TECHNICAL OIL RECOVERY POTENTIAL FROM RESIDUAL OIL ZONES: BIG HORN BASIN

Prepared for
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Fossil Energy - Office of Oil and Natural Gas

Prepared by
Advanced Resources International

February 2006
Disclaimer

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Department of Energy, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility of the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Department of Energy.
TECHNICAL OIL RECOVERY POTENTIAL FROM
RESIDUAL OIL ZONES: BIG HORN BASIN

Prepared for
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Fossil Energy
Office of Oil and Natural Gas

Prepared By
George J. Koperna
Vello A. Kuuskraa
Advanced Resources International
4501 Fairfax Drive, Suite 910
Arlington, VA 22203 USA

February 2006
TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION
II IDENTIFYING AND EVALUATING OIL FIELDS WITH ROZ RESOURCES
III. ESTIMATING TECHNICALLY RECOVERABLE ROZ RESOURCES
IV RESULTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Large Big Horn Basin (Tensleep) Oil Reservoirs with Potential for ROZ Resources
Table 2. Comparison of Compositional Model Simulation and CO2-PROPHET Model Simulation
Table 3. Results from Two ROZ Completion Schemes (Partial and Full)
Table 4. Comparison of Separate vs. Simultaneous MPZ and TZ/ROZ CO2-EOR Flooding: Sample Oil Reservoir
Table 5. Estimates of MPZ OOIP and TZ/ROZ OIP in Three Big Horn Basin Oil Plays.
Table 6. Technical Oil Recovery Totals, Two Big Horn Basin Oil Plays
LIST OF Figures

Figure 1. Oil Saturation Profile in the TZ/ROZ: Adapted from a Wasson Denver Unit Well

Figure 2. Location of Oil Fields, Structure and Direction of Hydrodynamic Flow, Big Horn Basin, Wyoming

Figure 3. The Frannie Field, Big Horn Basin, Wyoming

Figure 4. Potentiometric Surface, Tensleep Formation, Big Horn Basin, Wyoming and Montana

Figure 5. Location Map of Major Tensleep Oil Fields: Big Horn Basin

Figure 6. Analysis of Simultaneous MPZ and TZ/ROZ Oil Recovery: Simulation Comparison Results, Wasson Denver Unit

Figure 7. Analysis of Simultaneous MPZ and TZ/ROZ Oil Recovery: Simulation Comparison Results, Seminole San Andres Unit

Figure 8. Analysis of Simultaneous MPZ and TZ/ROZ Oil Recovery: Simulation Comparison Results, Wasson Bennett Ranch Unit

Figure 9. Analysis of Simultaneous MPZ and TZ/ROZ Oil Recovery: Simulation Comparison Results, Vacuum (San Andres/Grayburg)

Figure 10. Comparison of Simultaneous and Separate MPZ-ROZ CO₂ Flooding, Sample Oil Reservoir
I. INTRODUCTION

Residual oil zones (ROZ), the portion of an oil reservoir below its traditional producing oil-water contacts, can hold large volumes of previously undocumented and undeveloped domestic oil resources. The first comprehensive report on this topic, “Stranded Oil in the Residual Oil Zone,” examined the origin, nature and presence of ROZ resources.\(^1\) The second report “Assessing Technical and Economic Recovery of Resources in Residual Oil Zones” provided a reservoir simulation-based study of applying CO\(_2\)-EOR to establish the feasibility of recovering oil from residual oil zones in five major oil reservoirs\(^2\). The third report and the first in a series of three, “Technical Oil Recovery Potential from Residual Oil Zones: Permian Basin”, provided an in-depth documentation of the in-place and recoverable ROZ potential in the Permian Basin. The fourth report and the second in a series of three, “Technical Oil Recovery Potential from Residual Oil Zones: Williston Basin”, provided an in-depth documentation of the in-place and recoverable ROZ potential in the Williston Basin. This report, “Technical Oil Recovery Potential from Residual Oil Zones: Big Horn Basin”, is the third of this three part series and explores the in-place and recoverable ROZ potential for the Big Horn Basin.

A. Overview of ROZ Recovery Potential. Because of their low to moderate oil saturation settings, ROZ resources are not economic when using primary or secondary oil recovery. As such, the traditionally domestic oil wells have traditionally been completed at or above the oil-water contact (the first observance of water) and thus consistently above the residual oil zone. Outside of a small group of forward-looking operators, little is still known about the ability to successfully identify and produce the ROZ resource. However, in the current economic climate, with depleting domestic oil reserves and operators’ desires to extend reservoir life, ROZ resources offer an important new source of domestic oil production. Because of this, there is growing interest in further understanding the resource size and recoverable oil potential.


in the relatively thick (100 to 300 feet) residual oil zones located beneath the main pay zones of oil reservoirs.

Carbon dioxide (CO₂) enhanced oil recovery (EOR) has emerged as a viable technique for recovering residual oil left behind ("stranded") after waterflooding, mainly in light oil reservoirs below 3,000 feet in depth. Yet, the oil saturation in the transition (TZ) and residual oil zones (ROZ) of a reservoir is often similar to the oil saturations left after waterflooding. As such, with progress in CO₂ flooding technology and availability of affordable supplies of CO₂, the oil resource in the ROZ could readily become a feasibility target.

Further confirmation of this new oil resource potential is provided by the various residual oil zone CO₂-EOR pilot tests currently underway in Texas. Two of these pilot tests are operated by OxyPermian in the Denver and Bennett Ranch Units of the giant Wasson oil field. The Denver Unit pilot was the first to target transition and residual oil zones. A third ROZ pilot test, operated by Amerada Hess, is in the Seminole San Andres Unit. This is a 500 acre pilot TZ/ROZ flood underway since 1996. The response from this field pilot test has been most promising, providing an estimated cumulative recovery of 3 million barrels of oil to date, at an oil rate of 1,400 Bbls/day.³ An expanding CO₂-EOR project targeting the ROZ is also underway in the Salt Creek field (by ExxonMobil) involving 36 wells and incremental production of 2,000 bbls/day.⁴

The information on the operation and performance of these ROZ field pilot projects has been most valuable in calibrating the reservoir simulation-based oil recovery assessments of the TZ/ROZ resource examined by this study.

B. Outline for Report. This report assesses the size of the in-place technically recoverable oil resource from the transition and residual oil zones of the Big Horn Basin. It first provides a very brief introduction to the oil plays and the major fields

---
with tilted oil-water contacts (OWCs) and TZ/ROZ resources in the Big Horn Basin. Then, it examines, using a reservoir simulation calibrated streamtube model, the technical feasibility of recovering this previously by-passed TZ/ROZ resource using CO₂-EOR.

**C. Definition of Terms.** The term *residual oil zone (ROZ)*, as used in this study, also includes the more commonly known *transition zone (TZ)*. Although often used interchangeably, the two terms describe different portions of an oil reservoir. All oil reservoirs have a transition zone, an interval tens of feet below the traditionally-defined producing oil-water contact (OWC) where the oil saturation falls rapidly. The thickness of this interval is controlled by capillary forces and the nature of the rock’s "wetting phase", with lower permeability oil-wet rocks providing thicker TZs and water-wet rocks providing thinner ones.

While all oil reservoirs have a transition zone, not all have a residual oil zone, as specific hydrological or geological conditions need to have occurred to create a ROZ, as further discussed below. The great bulk of the ROZ will be at a residual oil saturation (similar to that after a conventional waterflood), tapering to near zero oil saturation at the base. A typical reservoir oil saturation profile is shown in **Figure 1**.

The transition zone (TZ) is the upper portion of the reservoir interval just below the traditional OWC and produces both water and oil. The residual oil zone (ROZ) is generally the middle and lower portions of the reservoir interval below the traditional OWC and upon initial completion produces primarily water.

The reason that both terms - - residual oil zone (ROZ) and transition zone (TZ) - - are used in this report is to bring special attention to the abnormally thick ROZs that can exist for reasons beyond normal capillary effects. For example, if the original oil trap possessed a thick oil column in its geologic past and the lower portion of this oil column was tilted and/or invaded by water, this lower reservoir interval would have an oil saturation much like that of the residual oil saturation in the swept zone of a waterflood.
In certain geologic settings, oil reservoirs can have an anomalously thick ROZ and thus could contribute considerable additional CO₂-EOR reserves.

Figure 1. Oil Saturation Profile in the TZ/ROZ: Adapted from a Wasson Denver Unit Well

D. Origin of Residual Oil Zones. A number of possible actions may create a ROZ after the initial accumulation of oil in a reservoir. Specifically, the original oil accumulation may subsequently be affected by natural forces such as regional basin uplift, seal breach, or a change in the hydrodynamics of the underlying regional aquifer, leading to the development of an ROZ. Additional discussion of the origins and nature of ROZs is provided into previously prepared reports.⁵,⁶

E. Evidence for ROZs in the Big Horn Basin. Much like the work done by Brown to detail the effects of hydrodynamic flow upon the oil-water contact in the

northern and central shelf carbonates of the Permian Basin\textsuperscript{7}, Bredehoeft, et. al., developed an excellent treatise of \textit{The Hydrodynamics of the Big Horn Basin: A Study of the Effects of Faults}\textsuperscript{8}. The authors studied the role that faults play in the hydrogeology of oil fields in the Big Horn Basin. Based on previous studies, the authors concluded that along the eastern margin of the Big Horn Basin oil accumulations in the Tensleep Formation, originally in stratigraphic traps, mirror the structural dip in their location as a result of hydrodynamic flow.

Prevalence of the Tensleep Formation (\textbf{Figure 2}) throughout the Big Horn Basin and the enclosure of the basin by mountains suggest that tilted OWC’s are most likely to be found in fields located around the edges of the basin. Based on the available geologic information and documented OWC tilts, a number of major oil reservoirs with ROZs were established in the Big Horn Basin oil plays.


---
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Figure 2. Location of Oil Fields, Structure and Direction of Hydrodynamic Flow, Big Horn Basin, Wyoming

II. IDENTIFYING AND EVALUATING OIL FIELDS WITH ROZ RESOURCES

A. Big Horn Basin (Tensleep Reservoir). The Big Horn Basin is an intermontane basin located in north-central Wyoming and south-central Montana, encompassing an area of 13,200 square miles. To date, the basin has produced 2.4 Bbbls of crude oil and has roughly 0.2 Bbbls of reserves. The source rock of the majority of the oil in the basin is the Permian-age Phosphoria formation, an organic-rich mudstone. Most of the field traps in the basin are classic anticlinal or domal structures where oil has migrated into the permeable Tensleep formation, a Pennsylvanian-age sandstone. Soon after production in the basin began, in the early 20th century, it was discovered that some fields, such as the Frannie field, did not have classic oil reservoir geometries with horizontal oil-water contacts (OWC’s), but instead had steeply dipping oil-water OWC’s.

At first glance, the Frannie field (Tensleep reservoir), discovered in 1928, has a typical anticline trap reservoir geometry. However, during development of the field, producers found that wells could be successfully completed further down dip to the west of the crest than on the east, Figure 3. It was determined that the OWC in the field was dipping towards the southwest at 600 feet per mile, suggesting that a strong hydrodynamic flow through the Tensleep formation from the northeast was flushing the oil downdip. This Hydrodynamic flow is thought to originate from the Tensleep formation outcrop in the Big Horn mountain range, 10 miles to the east. To date, the field has produced 118 MMbbls of oil.

---

After the discovery of the tilted OWC in the Frannie field, a USGS mapping project was conducted (in 1956) on the basin’s Tensleep sandstone to determine the extent of the hydrodynamic flow in the Big Horn Basin and its effect on the OWC's of the basin's
The study demonstrated that tilted OWC’s were common in the basin’s fields, identifying at least 11 fields with OWC tilts, generally dipping towards the basin center or following structural crests suggesting that the source of the tilts was hydrodynamic flow originating from the Tensleep Formation outcrops in the surrounding mountain ranges.

**Figure 4** shows a generalized potentiometric contour map of the Tensleep Formation in the Big Horn Basin. A potentiometric contour map represents locations of equal hydraulic head within a reservoir. Because groundwater flows from areas with high hydraulic head to those with low hydraulic head (generally perpendicular to the contour lines) such maps can illustrate hydrologic flow within a reservoir. In the case of the Big Horn Basin, hydrologic flow moves from the outer edges of the basin towards the center. The field OWC dips shown in the USGS map indeed show this trend, with OWC’s dipping basin-ward in many fields, with steeper dips occurring generally where the potentiometric gradients are steeper such as the north and south basin flanks. The OWC dip directions shown in the USGS map also show several examples where the dip direction does not follow the general hydrodynamic flow pattern, suggesting that secondary controls on flow are present.

The above described USGS map was the primary source of data for OWC dips used in this study. Additional data were gathered from a review paper on the hydrodynamic effects on oil accumulations by Hubbert (1967), and the Wyoming Geological Association’s Big Horn Basin oil field map series (1989). It should be noted that although dipping OWC’s in the basin are common, there are notable exceptions, such as the Garland field with an OOIP of over 350 MMbbls on the northern edge of the basin. In fields where a dip is present, the dip magnitude varies by as much as an order of magnitude. For example, in the Byron field the OWC dip less than 40 feet per mile compared to the Frannie field, located only 25 miles to the north, with a dip of 600 feet per mile.

---

Based on these studies, 13 large Big Horn Basin oil fields with Tensleep reservoirs were determined to have tilted OWC’s and potential residual oil zones (ROZ’s). Eight of these fields screened for miscible CO₂-EOR and five fields screened for immiscible CO₂-EOR due to their relatively heavy oil gravities (<23°). The ROZ’s within these 13 fields are the target for the CO₂-EOR simulations described in Chapter IV. Table 1 shows the cumulative Tensleep production in these fields and Figure 5 shows their location within the basin.

Figure 4. Potentiometric Surface, Tensleep Formation, Big Horn Basin, Wyoming and Montana

Figure 5. Location Map of Major Tensleep Reservoirs: Big Horn Basin
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field (Reservoir)</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Cum. Tensleep Oil Production (MMBbls) (1-1-05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscible CO2-EOR Fields</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Big Polecot (Tensleep)</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Byron (Embar/Tensleep)</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Big Horn</td>
<td>119.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elk Basin (Embar/Tensleep)</td>
<td>WY/MT</td>
<td>Park/Carbon</td>
<td>345.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Elk Basin South (Embar/Tensleep)</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Frannie (Phosphoria/Tensleep)</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>133.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gebo (Tensleep)</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Big Horn</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Grass Creek (Tensleep)</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Murphy Dome (Tensleep)</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Washakie</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immiscible CO2-EOR Fields</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Garland (Tensleep)</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Big Horn</td>
<td>101.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hamilton Dome (Tensleep)</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Hot Springs</td>
<td>239.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Little Buffalo Basin (Tensleep)</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>114.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Oregon Basin North (Tensleep)</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Oregon Basin South (Tensleep)</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>130.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. ESTIMATING TECHNICALLY RECOVERABLE ROZ RESOURCES

This chapter discusses the comparison and calibration of the CO2-PROPHET steamtube model with a full-scale, industry standard compositional reservoir simulator. As shown in the following materials, CO2-PROPHET provides an excellent match of oil recovery, for both the MPZ and the TZ/ROZ for four sample major Permian Basin oil fields. As such, there is confidence in using the CO2-PROPHET model to estimate oil recovery from the TZ/ROZ for the larger number of Big Horn Basin oil fields assessed by this study.

A. **Background on CO2-PROPHET.** The CO2-PROPHET model was developed by the Texaco Exploration and Production Technology Department (EPTD) as part of the DOE Class I cost-share program.22

   In its simplest form, this model generates streamlines for fluid flow between injection and production wells, and then uses finite difference methods to determine oil displacement and recovery calculations along the established streamlines. Data input requirements are less demanding and computational times are much shorter for using CO2-PROPHET than for using full-scale reservoir simulation. Moreover, input requirements for CO2-PROPHET can generally be obtained or calculated using engineering formulations. Key input parameters impacting oil recovery in CO2-PROPHET include:

   1. Residual oil saturation,
   2. Dykstra-Parsons coefficient,
   3. Oil and water viscosity,
   4. Reservoir pressure and temperature, and
   5. Minimum miscibility pressure.

B. **Comparison and Calibration of CO2-PROPHET with a Full-Scale Reservoir Simulator.** The CO2-PROPHET model was compared and calibrated by Advanced Resources with an industry-standard compositional reservoir simulator. The

---

22 “Post Waterflood CO₂ Flood in a Light Oil, Fluvial Dominated Deltaic Reservoir” (DOE Contract No. DE-FC22-93BC14960).
primary reason for the comparison was to determine whether CO2-PROPHET could effectively model oil recovery from the TZ/ROZ. A second reason was to better understand how the absence of a gravity override function in CO2-PROPHET might influence the calculation of oil recovery in these low oil saturation zones.

As a first step, the Wasson Denver Unit (San Andres) reservoir data set was used as the input file for modeling a simultaneous MPZ and TZ/ROZ CO2 flood using a full-scale simulator. An analogous data set was placed into CO2-PROPHET to replicate the MPZ and TZ/ROZ simultaneous flood. First, for simplicity, all oil saturations in the input database for the CO2-PROPHET model were set at residual oil. Under this simplified condition, CO2-PROPHET had lower oil recoveries than the full-scale simulator.

A closer review of the two input data sets enabled us to understand the reasons for the divergence. No mobile oil saturations were initially included in the input file for CO2-PROPHET; however, the input data file for the full-scale reservoir simulator had higher (and mobile) oil saturation in the TZ interval. Using simple weight-averaging, a small mobile oil saturation (~3%) was added to the reservoir intervals in the CO2-PROPHET input file to account for the mobile oil in the TZ. An excellent match for projected Wasson cumulative oil recovery was obtained between CO2-PROPHET and the full-scale simulator, after making this adjustment. This two step comparison and match is shown on Figure 6.
Similar CO2-PROPHET and full-scale simulator comparisons were completed for three additional oil fields - - Seminole (San Andres Unit), Wasson (Bennett Ranch Unit), and Vacuum (San Andres/Grayburg) (Figures 7, 8 and 9) - - again showing an excellent match between the two models when the oil saturation modification (discussed above) was included in the CO2-PROPHET input data set.
Figure 7. Analysis of Simultaneous MPZ and TZ/ROZ Oil Recovery: Simulation Comparison Results, Seminole San Andres Unit

Figure 8. Analysis of Simultaneous MPZ and TZ/ROZ Oil Recovery: Simulation Comparison Results, Wasson Bennett Ranch Unit
Table 2 provides the model comparisons, with the ultimate oil recovery from these four oil fields scaled to field level. While oil recovery calculations for individual fields vary somewhat, overall the two models provide an excellent match of the aggregate oil production from the four sample oil fields.
Table 2. Comparison of Compositional Model Simulation and CO2-PROPHET Model Simulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field/Unit</th>
<th>Compositional Model Simulation</th>
<th>CO2-PROPHET Model Simulation</th>
<th>% Difference Between Models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Level Oil Recovery (MMbbls)</td>
<td>Field Level Oil Recovery (MMbbls)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole (San Andres Unit)</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>(18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasson (Denver Unit)</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasson (Bennett Ranch Unit)</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuum (Grayburg/San Andres)</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,451</td>
<td>2,389</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Evaluating ROZ Development Strategies. Our analytic work shows that two “best practices” would enable the TZ/ROZ resource to be efficiently developed, namely: 1) selectively completing only the upper portion of the ROZ; and 2) simultaneously CO2 flooding the MPZ and TZ/ROZ.

1. Selective Zone Completion in the ROZ. Two ROZ completion options were explored: (1) completing only the upper 60% of the ROZ; and (2) completing the full ROZ interval. The two ROZ completion practices were then further examined under variable oil saturation profiles and alternative vertical permeability situations.

- Methodology. Reservoir simulation was used to model the injection of one HCPV of CO2 into the ROZ (only) zone. The Wasson Denver Unit’s San Andres reservoir ROZ interval was used as the input data set. Two oil saturation profiles were used: (1) a uniform saturation through the ROZ (uniform); and, (2) a variable, high to low, oil saturation through the ROZ (gradational). Finally, the vertical permeability was varied in the gradational oil saturation case.

- Results. Table 3 shows the results for the two completion schemes (partial and full) and for each of the three sensitivity cases (uniform ROZ oil saturation,
gradational ROZ oil saturation and gradational ROZ oil saturation with large vertical perm). These results are representative of a single forty acre CO₂-EOR pattern.

Table 3. Results from Two ROZ Completion Schemes (Partial and Full)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cumulative Oil Production (Mbbls)</th>
<th>Cumulative Gross CO₂ Injection (Bcf)</th>
<th>Gross CO₂/Oil Ratio (Mcf/Bbls)</th>
<th>Cumulative Water Production (Mbbls)</th>
<th>Producing Water-Oil Ratio (Bbls/Bbls)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Uniform Oil Saturation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial ROZ Completion</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>2,439</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full ROZ Completion</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>3,965</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gradational Oil Saturation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial ROZ Completion</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2,239</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full ROZ Completion</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>3,747</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gradational Oil Saturation/High Vertical Perm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial ROZ Completion</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>2,886</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full ROZ Completion</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>4,296</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The partial ROZ completion case outperforms the full ROZ completion case (in terms of CO₂-oil and water-oil ratios) and produces nearly as much oil. These results suggest that, in general, a partial ROZ completion should be considered. However, the full interaction of permeability and aquifer strength (not explored here) in combination with the oil saturation profile should be reviewed prior to making a final ROZ completion decision.
2. *Simultaneous MPZ and TZ/ROZ CO₂ Flooding.* Significant efficiencies may also be gained by simultaneously CO₂ flooding the MPZ and the TZ/ROZ. Even where a MPZ CO₂ flood is already underway, the TZ/ROZ flood can be added. In fact, many of the Seminole San Andres Unit, the Wasson Denver Unit and the Wasson Bennett Ranch Unit patterns are now being developed using joint MPZ and TZ/ROZ CO₂ floods, after initially CO₂ flooding only the MPZ.

- **Methodology.** Reservoir simulation was used to gain further understanding of simultaneously versus separately flooding the MPZ and TZ/ROZ zones. A 40 acre field pattern was modeled using an industry-standard compositional simulator. The input data drew on information from the Wasson Denver Unit's San Andres reservoir. The stacked pay included a 141 foot main pay zone, a 50 foot transition zone and a 150 foot residual oil zone. A weak Carter-Tracy aquifer was applied to the bottom of the reservoir to model water influx from the aquifer. Permeability was allowed to vary based on the Dykstra-Parsons coefficient, with an average permeability of 5 md.

Development of the reservoir started with a 2 HCPV water flush into the main pay zone (simulating primary and secondary recovery), to reach residual oil saturation. Following the initial MPZ waterflood, 1 HCPV of CO₂ was injected using a coarsely tapered one to one WAG scheme, which consisted of larger CO₂ slugs in the first 0.6 HCPV and smaller CO₂ slugs in the remaining 0.4 HCPV of CO₂. Initially, this CO₂ flooding process was performed separately—first, in the main pay zone, and then followed by the transitional and residual oil zones. Next, both the main pay zone and the TZ/ROZ were CO₂ flooded simultaneously.
• **Results.** Figure 10 shows the comparison of results for a forty acre pattern. The simultaneous MPZ and TZ/ROZ CO₂ flood has a 25% higher oil recovery than the separate zone CO₂ flooding scheme. Further, oil production is accelerated, which should provide a superior economic return. Water production over the life of the each CO₂ flooding option is similar, Table 4.

A closer look at the reasons for the higher oil recovery efficiency from simultaneous CO₂ flooding of the MPZ and TZ/ROZ shows that the simultaneous CO₂ flood has a more uniform distribution of pressure between the two zones, which limits out of zone CO₂ flow and losses. In the separate CO₂ flooding case, each of the two flooding stages is plagued by out of zone flow (particularly upward flow by the injected CO₂), reducing the overall oil recovery and CO₂ utilization efficiency.

![Figure 10. Comparison of Simultaneous and Separate MPZ-ROZ CO₂ Flooding, Sample Oil Reservoir](image-url)
### Table 4. Comparison of Separate vs. Simultaneous MPZ and TZ/ROZ CO₂-EOR Flooding: Sample Oil Reservoir

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO₂-EOR Strategy</th>
<th>Duration (Years)</th>
<th>Cumulative CO₂ Injection (Bcf)</th>
<th>Cumulative Oil (MMbbls)</th>
<th>Cumulative Water (MMbbls)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate MPZ and TZ/ROZ</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous MPZ and TZ/ROZ</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. RESULTS

A. MPZ AND TZ/ROZ OIL IN PLACE. In Section II, we identified 13 fields in the two Big Horn Basin oil plays that have potential for significant TZ/ROZ resources. Five of these fields, are heavy oil fields which will require immiscible CO$_2$-EOR methods. The TZ/ROZ OIP in these 13 fields is estimated at 4.4 billion barrels, which is nearly equivalent to the OOIP of the MPZ, Table 5.

Table 5. Estimates of MPZ OOIP and TZ/ROZ OIP in Two Big Horn Basin Oil Plays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play</th>
<th>MPZ OOIP (BBbls)</th>
<th>TZ/ROZ OIP (BBbls)</th>
<th>No. of Fields</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CO$_2$-miscible fields</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CO$_2$-immiscible fields</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Technically Recoverable Resources from the MPZ and ROZ. Based on reservoir modeling of applying CO$_2$-EOR to the TZ/ROZ resources, we estimate that 1.1 billion barrels is technically recoverable from the 4.4 billion barrels of TZ/ROZ oil in-place in these Two Big Horn Basin oil plays, Table 6.
Table 6. Technical Oil Recovery Totals, Two Big Horn Basin Oil Plays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Total CO$_2$-EOR (BBbls)</th>
<th>MPZ CO$_2$-EOR (BBbls)</th>
<th>TZ/ROZ CO$_2$-EOR (BBbls)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CO$_2$-miscible fields</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CO$_2$-immiscible fields</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To date, no CO$_2$-EOR projects of the TZ/ROZ have been undertaken in these study fields. As such, no information regarding the potential performance of such a flooding scheme is available to validate the results of this work. Nevertheless, the estimates of TZ/ROZ OIP for these 13 fields may make an attractive recovery target and data collected in ongoing Powder River basin MPZ CO$_2$-EOR floods such as Sussex, Salt Creek, and Hartzog Draw fields may add further insight into the potential flood performance of these TZ/ROZ targets.