



Primary funding is provided by

# The SPE Foundation through member donations and a contribution from Offshore Europe

The Society is grateful to those companies that allow their professionals to serve as lecturers

Additional support provided by AIME



Society of Petroleum Engineers Distinguished Lecturer Program www.spe.org/dl



Optimizing Liquid Recoveries from Shales: Through Geologic, Geomechanical, Fluid and Operating Considerations

Milind Deo Peter and Catherine Meldrum Professor Chair, Department of Chemical Engineering University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah

## Outline



- Liquids from shales status and challenges
- Field data and the story of gas oil ratios
- Effect of geologic and operational parameters
- Production of near-critical fluids
- Geomechanical controls
- Field-wide optimization
- Conclusions

## Where is the Activity?





Source: Energy Information Administration based on data from various published studies Updated: May 9, 2011

## **Status and Challenges**





- Data from Energy Information Administration
- Economic output from Eagle Ford alone \$87 billion (CCBR Eagle Ford Study)
- Tens of thousands of high-paying jobs

US oil imports below 30%

•

## Too good, Too fast?

- Low oil recoveries inadequate understanding
- Gas flaring inadequate infrastructure
- Water use and reuse
- Important to get the most out of each well





From Energy Information Administration



## **Primary Production from Shales**



- Slow overall pressure decline because of low permeability
- Transition to free gas and management of gas oil ratios over time
- Importance of fluid type and phase behavior
- Reservoir access and surface area creation

### **GOR Story: Conventional GOR Behavior**



GOR: Gas oil ratio



SPE DISTINGUISHED

## The Unconventional System

















• In general, higher gas oil ratio equates to lower cumulative oil









• The new Oklahoma plays





$$\nabla \cdot \left( \frac{\mathbf{k}k_{ro}}{B_o \mu_o} \nabla \varphi_o \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \phi \frac{S_o}{B_o} \right) + q_o,$$

$$\nabla \cdot \left( \frac{\mathbf{k}k_{rw}}{B_w \mu_w} \nabla \varphi_w \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \phi \frac{S_w}{B_w} \right) + q_w,$$

$$\nabla \cdot \left( R_s \frac{\mathbf{k}k_{ro}}{B_o \mu_o} \nabla \varphi_o + \frac{\mathbf{k}k_{rg}}{B_g \mu_g} \nabla \varphi_g \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \phi R_s \frac{S_o}{B_o} + \phi \frac{S_g}{B_g} \right) + R_s q_o + q_{fg}.$$

- Three-phase, three-dimensional reservoir simulation
- Commercial codes, in-house simulators

## **Field Unconventional**





#### Jones, URTec 2460396

- GOR does not rise to very high values
- This is fundamentally different from conventionals

## Why So Many Poor Wells?



Perhaps, gas accumulation due to migration or interference



17

### **Effect of Bubble Point on Recovery**



			30	
(Pb = BHP)	Pb 1000 1225 1450 1900 2350 2800 3250	<b>RF @ 40 years</b> 4% 9% 14% 18% 21% 24% 25%	30 25 <b>tu 20</b> 15 10 5	Higher amount of dissolved gas provides more energy
(pk – p:)	4375	25% 27%		5,
(PD = PI)	5500	26%	0 10 20 30 40	
			Time, years	

Higher recovery factors with higher bubble point pressure, Pb

## Field Data





 $RF = \frac{\overline{1.404N_PBo}}{\varphi X_f hL}$ 

 $t_D = \frac{0.0063Kt}{\varphi \mu C_t L^2}$ 



### Lessons from the Field



**Operational parameters** 

Reservoir and fluid parameters



## Geologic Factors Identification of Important Parameters



- Experimental design
- Reservoir simulations
- Generate response surfaces
- Perform Monte-Carlo simulations
- Ranking of parameters
- Identify and quantify uncertainty

#### Parameters of Importance in Shale Production

#### **Oil Recovery from Shales**



<b>1</b> yr	10 yrs	20 yrs	Economic Rate 5 bbl/d/fracture
Hydraulic Fracture spacing	Matrix permeability	Matrix permeability	Matrix permeability
Matrix permeability	Hydraulic Fracture spacing	Hydraulic Fracture spacing	Initial dissolved gas oil ratio
Initial dissolved gas oil ratio	Initial dissolved gas oil ratio	Initial dissolved gas oil ratio	Hydraulic Fracture spacing
Initial Reservoir pressure	Slope of dissolved GOR	Slope of dissolved GOR	Initial Reservoir pressure
Slope of dissolved GOR	Initial Reservoir pressure	Initial Reservoir pressure	Formation Compressibility
Producing BHP	Gas rel. perm exponent	Formation Compressibility	Slope of dissolved GOR
Gas rel. perm exponent	Formation Compressibility	Producing BHP	Producing BHP
Formation Compressibility	Producing BHP	Gas rel. perm exponent	Gas rel. perm exponent

- Six of the top 8 Parameters are Geologic
- Only 2 of the variables are operationally controllable parameters

### **Quantify Uncertainty**

Input: Variability in reservoir properties

Output: Probability distributions and variability





Probability density functions and P10, P50 and P90 can be generated



### Operational Parameter Effects Fracture Spacing



Hydraulically Fractured Unconventionals Panja, Conner and Deo (2015) International Journal of Oil, Gas and Coal technology. Conventional Reservoirs Under Primary Depletion

Levine and Prats (1961)

8

### **Production of Near-Critical Fluids**





### **Fluid Compositions**

![](_page_25_Figure_1.jpeg)

• Lean (Fluid 1) to Rich (Fluid 5)

## Phase Diagrams

![](_page_26_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_2.jpeg)

- Right of the critical point: Condensate
- Left of the critical point: volatile oil or oil

## **Production Optimization for Near-Critical Fluids**

Lean

![](_page_27_Figure_2.jpeg)

SPE DISTINGUISHED LECTURER<sup>®</sup>

Lean Condensate ۲

2 yrs. Step Down BHP

2

30

24

18

12

6

0

0

Condensate Recovery (%)

- Higher recoveries at higher BHP
- Two-year step down produces similar behavior
- Rich condensate choking the well does not make a big difference • 28

![](_page_28_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### Oil Drillers Bet Choking Wells Will Keep Shale From Going Bust

by Bloomberg | Dan Murtaugh & Rebecca Penty | Friday, October 02, 2015

• Some producers are choking back on wells to improve liquid rates and arrest sharper declines

### **Geomechanical Considerations**

- Analytical and numerical models available
- Discrete Element Model (DEM)
- Guidelines for attaining desired fracture outcomes, given formation characteristics
- Challenges: Field validation through micro-seismic or other means

![](_page_29_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_6.jpeg)

## **Effect of Stress**

![](_page_30_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Figure_2.jpeg)

 $\sigma_{H,MIN} / \sigma_{H,MAX} = 0.5$ 

Fractures nominally propagate in one direction – parallel to the maximum stress direction

$$\sigma_{H,MIN} / \sigma_{H,MAX} = 0.9$$

Due to stress shadowing, some perforations do not initiate fracture.  $\sigma_{H,MIN} / \sigma_{H,MAX} = 0.98$ 

Fracture propagation impacted by the overprint of additional mechanically induced stress associated with neighboring fractures

![](_page_31_Figure_0.jpeg)

- Incorporation of layering and full heterogeneity
- Decision on where to place the well

## **Effect of Natural Fractures**

Jing Zhou, Hai Huang, John McLennan and Milind Deo, Hydraulic SPE DISTINGUISHED Fracturing Journal, Volume 4, Number 2, pp 66-82. LECTURER σ<sub>H,MAX</sub>  $\sigma_{h,MIN}$ Low Viscosity **High Viscosity** b h 150 0.022 150 0.02 0.022 0.018 0.02 0.016 0.018 0.014 0.016 0.012 0.014 0.01 0.012 >100 >100 0.008 0.01 0.006 0.008 0.004 0.006 0.002 0.004 0.002 50 50 Ω 100 150 50 50 100 150 х Х

- Through-going fractures with higher viscosity fluids
- Reactivating natural fractures with lower viscosity fluids

### Some Geomechanical Guidelines

![](_page_33_Picture_1.jpeg)

Features	Completion Guidelines
Shorter fractures with large apertures	Higher viscosity fluids, high injection rates
Bi-wing fractures in higher permeability formations – clear stress contrast	Higher viscosity, higher rate
Overcome stress shadowing and fracture merging	Use perforation cluster spacing greater than 50 feet
Reactivate fractures in naturally fractured formations	Use lower rate or viscosity – more fluid into the fractures

• Treatment depends on outcomes desired for the fracture morphology

![](_page_34_Figure_0.jpeg)

### Bakken – Multiwell, Multilayer Model

![](_page_35_Figure_1.jpeg)

### Fracture and Well Spacing Optimization

![](_page_36_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_2.jpeg)

 Fracture and well spacing (nw) for given geologic conditions

## Conclusions

![](_page_37_Picture_1.jpeg)

- Improving liquid recoveries critical for sustaining liquids production from shales: Integrated understanding of reservoir and operational parameters necessary
- Gas-oil ratio signatures for low-permeability, hydraulically fractured reservoirs are different from conventionals and provide understanding of production
- Matrix permeability and fracture spacing emerge as the two top factors that determine fluid recoveries
- Importance of certain parameters like matrix permeability shift as the flow transitions to boundary dominated

## Conclusions

![](_page_38_Picture_1.jpeg)

- Holding higher producing bottom hole pressures leads to higher recoveries and often to higher liquid rates for near-critical fluids
- Possible to represent most liquids data in North America on a single curve
- Geomechanical models may be used to guide creation of desired fracture morphology given reservoir properties
- It is possible to use a simplified simulation workflow to accurately represent multi-fracture, multi-well cases and perform fracture and well spacing optimization

## Acknowledgements

![](_page_39_Picture_1.jpeg)

- Dr. Palash Panja, EGI, University of Utah
- Dr. Raul Velasco, Chemical Eng., Univ. of Utah
- Dr. Jing Zhou, Idaho National Laboratory
- Dr. Hai Huang, Idaho National Laboratory
- Dr. John McLennan, University of Utah
- Dr. Raymond Levey, EGI, University of Utah

**Pistinguished** Lecturer Program

![](_page_40_Picture_1.jpeg)

# Your Feedback is Important

Enter your section in the DL Evaluation Contest by completing the evaluation form for this presentation Visit SPE.org/dl

![](_page_40_Picture_4.jpeg)

Society of Petroleum Engineers Distinguished Lecturer Program www.spe.org/dl

![](_page_40_Picture_6.jpeg)