Hole Wash on reservoir permeability is greatly different on the reservoir scale. The average band-perpendicular effective permeability is approximately 18–20 md (1.8–2.0 × 10⁻¹⁴ m² [19.3–21.5 × 10⁻¹⁴ ft²]) at both locations, but the development of a deformation-band array capable of causing that reduction is associated with a discrete fault-damage zone at the Big Hole fault. In contrast, the deformation-band arrays at Buckskin Gulch occur over a widespread area without any discrete faults except for the deformation-band faults, which likely have displacements on the order of tens of centimeters.

Because the deformation-band arrays at Buckskin Gulch formed under a thrust-faulting environment and the band arrays at the Big Hole fault formed in the same lithology at a similar depth and time in a normal-faulting environment, reducing effective permeability on a reservoir scale in a thrust-faulting environment is easier than in a normal-faulting environment (all other parameters held
constant). This means that the risk of reservoir degradation and potentially production time-scale compartmentalization by deformation bands is higher in thrust-faulting environments.
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