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Abstract

The choice of EOR techniques should be based on knowledge of prior efforts in similar settings. The Minnelusa Formation of Wyoming offers such an opportunity. The formation is a prolific producer with over 607 million barrels of oil cumulative to date from approximately 100 Minnelusa fields located in the Powder River basin. These fields are relatively small, eolian sandstone deposits with similar porosity and permeability, but have a wide range of production by field. About half of these fields have been subjected to some form of enhanced oil recovery, primarily with polymer floods. While some of these fields followed the traditional EOR sequence of primary, secondary and tertiary treatment, there were many cases where application of polymer was coincident with start of waterflooding. An evaluation of the effectiveness of all phases of recovery was performed using production data. The metric used was the incremental production after treatment where incremental was limited to that oil produced in addition to normal production activities. This metric provides the basis for estimating potential income to pay for the treatment. Almost all cases of water or chemical flooding produced positive results in terms of increased oil production.

Based on the incremental production metric, in-field drilling produced 50% incremental production, standard waterflooding, also positive for most cases, reached a maximum of 300% incremental production. Traditional post-waterflood application of polymer also showed mostly positive results with the best response generating more than 400% incremental production. However, application of polymer concurrent with the start of waterflooding produced the best results with incremental production as high as 1500%. These high values are partially related to low primary production potential, but other factors also play a role. The much larger range in chemical flood response was not strongly related to geological factors. Specific factors such as net pay, size and age of the field, ndepth/temperature, number of wells, cumulative production, oil gravity and formation water chemistry played some role in controlling the degree of success, but the most important variable was how soon the polymer was applied after field production was started. Application of chemical treatment in the first five years of the field produced significantly better results.
Selected References


Shier, D.E., 1986, (author) Classification of oil traps and effective mapping; Upper Minnelusa Formation: Rocky Mountain Section SEPM, 1 volume, irregular pagination.

Evaluation of Chemical Flooding in the Minnelusa Formation, Powder River Basin, Wyoming

Geoffrey Thyne, Vladimir Alvarado and Glen Murrell
Enhanced Oil Recovery Institute
University of Wyoming
Acknowledgements

Contributions to this work by the EORI staff
Eolian Deposition - Jim Steidtmann
Maps - Brian Reyes
Strat and Photomicrographs – Pegui Yin
Minnelusa fields are found in Powder River Basin. Isolated units along former shoreline.
Minnelusa is Penn.-Permian in age
Equivalent to Tensleep (eolian system)

Minnelusa Stratigraphy

Minnelusa is a eolian dune system with inter-bedded dolomite layers

Markert and Al-Shaieb 1984
James 1989
Reservoirs

Generally small (<15 wells) with under 10 MMBO OOIP

Minnelusa trapping is generally stratigraphic in nature

Pinch out into Opeche Shale

Johnson 1985
Lithology and sedimentary structures

Minnelusa is fine to very fine grained
Moderately to well-sorted
70% detrital, 23% cements
Quartz Arenite
Anhydrite and Dolomite cements

Shier, 1986

Johnson 1985

Cross-bedded sandstone
Dolomitic sandstone
Sandy dolostone
Dolostone

Industry standard
Anhydrite and Dolomite cements control porosity (inverse relationship)

Anhydrite Dissolution

Johnson 1985
Why the Minnelusa?

- Total production to date over 607 MMBO
- 100+ operational fields with only Minnelusa production
- Geologically “uniform” and relatively simple
- About 30 fields have been treated with some form of chemical flooding, mostly polymer
- Provides basis to develop screening criteria
Production Analysis

- OOIP from volumetric calculation
- Assume exponential declines to calc. EUR
- Transitional phase assigned to successive phase production
- Each phase recovery factor calculated as %OOIP
OOIP vs. Recovery Factor

Triangles are chemical floods, squares are water flood only
Recovery Factor and Flooding Volumes
Normalize flooding history
EUR = estimated ultimate recovery

Triangles are chemical floods, squares are water flood only
Production Analysis
Each phase expressed as Recovery Factor (% OOIP)
Histogram of RF 2008

Normal

Mean 44.96
StDev 13.52
N 63

Distribution of Secondary and Tertiary Recovery Factors
Distribution of WF and Chem. Flood Recovery Factor
Parameters Evaluated to Explain Range of Recovery Factors

Number of Wells, Permeability, Porosity, Reservoir Salinity, Well Spacing, Pore Volumes Flooded, Oil Saturation, Duration of Flooding, Oil Density (API), Depth, Time between Discovery and EOR
Petrophysical and Production Controls

Triangles are chemical floods, squares are water flood only.
Regional Porosity Trend

Reyes 2009

Legend
- County
- Basin
- Lineament
- Inferred Lineament

Minnelusa Porosity
- 0.09 - 0.13
- 0.14 - 0.16
- 0.17 - 0.18
- 0.19 - 0.21
- 0.22 - 0.27

Recovery Factor at EUR (% OOIP)

Triangles are chemical floods, squares are water flood only
Regional Water Salinity Trend

Triangles are chemical floods, squares are water flood only.
Regional API Trend

Triangles are chemical floods, squares are water flood only.
How Soon EOR Started

Triangles are chemical floods, squares are water flood only
CONCLUSIONS

- Chemical flooding improves recovery by an average of 9% OOIP compared to waterflooding.
- Chemical flooding produces more oil sooner.
- The sooner you start EOR the more you get.
- Further work will focus on determining if completion interval, work over history, etc. are important factors for increased recovery.