



Historic IOR/EOR practices in the Minnelusa

Jim Mack & Mike Lantz

EORI Minnelusa Workshop Gillette, WY, May 6-7, 2013

Outline

• Introduction:

- Why EOR in the Minnelusa?
- Historical Development of Minnelusa EOR
- Summary of EOR in Wyoming
- N. Rainbow Ranch EOR Project
- What is Next in Improving Minnelusa Oil Recovery
- Closing Remarks

Why EOR in the Minnelusa?

- Minnelusa is a clean sandstone with good permeability
- Fresh Fox Hills Water is available for water injection
- Primary Production is low (5-15% OOIP)
- Confined Reservoirs with Good Communication
- Waterflooding is successful; 2-5 times Primary
- Waterflooding Ultimate Oil Recovery Limited (~ 35% OOIP)
 - Viscous Oil, High Permeability Variation & Good Residual Oil Saturation
 - Waterflood Efficiency Poor

Historical Development of Minnelusa EOR

- Polymer Flooding Improve Mobility Ratio (SE Kuehne Ranch, Kuehne Ranch)
- Cat-An Process Combining Cationic and Anionic polymers to provide more resistance to flow than polymer (W. Semlek, OK, Kummerfeld)
- Phillips Petroleum first developed the "layered process" which was first injected in the Hamm Unit in Mid-70's (Stewart Ranch)
 - Found sequential injection of HPAM / aluminum citrate (AlCit) created higher RRF than straight polymer

Historical Development of Minnelusa EOR

- Colloidal Dispersion Gel (CDG) Process CDGs (weak gels) generate higher viscosities & RRF than polymer solutions at lower concentrations (Edsel, Alpha,OK)
- The first CDG flood was implemented in 1985 in the Edsel Minnelusa Unit, Crook County, WY
 - The flood switched from the layered to the CDG process
 - Results showed an incremental recovery of 11.5 % OOIP
- MARCIT Bulk Gel Process strong gels formed with Cr crosslinker to significantly reduce flow in high permeability channels (N. Rainibow Ranch, Ash, Indian Creek)

Summary of EOR Projects in Wyoming

Wyoming Tertiary Projects: 2008 Wyoming O&G Stats, The WOGCC

Chemical Flooding Dominates



Evaluation of Chemical Flooding in the Minnelusa Formation, PRB, WY*

- EORI publication evaluated the EUR of 32 chemical (mostly polymer) and waterfloods
- The primary conclusions were:
 - Chemical flooding improves recovery by an average of 9% OOIP compared to waterflooding
 - Chemical flooding produces more oil sooner
 - The sooner you start EOR the more oil you recover

*Thyne, G., Alvarado, V., Murrell, G., Evaluation of Chemical Flooding in the Minnelusa Formation, Powder River Basin, Wyoming. *Search and Discovery*, Article # 50239, February 26, 2010.

Minnelusa Production Analysis



N. Rainbow Ranch EOR Project

• Summary of reservoir and fluid properties (R71W – T49N)

Formation	Minnelusa	
Depth	9,500 ft	
Porosity	19.7%	
Water Saturation	20%	
Temperature	202°F	
Permeability Range	1 - 1,000 mD	
Perm. Variation (DP)	0.9	
Oil Gravity	26°API	
Oil Viscosity	3.94 cP	

• Summary of CDG treatment design:

Stage	Injection bbls	Product*	Pounds	Concentration mg / I
1	81,000	Cationic Polymer	22,000	775
2	46,000	Anionic Polymer	22,500	1,400
3	198,000	Anionic Polymer Al-Citrate	83,100 71,000	1,200 1,000
4	654,000	Anionic Polymer Al-Citrate	68,700 76,000	300 330

* Polyacrylamide polymers





N. Rainbow Ranch Unit Summary Conclusions

- Approximately 12% PV was injected over the life of chemical flood
- CDGs using high molecular weight polymer were successfully injected into a non-fractured, high permeability sandstone formation
- Total recovery to date of 49.4% OOIP
- Preliminary incremental recovery estimates were estimated in 8.0% of OOIP (SPE-27773). Current analysis suggests an incremental recovery of 15.7% OOIP
- Updated results estimate a development cost of \$1 per incremental barrel

ASP Flooding

ASP Flooding

- <u>First ASP Flood ever</u> carried out in Minnelusa lower sand at West Kiehl Unit
 - Started in September 1987
 - Used Petrostep B100, Soda Ash and Pusher 700
- First ASP Flood started at the beginning of Secondary Recovery: Cambridge Minnelusa Unit
 - Started in 1993
 - Used Petrostep B100, Soda Ash, Alcoflood 1275A

Cambridge Field Conditions SPE 55633

Formation	Minnelusa Upper B
Depth	7,108 ft
Temperature	132 F
Pore volume	7,117 Mbbl
OOIP	4,900 Mbbl
Thickness	29 ft
Average porosity	18%
Average Permeability	845 mD
Initial water saturation	31.6%
Oil API gravity	20
Oil viscosity	31 cPs
Flood date	1993-1998

Cambridge Field Pilot Test Results



Delayed decline in Oil Production



Cambridge Recovery Summary

- Ultimate Oil Recovery 69.6 %OOIP
- Primary and Water flood 36.2 %OOIP
- ASP Incremental Recovery 33.4 %OOIP
- Cost per Incremental Barrel 4.07 \$/bbl (2.94\$/bbl)
- Chemical cost and facilities
 - 750m lb Petrostep B-100 @ \$2.00/lb
 - 1,350m lb Alcoflood 1275A @ \$1.20/lb
 - 10,200m lb Na2CO3 @ \$0.12/lb
 - Facilities @ \$1.0MM (\$170M)
- Incremental oil = 1.3MM bbl, Value @ 50\$/bbl = \$65MM

What is Next in Improving Minnelusa Oil Recovery

- Mature Floods with High WOR
- Need a Combination of Sweep Improvement with Reduction in Sor
- Start with Sweep Improvement CDG or Marcit
- Follow with ASP or SP
- Follow with Polymer
- Ultimate Oil Recovery > 60% OOIP

Closing Remarks

Closing Remarks

- Minnelusa is a great formation to try EOR
 - Clean sandstone, fresh water, successful waterflood, small confined reservoirs)
- Sweep improvement Processes have proven successful in improving oil recovery economically
- ASP Projects have shown good incremental oil recovery, although economics are more challenging than sweep
- Since most Minnelusa reservoirs are mature water/EOR floods, future EOR is challenging