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Exploitation of ultradeep, high pressure oil reservoirs is always associated with numerous risks, challenges, and obstacles. One of the most pronounced constraints in development of such fields is the number of wells, which is imposed by massively high cost of drilling. Low number of wells may lead to high pressure isolation regions left after primary production (pressure depletion) of the reservoir. Ultradeep reservoirs with high pressure are more prone to such leftover high pressure isolation regions due to their low permeable characteristic. These high pressure isolation regions can, subsequently, deteriorate the efficiency of enhanced oil recovery (EOR) as the injected fluid cannot access the residual oil in these regions. Therefore, well placement and inter-well spacing optimizations is of greater importance in ultradeep, high pressure oil reservoirs to ensure higher ultimate oil recovery at lower costs. Furthermore, due to high cost of development of ultradeep, high pressure oil reservoirs, the EOR strategy and commencement time for the selected EOR strategy are very critical.

The objective of this thesis is to demonstrate how optimization of well placement, well spacing, and startup time for miscible CO$_2$ flooding can enhance the incremental and ultimate oil recoveries in an ultradeep, high pressure oil reservoir. To do this, a synthetic grid model was made to run different simulation scenarios on it. The model was initialized with rock and fluid properties within the range of those in the ultradeep, high pressure Wilcox formation in the Gulf of Mexico to ensure that it mimics an ultradeep, high pressure oil reservoir.

The obtained results showed that optimization of well placement, well spacing, and commencement time for any EOR strategy such as miscible CO$_2$ flooding is very critical in the course of making a Field Development Plan (FDP) for an ultradeep, high pressure oil reservoir.

The results, discussions, and conclusions were finally used by the author to shed light on potential further work on each of the aforementioned challenges in ultradeep, high pressure oil reservoirs such as Wilcox formation in the Gulf of Mexico.
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# Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHP</td>
<td>Bottomhole Pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BML</td>
<td>Below the Mud Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOR</td>
<td>Enhanced Oil Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOS</td>
<td>Equation-of-State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDP</td>
<td>Field Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MME</td>
<td>Minimum Miscibility Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMP</td>
<td>Minimum Miscibility Pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OOIP</td>
<td>Original Oil In Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVT</td>
<td>Pressure-Volume-Temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSTVD</td>
<td>Sub-Sea True Vertical Depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THP</td>
<td>Tubing Head Pressure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nomenclature

\( \gamma_{API} \) oil API gravity
\( \gamma_g \) gas specific gravity
\( \Delta R \) incremental oil recovery
\( \mu_g \) gas viscosity
\( \mu_o \) oil viscosity
\( \mu_{ob} \) saturated oil viscosity
\( \mu_{oD} \) dead-oil viscosity
\( \rho_g \) gas density
\( \rho_{pr} \) pseudoreduced density
\( \varphi \) porosity
\( \omega \) acentric factor
\( A \) reservoir area
\( B_g \) gas formation volume factor
\( B_{oi} \) initial oil formation volume factor
\( c_i \) volume shift
\( C_o \) oil compressibility
\( \text{CO}_2 \) carbon dioxide
\( d \) dimension
\( DX \) length of grid blocks in \( X \) direction
\( DY \) length of grid blocks in \( Y \) direction
\( h \) reservoir thickness
\( J \) well index
\( k_r \) relative permeability
\( k_{rgro} \) relative permeability of gas at \( S_w = S_{wc} \) and \( S_g = S_{org} \)
\( k_{rocw} \) relative permeability of oil at \( S_w = S_{wc} \) and \( S_g = 0 \)
\( k_{rwro} \) relative permeability of water at \( S_w = 1 - S_{orw} \) and \( S_g = 0 \)
\( M \) molecular weight
n  number of moles

$n_g$  gas exponent for analytical $k_r$

$n_{og}$  oil/gas exponent for analytical $k_r$

$n_{ow}$  oil/water exponent for analytical $k_{volume}$

$n_w$  water exponent for analytical $k_r$

$NX$  number of grid cells in $X$ direction

$NY$  number of grid cells in $Y$ direction

$NZ$  number of grid cells in $Z$ direction

$p$  pressure

$p_b$  bubblepoint pressure

$p_c$  capillary pressure

$p_{cr}$  critical pressure

$p_{pc}$  pseudocritical pressure

$p_{pr}$  pseudoreduced pressure

$p_r$  reduced pressure

$p_{sat}$  saturation pressure

$p_{sc}$  standard conditions pressure

$PV$  pore volume

$r_0$  Peaceman’s effective well radius

$r_w$  wellbore radius

$R$  universal gas constant

$R_s$  solution gas/oil ratio

$S_{gc}$  critical gas saturation

$S_{gr}$  trapped gas saturation

$S_{org}$  residual oil saturation to gas

$S_{orw}$  residual oil saturation to water

$S_{wc}$  connate water saturation

$S_{wir}$  irreducible/initial water saturation

$t_D$  EOR startup time
\( t_{EOR} \): simulation run duration where economic limit is reached

\( T \): temperature

\( T_{cr} \): critical temperature

\( T_{pc} \): pseudocritical temperature

\( T_{pr} \): pseudoreduced temperature

\( T_r \): reduced temperature

\( T_{sc} \): standard conditions temperature

\( V \): volume

\( Z \): Z-factor

\( Z_c \): critical Z-factor
Introduction

Outages in oil production due to political issues and declining conventional oil reservoirs in addition to struggles to catch up with global rising oil demand have given rise to approaching unconventional and difficult-to-develop oil resources. One type of difficult-to-develop oil resources is ultra deepwater oil reservoirs which are extremely costly and challenging to exploit. Some of the inherent characteristics of ultradeep oil reservoirs such as low permeability and high initial reservoir pressure, make drilling and extraction of oil from these reservoirs more challenging and expensive. A well-known example of such challenging reservoirs is Wilcox sandstone in the Gulf of Mexico with a permeability of typically less than 10 md, average oil viscosity of 5 cp, and initial reservoir pressure of about 20000 psi. Combining these characteristics with water depth of typically greater than 5000 ft and reservoir depth ranging from 25000 to 35000 ft below the mud line (BML) highlights the importance of optimization process in development of Wilcox sandstone to maximize the oil recovery at reduced costs.

Drilling wells in ultra deepwater, high pressure reservoirs has the highest contribution to field development costs. Therefore, one of the constraints in development of such reservoirs is the number of wells to drill. Low number of wells and improper well placement and inter-well spacing in addition to structural and stratigraphic controls that compartmentalize the reservoir can lead to localized pressure isolations at the end of primary production of high pressure reservoirs. These leftover high pressure regions not only may contain huge amounts of residual oil, but also can lead to high injection pressures required in the course of EOR processes. Therefore, new dedicated wells may be required to target the accumulations in the isolated regions and this imposes higher costs. This can be avoided by optimization of well placement and inter-well spacing for a given number of wells to drill in ultradeep, high pressure reservoirs in order to ensure maximized oil recovery at a minimum cost. Furthermore, to acquire the highest incremental production for an EOR strategy, the EOR commencement time should also be optimized.

The objective of this thesis is to demonstrate how optimization of well placement, inter-well spacing, and EOR startup time lead to maximized ultimate and incremental oil productions in an ultradeep, high pressure oil reservoir. The EOR process in this study is miscible CO₂
injection and due to high-pressure characteristic of the reservoir, no secondary oil production is considered for the reservoir model under study.

According to Muskat (1949), the well spacing problem can be approached from two different perspectives: the physical ultimate recovery and economic ultimate recovery. The optimization in this study was conducted based on the physical ultimate recovery obtained from reservoir simulation. Therefore, the optimal well spacing defined in this report is only based on the volume of oil produced and does not consider the maximum economic return from the development of the reservoir.

Due to lack of real data, a synthetic cubic model was made and it was initialized with the reservoir properties within the range of those of the ultradeep, high pressure Wilcox formation in the Gulf of Mexico to ensure that the model mimics an ultradeep, high pressure oil reservoir. The black oil table required for black oil simulations was made using the available correlations and limited available data on Wilcox in literature. For the compositional model, we had to make up a fluid composition and EOS which generated the black oil table made based on the limited data available in open literature.

Inter-well spacing and EOR startup time optimization was done for four different well patterns on the reservoir model to achieve the objective of the study. In order to reduce the simulation cost and numerical dispersion imposed by the constraint on the number of grid cells (6000 grid cells for SENSOR) the optimization was performed for a given well pattern on a section of the reservoir using the concept of symmetry.

The report is outlined as explained in the following paragraphs.

**Chapter 1** is a precise literature review to the extent that might be required by the reader to understand the contents of the next chapters.

**Chapter 2** explains how the black oil and compositional models were made using the correlations given in Chapter 1. The grid model is also discussed in this chapter.

**Chapter 3** gives an explanation on the optimization strategy used in the study.

**Chapter 4** covers the optimization process and the corresponding results.

In **Chapter 5**, integrates the conclusions that can be made based on the results obtained in the previous chapter.

In **Chapter 6**, outlines the recommendations made based on the conclusions drawn in the previous chapter. The goal of this chapter is to draw the reader’s attention to the potential areas of research similar to this thesis subject.
Chapter 1: Literature Review

This chapter covers the background information from literature review which will be used in the discussions in the next chapters.

1.1 Oil and Gas Properties and Correlations

This section gives definitions and correlations for the required PVT properties of oil and natural gases to make the black oil PVT table for the model under study.

1.1.1 Critical and Reduced Properties

Reduced temperature \( T_r \) and reduced pressure \( p_r \) are dimensionless properties of a pure component and are defined as

\[
T_r = \frac{T}{T_{cr}} \tag{1.1}
\]

\[
p_r = \frac{p}{p_{cr}} \tag{1.2}
\]

Absolute units must be used whilst calculating reduced temperature and pressure. \( p_{cr} \) and \( T_{cr} \) are the true critical properties of a pure component. In most petroleum engineering applications, \( p_r \) ranges from 0.02 to 30 for gases and 0.03 to 40 for oils and \( T_r \) ranges from <1 to 0.25 for gases and from 0.4 to 1.1 for oils (Whitson and Brule’ 2000).

1.1.2 Gas Pseudocritical and Pseudoreduced Properties

Average hydrocarbon gas mixture critical properties, known as pseudocritical properties \( (p_{pc} \text{ and } T_{pc}) \), can be obtained from mixture specific gravity.
Sutton (1985) presented the following correlations for estimation of $p_{pc}$ and $T_{pc}$ of hydrocarbon gas mixtures, knowing the hydrocarbon gas mixture specific gravity ($\gamma_g$).

$$T_{pc} = 169.2 + 349.5\gamma_g - 74.0\gamma_g^2$$  \hfill (1.3)

$$\rho_{pc} = 756.8 - 131.0\gamma_g - 3.6\gamma_g^2$$  \hfill (1.4)

Standing (1981) suggested the following two correlations for dry hydrocarbon gases ($\gamma_g < 0.75$).

$$T_{pc} = 168.0 + 325.0\gamma_g - 12.5\gamma_g^2$$  \hfill (1.5)

$$\rho_{pc} = 667.0 - 15.0\gamma_g - 37.5\gamma_g^2$$  \hfill (1.6)

The Standing correlations are used in the industry extensively.

Pseudocritical properties of hydrocarbon gas mixtures are used to calculate pseudoreduced temperature and pseudoreduced pressure for the gas mixture using Eqs. 1.7 and 1.8.

$$T_{pr} = \frac{T}{T_{pc}}$$  \hfill (1.7)

$$p_{pr} = \frac{p}{p_{pc}}$$  \hfill (1.8)

### 1.1.3 Gas Deviation Factor

According to the ideal-gas law,

$$pV = nRT$$  \hfill (1.9)

where $R$ is the universal gas constant.

At moderate to high pressure or at low temperatures, volume of constituting molecules of a gas mixture and the corresponding intermolecular forces affect the volumetric behavior of the gas and the ideal-gas law does not hold anymore. The deviation from ideal-gas law can be expressed by gas deviation factor, also known as $Z$-factor. By definition,

$$Z = \frac{\text{volume of one mole of real gas at } p \text{ and } T}{\text{volume of one mole of ideal gas at } p \text{ and } T}.$$  \hfill (1.10)
According to the definition of $Z$-factor, this parameter is unitless.

Having pseudoreduced pressure and temperature of a given hydrocarbon gas mixture, one can use Standing-Katz $Z$-factor chart (Fig. 1) to estimate the $Z$-factor for that mixture.

**Figure 1 - Standing-Katz $Z$-factor Chart (Whitson and Brule’ 2000)**

Sutton (1985) claimed that his suggested correlations (Eqs. 1.3 and 1.4) are the most reliable correlations for estimating $Z$-factor with the Standing-Katz $Z$-factor chart.

Dranchuk and Abou-Kassem (1975) fitted one of the most accurate equations-of-state to the Standing-Katz $Z$-factor chart, which is more convenient for estimating the $Z$-factor for a gas mixture. Their equation is expressed as follows:
\[ Z = 1 + \left( A_1 + \frac{A_2}{T_{pr}} + \frac{A_3}{T_{pr}^2} + \frac{A_4}{T_{pr}^3} + \frac{A_5}{T_{pr}^4} \right) \rho_{pr} + \left( A_6 + \frac{A_7}{T_{pr}} + \frac{A_8}{T_{pr}^2} \right) \rho_{pr}^2 \rho_{pr}^2 - A_9 \left( \frac{A_9}{T_{pr}^2} + \frac{A_8}{T_{pr}^2} \right) \rho_{pr}^5 + A_{10} \left( 1 + A_{11} \rho_{pr}^2 \right) \left( \frac{\rho_{pr}^2}{T_{pr}^2} \right) \exp \left( -A_{11} \rho_{pr}^2 \right) , \] 

(1.11)

where

\[ \rho_{pr} = \frac{0.27 p_{pr}}{Z T_{pr}} \]  

(1.11a)

and where the constants \( A_1 \) to \( A_{11} \) are as follows:

\[ A_1 = 0.3265, \]
\[ A_2 = -1.0700, \]
\[ A_3 = -0.5339, \]
\[ A_4 = 0.0157, \]
\[ A_5 = -0.0517, \]
\[ A_6 = 0.5475, \]
\[ A_7 = -0.7361, \]
\[ A_8 = 0.1844, \]
\[ A_9 = 0.1056, \]
\[ A_{10} = 0.6134, \]
\[ A_{11} = 0.7210. \]

Dranchuk and Abou-Kassem equation can be used for a broad range of pressures and temperatures and is valid for \( 0.2 \leq p_{pr} \leq 30 \) and \( 1.0 \leq T_{pr} \leq 3.0 \) and for \( p_{pr} \leq 1 \) with \( 0.7 \leq T_{pr} \leq 1.0 \).

### 1.1.4 Gas Density

One can derive all volumetric properties of gases from the real gas law. Gas density, \( \rho_g \), is given by

\[ \rho_g = \frac{p M_g}{Z R T} . \]  

(1.12)
Alternatively, in terms of gas specific gravity,

$$\rho_g = 28.97 \frac{\rho_ag}{ZRT}. \quad (1.13)$$

in which $p$ is in psia, $R$ is in $(\text{psia} \cdot \text{ft}^3)/(^\circ \text{R} \cdot \text{lb-mol})$, $T$ is in $^\circ \text{R}$, and $\rho_g$ is in lb/ft$^3$.

### 1.1.5 Gas Formation Volume Factor

By definition, gas formation volume factor, $B_g$, is the ratio of gas volume at specific temperature and pressure (e.g. reservoir temperature and pressure) to the ideal-gas volume at standard conditions. Therefore, $B_g$ is given by

$$B_g = \frac{ZT_p\rho_{sc}}{\rho T_{sc}}. \quad (1.14)$$

### 1.1.6 Gas Viscosity

Typical reservoir gas viscosities range from 0.01 to 0.03 cp at standard and reservoir conditions, reaching up to 0.1 cp for near critical gas condensate (Whitson and Brule’ 2000).

Lee-Gonzalez (1966) suggested a gas viscosity correlation (Eq. 1.15) which is nowadays the most commonly used correlation in PVT laboratories.

$$\mu_g = A_1 \times 10^{-4} \exp(A_2/\rho_g) \quad (1.15)$$

where

$$A_1 = \frac{(9.379 + 0.01607 \rho_g)^{1.5}}{209.2 + 19.26 \rho_g + T}, \quad (1.15a)$$

$$A_2 = 3.448 + (986.4/T) + 0.01009 \rho_g, \quad (1.15b)$$

and

$$A_1 = 2.447 - 0.2224 A_2. \quad (1.15c)$$

In Lee-Gonzalez gas viscosity correlation, $\mu_g$ is in cp, $\rho_g$ is in g/cm$^3$, and $T$ is in $^\circ \text{R}$. McCain (1991) showed that the accuracy of Lee-Gonzalez correlation is 2 to 4% for $\gamma_g < 1$. 
1.1.7 Solution Gas/Oil Ratio

Solution gas/oil ratio, $R_s$, is the volume of gas at standard conditions liberated from a single-phase oil at elevated pressure and temperature (e.g. reservoir pressure and temperature) divided by the resulting stock-tank oil volume, with units scf/STB (Whitson and Brule´ 2000).

1.1.8 Bubblepoint Pressure

Petrosky and Farshad (1993) presented a correlation for estimating bubblepoint pressure for the Gulf of Mexico crude oils. They claimed that their correlation provided improved results for the Gulf of Mexico oils compared to other correlations developed by other researchers for California oils, North Sea oils, etc. Their correlation gives

$$ p_b = 112.727 \left( \frac{R_s^{0.5774}}{\gamma_g^{0.8439}} \right) 10^x - 12.34, \quad (1016) $$

where

$$ x = 0.000045617^{13911} - 0.0007916^{1.541} \gamma_g^{1.000045617}. \quad (1.16a) $$

In Petrosky and Farshad correlation, $R_s$ is in scf/STB, $T$ is in °F, and $p_b$ is in psia.

1.1.9 Oil Viscosity

Based on the curve fitting of the undersaturated oil viscosity versus pressure data presented by Beal (1946), Standing (1981) suggested the following correlation for estimation of undersaturated oil viscosities.

$$ \frac{\mu_o - \mu_{ob}}{0.001(\rho - p_b)} = 0.024 \mu_{ob}^{1.6} + 0.038 \mu_{ob}^{0.56} \quad (1.17) $$

Chew and Connally (1959) tried to correlate saturated oil viscosity with dead-oil viscosity. They proposed the following correlation.

$$ \mu_{ob} = A_1 \mu_{obD}^{A_2} \quad (1.18) $$

Different researchers tried to present mathematical relations for $A_1$ and $A_2$ in Chew and Connally correlation. For example, Standing (1981) suggested the following relations in terms of $R_s$ for $A_1$ and $A_2$. 
\[ A_1 = 10^{-(0.00074R_s+0.000022R_s^2)} \]  
\[ A_2 = \frac{0.68}{10^{0.000862R_s}} + \frac{0.25}{10^{0.0011R_s}} + \frac{0.062}{10^{0.00374R_s}} \]  

### 1.1.10 Oil Compressibility

Petrosky and Farshad (1993) proposed the following correlation for estimation of oil compressibility of undersaturated oils in the Gulf of Mexico.

\[ c_o = 1.705 \times 10^{-7} n_{sb}^{0.69357}, \gamma_g^{0.1885}, \gamma_{API}^{0.3272}, \gamma_R^{0.6729}, p^{-0.5906} \]  

where \(2.464 \times 10^{-5} < c_o < 3.507 \times 10^{-5}\).

Vasquez and Beggs (1980) also suggested a more general correlation (Eq. 1.20) for prediction of undersaturated oil compressibility.

\[ c_o = \frac{-1433 + 5R_s + 17.2T - 1180\gamma_R + 12.61\gamma_o}{10^5 p} \]  

### 1.1.11 Oil Formation Volume Factor

Oil formation volume factor ranges from 1 bbl/STB for oils with little solution gas to about 2.5 bbl/STB for volatile oils (Whitson and Brule’ 2000).

Petrosky and Farshad (1993) correlation for estimation of bubblepoint oil formation volume factor for Gulf of Mexico crude oils is

\[ B_{ob} = 0.9759 + 0.00012A^{1.2} \]  

where

\[ A = R_s(\gamma_g / \gamma_o)^{0.5} + 1.25T. \]  

One can use oil compressibility and bubblepoint oil formation volume factor to calculate the variations in oil formation volume factor using Eq. 1.22.

\[ B_o = B_{ob} \exp[c_o(p_b - p)] \]
1.2 Miscibility

Miscibility is different from solubility. Two fluids are said to be miscible when they combine in any proportion to form one phase. For example water and methanol are two miscible fluids. But if a fluid gets dissolved in another fluid up to a certain proportion, it is said to be soluble in the other fluid. Solubility is a function of the nature of fluids, temperature, and pressure. An intermediate phenomenon is known as dynamic miscibility where miscibility is attained gradually, through multi-contact, and involves extraction or vaporization of light ends (Khatib et al. 1981).

Miscibility can be achieved either by first-contact (absolute) miscibility process or by a multiple-contact (thermodynamic) miscibility process. First-contact miscibility is a condition in which the injected gas (solvent) and oil are miscible (i.e. they form a single phase when mixed in any proportion when first brought into contact at a given pressure and temperature). Condition of first-contact miscibility for reservoir gasflooding depends on the composition of the injected gas, composition of oil, temperature, and the injection pressure. By contrast, fluids that develop miscibility after exchanging components have multiple-contact miscibility (Oilfield Glossary, First-Contact Miscibility 2013). Multiple-contact (dynamic) miscibility is a dynamic fluid-mixing process in which the injected gas exchanges components with in situ oil until the phases achieve a state of miscibility within the mixing zone of the flood front. In a vaporizing drive, light and intermediate components from the oil phase enter the gas phase. By contrast, in a condensing drive, intermediate components from the gas phase enter the oil phase. The process may be a combination of vaporizing and condensing drives (Oilfield Glossary, Multiple-Contact Miscibility 2013).

1.2.1 Minimum Miscibility Pressure (MMP)

Figure 6 shows a series of hypothetical slimtube experiments. In these experiments, the solvent displaces oil from the fully oil-saturated slimtube at several pressures. Oil recovery is shown after 1.2 pore volume (PV) of injection for each pressure. Oil recovery increases with pressure up to approximately 95 to 98% and then increases very little thereafter. The pressure at which the break in the recovery curve occurs is called the minimum miscibility pressure (MMP). If the displacements had been conducted at constant pressure and with increasing enrichment by components such as ethane, propane, and butane, the break would have been at the minimum miscibility enrichment (MME). Above the MMP or MME, the displacement is said to be multiple-contact or dynamically miscible. The increasing recovery with pressure or solvent enrichment results from in-situ mass transfer of components between solvent and resident oil. Each pressure increase produces an equilibrium mixture that becomes compositionally similar at the MMP or MME (Petrowiki, Miscible Flooding 2013).
It should be noted that a slimtube test cannot fully represent the performance in reservoir rock because it does not account for the effects of factors such as gravity segregation and reservoir heterogeneity on volumetric sweep (Petrowiki, Miscible Flooding 2013).

CO₂ flooding is applicable with medium-gravity oils. At temperatures less than approximately 125°F, MMP is estimated to be as low as 1200 psia. MMP increases with temperature. (Petrowiki, Designing a Miscible Flood 2013).

1.2.2 Effect of Numerical Dispersion on Miscible Gas Injection Simulation

Miscible gas injection is one of the most promising EOR techniques which was invented many years ago and since 1950s it has been implemented in many places around the world.

From a reservoir simulation standpoint, one of the main factors affecting recovery calculations by simulation of a miscible solvent injection is grid refinement. Numerical dispersion due to large grid block size, greatly affects oil/gas miscibility in reservoir simulation of 1D displacement. This, in consequence, results in reduction of local displacement efficiency. Therefore, refinement of grid cells can diminish the effect of numerical dispersion in reservoir simulations (Johns et al. 1992; Haajizadeh et al. 1999; Solano et al. 2001). However, different studies (Stalkup 1990; Lim et al. 1997; Haajizadeh et al. 2000) on the effect of numerical dispersion on 2D displacement efficiency for miscible gas flooding drew different conclusions about if very small grid blocks can diminish the error introduced by numerical dispersion in reservoir simulation of 2D displacement. It seems that the sensitivity of recovery to grid refinement for miscible flooding is a function of injection conditions and reservoir descriptions.
1.3 SENSOR Reservoir Simulator

SENSOR is a generalized 3D numerical reservoir simulation model for simulating compositional and black oil problems.

1.3.1 SENSOR Data File Structure

SENSOR data file consists of 3 main sections:

- Initial Data: The data file starts with TITLE/alphanumeric lines/ENDTITLE, followed by GRID Nx Ny Nz, and remaining Initial Data. The Initial Data ends with the keyword ENDINIT.

- Modification Data: The Modification Data, if present, start with the keyword MODIFY, following ENDINIT.

- Recurrent Data: Recurrent Data normally start with the keyword WELL, and end with the keyword END, which is the last keyword in the data file.

All the keywords in SENSOR data file are upper case. Apart from the PVT data, there are almost no differences in the data input for black oil and compositional problems (INITIAL data formats and specifications for injected gas composition differ). Comments may be included on any keyword or data line following an !. A comment line is one where the first character on the line is a “!” or “e”, followed by one or more blanks.

The general layout of SENSOR data file is shown in Appendix 1.

1.3.2 Analytical Relative Permeability and Capillary Pressure Curves in SENSOR

In research problems or in case of occurrence of large scatter and uncertainty in relative permeability data, analytical relative permeability (kr) and capillary pressure (pc) data are often used. Using analytical expressions makes it easy to change kr data for the purpose of sensitivity runs and history matching.

Endpoint saturations and curvature are the most important properties of kr curves. KRANALYTICAL keyword in SENSOR is used to represent these properties using the minimum number of variables.

To use the analytical kr data, the following variables should be entered:

- Swc: connate water saturation
- Sorw: residual oil saturation to water
- Sorog: residual oil saturation to gas
$S_{gc}$: critical gas saturation

$S_{gr}$: trapped gas saturation, optional, default=$S_{gc}$

$k_{rwo}$: relative permeability of water at $S_w=1-S_{orw}$ and $S_o=0$

$k_{rgo}$: relative permeability of gas at $S_w=S_{wc}$ and $S_o=S_{org}$

$k_{row}$: relative permeability of oil at $S_w=S_{wc}$ and $S_g=0$

$n_w$, $n_{orw}$, $n_g$, and $n_{og}$: exponents for analytical $k_r$

The relative permeabilities are calculated by SENSOR as

$$k_{rw} = k_{rwo}[(S_w - S_{wc}) / (1 - S_{orw} - S_{wc})]^{n_w}$$

(1.23)

$$k_{row} = k_{row}[(1 - S_{orw} - S_w) / (1 - S_{orw} - S_{wc})]^{n_{orw}}$$

(1.24)

$$k_{rog} = k_{rocw}[(1 - S_{org} - S_{wc} - S_g) / (1 - S_{org} - S_{we})]^{n_{og}}$$

(1.25)

$$k_{rg} = k_{rgro}[(S_g - S_{gc}) / (1 - S_{org} - S_{wc} - S_{gc})]^{n_g}$$

(1.26)

Analytical $p_c$ are calculated by SENSOR as

$$p_{cwo} = A_1 + A_2(1 - S_{wn})^{A_3}$$

(1.27)

$$p_{cwoi} = B_1 + B_2(1 - S_{wn})^{B_3} - B_4 S_{wn}^{B_5}$$

(1.28)

$$p_{cgo} = C_1 + C_2 S_{gn}^{C_3}$$

(1.29)

where

$p_{cwo}$: drainage water/oil $p_c$

$p_{cwoi}$: imbibition water/oil $p_c$

$p_{cgo}$: drainage gas/oil $p_c$

$$S_{wn} = (S_w - S_{wc}) / (1 - S_{wc})$$

(1.30)

$$S_{gn} = S_g / (1 - S_{wc})$$

(1.31)

$A_1$ to $A_3$, $B_1$ to $B_5$, and $C_1$ to $C_3$ are variables entered for PCWO, PCWOI, and PCGO keywords.
1.4 Well Productivity Index Calculations

Well index ($J$) can be calculated using the formulae (Eq. 1.32) presented by Peaceman (1983). Assume that the wellbore penetrates the center of a grid block in any direction, $X$, $Y$, or $Z$. The wellbore direction is labeled direction 3 and the directions in the plane perpendicular to the wellbore are labeled directions 1 and 2. Considering this convention, block permeability and dimensions in directions 1, 2, and 3 are $k_1$, $k_2$, and $k_3$ and $d_1$, $d_2$, and $d_3$, respectively. Peaceman’s formula for an anisotropic case ($k_1 \neq k_2$) is

$$J = 0.00708kd_3 / (\ln(r_0 / r_w) + s)$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.32)

where

$$k = \sqrt{k_1k_2}$$

$k$ and $d$ are in units of md and ft, and

$$r_0 = 0.28 [(k_2 / k_1)^{0.5} d_1^2 + (k_1 / k_2)^{0.5} d_2^2]^{0.5} / [(k_2 / k_1)^{0.25} + (k_1 / k_2)^{0.25}]$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.33)

For an isotropic case ($k_1 = k_2$), Eq. 1.33 is reduced to

$$r_0 = 0.14 (h_1^2 + h_2^2)^{0.5}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.34)
Chapter 2: Model Preparations

This chapter presents the methodology used for making the two fundamental components of the simulation model: PVT data and grid model. Furthermore, other components of the model such as well data (productivity index, perforations, well constraints, etc.) are also discussed in this chapter. The model was made based on the limited data available in open literature on Wilcox formation in the Gulf of Mexico to assure that it mimics an ultradeep, high pressure reservoir.

2.1 PVT Data

There are very limited publications on Wilcox formation in the Gulf of Mexico in open literature and, consequently, one of the major constraints on making the model for this study was lack of real data. Tables 1 and 2 summarize the only useful data available on Wilcox formation in open literature which were used as the basis for making the model.

Table 1-Wilcox formation properties found in open literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reservoir Property</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permeability, md</td>
<td>0.3-30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average porosity, %</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock type</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Wilcox formation consists of similar layers (subdivisions). Permeability of each layer is typically less than 10 md and it degrades from 30 md on the top to 0.3 md at the bottom. Overall average permeability is about 5 md.
An initial black oil PVT table was first made using the oil and gas correlations given in Section 1.1 and the available data in Table 2. The following paragraphs explain step by step how the initial black oil table was made.

To make the initial black oil table, pseudo-reduced pressure and temperature of the reservoir fluid were first estimated using the given reservoir temperature and pressure in Table 2 and Standing correlations (Eqs. 1.5 and 1.6).

Gas deviation factor (Z-factor) was then estimated at pressures between standard pressure and initial reservoir pressure inclusive using Dranchuk and Abou-Kassem correlation (Eq. 1.11). Having done that, gas density and gas formation factor at each pressure were calculated using Eqs. 1.12 and 1.14, respectively.

Having gas density calculated, Lee-Gonzalez correlation (Eq. 1.15) was used to estimate gas viscosity at each pressure.

Wilcox oil is a low-GOR oil. Therefore, solution gas/oil ratio at pressures less than bubblepoint pressure was obtained by linear interpolation between standard conditions solution gas/oil ratio (0 scf/STB) and bubblepoint solution gas/oil ratio (181.08 scf/STB).

Having Wilcox oil viscosity at initial reservoir pressure, oil viscosity at bubblepoint pressure was back-calculated using Beal correlation (Eq. 1.17). The same correlation was then used to estimate other oil viscosities for undersaturated oil. After that, dead-oil viscosity was back-calculated using the estimated bubblepoint oil viscosity in the previous step and Chew and Connally correlation (Eq. 1.18). The same equation was used to estimate other oil viscosities for saturated oil. $A_1$ and $A_2$ parameters in Eq. 1.18 were obtained from Standing correlations given in Eqs. 1.18a and 1.18b.
Oil compressibility for undersaturated oil was estimated from Petrosky and Farshad correlation (Eq. 1.19). The estimated undersaturated oil compressibilities were comparable to estimated values from Vasquez and Beggs correlation (Eq. 1.20).

For estimation of bubblepoint oil formation volume factor, Petrosky and Farshad correlation (Eq. 1.21) was used. Having done that, linear interpolation was done between standard conditions oil formation volume factor (1 RB/STB) and bubblepoint oil formation volume factor. Then, Eq. 1.22 was used to calculate oil formation volume factor at undersaturated pressures.

Table 3 gives the initial black oil PVT table estimated for Wilcox oil through the aforementioned procedure.

The black oil PVT data given in Table 3 can be representative of different reservoir fluid compositions and equation-of-states (EOS). Therefore, it is not possible to estimate a unique fluid composition and its corresponding EOS from the initial black oil PVT table. On the other hand, black oil PVT table can only be used in simulation of recovery mechanisms in which reservoir fluid composition is not altered while for simulation of miscible CO₂ injection we needed to make a compositional model. Therefore, it was decided to consider one of the fluid compositions and EOS which can generate the initial black oil PVT table as the reservoir fluid composition and EOS for the compositional model.
To estimate a fluid composition and EOS for the reservoir fluid consistent with the initial black oil PVT table, we tried to tune the fluid composition and EOS parameters given by Killough and Kossack (1987) in the fifth SPE comparative solution project. The fluid composition and EOS used in the project is given in Table 4.

### Table 3-Initial black oil PVT table estimated from oil and gas correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saturated Table</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P_{sat}$</td>
<td>$B_0$</td>
<td>$B_\xi$</td>
<td>$R_\xi$</td>
<td>$\mu_o$</td>
<td>$\mu_\xi$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(psia)</td>
<td>(RB/STB)</td>
<td>(RB/scf)</td>
<td>(scf/STB)</td>
<td>(cp)</td>
<td>(cp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1160.3000</td>
<td>1.1342</td>
<td>0.0028</td>
<td>181.0800</td>
<td>2.2191</td>
<td>0.0147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000.0000</td>
<td>1.1154</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
<td>155.7500</td>
<td>2.3591</td>
<td>0.0146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750.0000</td>
<td>1.0861</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>116.2300</td>
<td>2.6091</td>
<td>0.0143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500.0000</td>
<td>1.0568</td>
<td>0.0067</td>
<td>76.7100</td>
<td>2.9077</td>
<td>0.0141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.0000</td>
<td>1.0276</td>
<td>0.0133</td>
<td>37.1900</td>
<td>3.2706</td>
<td>0.0139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.7000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.2368</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>3.7312</td>
<td>0.0137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undersaturated Table</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$B_0$</td>
<td>$B_\xi$</td>
<td>$\mu_o$</td>
<td>$\mu_\xi$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(psia)</td>
<td>(RB/STB)</td>
<td>(RB/scf)</td>
<td>(cp)</td>
<td>(cp)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.13243</td>
<td>0.00156</td>
<td>2.34110</td>
<td>0.01560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>1.13036</td>
<td>0.00105</td>
<td>2.48640</td>
<td>0.01670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>1.1283</td>
<td>0.00082</td>
<td>2.63170</td>
<td>0.01760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>1.12524</td>
<td>0.00070</td>
<td>2.77700</td>
<td>0.01840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td>1.12419</td>
<td>0.00063</td>
<td>2.92230</td>
<td>0.01910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000</td>
<td>1.12214</td>
<td>0.00058</td>
<td>3.06750</td>
<td>0.01960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000</td>
<td>1.12009</td>
<td>0.00054</td>
<td>3.21280</td>
<td>0.02010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9000</td>
<td>1.11805</td>
<td>0.00052</td>
<td>3.35810</td>
<td>0.02050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000</td>
<td>1.11601</td>
<td>0.00049</td>
<td>3.50340</td>
<td>0.02080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11000</td>
<td>1.11397</td>
<td>0.00048</td>
<td>3.64870</td>
<td>0.02120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12000</td>
<td>1.11194</td>
<td>0.00046</td>
<td>3.79400</td>
<td>0.02150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13000</td>
<td>1.10991</td>
<td>0.00045</td>
<td>3.93930</td>
<td>0.02170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14000</td>
<td>1.10789</td>
<td>0.00044</td>
<td>4.08460</td>
<td>0.02200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15000</td>
<td>1.10587</td>
<td>0.00043</td>
<td>4.22990</td>
<td>0.02220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16000</td>
<td>1.10385</td>
<td>0.00042</td>
<td>4.37520</td>
<td>0.02240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17000</td>
<td>1.10183</td>
<td>0.00041</td>
<td>4.52050</td>
<td>0.02260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18000</td>
<td>1.09983</td>
<td>0.00041</td>
<td>4.66580</td>
<td>0.02280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19000</td>
<td>1.09782</td>
<td>0.00040</td>
<td>4.81110</td>
<td>0.02300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20000</td>
<td>1.09582</td>
<td>0.00039</td>
<td>4.95640</td>
<td>0.02310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20300</td>
<td>1.09522</td>
<td>0.00039</td>
<td>5.00000</td>
<td>0.02320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Wilcox oil is a low-GOR oil, the mole fraction of light components in the given fluid composition in Table 4 was decreased to be more consistent to that of Wilcox formation. Doing this, a reasonable match was obtained between Wilcox initial bubblepoint pressure (1160.3 psia) and our fluid initial bubblepoint pressure (1144.4 psia).

Volume shift for all the components were also added to the EOS given in Table 4 to match the resulting oil gravity to that of Wilcox oil (30.0 °API).

To get a match with Wilcox oil viscosity at initial reservoir pressure, critical Z-factors in the EOS in Table 4 were tuned. However, we did not manage to match the oil viscosities from the tuned EOS and those estimated in the initial black oil PVT table.

Table 5 gives the final fluid composition and EOS which was used for making the compositional model in this study.
Table 5 - Final reservoir fluid composition and equation-of-state used for the model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Mol%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁</td>
<td>28.07430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂</td>
<td>4.31550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₆</td>
<td>10.06960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁₀</td>
<td>28.77030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁₅</td>
<td>21.57770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂₀</td>
<td>7.19226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data file which generates this black oil table is presented in Appendix 2. This final black oil table which is consistent with fluid composition and EOS in Table 5, was used in the black oil runs of this study.

Table 6 presents the black oil PVT table which is generated from the fluid composition and EOS given in Table 5 using the BLACKOIL keyword in SENSOR. The data file which generates this black oil table is presented in Appendix 2. This final black oil table which is consistent with fluid composition and EOS in Table 5, was used in the black oil runs of this study.
Figures 3 to 7 illustrate the comparison between the initial and final black oil PVT table parameters. The parameters in the initial black oil PVT table were estimated using oil and gas correlations and the ones in the final black oil PVT table were obtained from the EOS and fluid composition presented in Table 5.
Figure 3 - Gas formation volume factor from the initial and final black oil PVT tables

Figure 4 - Oil formation volume factor from the initial and final black oil PVT tables: a reasonable match for initial bubblepoint pressure
Figure 5-Oil viscosity factor from the initial and final black oil PVT tables: a perfect match for oil viscosity at initial reservoir pressure

Figure 6-Solution gas/oil ratio from the initial and final black oil PVT tables
Another problem in making the model was constraint on the maximum possible number of grid cells (6000) in SENSOR. This could result in a very coarse-grid model which, in consequence, would possibly yield erroneous simulation results due to numerical dispersion. To reduce the effect of numerical dispersion, one-twentieths of the main cubic reservoir grid model was selected for the simulation study. To do this the reservoir area for the main cubic reservoir containing the same volume of oil as initially found in Wilcox formation was calculated using Eq. 2.1.

$$\text{OOIP} = Ahp \frac{(1-S_{wi})}{5.615 B_{oi}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.1)

in which $h$ is reservoir thickness in ft, $A$ is reservoir area in ft$^2$, $B_{oi}$ is in RB/STB, and original oil in place (OOIP) is in STB.

As shown below, using an average OOIP of 3000 MMSTB and an assumed initial average water saturation of 0.2 gave a reservoir area of $1.59667 \times 10^8$ ft$^2$.

$$A = \frac{3 \times 10^9 \times 1.0616}{0.17809 \times 140 \times 0.2 \times (1-0.2)} = 1.59667 \times 10^8 \text{ (ft}^2)$$

On the basis of symmetrical cubic reservoir and considering the fact that Wilcox formation consists of repetitive layers (see Table 1), a cubic section of the reservoir was selected as the...
final model for the simulation study. The selected section was then discretized to 24x24 uniform numerical grids in $XY$ plane and 10 nonuniform numerical grids in $Z$ direction. Table 7 gives the dimensions of the selected section and the corresponding grid blocks.

Table 7- Dimensions of the selected section of the cubic Wilcox reservoir model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Grid Block</th>
<th>Thickness, ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OOIP, STB</td>
<td>$3 \times 10^9 / 20 = 1.5 \times 10^8$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservoir thickness, ft</td>
<td>700/5 = 140</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservoir area, $ft^2$</td>
<td>$1.59667 \times 10^9 / 4 = 3.99166 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_X$</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_Y$</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_Z$</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$DX$, ft</td>
<td>263.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$DY$, ft</td>
<td>263.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>74.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8 also illustrates the final grid model the dimensions of which are given in Table 7. As shown in Table 7 and Fig. 8, the final grid model, which was used in this study, is a cubic model which is one-twentieth of the main cubic reservoir model in volume. It has an area equal to a quarter of the area of the main reservoir model and a thickness equal to one-fifth of the thickness of the main reservoir model.
As shown in Table 8, the 10 grid blocks in Z direction in the final grid model are grouped into three layers. The first layer from top is made up of the first three grid blocks, the second layer consists of the next four grid blocks, and the last three grid blocks make up the last layer at the bottom. Permeability in each layer is distributed in the constituting grid blocks in a manner that is consistent with permeability distribution in the individual layers and the overall average permeability in Wilcox formation as shown in Table 1.

The data used for model equilibration (initialization) are given in Table 9. Due to lack of data on Wilcox formation, some of these data (water properties, initial water saturation, and rock compressibility) were taken from available typical data in the literature. Also, a water depth of 2500 m SSTVD and a reservoir depth of 10,000 m SSTVD for the model were assumed. These values are within the ranges of those of Wilcox formation in the Gulf of Mexico.
Table 8 - Permeability distribution in the final grid model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>$k_x = k_y$, md</th>
<th>Thickness, ft</th>
<th>Grid Block</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall average permeability = $\frac{\sum k_i h_i}{\sum h_i} = 5$ md

$k_z = 0.1(k_x k_y)^{0.5}$

Table 9 - Data used for model initialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reservoir Grid and Saturation Input Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Datum (from sea floor), ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No gas/oil contact and water/oil contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial reservoir pressure, psia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial water saturation, %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porosity (at initial reservoir pressure), %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial saturation pressure, psia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density, lb/ft$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressibility, 1/psi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock pore volume compressibility, 1/psi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Relative Permeability and Capillary Pressure Curves

Due to lack of relative permeability data, we had to use analytical $k_r$ data. Table 10 gives the values used for analytical $k_r$ calculations.
Table 10- Variables used for analytical k_r calculations in the model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Used Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S_{WC}</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S_{ORW}</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S_{orw}</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S_{fg}</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k_{rwco}</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k_{rgco}</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k_{drow}</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n_{w}</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n_{orw}</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n_{g}</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n_{orw}</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 9 and 10 illustrate the calculated analytical relative permeability curves by SENSOR using the variables given in Table 10.

![Figure 9-Analytical oil/water relative permeability curves generated by SENSOR](image)

Figure 9-Analytical oil/water relative permeability curves generated by SENSOR
Zero capillary forces were assumed for the model under study.

2.4 Well Data

All layers were perforated in the producer(s) and injector(s) and the default well radius in SENSOR (0.25 ft) was considered for the wellbores. To be consistent with the typical bottomhole pressures in Wilcox formation in the Gulf of Mexico, a minimum bottomhole pressure of 8000 psia for producer(s) and a maximum injection pressure of 15000 psia for injector(s) were considered for the wells in the model. Very high production and injection rates were considered in the model to set the production and injection constraints on the minimum bottomhole pressure in producer(s) and maximum injection pressure in injector(s).

Well indexes (productivity index and injectivity index) in each layer was calculated using Peacemen’s formula.

Table 11 summarizes the well data used in the final model.
### Table 11-Well data in the final model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production Well Data</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Productivity Index (RB cp)/(d psi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perforations K=1-10 (all layers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radius, ft</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum bottomhole pressure, psia</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum production rate, STB</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^{10}$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection Well Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perforations K=1-10 (all layers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radius, ft</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum injection pressure, psia</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum injection rate, MMscf</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^{10}$</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3: Optimization Strategy

Through this study, we tried to demonstrate how optimization of well placement, inter-well spacing, and EOR startup time can maximize ultimate and incremental oil productions in an ultradeep, high pressure oil reservoir.

Ultimate oil recovery resulting from depletion of the ultradeep, high pressure oil reservoir in this study followed by miscible CO\textsubscript{2} injection is a function of numerous parameters which include but are not limited to injection pressure, BHP, number of wells, injection and production schemes, inter-well spacing, well placement (well location), CO\textsubscript{2} injection startup time, well completion, etc. Of these parameters, considering the objective of this study, number of wells, well placement, inter-well spacing, and CO\textsubscript{2} startup time were taken as variables. All other parameters in the model were set as explained in Chapter 2.

The optimization strategy employed in the study consists of two main steps:

1) Determining the maximum ultimate oil recovery ($R_{EOR}$) from pressure depletion of the reservoir followed by miscible CO\textsubscript{2} flooding by finding the optimum CO\textsubscript{2} injection startup time ($t_D$) and well spacing: This was done for different well patterns (2-spot, 3-spot, 4-spot, and 5-spot) to account for different well placements and number of wells. Therefore, the variables for each well pattern were only $t_D$ and well spacing. We assumed that 1000 STB of oil production was the economic criteria for end of simulation run ($t_{EOR}$) for each well pattern scenario.

2) Determining the maximum incremental oil recovery ($\Delta R$) for the optimum $t_D$ and well spacing defined in the previous step: To do this, first, ultimate oil recovery ($R_D$) from depletion of the reservoir was determined for the optimum well spacing and over $t_{EOR}$ defined in the previous step. Then, $\Delta R$ was determined using Eq. 3.1.

\[
\Delta R = R_{EOR} - R_D
\]  
(3.1)
Chapter 4: Results and Discussions

4.1 MMP Estimation for CO₂ Miscible Injection

In miscible gas injection, injection pressure should be sufficiently more than the MMP estimated for the reservoir fluid system and injected gas.

The estimated MMP by PhazeComp, which is an EOS-based program, for our reservoir fluid and CO₂ as the injectant was 2499 psia. The estimated MMP is much lower than the maximum injection pressure of 15000 psia set in the model and, thus, CO₂ injection was miscible throughout the EOR phase. However, we used the first-contact miscibility option in SENSOR by using the OIL keyword and setting p_sat equal to zero in the model to make sure that our displacement mechanism is fully miscible.

The PhazeComp data file used for MMP estimation is given in Appendix 3.

4.2 Well Spacing and $t_D$ Optimization for 2-Spot Well Pattern

In the 2-spot well pattern both wells produced for a while and one of the producers (well 2) was then converted to CO₂ injector till end of CO₂ injection, where economic limit of 1000 STB of oil production was approached.

Figure 11 shows the plan view of the final grid model. As clear from the figure, the 2-wells in the model can be placed in thousands of positions with respect to each other and each position results in a specific cumulative oil production at $t_{EOR}$ for a given $t_D$. To reduce the number of simulation runs in the simulation process, first, we did a sensitivity analysis on the effect of moving the wellbore positions from center of the model to the corners and boundaries of the model on cumulative oil production. To do this, cumulative oil production after 20 years of pressure depletion of the reservoir for different well spacings along AA’, BB’, and CC’ lines shown in Fig. 12 were compared. Similar comparison was done for different well spacings along DD’, EE’, FF’, and GG’ lines shown in Fig. 13.
Figure 14 shows cumulative oil productions after 20 years of pressure depletion of the reservoir for all possible well spacings along AA’, BB’, and CC’ lines. As clear from the figure, maximum cumulative oil production was observed along AA’ line where producer 1 was on \( i=6 \) and producer 2 was located on \( i=18 \). Furthermore, the maximum cumulative oil production decreased as we moved the wells from AA’ line to BB’ line and from BB’ line to CC’ line. In other terms, as we moved the wells from the center of the model to the boundaries of the model, maximum cumulative oil production decreased. The same behavior was observed in pressure depletion of the reservoir followed by CO\(_2\) miscible injection.

Figure 15 illustrates cumulative oil productions after 20 years of pressure depletion of the reservoir for all possible well spacings along DD’, EE’, FF’, and GG’ lines. We observed the maximum cumulative oil production along DD’ line where producer 1 was on \( i=8 \) and producer 2 was located on \( i=17 \). Furthermore, the maximum cumulative oil production decreased as we moved the wells from DD’ line to EE’ line, from EE’ line to FF’ line, and from FF’ line to GG’ line. In other terms, as we moved the wells from the center of the model to the corners of the model, maximum cumulative oil production decreased. The same behavior was observed in pressure depletion of the reservoir followed by CO\(_2\) miscible injection.

Based on the observations made in the sensitivity analysis (Figs. 14 and 15), to reduce the number of simulation runs in the optimization process, we went through the two steps of the optimization process, explained in Chapter 3, along AA’ and DD’ lines. The optimization
process for the 2-spot well pattern along AA’ and DD’ lines consisting of 1663 simulation runs found the optimum \( t_D \) and well spacing along DD’ given in Table 12.

**Table 12-Optimum well locations and EOR startup time for 2-spot well pattern**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well 1 ( (9, 16) )</th>
<th>Well 2 ( (16, 9) )</th>
<th>Optimum ( t_D ), years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12-Moving well positions to the boundaries of the model
Figure 13-Moving well positions to the corners of the model

Figure 14-Cumulative oil productions after 20 years of pressure depletion for different 2-spot well spacings along AA', BB', and CC' lines
Well 2 was converted to an injector after 5.2 years of production and CO₂ injection continued up to 63.84 years ($t_{EOR}$) where the economic limit of 1000 STB of oil production was reached. This optimum $t_D$ and well spacing gave a maximum cumulative oil recovery of 44.876 MMSTB which is equivalent to an oil recovery of 29.9% over $t_{EOR}$.

**Figure 16** compares the oil recovery from the optimum $t_D$ (5.2 years) and well spacing with those from the same well spacing but later CO₂ injection startup times.
Figure 16-Comparison between recoveries from optimum $t_D$ and those from other $t_D$s over $t_{EOR}$ for a 2-spot well pattern

According to Fig. 17 higher oil production rate is maintained for a longer time in the case of the optimum $t_D$ which in consequence results in maximized cumulative oil production over $t_{EOR}$.
Figs. 18, 19, and 20 demonstrate pressure distribution at optimum \( t_D \) in grid blocks 1, 2, and 3 of layer 1, respectively. It is clear from these figures that no high pressure isolation region was left after pressure depletion of these layers regardless of the permeability of these layers. Similar uniform pressure distribution was observed in all grid blocks of the other 2 layers in the model regardless of their permeability (see Table 8).
Figure 18 - Uniform pressure distribution in grid block 1 of layer 1 with k=30 md at optimum t_D and for optimum well spacing.

Figure 19 - Uniform pressure distribution in grid block 2 of layer 1 with k=19 md at optimum t_D and for optimum well spacing.
4.3 Well Spacing and $t_D$ Optimization for 3-Spot Well Pattern

In the 3-spot well pattern analysis, producer 2 which was converted to an injector at $t_D$ was placed on grid cell (13,12) throughout the simulation run and the other two wells were relocated through optimization process to find the optimum well spacing and $t_D$.

Similar sensitivity analysis that we did for the 2-spot well pattern was performed for the 3-spot well pattern to reduce the number of simulation runs and the same conclusions were drawn. That is, while keeping producer 2 at grid number (13,12), moving producer 1 and 3 from the center of the model to the boundaries and corners of the model resulted in decrease in cumulative oil production. Therefore, like the 2-spot well pattern, we conducted the optimization process along AA’ and DD’ lines consisting of 1099 simulation runs. The found optimum $t_D$ and well spacing, which was along AA’, are given in Table 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optimum Well Locations ($I, J$)</th>
<th>Optimum $t_D$, years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well 1 (2,12)</td>
<td>Well 2 (13,12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Well 2 was converted to CO$_2$ I injector after 3.15 years of production and CO$_2$ injection continued up to 59.31 years ($t_{EOR}$) where the economic limit of 1000 STB of oil production was reached. This optimum $t_D$ and well spacing gave a maximum cumulative oil recovery of 57.443 MMSTB which is equivalent to an oil recovery of 38.29% over $t_{EOR}$.  

41
Figure 21 compares the oil recovery from the optimum $t_D$ (3.15 years) and well spacing with those from the same well spacing but later CO$_2$ injection startup times.

Figure 21-Comparison between recoveries from optimum $t_D$ and those from other $t_D$s over $t_{EOR}$ for a 3-spot well pattern

Figure 22-Effect of EOR startup time on oil production rate and oil recovery
As shown in Fig. 22, higher oil production rate is maintained for a longer time in the case of the optimum $t_D$ which in consequence results in maximized cumulative oil production over $t_{EOR}$.

Similar to the case of optimum 2-spot well pattern, for the case of optimum 3-spot well pattern, uniform pressure distribution was observed at $t_D$ in all grid blocks of the 3 layers in the model regardless of their permeability. This is shown for the 3 grid blocks of layer 1 in Figs. 23, 24, and 25.

![Pressure Distribution Map (K=1)](image)

*Figure 23-Uniform pressure distribution in grid block 1 of layer 1 with $k=30$ md at optimum $t_D$ and for optimum well spacing*
4.4 Well Spacing and $t_D$ Optimization for 4-Spot Well Pattern

In the 4-spot well pattern, 3 wells (wells 1, 3, and 4) were located on the 3 vertices of a triangle and the 4th well (well 2) was placed at the center of the triangle. Well 2 was permanently positioned at the center of the triangle while the other 3 well on the vertices of
the triangle were moved uniformly away from well 2 through the optimization process to find the optimum well spacing for the 4-spot well pattern. Sensitivity to $t_D$ was also done for each 4-spot well pattern to find the optimum $t_D$.

Before the optimization process, similar sensitivity analysis to that in the case of 2-spot and 3-spot well patterns was done to investigate the effect of moving the wells in the model to the boundaries and corners of the model on cumulative oil production. To do this, well 2 at the center of the 4-spot well pattern was moved along AA', CC', DD', and EE' lines (Fig. 26) and the cumulative oil production for a 20-year pressure depletion for all the possible 4-spot well patterns along these lines were obtained and compared (Fig. 27).

![Figure 26: Moving well positions to the boundaries and corners of the model](image)

As shown in Fig. 27, moving the wells to the boundaries and corners of the reservoir resulted in reduction in cumulative oil production. The same behavior was observed for the case of pressure depletion of the reservoir followed by miscible CO$_2$ injection.
Based on the results of the sensitivity analysis, optimization process was performed for all possible 4-spot well patterns along AA', BB', and CC' lines. Table 14 gives the optimum well spacing and $t_D$ found in optimization of the 4-spot well pattern consisting of 525 simulation runs. These optimum parameters gave maximum cumulative oil production of 62.045 MMSTB over $t_{EOR}$ of 54.11 years which is equivalent to an oil recovery of 41.36%.

**Table 14- Optimum well locations and EOR startup time for 4-spot well pattern**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optimum Well Locations $(i,j)$</th>
<th>Optimum $t_D$, years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well 1: (5,5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well 2: (13,13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well 3: (21,5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well 4: (13,22)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 28** compares the oil recovery from the optimum $t_D$ (2 years) and well spacing with those from the same well spacing but later CO$_2$ injection startup times.

Similar to 2-spot and 3 spot well pattern scenarios, as shown in **Fig. 29**, for the 4-spot well pattern, higher oil production rate is maintained for a longer time in the case of the optimum $t_D$ which in consequence results in maximized cumulative oil production over $t_{EOR}$. 

---

*Figure 27-Cumulative oil production after 20 years of pressure depletion for different 4-spot well spacings along AA', CC', DD', and EE' lines*
Figure 28- Comparison between recoveries from optimum $t_D$ and those from other $t_D$'s over $t_{EOR}$ for a 4-spot well pattern

Figure 29- Effect of EOR startup time on oil production rate and oil recovery

Unlike the case of optimum 2-spot and 3-spot well patterns, for the case of optimum 4-spot well pattern, we observed non-uniform pressure distribution in the grid blocks of all the 3
layers in the model regardless of their permeability. This is shown for the 3 grid blocks of layer 1 in Figs. 30, 31, and 32. The non-uniform pressure distribution in all layers resulted in a pressure range of about 12700 to 13800 psia in the model. However, this pressure range was below the injection pressure of 15000 psia in the model and, hence, no problem in wellbore injectivity was observed at $t_D$.

Figure 30- Non-uniform pressure distribution in grid block 1 of layer 1 with $k=30$ md at optimum $t_D$ and for optimum well spacing

Figure 31- Non-uniform pressure distribution in grid block 2 of layer 1 with $k=19$ md at optimum $t_D$ and for optimum well spacing
4.5 Well Spacing and $t_D$ Optimization for 5-Spot Well Pattern

In the 5-spot well pattern, 4 wells (wells 1, 3, 4, and 5) were located on the 4 vertices of a square and the 5<sup>th</sup> well (well 2) was placed at the center of the square. Well 2 was permanently positioned at the center of the square while the other 4 well on the vertices of the square were moved uniformly away from well 2 through the optimization process to find the optimum well spacing for the 5-spot well pattern. Sensitivity to $t_D$ was also done for each 5-spot well pattern to find the optimum $t_D$.

To reduce the number of simulation runs, a sensitivity analysis was done similar to those done for the other well patterns studied earlier. The analysis was done to investigate the effect of moving the wells in the model to the boundaries and corners of the model on cumulative oil production. The sensitivity was done for all possible 5-spot well patterns along AA’, BB’, CC’, and DD’ lines shown in Fig. 33. Well 2 at the center of the 5-spot well patterns was moved along these lines and cumulative oil production for 20 years of pressure depletion for all the possible 5-spot patterns along these lines were compared (Fig. 34).

The sensitivity analysis showed that as wells in the 5-spot well pattern get closer to the boundaries and corners of the model, cumulative production decreases. Similar results to the ones shown in Fig. 34 were observed for the case of pressure depletion followed by miscible CO<sub>2</sub> flooding. Based on this conclusion, the optimization process was done only along AA’, BB’, and CC’ lines.
Figure 33- Moving well positions to the boundaries and corners of the model

Figure 34- Cumulative oil production after 20 years of pressure depletion for different 5-spot well spacings along AA, BB, CC, and DD lines
Table 15 gives the optimum well spacing and $t_D$ found in optimization of the 5-spot well pattern consisting of 341 simulation runs. These optimum parameters gave maximum cumulative oil production of 65.963 MMSTB over $t_{EOR}$ of 48.76 years which is equivalent to an oil recovery of 43.96%.

Table 15-Optimum well locations and EOR startup time for 5-spot well pattern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optimum Well Locations (L,J)</th>
<th>Optimum $t_D$, years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well 1 (5,4)</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well 2 (13,12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well 3 (21,4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well 4 (21,20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well 5 (5,20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 35 compares the oil recovery from the optimum $t_D$ (1.64 years) and well spacing with those from the same well spacing but later CO$_2$ injection startup times.

Similar to other well patterns studied earlier, as shown in Fig. 36, for the 5-spot well pattern, higher oil production rate is maintained for a longer time in the case of the optimum $t_D$ which in consequence results in maximized cumulative oil production over $t_{EOR}$.
Like the case of optimum 4-spot well pattern, for the 5-spot well pattern, we observed non-uniform pressure distribution in the grid blocks of all the 3 layers in the model regardless of their permeability. This is shown for the 3 grid blocks of layer 1 in Figs. 37, 38, and 39. The non-uniform pressure distribution shows a pressure range of 10900 to 12900 psia in the model. However, this pressure range is below the injection pressure of 15000 psia in the model and, hence, no problem in wellbore injectivity was observed at $t_D$. 

*Figure 36- Effect of EOR startup time on oil production rate and oil recovery*
Figure 37-Non-uniform pressure distribution in grid block 1 of layer 1 with \( k=30 \) md at optimum \( t_D \) and for optimum well spacing.

Figure 38-Non-uniform pressure distribution in grid block 2 of layer 1 with \( k=19 \) md at optimum \( t_D \) and for optimum well spacing.
4.6 Effect of Optimized Well Pattern on Cumulative Oil Production and Incremental Oil Recovery

In Sections 4.2 to 4.5, the effect of optimized well spacing and $t_D$ for different well patterns was discussed. However, no comparison was done for the effect of optimized well patterns on the cumulative oil production and incremental oil recovery.

Table 16 gives a comparison between the optimization results of different well patterns studied earlier.

Table 16-Comparison of the optimization results for different well patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well Pattern</th>
<th>$t_{opt}$ years</th>
<th>Optimum $t_D$ years</th>
<th>Maximum Cumulative Oil Production, MMSTB</th>
<th>Maximum Oil Recovery, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-spot</td>
<td>59.31</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>57.443</td>
<td>38.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-spot</td>
<td>54.11</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>62.245</td>
<td>41.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-spot</td>
<td>48.76</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>65.963</td>
<td>43.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 40 to 42 compare the effect of each of the discussed optimized well patterns in terms of well spacing and $t_D$ on cumulative oil production and incremental oil recovery for pressure depletion of the reservoir followed by miscible CO$_2$ injection.
According to Figs. 40 to 42, both cumulative oil production and incremental oil recovery increased with increasing the number of wells in an optimum way.

*Figure 40- Effect of optimized well pattern on cumulative oil production*

*Figure 41- Effect of optimized well pattern on oil recovery*
Figure 42-Effect of optimized well pattern (number of wells) on incremental oil recovery
Chapter 5: Conclusions

A compositional model was made up in this study with the help of limited data available for Wilcox formation in the Gulf of Mexico to represent an ultradeep, high pressure reservoir. The model was then used to investigate the effect of number of wells, EOR startup time, well spacing, and well placement on the incremental and cumulative oil recovery of depletion of the reservoir followed by miscible CO$_2$ injection. Hundreds and sometimes thousands of simulation runs were done to find the optimum well spacing and CO$_2$ injection startup time for each well pattern representing a specified well placement and number of wells. On the basis of the results and discussions made in Chapter 4, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Miscible CO$_2$ injection strategy could result in considerable incremental oil recovery in the ultradeep, high pressure reservoir under study.

2. Both incremental oil recovery and cumulative oil recovery were increased with number of wells on the model.

3. No pressure isolation region was left after primary depletion of the reservoir in any of the well pattern scenarios and, hence, no problem with injectivity was observed in all scenarios. This was most probably due to the fact that the reservoir was neither stratigraphically nor structurally compartmentalized in the model.

4. The higher the number of wells, the earlier the optimized startup time. Therefore, the optimized EOR startup time is dependent on the well pattern.

5. Sensitivity analysis for well positions with respect to the boundaries and corners of the model was done before optimization process and it considerably reduced the number of simulation runs in the optimization process.

6. The optimum location on the model for the injector (well 2) at the center of the 4-spot and 5-spot well patterns is the center of the model.
Chapter 6: Recommendations for Future Research

The following recommendations can be made based on the results discussed in Chapter 4 and conclusions made in the previous chapter. Some of these recommendations can be used to conduct further research in the field of ultradeep, high pressure reservoirs.

1. Although miscible CO$_2$ flooding resulted in considerable incremental oil recovery, this EOR strategy should be evaluated economically and its feasibility should be studied in terms of CO$_2$ availability.

2. The optimization process in this study did not consider any economic evaluation. In other terms, the optimization process was conducted only from physical ultimate recovery perspective. Optimization can also be done to maximize economic ultimate recovery to take into account the economic aspects of field development.

3. Other EOR strategy such as water flooding and miscible natural gas injection should be studied and the results should be compared with those of miscible CO$_2$ flooding.

4. We did not consider any aquifer in the model. The effect of an aquifer on the optimized variables can be studied.

5. No reservoir compartmentalization was considered in the model. To see the effect of reservoir compartmentalization on pressure distribution just before EOR startup, the model should be compartmentalized structurally or stratigraphically.
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Appendix 1 - SENSOR Data File Structure

C **START OF INITIAL DATA**
TITLE
   . . . any number of 132-column alphanumeric lines . . .
ENDTITLE
GRID N_x, N_y, N_z
C   default solver is RBILU(0)
C   default formulation is IMPES
D4   ! if the direct-solution D4 solver is to be used
NF   ! if the Nested Factorization solver is to be used
IMPLICIT   ! if the fully implicit formulation is to be used
MISC . . . 6 numbers . . .   ! water properties, pref
PVTEOS   ! if this is a compositional problem
   . . . EOS data . . .
PVTBO   ! if this is a back oil problem
   . . . black oil PVT table . . .
SWT n (SGT n)
   . . . tables giving k, and p, vs. saturation . . .
COMPACTABLE   ! if compaction is used for rock compressibility
   . . . compaction tables . . .
DEPTH   VALUE or CON or ZVAR or . . . etc.
   . . . array data . . .
THICKNESS   VALUE or . . .
   . . . array data . . .
KX (and/or TX)   VALUE or . . .
   . . . array data . . .
KY (and/or TY)   VALUE or . . .
   . . . array data . . .
KY (and/or TY)   VALUE or . . .
   . . . array data . . .
POROS (and/or PV)   VALUE or . . .
   . . . array data . . .
SEP   ! surface separator data if a compositional problem
   . . . data . . .
INITIAL
   . . . data specifying initial P, WOC, GOC, etc. . . .
ENDINIT   ! end of Initial Data
C **MODIFICATION DATA START HERE**
MODIFY PV   ! optional, to modify pore volumes
   . . . data . . .
MODIFY TX   ! optional, to modify transmissibility T_x
   . . . data . . .
   . . . other optional additional MODIFY data . . .
C **RECURRENT DATA START HERE**
C WELL data must precede other well data
WELL
   . . . well locations and perforations data . . .
C Remaining data here are order independent
C Except for chronological order of TIME and data changes

WELTYPE
. . . defines wells as producers or injectors, and defines units . . .
LIMITWELL ! optional
. . . economic limit data for wells . . .
BHP ! for wells not using Tubing Head Pressure (THP) tables
. . . minimum flowing Bottomhole Pressure (BHP) wells . . .
THP ! for wells using THP tables
. . . minimum wellhead pressures for THP wells . . .
THPTABLE ! needed only if there are THP wells
. . . tubinghead pressure tables for THP wells . . .
RATE
. . . well rate data . . .
WELLPLAT ! if any platforms are to be used
. . . assign wells to platforms . . .
. . . other platform keywords/data . . .
LIMITFIELD . . . 5 numbers . . . ! optional field economic limit data
TIME t1 ! proceed to time = t1
TIME t1 dtime ! optional, in place of previous line,
C proceed to time t1, with printout every dtime days
WELL ! optional, to add new wells or change perforations of old ones
. . . data . . .
RATE ! optional, to change well rates (default rates are shut in, with no recirculation
. . . data . . .
TIME t2 ! proceed to time = t2
. . . WELL, RATE, etc. data changes . . .
TIME t3 . . . etc . . . data changes . . . time entries . . .
. . .
TIME tlast
END **END OF DATA FILE**
Appendix 2 – From Compositional to Black Oil

TITLE
Compositional to Black Oil
ENDTITLE
GRID 24 24 10
CPU
MISC 1.0 3.OE-6 62.4 0.7 1.0E-6 5000
KRL ANALYTICAL
0.2 0.2 0.0 0.0
1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0
2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0
DELY CON
24*267.38
DELY CON
24*267.38
THICKNESS ZVAR
3*6.82 4*7.535 3*29.8
POROS CON
0.2
DELY CON
24606
KX ZVAR
3*20.40 4*6.12 3*1.10
KY EQUALS KX
KZ EQUALS KX
MOD
1 24 1 24 1 10 * 0.1
BLACKOIL 1 15 31 EXTEND
PRESSURES 14.7 250 500 750 1000 1160.30 1500 2000 2250 2500 2750 2800 3000 4000 5000 6000
7000 8000 9000 10000 11000 12000 13000 14000 15000 16000 17000 18000 19000 20000 20300
RESERVOIR FLUID
0.000000 0.000000 0.280743 0.043155 0.100696 0.287703 0.215777 0.071926
INJECTION GAS
1 0 0 0 0 0 0
ENDBLACKOIL
PVTEOS
200
CPT  PC  TC  MW  AC  ZCRIT  SHIFT  OMEGA  OMEGB  PCHOR
CO2 1069.51 547.42 44.010 0.2250 0.27433 0.00189 0.45724 0.0778 80.0
N2 491.680 227.29 28.000 0.0400 0.29178 -0.16453 0.45724 0.0778 59.1
C1 667.800 343.00 16.040 0.0130 0.29345 -0.15193 0.45724 0.0778 71.0
C3 616.300 665.70 44.100 0.1524 0.27630 -0.06428 0.45724 0.0778 151.0
C6 436.900 913.90 86.180 0.3007 0.25862 0.09681 0.45724 0.0778 241.8
C10 304.000 1111.80 142.290 0.4885 0.23435 0.20911 0.45724 0.0788 376.5
C15 200.000 1270.00 206.000 0.6500 0.19872 0.40916 0.45724 0.0778 529.4
C20 162.0000 1380.0000 282.0000 .8500000 0.20143 0.40155 0.4572400 .0788 711.80
BIN
-0.02000 0.10000 0.13500 0.10000 0.10000 0.10000 0.10000 0.10000 0.10000 0.03600 0.08000 0.10020 0.10000 0.10000 0.10000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.05000 0.05000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000

PSM
INITIAL
DEPTH PSATBP
24606 1160.3
PINIT 20300
ZINIT 24606
ENDINIT
WELL
I J K PI
WELL1
17 8 1 0.413
17 8 2 0.413
17 8 3 0.413
17 8 4 0.137
17 8 5 0.137
17 8 6 0.137
17 8 7 0.137
17 8 8 0.097
17 8 9 0.097
17 8 10 0.097
WELL2
8 17 1 0.413
8 17 2 0.413
8 17 3 0.413
8 17 4 0.137
8 17 5 0.137
8 17 6 0.137
8 17 7 0.137
8 17 8 0.097
8 17 9 0.097
8 17 10 0.097
WELLTYPE
WELL1 STBOIL
WELL2 MCFINJ
INJGAS
WELL2
1 0 0 0 0 0 0
BHP
WELL1 5000
WELL2 15000
RATE
WELL1  1.E10
WELL2  1.E10
TIME 7300 100
END
Appendix 3 – PhazeComp Data File for MMP Estimation

TITLE "MMP Calculations"

TEST1 ON
TEST2 ON

CHAR
EOS PR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>MW</th>
<th>Tc(R)</th>
<th>Pc(psi)</th>
<th>AF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>44.01</td>
<td>547.420</td>
<td>1069.51</td>
<td>0.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>227.290</td>
<td>491.68</td>
<td>0.0400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>16.040</td>
<td>343.000</td>
<td>667.80</td>
<td>0.0130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>44.100</td>
<td>665.700</td>
<td>616.30</td>
<td>0.1524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>86.180</td>
<td>913.400</td>
<td>436.90</td>
<td>0.3007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>142.29</td>
<td>1111.80</td>
<td>304.00</td>
<td>0.4885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>206.00</td>
<td>1270.00</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>0.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C20</td>
<td>282.00</td>
<td>1380.00</td>
<td>162.00</td>
<td>0.8500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Binaries</th>
<th>CO2</th>
<th>N2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C6</th>
<th>C10</th>
<th>C15</th>
<th>C20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.1002</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END

MIX OIL 0.0 0.0 0.280743 0.043155 0.100696 0.287703 0.215777 0.071926
MIX INJE 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
MIX FEED OIL 1 MOLE
TEMP 200 F
PRESS 0 PSIA
MIX FEED OIL 1 MOLE
TEMP 200 F
PRES PSIA
PSAT
MMP STAGES 500
EOF
Appendix 4 – Submitted Paper Based on the Thesis Work

A paper was submitted to the 19th Middles East Oil & Gas Show Conference and is still pending for approval by the review committee. The same paper will be submitted to similar EAGE and SPE events.

Effect of Well Spacing and Well Placement Optimization On Ultimate and Incremental Oil Recoveries In An Ultradeep, High Pressure Oil Reservoir: A Simulation Study

Author Block: A. Hossein Zadeh, Norwegian University of Science and Technology; J. Kloppe, Norwegian University of Science & Tech; M. Ghasemi, C. Whithson, Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Abstract:
Exploitation of ultradeep, high pressure oil reservoirs is always associated with numerous risks and challenges. One of the most pronounced constraints in development of such fields is the number of wells, which is imposed by massively high cost of drilling. Low number of wells may lead to high pressure isolation regions left after primary production of the reservoir. Ultradeep reservoirs with high pressure are more prone to such leftover high pressure isolation regions due to their low permeable characteristics. Those regions can, subsequently, deteriorate the efficiency of EOR as the injected fluid cannot access the residual oil in these regions. Therefore, well placement and inter-well spacing optimizations is of greater importance in ultradeep, high pressure oil reservoirs to ensure higher ultimate oil recovery at lower costs. Furthermore, due to high cost of development of these reservoirs, the EOR strategy and commencement time for the selected EOR strategy are very critical. This paper demonstrates how optimization of well placement, inter-well spacing, and startup time for miscible gas flooding can enhance the incremental and ultimate oil recoveries in an ultradeep, high pressure oil reservoir. To do this, a synthetic grid model was made to run different simulation scenarios on it. The model was initialized with rock and fluid properties within the range of those in the ultradeep, high pressure Wilcox formation in the Gulf of Mexico to ensure that it mimics an ultradeep, high pressure oil reservoir. The results show that the proposed optimization process for the selected EOR strategy is very beneficial and can improve the incremental recovery in an ultradeep, high pressure oil reservoir. Similar optimization approaches to the one proposed in this paper can be used while studying other EOR strategies for an ultradeep, high pressure reservoir to acquire maximum recovery at a lower cost.