Chemically Enabled CO₂-Enhanced Oil Recovery in Multi-Porosity, Hydrothermally Altered Carbonates in the Southern Michigan Basin

DE-FE-0031792 DOE FOA-1988

Aubrey Collie Battelle Memorial Institute DOE Resource Sustainability Annual Meeting 04/02/2024



Disclaimer

This presentation was prepared by Battelle as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government and other project sponsors. Neither the United States Government, nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, nor Battelle and other cosponsors, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendations, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and the opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.



Project Overview and Team

- DOE Funds: \$7,999,659
- Cost Share: \$2,153,668
- Total Cost: \$10,153,327
- October 2020-March 2026





Project Goals and Objectives





Project Objective: Carry out a comprehensive laboratory experiment, computer modeling, and field testing-based evaluation of chemically enabled CO_2 -EOR in the Southern Michigan Basin conventional Trenton/Black River play to optimize recovery in a complex, multi-porosity, hydrothermally altered carbonate



Summary of Tasks to be Performed





Regional Trenton-Black River Play

- Trenton/Black River play
 - >170 MMBO produced
 - >170 MMBO remaining
 - >800 MMBO potentially undiscovered
 - ~ 20 fields



Complex Carbonate System

- Facies heterogeneity
- Dolomitization from hydrothermal fluids
- Zones of enhanced porosity and permeability from vugs and fractures
- Developed methods and technology applicable to many large producing complex carbonate fields globally









BP1, Early 2020- Field Evaluation









Key Point: Full field characterization, including wireline, core, and seismic analysis were completed, indicating favorable conditions for CO_2 -EOR in the Trenton-Black River trend.



BP1, 2021 McCann #1-20 Production Analysis



- Drilling, logging, and completion successful.
- Oil production lower than expected; water production higher than expected.
- Conclusion: Proceed with initial CO_2 flood plan but move to location with suitable geology and existing wells.
- Established production history, existing well pair, and known geology

- West Bay Exploration's Lee 26 field
 - Unitized field
 - Previously permitted and approved for injection
 - Onsite source of water for repressurization
 - OOIP ~1.4 MMBbls (324,000 bbls produced)



Ø

Pivot Point: Well drilling was a technical success, but oil production was not commercially viable. Project pivoted to an analogous field with proven production and available wells.











Lee Field Overview

• = Well Bottom Hole Location



Machine Learning Analysis of Image Logs





Key Point: Trained model was able to predict the presence of vugs and fractures with moderate precision if a robust log suite is available in the target well.



Lee Field Lab Testing Foam and core flood preliminary results

Produced water



Contact angle: ~ 180° Oil wet





Contact angle: ~ 90° Intermediate wet



Contact angle: ~ 180° Oil wet



Contact angle: ~ 70° Water wet

Foam flooding
0.5wt% CETAC at low salinity



Oil recovery WF (4PV) : 39.1% Foam (0.625PV) + CWF (3PV): 63.1% Incremental: 24.0%



Key Point: Preliminary core flood with CO_2 and CETAC-30 boosts recovery by 24%.



1 day

2 days

Seismic Analysis of Albion-Scipio & Lee Fields

Albion-Scipio structural attributes



Lee Field structural attributes





Key Point: Reservoir-bounding and intra-reservoir faults identified and integrated into static earth model to spatially constrain fractures, vugs, and reservoir intervals.



Facies Identification

- Blocks in the static model were grouped according to three facies:
 - 1 Tight limestone
 - 2 Matrix dolomite
 - 3 Cavernous dolomite

Assumption: Limestone facies (1) does not contribute to storage or pressure support – validated by core flood tests



Static Earth Model





- Fault picks from seismic analysis integrated into model
- Hydrothermal facies distribution tied to fault proximity
- Addition of mud log information further constrained the facies distribution



Dual Porosity Modeling

- Field and lab testing indicate limestone facies does not contribute to reservoir volume
- Top of model determined by HCPV constrained by Material Balance Analysis (MBA) – reservoir in Black River and lower Trenton
- Two porosity systems: matrix dolomite and cavernous dolomite/fractures
 - Porosity based on facies modeling
 - Log-based effective permeability split based on well test data, previous work (Brock & Baker, 2012)





SG 1.0



- Fluid saturations and contacts based on MBA, well log and production data
- Initial pressure and temperature determined from field data
- Assume 15% Connate Water from analogous field
- Relative permeability curves from standard correlations for carbonates (Honarpour et al., 1986)

19



Full Field History Match

• Calibrated model matched to field and well production/pressure data



Full Field Production/Pressure Data



Well Drainage Area

• Drainage flow-lines show approximate area of reservoir impacted by each well; representative of production history of the field





2022 Field Repressurization Plan

- Install downhole pressure gauges in Fischhaber and Marshell wells.
- Begin field repressurization through the Marshell 1-35 well.
- On achieving minimum miscibility pressure, initiate CO₂ flood, sweeping from the Marshell 1-35 to the Fischhaber 2-35.





Calculated CO₂ volumes

- Initial flood design called for 30,000 tonnes to implement minimum useful flood.
- Project approval in 2019 when CO_2 prices were ~\$170/tonne. Current price: ~\$500+/tonne.
- Project budget for CO₂ injection is \$1.75 million. At current price, flood would cost \$15 million.



Pivot Point: Market conditions preclude a chemically enhanced CO_2 flood. Modeling indicates that a chemically enhanced CO_2 huff and puff will allow us to deliver project objectives.



Pivot Point: Huff & Puff



CO₂ Huff & Puff with Tracer Test

- Deviation from original project plan, but has been discussed as a back-up plan over the life of the project.
- Test huff & puff the Fischhaber 2-35:
 - 1,000-2,000 tons with partitioning tracer to understand efficacy of CO₂ at mobilizing residual oil.



Huff & Puff Single Well Chemical Tracer Test

- The SWCTT is a non-intrusive test based on injection of a partitioning tracer (ester) into the reservoir.
- Some of the ester hydrolyses to alcohol during shut-in, and backproduction of the well yield tracer production curves with different retention times.
- Analysis of tracer production curves yields residual oil saturation and percentage of oil mobilized by CO₂.



Partitioning ester lags behind the alcohol and the timedifference is directly related to oil saturation in the formation.



Forecasting Simulations – CO₂ Huff and Puff

- Simulating CO₂ Huff and Puff following re-pressurization through Fischhaber well
 - Pseudomiscible black-oil simulation
 - 1000 tonnes CO₂ injected, chase injection with water, 3-week soak
- CO₂ spreads out through the reservoir due to conductive fracture system
- Production rates are improved (~100 bpd peak) after treatment ^g/_g
 - Oil in matrix mobilized by pressurization and CO₂
 - ~50% recovery of injected CO₂







Field Repressurization and Monitoring

- Install downhole pressure gauges in Fischhaber and Marshell wells.
- Begin field repressurization through Fischhaber well.
- On achieving minimum miscibility pressure, complete single-well partitioning tracer test in Fischhaber.
- Inject CO₂, flow back, and monitor pressure and production.





Pressure Monitoring

~400,000 barrels injected to date

Beattie (westernmost well in Lee 26 field)

BEATTIE #1-27 View / Update Values -- CASING PRESS TUBING PRESS 10/6/2023 11:06:42 to 3/4/2024 10:06:42 70 60 v 50 股 40 Q Feb Nov Dec Jan 2024 Mar 2023

Beattie 1-27 Jacoby 1-26 Fischhaber 2-35 Marshell 1-35

Fischhaber (Nearest offset to injector)





Key Point: Pressure buildup observed across the field, indicating reservoir well connected by fractures and/or vugs. Anticipated total injection 800,000-1 million barrels water.



Assessing Pressurization Operations

- Tracking field pressure monitoring against anticipated pressure gain from history matched blackoil simulation model
- Observed pressurization is not a perfect match to predictions from black oil model, but sufficiently close to merit continued injection and continued confidence in our model build.





1400.00

-1200.00

-1000.00

-800.00

-600.00

-400.00

-200.00

PVT Results

- PVT analysis of analogous oil completed by GeoMark 12/1
 - Gas gravity = 0.85 (consistent with Lee 26)
 - Oil density = 0.83 g/cc
 - Recombinations performed at 512 & 350 GOR
- Fluid deemed most representative of saturated reservoir oil was 350 GOR recombined fluid
 - Bubble point = 1750 psi, very close to initial reservoir pressure
 - GOR matches initial producing GOR of field







Incorporating PVT Results – Compositional Models

- **Next step:** Populate HM reservoir model with compositional fluid models and re-tune history match with new fluid interactions.
- Modeling full compositional behavior will greatly improve accuracy of CO₂ Huff & Puff forecasting simulations.





Two Oral Presentations at GSA Connects 2023



- Submitted as two-part discussion featuring two project geologists and one reservoir engineer
- Presentation was well received, with audience questions focusing on characteristics of hydrothermal alteration, integration of faults into the 3D geomodel, and CO₂ sourcing.



Project Impacts and Scale-up Opportunities

- Key outcomes and impacts:
 - Gained an understanding of the distribution and extentof vugs and fractures in the TBR reservoir using traditional ML and modeling techniques.
 - Laboratory experiment driven improved design of chemically-enabled CO₂ EOR which targets multi-porosity, complex carbonate reservoirs and improves flood efficiency.
 - Modeling and field testing-based evaluation of the viability of chemically CO₂-EOR for stranded oil recovery in the TBR and similar HTD plays, along with field development plan.
- EOR advancements in the TBR in southern Michigan would be applicable to numerous fields and improved methodologies for enhancing oil recovery in complex carbonate systems.
- Project will illuminate CO₂-EOR infrastructure needs in the Midwest, which will also lay the groundwork for future work and demonstrate the path forward in re-evaluating historical plays.
- This work will greatly benefit local oil and gas operators, CO₂ emitters and providers, and other local and regional industrial businesses.



Summary

- Key Technical Findings
 - Core floods indicate that CO₂ EOR should provide a 14% uplift to production within the accessed pore volume.
 - Lab testing indicates that CETAC-30 optimizes pore surface wettability, improving oil recovery by an additional 9.6%.
 - Modeling and repressurization data indicate that the Lee 26 reservoir is fully connected by fractures and/or vuggy intervals.
- Future Plans
 - Continue repressurization until semi-miscible pressure achieved in region surrounding Fischhaber 2-35
 - Conduct 1-spot chemical tracer test to assess residual oil in the Fischhaber 2-35 near wellbore region
 - Complete large-scale huff & puff stimulation and production monitoring at the Fischhaber 2-35.



Take-away Message: Maintaining agility in the face of scientific and market challenges is critical to delivering results for complex projects in complex field environments.



Project Organization





Key Individual Contributors

Current Project Team

- Dr. Neeraj Gupta- Principal Investigator
- Tim Vance- Geologist
- Derrick James- Reservoir Engineer
- Stuart Skopec-Geologist
- Dan Brugeman- West Bay Energy
- Shane Jones- West Bay Energy
- Dr. Shuvajit Bhattacharya- UT Austin, BEG
- Dr. Kishore Mohanty- UT Austin
- Gary Covatch- DOE
- Kyle Clark- DOE

Past Contributors

- Dr. Srikanta Mishra- Principal Investigator
- Tim Baker- West Bay Energy
- Dr. Autumn Haagsma- Geologist, DPI
- Amber Connor- Geologist
- Ashwin Pasumarti- Reservoir Engineer



In Memoriam

Mark Moody- Battelle





Ron Budros- Innova Exploration



1950 - 2023



Thank You!

For questions or comments, reach out to: Aubrey Collie- collie@battelle.org

Acknowledgements: The primary funding is from the US Department of Energy's National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL) under DOE project number DE-FE-0031792.







800.201.2011 | solutions@battelle.org | www.battelle.org

Project Gantt

| Chem Enhanced CO2 EOR - Battelle/West Bay 2024 | | | FY2024 | | | | | | FY | | | | | | | 2025 | | | | | | | FY2 | .026 | | | |
|--|--------------------|-------------------|---------|-------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|--------|--------|---------|------|---------|--------|---------|--------|----------|----------|---------|--|
| = critical path | duration | Mar | r Apr | May J | un | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | / Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | |
| BP2 - current DOE budget period | d | | | | | | | | | | | | | Х | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Permitting | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CO2 and Water Inj permitting complete for Fishaber | | r and | Mars | hell | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lab | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline Fluid Sampling and P | /T | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Modeling | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Create compositional fluid model from PVT | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Convert Black Oil model to compositional | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Compositional model history match | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Forecasting simulations for CO2 ops | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Update of Dynamic Modelling | results | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Procurement | | | | | | | | | i | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CO2 procurement | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Surfactant Procurement | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Huff & Puff injection equipment procurement | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | i | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Quarterly Downhole Pressure N | Measurements | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Chemical Tracer sampling TBD until presence | | | ll 4 we | ells | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Repressurization | 1300 psi or end of | psi or end of BP2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Injection Site Prep & Staging | 2 months | | | | | | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BP3 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | В | P3 | | | | | | |
| One Spot Tracer | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Injection Ops | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | Х | X - in | jectio | n expe | cted to | take | place 3 | /25 bu | t could | l happ | ien as i | early a: | s 11/24 | |
| Huff & Puff - injection | 2000t @ 500t/day | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| CO2 Soak | 1 month | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | - | • | | | | | | | | | |
| Huff & Puff - production/flowb | TBD | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | |
| Post-injection | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monitor | | | | | | | | | i | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Development Strategy | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reporting | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DOE End of Program | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | Prog | gram | End [|)ate - | Х | |
| | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

