

SUBSURFACE GEOMETRY AND GROWTH HISTORY OF THE WARFIELD  
STRUCTURE IN SOUTH-CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA,  
CENTRAL APPALACHIAN BASIN

THESIS

Submitted to the College of Arts and Sciences  
of  
West Virginia University  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
The Degree of Master of Science

By

DENGLIANG GAO

Morgantown

West Virginia

1994

## ABSTRACT

The subsurface geometry and growth history of the Warfield structure were studied based on seismic and well data in south-central West Virginia. Using computer software packages of the MCS (Mapping-Contouring System), the SURFACEIII (Surface Contouring System) and the DEAM (Data Editing and Management System), structure and isopach maps of the Upper Paleozoic System were completed by retrieving, editing and contouring over six thousand shallow wells from the database of the DEAM system. Seismic data were quantitatively processed and analyzed in order to provide constraints on the deeply-buried structures in the Lower Paleozoic System.

The shallow Warfield structure above the Devonian Onondaga Limestone largely consists of the Warfield anticline and the Lovely monocline: the crestal trace of the anticline is horizontal at this level with a generally northeast-trending closure and a northwest-dipping axial plane; the Lovely monocline is on the southeastern limb of the Warfield anticline forming a steeper-dipping segment of that limb. At the intermediate level between the Devonian Onondaga Limestone and the Ordovician Trenton Limestone, the closure of the anticline is lost as the fold plunges northeastward. At the deep level below the Ordovician Trenton horizon, however, the Warfield anticline no longer exists, and it is replaced by an asymmetric half-graben which is bounded by a basement fault along the eastern margin of the Rome Trough called the Trough-

Margin fault; the Trough-Margin fault is a deeply-buried basement fault with a steep dip; the Warfield fault, which is adjacent to the Trough-Margin fault and is associated with the Lovely monocline, dips steeply to the north but extends to the surface and had a small amount of post-Pennsylvanian, normal displacement.

The Warfield structure had a complex growth history and significantly influenced the sedimentation in south-central West Virginia throughout the Paleozoic. From the Early Cambrian to the Late Ordovician, the tectonic regime of the Warfield structure area was characterized by extension and differential sedimentation which were responsible for the formation of the half-graben and the deposition of the thick sequence of the Lower and Middle Cambrian System. From the Late Ordovician to the Middle Devonian, the Warfield anticline formed as a northeast-plunging fold at the intermediate level. From the Middle Devonian to the Pennsylvanian, the crustal stress caused a structural inversion and southeastward shifting in thickening trend of sediments across the horizontal Warfield anticline and the Lovely monocline at the shallow level. Finally, during the post-Pennsylvanian period, minor extension and normal dip-slip displacement occurred on pre-existing faults.

The trend of the Warfield structure changes from east-west at its southern bend, to northeast in the middle segment and north-south at its northern bend. The southern bend is linked to a east-west-trending regional fault system called

the 38th Parallel lineament and the northern bend to a north-south-trending fault system called the Burning-Mann lineament, whereas the middle segment is parallel to a northeast-trending magnetic gradient called the New York-Alabama lineament. The geometry and growth history of the Warfield structure is speculated to be influenced by the 38th Parallel and the Burning-Mann lineaments, which define a Wedge-shaped Fault System in the west-central Appalachian basin.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
LIST OF FIGURES.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	xvii
ABSTRACT.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	4
CHAPTER 1 TECTONIC SETTING AND SIGNIFICANCE.....	11
CHAPTER 2 PREVIOUS WORK REVIEW.....	17
2.1 The Warfield anticline and related regional lineaments.....	17
2.2 The Lovely monocline.....	19
2.3 The Warfield fault.....	20
2.4 The Trough-Margin fault zone.....	21
CHAPTER 3 DATABASE AND DATA-PROCESSING TECHNIQUES.....	23
3.1 Database description.....	23
3.1.1 The DEAM (Data Editing and Management) database system.....	23
3.1.2 Intermediate-deep structure data.....	30
3.1.3 Synthetic seismic data.....	32
3.1.4 Digitized seismic time-sections.....	32
3.2 Data-processing techniques.....	32
3.2.1 Mapping with the SURFACEIII contouring software package.....	32
3.2.2 Projection using the MCS (Mapping Contouring System) software package.....	33
3.2.3 Synthetic seismograms.....	35
3.2.4 Quantitative seismic analysis.....	42
(1) Two-way arrival time--t.....	42
(2) First degree time difference--dt.....	42
(3) Second degree time difference--d(dt).....	44
(4) Time difference gradient--grad(dt).....	46
(5) Apparent differential-subsidence curve.....	46
(6) Shifting operation.....	47
CHAPTER 4 SHALLOW STRUCTURES AND SYNTECTONIC SEDIMENTATION.....	51
CHAPTER 5 INTERMEDIATE STRUCTURES AND SYNTECTONIC SEDIMENTATION.....	78
CHAPTER 6 DEEP STRUCTURES AND SYNTECTONIC SEDIMENTATION.....	90
CHAPTER 7 QUANTITATIVE SEISMIC ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION.....	103

7.1 Middle segment of the Warfield structure.....	105
7.2 Southern bend of the Warfield structure.....	110
7.3 Northern bend of the Warfield structure.....	122
7.4 Western flank of the Warfield structure.....	135
7.5 Within the Rome Trough.....	145
7.6 East of the Warfield structure.....	153
CHAPTER 8 GROWTH HISTORY OF THE WARFIELD STRUCTURE.....	161
8.1 Precambrian.....	161
8.2 Early Cambrian-Late Ordovician.....	162
8.2.1 Pre-Conasauga (Early Cambrian) rifting.....	162
8.2.2 Conasauga-Trenton slow subsidence.....	162
8.3 Late Ordovician-Middle Devonian.....	162
8.4 Middle Devonian-Pennsylvanian.....	163
8.5 Post-Pennsylvanian (Alleghanian).....	163
CHAPTER 9 DISCUSSION — THE WARFIELD STRUCTURE AND A WEDGE-SHAPED FAULT SYSTEM.....	172
CONCLUSIONS.....	185
REFERENCES CITED.....	190
APPENDIX I The Warfield structure and isopach maps (contour line) at the shallow, intermediate and deep levels superimposed with basement faults in Mingo, Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties, south-central West Virginia.....	197
APPENDIX II Tests for the MCS (Mapping Contouring System) Multi-Surface Stack procedure.....	234
APPENDIX III Correlations between the synthetic seismograms and their adjacent seismic sections.....	239
APPROVAL OF EXAMINING COMMITTEE.....	243

## LIST OF FIGURES

## INTRODUCTION

- Fig.1A Location map showing the study area of the Warfield structure in south-central West Virginia.....5
- Fig.1B Tectonic map showing the Warfield structure at the intersection of the 38th Parallel, the Burning-Mann and the New York-Alabama Lineaments in the west-central Appalachian foreland basin (after Shumaker, 1978).....6
- Fig.2A Coal form-line structure map in south-central West Virginia (from Shumaker, 1974, Shumaker and Werner, 1987).....7
- Fig.2B Detailed structure at the southern end of the Warfield anticline (from Shumaker, 1993).....8

## CHAPTER 1

- Fig.1.1 Magnetic intensity map showing the 38th Parallel, the Burning-Mann and the New York-Alabama lineaments and the Warfield structure (after King and Zietz, 1978)... ..12
- Fig.1.2 Stratigraphic column in southwestern West Virginia (from Schwietering and Roberts, 1988).....15

## CHAPTER 3

- Fig.3.1 Index map showing the location of wells and/or cross sections at the horizon of the Little Lime (A), the Pencil Cave (B), the Greenbrier Limestone (C), the Coffee Shale (D), the Berea Sandstone (E) and the Onondaga Limestone (F) and Multi-Surface projection control points (G) for structures at the deep horizons below the Trenton Limestone.....24
- Fig.3.2 Digitized sonic and density logs for deep well K3462 in Kanawha County (A), basement wells M805 in Mingo County (B) and L1469 in Lincoln County (C).....36
- Fig.3.3 Synthetic seismograms for deep well K3462 in Kanawha County (A), basement wells M805 in Mingo County (B) and L1469 in Lincoln County (C).....39
- Fig.3.4 Comparison between the original time section (A) and the resampled section (B).....43
- Fig.3.5 Quantitative seismic analysis flow-chart.....45

Fig.3.6 Apparent differential subsidence (A) and differential-  
subsidence history(B).....48

Fig.3.7 Comparison between Unshifted (A,C) and shifted (B,D)  
arrival time and time difference.....50

#### CHAPTER 4

Fig.4.1 Structure map at the top of the Little Lime in Mingo,  
Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties, south-  
central West Virginia (A: contour map; B: 3-D  
perspective).....52

Fig.4.2 Structure map at the top of the Pencil Cave in Mingo,  
Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties, south-  
central West Virginia.....54

Fig.4.3A Structure map at the top of the Greenbrier Limestone  
in Mingo, Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties,  
south-central West Virginia.....55

Fig.4.3B Detailed structure at the base of the Big Lime in the  
southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....56

Fig.4.4 Structure map at the top of the Big Injun (Indian)  
Sand in Mingo, Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln  
Counties, south-central West Virginia.....57

Fig.4.5 Structure map at the top of the Coffee Shale in Mingo,  
Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties, south-  
central West Virginia.....58

Fig.4.6A Structure map at the top of the Berea Sandstone in  
Mingo, Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties,  
south-central West Virginia.....59

Fig.4.6B Detailed structure at the top of the Berea Sandstone  
in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure  
.....60

Fig.4.7 Cross section showing structure and thickness  
variations for the Little Lime and the Big Lime along  
line A-A' across the southern bend area of the  
Warfield structure .....63

Fig.4.8 Cross section showing structure and thickness  
variations for the Big Lime and the Berea Sandstone  
along line A-A' across the southern bend area of the  
Warfield structure.....63

Fig.4.9 Cross section showing structure and thickness  
variations for the Berea Sandstone and the Onondaga



Limestone along line A-A' across the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....	63
Fig.4.10 Cross section showing structure and thickness variations for the Little Lime and the Big Lime along line B-B' across the middle segment of the Warfield structure.....	64
Fig.4.11 Cross section showing structure and thickness variations for the Big Lime and the Berea Sandstone along line B-B' across the middle segment of the Warfield structure.....	64
Fig.4.12 Cross section showing structure and thickness variations for the Berea Sandstone and the Onondaga Limestone along line B-B' across the middle segment of the Warfield structure.....	64
Fig.4.13 Cross section showing structure and thickness variations for the Little Lime and the Big Lime along line C-C' across the northern bend area of the Warfield structure.....	65
Fig.4.14 Cross section showing structure and thickness variations for the Big Lime and the Berea Sandstone along line C-C' across the northern bend area of the Warfield structure.....	65
Fig.4.15 Cross section showing structure and thickness variations for the Berea Sandstone and the Onondaga Limestone along line C-C' across the northern bend area of the Warfield structure.....	65
Fig.4.16 Cross section showing structure and thickness variations for the Little Lime and the Big Lime along line D-D' at the northern end of the Warfield structure.....	66
Fig.4.17 Cross section showing structure and thickness variations for the Big Lime and the Berea Sandstone along line D-D' at the northern end of the Warfield structure.....	66
Fig.4.18 Cross section showing structure and thickness variations for the Berea Sandstone and the Onondaga Limestone along line D-D' at the northern end of the Warfield structure.....	66
Fig.4.19 Isopach map for the interval between top of the Little Lime and top of the Onondaga Limestone in Mingo, Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties, south-central West Virginia.....	68

- Fig.5.4 Structure map at the top of the Tuscarora Sandstone in Mingo, Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties, south-central West Virginia.....83
- Fig.5.5 Isopach map for the interval between top of the Onondaga Limestone and top of the Tuscarora Sandstone in Mingo, Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties, south-central West Virginia.....86
- Fig.5.6 Isopach map for the Onondaga Limestone in Mingo, Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties, south-central West Virginia.....88
- Fig.5.7 Isopach map for the interval between top of the Onondaga Limestone and base of the Oriskany Sandstone in Mingo, Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties, south-central West Virginia.....89

#### CHAPTER 6

- Fig.6.1 Structure map of the Trenton Limestone in Mingo, Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties, south-central West Virginia.....93
- Fig.6.2 Structure map of the Conasauga Formation in Mingo, Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties, south-central West Virginia.....94
- Fig.6.3 Structure map of the Rome (?) Formation in Mingo, Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties, south-central West Virginia.....95
- Fig.6.4 Structure map of the Tomstown (?) Dolomite in Mingo, Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties, south-central West Virginia.....96
- Fig.6.5 Structure map of the basement in Mingo, Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties, south-central West Virginia.....97
- Fig.6.6 Isopach map for the interval between the Onondaga Limestone and the Trenton Limestone in Mingo, Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties, south-central West Virginia.....98
- Fig.6.7 Isopach map for the interval between the Trenton Limestone and the Conasauga Formation in Mingo, Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties, south-central West Virginia.....99
- Fig.6.8 Isopach map for the interval between the Conasauga Formation and the Rome (?) Formation in Mingo, Logan,

Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties, south-central West Virginia.....	100
Fig.6.9 Isopach map for the interval between the Rome(?) Formation and the Tomstown (?) Dolomite in Mingo, Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties, south-central West Virginia.....	101
Fig.6.10 Isopach map for the interval between the Tomstown (?) Dolomite and the basement in Mingo, Logan, Boone, Kanawha and Lincoln Counties, south-central West Virginia.....	102
<b>CHAPTER 7</b>	
Fig.7.1 Index map showing the location of the seismic lines in the study area.....	104
Fig.7.2 Seismic line No.1 across the Trough-Margin fault in the middle segment of the Warfield structure.....	106
Fig.7.3 Shifted arrival time for seismic line No.1 across the Trough-Margin fault in the middle segment of the Warfield structure.....	108
Fig.7.4 Shifted time difference for seismic line No.1 across the Trough-Margin fault in the middle segment of the Warfield structure.....	108
Fig.7.5 Second degree time difference for seismic line No.1 across the Trough-Margin fault in the middle segment of the Warfield structure.....	109
Fig.7.6 Time difference gradient for seismic line No.1 across the Trough-Margin fault in the middle segment of the Warfield structure.....	109
Fig.7.7 Seismic line No.2 across the Trough-Margin fault in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure....	113
Fig.7.8 Shifted arrival time for seismic line No.2 across the Trough-Margin fault in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....	114
Fig.7.9 Shifted time difference for seismic line No.2 across the Trough-Margin fault in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....	114
Fig.7.10 Second degree time difference for seismic line No.2 across the Trough-Margin fault in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....	115

- Fig.7.11 Time difference gradient for seismic line No.2 across the Trough-Margin fault in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....115
- Fig.7.12 Seismic line No.3 across the Trough-Margin fault in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....116
- Fig.7.13 Shifted arrival time for seismic line No.3 across the Trough-Margin fault in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....117
- Fig.7.14 Shifted time difference for seismic line No.3 across the Trough-Margin fault in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....117
- Fig.7.15 Second degree time difference for seismic line No.3 across the Trough-Margin fault in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....118
- Fig.7.16 Time difference gradient for seismic line No.3 across the Trough-Margin fault in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....118
- Fig.7.17 Seismic line No.4 across the Trough-Margin fault in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....119
- Fig.7.18 Shifted arrival time for seismic line No.4 across the Trough-Margin fault in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....120
- Fig.7.19 Shifted time difference for seismic line No.4 across the Trough-Margin fault in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....120
- Fig.7.20 Second degree time difference for seismic line No.4 across the Trough-Margin fault in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....121
- Fig.7.21 Time difference gradient for seismic line No.4 across the Trough-Margin fault in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....121
- Fig.7.22 Seismic line No.5 in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....123
- Fig.7.23 Shifted arrival time for seismic line No.5 in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....124
- Fig.7.24 Shifted time difference for seismic line No.5 in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....124

- Fig.7.25 Second degree time difference for seismic line No.5 in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure .....125
- Fig.7.26 Time difference gradient for seismic line No.5 in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....125
- Fig.7.27 Seismic line No.6 across the Trough-Margin fault in the northern bend area of the Warfield structure....  
.....126
- Fig.7.28 Shifted arrival time for seismic line No.6 across the Trough-Margin fault in the northern bend area of the Warfield structure.....128
- Fig.7.29 Shifted time difference for seismic line No.6 across the Trough-Margin fault in the northern bend area of the Warfield structure.....128
- Fig.7.30 Second degree time difference for seismic line No.6 across the Trough-Margin fault in the northern bend area of the Warfield structure.....130
- Fig.7.31 Time difference gradient for seismic line No.6 across the Trough-Margin fault in the northern bend area of the Warfield structure.....130
- Fig.7.32 Seismic line No.7 across the Trough-Margin fault in the northern bend area of the Warfield structure....  
.....131
- Fig.7.33 Shifted arrival time for seismic line No.7 across the Trough-Margin fault in the northern bend area of the Warfield structure.....133
- Fig.7.34 Shifted time difference for seismic line No.7 across the Trough-Margin fault in the northern bend area of the Warfield structure.....133
- Fig.7.35 Second degree time difference for seismic line No.7 across the Trough-Margin fault in the northern bend area of the Warfield structure.....134
- Fig.7.36 Time difference gradient for seismic line No.7 across the Trough-Margin fault in the northern bend area of the Warfield structure.....134
- Fig.7.37 Seismic line No.8 across the western flank of the Rome Trough.....136
- Fig.7.38 Shifted arrival time for seismic line No.8 across the western flank of the Rome Trough.....137

- Fig.7.39 Shifted time difference for seismic line No.8 across the western flank of the Rome Trough.....137
- Fig.7.40 Second degree time difference for seismic line No.8 across the western flank of the Rome Trough.....139
- Fig.7.41 Time difference gradient for seismic line No.8 across the western flank of the Rome Trough.....139
- Fig.7.42 Seismic line No.9 across the western flank of the Rome Trough.....140
- Fig.7.43 Shifted arrival time for seismic line No.9 across the western flank of the Rome Trough.....141
- Fig.7.44 Shifted time difference for seismic line No.9 across the western flank of the Rome Trough.....141
- Fig.7.45 Second degree time difference for seismic line No.9 across the western flank of the Rome Trough.....142
- Fig.7.46 Time difference gradient for seismic line No.9 across the western flank of the Rome Trough.....142
- Fig.7.47 Seismic line No.10 across the western flank of the Rome Trough.....143
- Fig.7.48 Shifted arrival time for seismic line No.10 across the western flank of the Rome Trough.....144
- Fig.7.49 Shifted time difference for seismic line No.10 across the western flank of the Rome Trough.....144
- Fig.7.50 Second degree time difference for seismic line No.10 across the western flank of the Rome Trough.....146
- Fig.7.51 Time difference gradient for seismic line No.10 across the western flank of the Rome Trough.....146
- Fig.7.52 Seismic line No.11 in the Rome Trough.....147
- Fig.7.53 Shifted arrival time for seismic line No.11 in the Rome Trough.....148
- Fig.7.54 Shifted time difference for seismic line No.11 in the Rome Trough.....148
- Fig.7.55 Second degree time difference for seismic line No.11 in the Rome Trough.....150
- Fig.7.56 Time difference gradient for seismic line No.11 in the Rome Trough.....150

Fig.7.57 Seismic line No.12 in the Rome Trough.....	151
Fig.7.58 Shifted arrival time for seismic line No.12 in the Rome Trough.....	152
Fig.7.59 Shifted time difference for seismic line No.12 in the Rome Trough.....	152
Fig.7.60 Second degree time difference for seismic line No.12 in the Rome Trough.....	154
Fig.7.61 Time difference gradient for seismic line No.12 in the Rome Trough.....	154
Fig.7.62 Seismic line No.13 on the basement high to the south of the Trough-Margin fault.....	155
Fig.7.63 Shifted arrival time for seismic line No.13 on the basement high to the south of the Trough-Margin fault .....	156
Fig.7.64 Shifted time difference for seismic line No.13 on the basement high to the south of the Trough-Margin fault .....	156
Fig.7.65 Second degree time difference for seismic line No.13 on the basement high to the south of the Trough-Margin fault.....	157
Fig.7.66 Time difference gradient for seismic line No.13 on the basement high to the south of the Trough-Margin fault.....	157
Fig.7.67 Seismic line No.14 on the basement high to the southeast of the Trough-Margin fault.....	158
Fig.7.68 Shifted arrival time for seismic line No.14 on the basement high to the southeast of the Trough-Margin fault.....	159
Fig.7.69 Shifted time difference for seismic line No.14 on the basement high to the southeast of the Trough-Margin fault.....	159
Fig.7.70 Second degree time difference for seismic line No.14 on the basement high to the southeast of the Trough-Margin fault.....	160
Fig.7.71 Time difference gradient for seismic line No.14 on the basement high to the southeast of the Trough-Margin fault.....	160

**CHAPTER 8**

- Fig.8.1 Apparent differential-subsidence of contiguous intervals (A) and differential-subsidence history (B) for seismic line No.1 across the Trough-Margin fault in the middle segment of the Warfield structure.....164
- Fig.8.2 Apparent differential-subsidence of contiguous intervals (A) and differential-subsidence history (B) for seismic line No.2 across the Trough-Margin fault in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....165
- Fig.8.3 Apparent differential-subsidence of contiguous intervals (A) and differential-subsidence history (B) for seismic line No.3 across the Trough-Margin fault in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....166
- Fig.8.4 Apparent differential-subsidence of contiguous intervals (A) and differential-subsidence history (B) for seismic line No.4 across the Trough-Margin fault in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....167
- Fig.8.5 Apparent differential-subsidence of contiguous intervals (A) and differential-subsidence history (B) for seismic line No.6 across the Trough-Margin fault in the northern bend area of the Warfield structure.....168
- Fig.8.6 Apparent differential-subsidence of contiguous intervals (A) and differential-subsidence history (B) for seismic line No.7 across the Trough-Margin fault in the northern bend area of the Warfield structure.....169
- Fig.8.7 Apparent differential-subsidence of contiguous intervals (A) and differential-subsidence history (B) for seismic line No.12 in the Rome Trough.....170

**CHAPTER 9**

- Fig.9.1 Terminology and geometric classification of the Wedge-shaped Fault System.....173
- Fig.9.2 The Wedge-shaped Fault System and the Warfield structure — Kinematics and dynamics.....176
- Fig.9.3 Structure map at the top of the Berea Sandstone (A) and the top of the Onondaga Limestone (B) superimposed



with underlying basement faults in the "FRONT" of the Wedge-shaped Fault System.....177

Fig.9.4 Detailed structure map at the base of the Big Lime (A) and the top of the Berea Sandstone (B) superimposed with underlying basement faults in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure, and isopach map (C) for the interval between base of the Big Lime and top of the Berea Sandstone superimposed with underlying basement faults in the southern bend area of the Warfield structure.....180

#### LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 Major horizons to be mapped.....	23
Table 3.2 Deep wells for synthetic seismograms.....	32
Table 4.1 Elevation, closure and limb-angle of the Warfield anticline at various shallow horizons.....	51
Table 5.1 Elevation, plunging-angle and limb-angle of the Warfield anticline at various intermediate horizons .....	78
Table 6.1 Depths, arrival times and average velocities to the major deep reflectors in the study area (after Zheng, 1990).....	90
Table 7.1 Index of the seismic lines available in the Warfield structure area.....	105
Table 9.1 2-D geometric classification of a Wedge-shaped Fault System based on the convergence angle between the two FLANKS.....	174
Table 9.2 Kinematics (displacement field) of a Wedge-shaped Fault System based on the movement direction of the WEDGE-BLOCK.....	174
Table 9.3 Dynamics (stress field) of a Wedge-shaped Fault System based on the movement direction of the WEDGE-BLOCK.....	175

## CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions are drawn from subsurface studies of the Warfield structure:

1. The Warfield structure consists of several genetically related structural elements including the Warfield anticline, the Lovely monocline, the Warfield fault, the Trough-Margin fault and several other folds, monoclines and faults at the eastern margin of the Rome Trough. The Trough-Margin fault is a deeply-buried basement structure with a high-angle dip toward the northwest under the southeastern limb of the Warfield anticline (Figs 7.3, 7.28 and 7.33). It formed and was most active during the Early and Middle Cambrian. The Warfield anticline, which is situated on the down-thrown side of the Trough-Margin fault, is a basement-controlled shallow structure above the Ordovician Trenton Limestone (APPENDIX I-1 through APPENDIX I-10). There developed several smaller anticlines over the basement horst blocks at the southern and northern ends of the Warfield anticline (Figs 7.8, 7.33, and 7.58). The configuration of the Warfield anticline changes with depth (compare Figs 4.1 through 4.6 with Figs 5.1 through 5.4): the northeast-trending crestal trace of the fold is horizontal at the Mississippian horizons (the Mississippian Little Lime, Pencil Cave, Greenbrier Limestone, Big Injun Sand, Coffee Shale and Berea Sandstone, etc.) with a northeast-trending closure of about 300 feet and a northwest-dipping axial plane; at the intermediate horizons (the Devonian Onondaga Limestone and Oriskany Sandstone, the

Silurian Newburg Sandstone and Tuscarora Sandstone), the closure is lost as the fold plunges toward the northeast. The Warfield fault is a steep north-dipping dip-slip fault adjacent to the Trough-Margin fault, which shows the post-Pennsylvanian normal displacement (Shumaker and Coolen, 1993). The Lovely monocline, a shallow structure on the southeastern limb of the Warfield anticline that is close and sub-parallel to the Warfield fault and the Trough-Margin fault, is related to the post-Onondaga reactivation of the Trough-Margin fault with a small amount of reverse movement (Shumaker and Coolen, 1993), and part of the movement is post-Pennsylvanian as the monocline is also mapped on the surface coals (Shumaker, personal communication).

2. The trend of the Warfield structure changes from east-west in the southern bend area to northeast in the middle segment and north-south in the northern bend area. The southern and northern bends are linked to the 38th Parallel and the Burning-Mann lineaments, respectively, and the middle segment is parallel to the New York-Alabama lineament. The geometry and growth history of the Warfield structure during the Paleozoic were influenced by these three lineaments to define a wedge-shaped structure in the central part of the Appalachian basin.

3. On the basis of subsurface mapping and seismic analysis, the Warfield structure is divided vertically into the shallow, intermediate and deep structural levels according to their changes in geometry and structural style. The shallow

Warfield structure largely consists of the horizontal Warfield anticline and the Lovely monocline above the Devonian Onondaga Limestone (Figs 4.1 through 4.6). The intermediate Warfield structure is characterized by a gently northeast-plunging Warfield anticline between the Devonian Onondaga Limestone and the Ordovician Trenton Limestone (Figs 5.1 through 5.4). The deep Warfield structure, below the Trenton Limestone, is an asymmetric half-graben bounded by the Trough-Margin fault (Figs 6.1 through 6.5).

4. The growth history of the Warfield structure can be generalized in terms of 5 tectonic regimes: the Precambrian regime was probably responsible for the formation of the 38th Parallel, the Burning-Mann and the New York-Alabama lineaments related to the Grenville orogeny; the Early Cambrian-Late Ordovician regime, which was characterized by a regional extension and differential subsidence probably in association with the Iapetus rifting, was responsible for the formation of the Warfield structure at the deep level; the Late Ordovician-Middle Devonian regime, which might have resulted from the Taconic orogeny, was responsible for the formation of the northeast-plunging Warfield anticline at the intermediate level; the Middle Devonian Onondaga-Pennsylvanian regime, which might have been initiated by the Acadian orogeny and probably terminated by the Alleghanian orogeny, was responsible for the structural inversion and southeastward shifting in the trend of increased rock thickness; finally, the post-Pennsylvanian regime was characterized by extension

and normal dip-slip displacement along preexisting faults (for example the Warfield fault). The complex history and changes in stress regime of the Warfield structure might be related to alternating FORWARD and BACKWARD movement of a basement WEDGE-BLOCK bounded by the 38th Parallel, the Burning-Mann and the New York-Alabama lineaments in response to regional changes in stress regime within the North America Plate.

5. The Warfield structure influenced the sedimentation in south-central West Virginia throughout the Paleozoic. The large offset of basement along the Trough-Margin fault during the Cambrian was responsible for the deposition of a thick sequence of rift sediments that abruptly changes thickness across the Trough-Margin fault (Figs 6.7 through 6.10, Figs 7.4, 7.29 and 7.34). This study also found a shift in the trend of rock thickness from northwest to southeast after deposition of the Onondaga Limestone (Figs 4.7 through 4.18, Figs 4.25 through 4.27, Figs 7.4, 7.29 and 7.34) which is attributable to the structural inversion and reactivation of the Wedge-shaped Fault System.

6. The vertical change in structural style of the Warfield structure should affect the entrapment of hydrocarbons in south-central West Virginia. Shallow structure, from the surface to the Onondaga Limestone, is a horizontal anticline with a closure of 300 feet and several monoclines, and hydrocarbons are presently being produced from both structural and stratigraphic traps; the northeast-plunging Warfield anticline at the intermediate level might be

favorable for the up-dip migration and entrapment of hydrocarbons toward the southwest in reservoirs of the Devonian and Silurian Systems; the small drape anticlines developed over the uplifted basement blocks southeast of the Trough-Margin fault and in the southern and northern bend areas could trap hydrocarbons either at shallow or at deep levels given suitable reservoirs. Generally, the deep structures beneath the Warfield anticline northwest of the Trough-Margin fault lack the closure traps, but fault traps and sedimentary traps such as the pinch-out and unconformities might exist according to the abrupt thickness changes across the Trough-Margin fault. More detailed seismic data and an analysis of deeply-buried reservoir potential including thermal maturation studies are required to further assess the deep potential of the Warfield structure.