

Pressure Analysis Toolkit


Joshua White

Project Number:


FWP-FEW0191-Task 4

LLNL-Statoil CRADA TC002228.001

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory




Fundamental question: How to design a monitoring program to adequately balance effectiveness vs. cost?



Project Objective

Develop an **open-source software toolkit** to support the development and deployment of novel techniques for analyzing **well gauge data**.




Project Timeline

May 2016 to April 2019

Deliverable Status


- **April 2017:** Cypress version 0.9 (pre-release) delivered for testing to Statoil
- **April 2018:** First open-source release
- **April 2019:** Second open-source release

Major Features



- Data visualization and manipulation
- Bottomhole pressure estimation algorithms
- Deconvolution welltest algorithms
- Rapid pressure forecasting
- Type-curve analysis support
- Fracture-pressure identification algorithms

User Interface



Bottomhole Pressure Estimation

BHP Wizard

Configuration

Method

Two-point extrapolation

Input

Pressure gauge 1: Tubåen > wellhead pressure

Pressure gauge 2: Tubåen > gauge pressure

Flow rate: Tubåen > injection rate

Extrapolate to depth: 2632.5

Friction pressure: User specified ΔP

8

Name for results: BHP at 2632.5m

< Back Run Analysis


Conversion Method

Input Data

Method Types:


- 1) Extrapolation-based
- 2) EoS-based

Welltest Analysis



Falloff testing (and other welltests) are commonly used to probe reservoir properties and structure away from the well.

Traditional welltest techniques require shutting in the well for significant periods



Key question: Is the same information from ongoing injection data, without shutting in for long periods?

Deconvolution Welltest Analysis

Convolution Integral:

$$\Delta p(t) = \int_0^{\tau} q(\tau) g(t - \tau) d\tau$$

Reservoir Pressure Change
(Measured)

Injection Rate
(Measured)

Reservoir Impulse Response
(Unknown)

Basic Idea: Given $p(t)$ and $q(t)$, estimate $g(t)$ through a deconvolution method.


Deconvolution results can be readily converted to a traditional diagnostic plot format

Buildup (or Falloff) Response:


$$P_u(t) = \int_0^t g(t) dt$$

Logarithmic Derivative:


$$\frac{dP_u}{d \ln t} = tg(t)$$




Fast-running pressure forecasting




Fast-running pressure forecasting




Fast-running pressure forecasting




Fast-running pressure forecasting



Fast-running pressure forecasting



Fast-running pressure forecasting



Looking forward, our goal is to provide a research platform to help answer the following questions:

- ① How can operators identify (and understand) reservoir properties and structure as quickly as possible?
- ② What mix of monitoring and characterization techniques provides the best information while still being cost effective?
- ③ How can operators forecast reservoir behavior to make informed and timely decisions?
- ④ What engineering solutions are available to maximize storage and manage integrity risks?

Synergistic Opportunities

We welcome new ideas for pressure analysis algorithms that might be included in the toolkit.

We are also happy to partner with operators to further validate the proposed methods on real field cases.

Acknowledgements

- This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344. Funding was provided by the DOE Office of Fossil Energy, Carbon Sequestration Program and by Statoil SA.

Contact

- **Joshua A. White**
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

jawhite@llnl.gov

Appendix: Program Management


Program Goal No. 4

- Develop Best Practice Manuals for monitoring, verification, accounting, and assessment; site screening, selection and initial characterization; public outreach; well management activities; and risk analysis and simulation.

Benefit Statement

- An understanding of hydro-mechanical interactions is essential for effective monitoring and management of reservoir performance.
- This project seeks to develop:
 - An open source toolkit to support dynamic well-test analysis using well gauge data
 - Best practices for using gauge data to cost-effectively monitor reservoir performance

Org Chart



Project Timeline for FEW0191


Task	Milestone Description*	Project Duration Start : Oct 1, 2014 End: Sept 30, 2017												Planned Start Date	Planned End Date	Actual Start Date	Actual End Date	Comment (notes, explanation of deviation from plan)
		Project Year (PY) 1				PY 2				PY 3								
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12					
1.1	Calibrate Reactive Transport Model						x							1-Oct-14	30-Mar-15			
1.2	Calibrate NMR Permeability Estimates						x							1-Oct-14	30-Mar-15			
1.3	Scale Reactive Transport Simulations from the core to reservoir scale											x		1-Jul-15	28-Feb-17			
1.4	Write topical report on CO2 storage potential in carbonate rocks												x	1-Dec-16	30-Sep-17			
2.1	Algorithm development and testing				x									1-Oct-14	30-Sep-15			
2.2	Array design and monitoring recommendations								x					1-Oct-15	30-Sep-16			
2.3	Toolset usability and deployment												x	1-Oct-16	30-Sep-17			
3.1	Analysis of monitoring and characterization data available from the In Salah Carbon Sequestration Project					x								1-Dec-14	30-Sep-15			
3.2	Wellbore model development				x									1-Oct-14	30-Sep-15			
3.3	Analysis of the full-scale wellbore integrity experiments											x		1-Mar-14	28-Feb-17			
3.4	Refining simulation tools for sharing with industrial partners												x	1-Oct-16	30-Sep-17			
4.1	Engage with industrial partnerships		x											1-Oct-14	28-Feb-15			Future tasks pending discussions with industrial partners
4.2	Develop work scope with industrial partners				x									1-Mar-14	30-Sep-15			

* No fewer than two (2) milestones shall be identified per calendar year per task

Bibliography

- J.A White. Cypress User Manual Version 1.0, April 2017, LLNL-SM-730935.

The Snøhvit CO₂ Storage Project



[Spencer et al. 2008; Chiaramonte et al. 2014]

Snøhvit CO₂ Storage Project





Figure: N-S vertical cross section through stratigraphy


- **2008 to 2011:** ~1 Mtpa injection into Tubåen Formation
- **2011:** Well re-completion
- **2011 to present:** ~1 Mtpa into Stø Formation

Getting CO₂ into the Tubåen Fm. was harder than expected



Depositional environment controls pressure behavior

- CO₂ and pressure confined to narrow sand channels, with limited connectivity between channels



4D difference amplitude map, 2003-2009, lower perforation.

(Hansen et al. 2012)

Statoil falloff analysis shows clear indications of flow barriers

- Welltest model suggests flow barriers at 110, 110, and 3000m




Figure: Falloff analyses using permanent gauge (2009) and PLT data (2011).