

Performance Assessment of CO₂-Enhanced Oil Recovery and Storage in the Morrow reservoir

William Ampomah, PhD
(Petroleum Recovery Research Center- New Mexico Tech)


Outline of Presentation

- Introduction
- FWU Reservoir History
- Reservoir Fluid Analysis
- Reservoir Simulation & History Matching
- Prediction Models
- Optimization Process
- Conclusions

FWU's Large-scale EOR- Carbon Capture, Utilization and Storage (CCUS)

As of August 2017;

- 1,170,508 metric tonnes of CO₂ purchased
- 1,087,533 of purchased CO₂ stored within Morrow B sand
- ~ 93% of purchased CO₂ stored




FWU Reservoir History


- First discovery well drilled by Unocal in October 1955
- Initial reservoir pressure at datum of 4900 ft was 2203 psig
- Original bubble point pressure was 2059 psig
- OOIP ~120 MMSTB
- Secondary recovery started 1964
- Tertiary recovery started 2010

Model Horizons


System	Series	Group	Informal Names	Wireline Log Characteristics		Lithology	
				Farnsworth Unit			
				Gamma	Resistivity		
Pennsylvanian		Atokan	Atoka	Thirteen Finger Limestone			
Morrowan	Upper		Morrow Shale				
			Morrow B Sandstone				
			Morrow Shale				
			Morrow B_1				
			Morrow Shale				



Model Details





Porosity Distribution (Morrow Sand)



Model Details

Permeability Distribution (Morrow Sand)




Fault Modeling

- Model : *Sperrivick* Model
- Use Vsh, NGR, Permeability to compute SGR
- High SGR means completely seal fault
- Maximum burial depth: ~3300m
- Maximum depth at time of deformation: 1300m
- Minimum depth at time of deformation: 300m



Fluid Analysis- Regression Summary


Properties	Units	% Error
Saturation Pressure	psia	2.84
Oil Density	g/cc	1.3
Vapor Z-factor		0.22
GOR	Mscf/stb	1.58
Gas Gravity		2.39
Liquid Viscosity	cp	9.7



Properties	Units	Observed	Before Regression	After Regression	%Error
MMP	psia	4200	3038.4	4008.8	4.5

Reservoir Simulation Base Model


P_{init} , psig @ Datum Depth	2203
P_{bubble} , psig @ Datum Depth	2059
OOIP, MMStb	71
Temperature, °F	168
Initial Water saturation	0.31



History Matching (HM) Process

Objectives


- *To match*
 - Field average reservoir pressure
 - Field ratios
 - Field production rates
 - Well production rates



HM Process


$$RMS = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_1^N (Simulated - Observed)^2}{N}}$$

Vector	RMS
Field Oil Production	0.025
Field Water cut	0.03
Field Gas-Oil ratio	0.22




Production History


- *Primary (1956 – 1964)*
- *Secondary (1964 – 2010)*



Assuming No flow across faults







HM Process- Primary & Secondary Recovery



History Match- CO₂-WAG

- Initial simulations showed a good match until CO₂ breakthrough
- This was attributed to potential changes in wettability and interfacial tension
- There is a possibility of the Morrow B transitioning into a mixed-wet wettability system
- Corey parameters were adjusted to capture these potential changes to match tertiary recovery process

History Match- CO₂-WAG



Prediction Models

Prediction cases (Aug. 2016 – Jan 2036)

- **Case 1:** Current WAG patterns (12 wells) and adjacent water injectors (7 wells) with constant 10,000 Mscf/d CO₂ purchase in addition to recycle.
- **Case 2:** Convert all injectors to WAG wells (25 wells) with CO₂ purchase and recycle;
 - A. With constant CO₂ purchase (10,000 Mscf/d).
 - B. With decreasing CO₂ purchase from 2022 to 2030 and inject only recycled gas after 2030


Prediction Models- Additional Conditions

- Compressor capacity ~ 20,000 Mscf/d
- Initial WAG cycle = 3:1
- Production target = 3500 stb/d
- Injection target = CO₂ purchase + Produced (recycled)

Prediction Models- Summary

Results	Units	Case 1	Case 2A	Case 2B
CO ₂ Purchased	Bscf	90	90	61
Cumulative CO ₂ injected	Bscf	112	123	118
Gross CO ₂ Utilization	Bscf/MMStb	8	8	8
Cumulative CO ₂ Produced	Bscf	72	73	73
CO ₂ Recycle	Bscf	22	33	56
Cumulative volume CO ₂ stored	Bscf	40	50	45
% Storage	%	45	56	74
Net CO ₂ Utilization	Bscf/MMStb	3.0	3.0	3.0
Oil Incremental Recovery	MMStb	14	15	15
% Oil Incremental Recovery	%	19	21	21
Water Injection volume	MMStb	21	14	16

Can the best case be improved?



A possible
answer is

OPTIMIZATION

?

Optimization with proxy

- To evaluate the objective function with respect to a set of control parameters, a full simulation must be run. Therefore, the optimization can be a computationally intensive procedure.
- As a simplification, a proxy model can be used to replace the simulations in the optimization process.
- Unless the proxy model is properly validated, the optimization does not have any value.

Objective Function

- To co-optimize CO₂ storage and the oil recovery
- Multi-objective function

$$w_1 \times \text{FOPT} + w_2 \times \text{CO}_2 \text{ storage}$$

where

w = weight assigned to vector

FOPT = Cumulative oil production

CO₂ storage = CO₂ purchased – CO₂ produced + CO₂ recycle

Selected Control Variables

Control Variables	Units	Minimum	Maximum
Gas cycle Well Group 1(GD1) (2020-2036)	months	2	10
Gas cycle Well Group 2 (GD2) (2020-2036)	months	2	10
Gas cycle Well Group 3 (GD3) (2020-2036)	months	2	10
Gas cycle Well Group 4 (GD4) (2020-2036)	months	2	10
Water Cycle Well Group 1 (WD1) (2020-2036)	months	0	3
Water Cycle Well Group 2 (WD2) (2020-2036)	months	0	3
Water Cycle Well Group 3 (WD3) (2020-2036)	months	0	3
Water Cycle Well Group 4 (WD4) (2020-2036)	months	0	3
Production Group Rate Target (PROD_30)(2020-2036)	stb	500	3500
Well Bottomhole Injection Pressure (BHP_I)	psia	4700	5000
Well Bottomhole Production Pressure (BHP_P2) (2020-2036)	psia	1500	2500

Proxy Modeling

- Polynomial Response surface method


$$y(x) = \beta_0 + \sum_i \beta_i X_i + \sum_i \sum_j \beta_{ij} X_i X_j + \sum_i \beta_{ii} X_i^2$$

- The quadratic model requires a minimum of $(N+1)(N+2)/2$
- 100 full simulations for training
- 10 validation simulations
- Using Latin hypercube sampling (DoE) algorithm

Proxy Validation


Multi-Objective function

Oil Production



Symbol legend

● Validation data × Training data



Symbol legend


● Validation data × Training data

Genetic Algorithm

- Stronger global search capabilities than the Evolution strategy
- Mixed-integer capabilities
- Roulette Wheel used as fitness selection operator
- ***Optimum solution realized at iteration # 1051***

Parameters used in the optimization process

Population	100
Maximum generations	20
Mutation probability	5%
Minimum Iterations	1101



Flowchart of a genetic algorithm

Optimum Surrogate Case Validation

Response Surface Equation Export For Multi-Objective Function 2036-01-01 00:00:00.000

Proxy Name : Response surface proxy

Variables	Min	Max
\$BHP_INJ1	4602	4997.24
\$BHP_PROD2	1008	2485.62
\$GCB1	2.074	9.92
\$GCB2	2.02	9.96
\$GCB3	2.076	9.95
\$GCB4	2.076	9.99
\$PROD1	1801	2989.83
\$PROD2	1506	2493.69
\$WCB1	0.016	2.98
\$WCB2	0.028	2.99
\$WCB3	0.026	3.00
\$WCB4	0.009	2.99

Variables	Input Value
\$BHP_INJ1	4585.0
\$BHP_PROD2	1735.0
\$GCB1	9.5
\$GCB2	7.0
\$GCB3	9.0
\$GCB4	5.8
\$PROD1	2318.2
\$PROD2	2417.7
\$WCB1	0.9
\$WCB2	0.4
\$WCB3	0.3
\$WCB4	0.2

Response 76621657

Simulated 77811411



% Error 1.53

Coefficient Type **Coefficient Value** NOTE: Coefficients are related to the equation in terms of shifted variables. Example: $F(X) = F[(X1-X1min),(X2-X2min),...]$



Prediction Models- Summary

Results	Units	Case 2B	Optimized
CO ₂ Purchased	Bscf	61	61
Cumulative CO ₂ injected	Bscf	118	158
Gross CO ₂ Utilization	Bscf/MMStb	8	7
Cumulative CO ₂ Produced	Bscf	73	100
CO ₂ Recycle	Bscf	56	97
Cumulative volume CO ₂ stored	Bscf	45	58
% Storage	%	74	94
Net CO ₂ Utilization	Bscf/MMStb	3.0	3.2
Oil Incremental Recovery	MMStb	15	18
% Oil Incremental Recovery	%	21	25
Water Injection volume	MMStb	16	13

Prediction Models- CO₂ Volume Profile



3D Total Mole fraction of CO₂ distribution



Prediction Models- Simple Economic Model

Assumptions

- Oil price ~ \$45/bbl
- Royalty ~ 10%
- Water injection cost ~ \$1/bbl
- Recycle CO₂ credit ~ \$0.01/ton
- Produced CO₂ charge ~ \$0.01/ton
- Taxes (on Taxable income) ~ 10%

Prediction Models- Simple Economic Model

Economic Parameters	Unit cost	Case 1	Case 2A	Case 2B	Optimized
Total Oil Revenue (\$M)	\$ 45/bbl	613	670	676	1138
Royalty (10%)	0.01	6	7	7	11
Recycle CO ₂ Credit	\$ 0.01	12	17	30	51
Total Revenue (\$M)		619	680	699	1177
Purchased CO ₂ Cost	\$ 40/ton	187	187	128	128
Produced CO ₂ Charge	\$ 0.01	38	38	38	53
Water injection Cost	1	21	14	16	13
Total Operating Cost (\$M)		245	239	182	194
Taxable Income		373	441	517	984
Taxes (10%)	0.01	4	4	5	10
Net Present Value (\$M)		370	437	512	974

Conclusions

- This work presented a recent efforts on history matching; scenario based performance assessment and optimization for CO₂-EOR process in the FWU
- Predicted models showed recycling a high percentage of produced gas, addition of well/patterns, and reduction of CO₂ purchase after some years of operations has a tendency of yielding higher oil recovery and CO₂ storage
- The use of complex multi-objective function resulted in optimum operational variables that yielded 94% of CO₂ storage and more than 25% incremental of OOIP oil recovery beyond waterflood at FWU.
- This work, and ongoing efforts, will serve as blue print for future CCUS project with Anadarko basin and similar geological basins in the world

Acknowledgements / Thank You / Questions

Funding for this project is provided by the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL) through the Southwest Regional Partnership on Carbon Sequestration (SWP) under Award No. DE-FC26-05NT42591. Additional support was provided by Chaparral Energy, LLC and Schlumberger Carbon Services.

The author gratefully acknowledges the contributions of more than 50 SWP scientists and engineers, working at New Mexico Tech, the University of Utah, the University of Missouri, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, and Sandia National Laboratories.