11/30/04

1 of 2

FIELD TESTING & OPTIMIZATION OF CO₂/SAND FRACTURING TECHNOLOGY

Final Report

County	State	Date	Wells	Stage	Grp #
Crockett	TX	12/95	3	6	1A
Crockett	TX	12/95	6	3	1B
San Juan	NM	01/96	3	3	2
Phillips	MT	07/98	3	3	5
Blaine	MT	09/02	4	4	7
		Total	16	19	

By

RAYMOND L. MAZZA

Period of Performance

October 1, 1994 -- November 30, 2004

Work Performed Under Contract No.: Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199

"Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

For:

U. S. Department of Energy
National Energy Technology Laboratory
Morgantown, West Virginia

By

Petroleum Consulting Services
Canton, Ohio

THE ATTACHED REPORTS HAVE BEEN
ENTERED INTO FITS AND DISTRIBUTED
ON 02/28/05 *clw*

Table of Contents

DISCLAIMER.....	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
I. ABSTRACT.....	5
II. INTRODUCTION	5
III. BACKGROUND.....	6
IV. IDENTIFICATION AND SELECTION OF CANDIDATE WELLS.....	7
V. METHODOLOGY.....	8
A. Mathematical Analog of Production Data.....	8
B. Missing Data.....	9
D. Examples	9
VI. CO ₂ /SAND STIMULATION TREATMENTS.....	11
A. Design	11
VII. DOE APPROVALS	11
VIII. FIELD ACTIVITIES	12
A. Preparations.....	12
B. Stimulations.....	12
IX. IS THE PROPOSED RESERVOIR LIKELY TO BENEFIT FROM THE CO ₂ /SAND TECHNOLOGY?.....	12
X. OPERATORS	12
A. An interest in CO ₂ /Sand technology?.....	12
B. An adequate test opportunity?.....	12
C. A presently active drilling program?	12
D. A future for successful results? Is the operator likely to continue implementing this technology without DOE cost support?.....	12
E. An interest in DOE cost-supported participation?.....	12
F. Share production data for five years?	12
G. Letter of Intent	13

Table of Contents

XI.	TEST AREAS.....	13
A.	TEST AREA #1 – Crockett Co, Tx – Package #'s 1A & 1B - 9 Stages / 6 Wells	13
1.	Location.....	13
2.	Operator.....	14
3.	Reservoir.....	14
4.	Producing Horizon	15
5.	Test Area #1A - Block NG (Montgomery) - Two Stage Completions.....	15
a.	Permeability.....	15
b.	Reservoir Pressure and Temperature.....	16
c.	Sensitivity to Stimulation Liquids.....	16
d.	Control Wells.....	17
e.	Candidate Wells.....	17
(1)	Stimulation #1 - Candidate Well # 1 – Montgomery 13-18	17
(a)	Stage #1	17
(b)	Stage #2	18
(2)	Stimulation #2 - Candidate Well #2 – Montgomery 12-18	18
(a)	Stage #1	18
(b)	Stage #2	18
(3)	Stimulation #3 - Candidate Well #3 -- Montgomery 14-18.....	19
(a)	Stage #1	19
(b)	Stage #2	19
(4)	Stimulation Summary	19
f.	Results.....	20
(1)	Production Comparisons	20
(a)	Summary – Control Wells.....	20
(b)	Summary – Candidate Wells	21
(c)	Summary Control and Candidate Wells	22
g.	Conclusions - Test Area #1A	23
6.	Test Area #1B - Block MM (Hoover-Hatton) – Single Stage Completions	25
a.	Control Wells.....	26
b.	Candidate Wells.....	26
(1)	Stimulation #1 - Candidate Well #1 - Hatton 13-14	27
(2)	Stimulation #2 - Candidate Well #2 - Hatton 7C-7	27
(3)	Stimulation #3 - Candidate Well #3 - Hatton 8C-4	27
(4)	Stimulation Summary	27
c.	Results.....	28
(1)	Production Comparisons	28
(a)	Summary – Control Wells.....	28
(b)	Summary – Candidate Wells	29
(c)	Summary Control and Candidate Wells	30
d.	Conclusions - Test Area #1B	31
e.	Costs	32
f.	Well Specific Data	33
7.	Conclusions Test Areas 1A & 1B	33

Table of Contents

B.	TEST AREA #2 – San Juan Co, NM - Package # 2 – 3 Stage / 3 Wells	38
1.	Location.....	38
2.	Operator – Amoco Production	39
3.	Reservoir.....	39
4.	Producing Horizon - Type III Area.....	39
5.	Reservoir Pressure and Temperature.....	40
6.	Control Wells	40
7.	Candidate Wells	42
a.	Perforation Strategy	42
b.	Stimulations.....	42
(1)	Stimulation #1 - Florance GCL-1 – (Candidate Well # 2).....	42
(2)	Stimulation #2 – Florance Q-1 – (Candidate Well # 3).....	43
(3)	Stimulation #3 - Riddle I-1 – (Candidate Well # 1)	43
c.	Stimulation Summary.....	44
8.	Results	46
a.	Production Comparisons.....	46
(1)	Summary – Control Wells.....	46
(2)	Production Summary – Candidate Wells.....	47
(3)	Summary Control and Candidate Wells.....	48
b.	Costs	49
(1)	Projected.....	49
(2)	Actual	49
c.	Conclusions	49
d.	Well specific data.....	50
C.	TEST AREA #3 - Phillips Co, Mt - Package # 5 – 3 Stages / 3 Wells	51
1.	Location	51
2.	Operator	52
3.	Reservoir	52
4.	Producing Horizon.....	52
a.	Reservoir Pressure and Temperature.....	53
b.	Gas properties.....	53
c.	Sensitivity to Stimulation Liquids	53
5.	Control Wells.....	53
6.	Candidate Wells.....	54
7.	Success criteria	54
8.	Stimulations.....	55
a.	Stimulation #1 – Well # 1021 (Candidate Well #1)	55
b.	Stimulation #2 – Well # 1020 (Candidate Well #2)	55
c.	Stimulation #3 – Well # 1019 (Candidate Well #3)	56
9.	Costs	56
a.	Conventional Stimulation.....	56
b.	CO ₂ /Sand Stimulation.....	57
c.	Projected vs. Actual	57

Table of Contents

10.	Results	57
a.	Production Comparisons	57
11.	Proppant size	59
12.	Conclusions	59
D.	TEST AREA #4 - Blaine Co, Mt - Package # 7 – 4 Stages / 4 Wells.....	61
1.	Location	61
2.	Operator	61
3.	Reservoir	61
a.	Porosity Permeability, Thickness, and EUR	61
b.	Reservoir Pressure and Temperature.....	62
c.	Gas Properties.....	63
4.	Producing Horizon.....	63
5.	Sensitivity to Stimulation Liquids	63
6.	Control Wells.....	64
7.	Candidate Wells.....	65
a.	Completion.....	65
b.	Perforation Strategy	65
c.	Production Review and Projections	66
8.	Success Criteria	67
9.	Stimulations.....	70
a.	Stimulation #1 – S-B Ranch 02-05 (Candidate Well # 1).....	70
b.	Stimulation #2 – Kane 05-08 (Candidate Well # 2)	70
c.	Stimulation #3 - Kane 05-05 (Candidate Well # 3).....	70
d.	Stimulation #4 – Blackwood 06-09 (Candidate Well # 4).....	70
e.	Stimulation Summary	71
10.	Results	71
a.	Production Comparisons - Pre and Post Stimulation	71
(1)	Pre-Stimulation.....	71
(2)	Post-Stimulation	72
(3)	Incremental Production Improvement	73
11.	Costs - Projected vs. Actual.....	74
12.	Conclusions	74
XII.	CONCLUSIONS.....	77
A.	Test Area #1 - Crockett Co, Tx – Package #'s 1A & 1B - 9 Stages / 6 Wells	77
B.	Test Area #2 - San Juan Co, NM - Package # 2 – 3 Stage / 3 Wells.....	78
C.	Test Area #3 - Phillips Co, Mt - Package # 5 – 3 Stages / 3 Wells	79
D.	Test Area #4 - Blaine Co, Mt - Package # 7 – 4 Stages / 4 Wells.....	79
XIII.	DELIVERABLES	80

Final Report - Grp #'s 1A & 1B (Crockett Co, TX), Grp #2 (San Juan Co, NM), Grp #5 (Phillips Co, MT), Grp #7 (Blaine Co, MT)
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

DISCLAIMER

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

These contract efforts involved the demonstration of a unique liquid free stimulation technology which was, at the beginning of these efforts, in 1993 unavailable in the U.S. The process had been developed, and patented in Canada in 1981, and held promise for stimulating liquid sensitive reservoirs in the U.S. The technology differs from that conventionally used in that liquid carbon dioxide (CO₂), instead of water is the base fluid. The CO₂ is pumped as a liquid and then vaporizes at reservoir conditions, and because no other liquids or chemicals are used, a liquid free fracture is created. The process requires a specialized closed system blender to mix the liquid CO₂ with proppant under pressure.

These efforts were funded to consist of up to 21 cost-shared stimulation events. Because of the vagaries of CO₂ supplies, service company support and operator interest only 19 stimulation events were performed in Montana, New Mexico, and Texas.

County	State	Date	Wells	Stages	Grp #
Crockett	TX	12/95	3	6	1A
Crockett	TX	12/95	6	3	1B
San Juan	NM	01/96	3	3	2
Phillips	MT	07/98	3	3	5
Blaine	MT	09/02	4	4	7
		Total	16	19	

Final Reports have been prepared for each of the four demonstration groups, and the specifics of those demonstrations are summarized therein.

Crockett County, Texas

The first demonstrations were in Crockett County in the Canyon sands and consisted of two groups of three wells. The placed proppant volumes with the CO₂/sand process were much lower than the design volumes do in part to reduced pump rates because of pressure limitations. The production responses were poor, and it was concluded that the fracture lengths generated by the liquid CO₂ stimulations were insufficient.

San Juan Co, New Mexico

Three Candidate Wells completed in the Fruitland Coals were stimulated with the CO₂/Sand process and minimal proppant volumes were placed believed to be a result of an unusually large number of perforations. The projected five year cumulative production ranged from the three Candidate Wells ranged from 65.3 to 141.9 MMcf and averaged 91.3 MMcf while that from the six Control Wells ranged between 15.6 and 445.2 MMcf averaging 231.3 MMcf or 2.5 times that from the wells.

These poor responses from the wells stimulated with the CO₂/sand process are unquestionably related to a number of factors regarding the formation characteristics of permeability, and pressure, but to a larger extent to the reduced proppant volumes placed by the liquid-free treatments

Phillips County, Montana

Full proppant volume (40,000 pound) CO₂/sand stimulations were easily executed in three Candidate Wells completed in the Phillips Sand in the Phillips Co, Montana test area, but the production from the Candidate Wells failed to meet those required by the criteria for success.

The twenty-four month cumulative production volumes from the wells stimulated with the liquid-free CO₂/sand process are essentially the same as that from the Control Wells treated with N₂ Foam and utilizing the same 40,000 pound proppant volume, and there is a suspicion that the wells which were stimulated with CO₂/sand are being choked by limited conductivity in the hydraulically created fracture, probably as a consequence of the smaller proppant size used (20/40 vs. 12/20). This is based on the observation of the nearly identical monthly production volumes from all three Candidate Wells. And, also on the production comparisons of twenty nearby wells which utilized larger proppant.

Final Report - Grp #'s 1A & 1B (Crockett Co, TX), Grp #2 (San Juan Co, NM), Grp #5 (Phillips Co, MT), Grp #7 (Blaine Co, MT)
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Blaine County, Montana

Full proppant volume CO₂/sand stimulations were successfully pumped in three of four Candidate Wells which were completed in the Eagle Sands. All four Candidate Wells had production improvements which through July, 2004 (22 months following the stimulation) ranged from 3.1 to 54.1 MMcf and averaged 19.5 MMcf. The total incremental improvement is 77.8 MMcf.

One well, Blackwood 06-09, accounted for the majority – 70% (54.1/77.8) of the incremental production increase, and it is the only well which exceeded the success criteria.

SUMMARY

The liquid free CO₂/Sand stimulation technology results in a liquid free propped fracture and is the only known process which provides this benefit. Because the viscosity of CO₂ is low (0.1cp) the fracture lengths are limited, but the benefits of a non-damaging fracture can prove beneficial to liquid sensitive formations especially as the reservoir pressure diminishes.

ABSTRACT

A summary of the demonstrations of a novel liquid-free stimulation process which was performed in four groups of "Candidate Wells" situated in Crockett Co, TX, San Juan Co, NM, Phillips Co, MT, and Blaine Co, MT. The stimulation process which employs carbon dioxide (CO₂) as the working fluid and the production responses were compared with those from wells treated with conventional stimulation technologies, primarily N₂ foam, excepting those in Blaine Co, MT where the reservoir pressure is too low to clean up spent stimulation liquids.

A total of 19 liquid-free CO₂/sand stimulations were performed in 16 wells and the production improvements were generally uneconomic

I. ABSTRACT

A summary of the demonstrations of a novel liquid-free stimulation process which was performed in four groups of "Candidate Wells" situated in Crockett Co, TX, San Juan Co, NM, Phillips Co, MT, and Blaine Co, MT. The stimulation process which employs carbon dioxide (CO₂) as the working fluid and the production responses were compared with those from wells treated with conventional stimulation technologies, primarily N₂ foam, excepting those in Blaine Co, MT where the reservoir pressure is too low to clean up spent stimulation liquids.

A total of 19 liquid-free CO₂/sand stimulations were performed in 16 wells and the production improvements were generally uneconomic

II. INTRODUCTION

The demonstration of a unique liquid-free stimulation treatment technique which utilizes carbon dioxide (CO₂) as the working fluid and which was previously unavailable in the U.S. was initiated and performed in the eastern U.S. under another contract (#DE-AC21-90MC26025 - "Production Verification Tests") and extended under this contract to demonstrations in the western states.

The technology held promise for stimulating liquid-sensitive reservoirs in that the CO₂ is pumped as a liquid to hydraulically create fractures, and then will vaporize at reservoir conditions and flow from the reservoir as a gas, resulting in a liquid-free induced fracture. Additionally, the process which had been developed in Canada utilized specialized equipment to enable proppant to be mixed with and transported by the liquid CO₂ thereby resulting in a propped fracture to prevent it from closing.

These efforts required the cooperation of gas well operators to provide "Candidate Wells" wells for the demonstrations, and in return they received financial cost-shared support for this DOE sponsored program. The operators provided the Candidate Wells, the specifics on nearby "Control Wells", and the production data from the Candidates for five years following the stimulations. The production responses from the Candidate Wells, which were stimulated with the CO₂/Sand process were then

compared to that from the conventionally stimulated Control Wells to determine if any advantage would be realized from this process.

These efforts were funded to consist of up to 18 cost-shared stimulation events, another 3 were subsequently added bringing the total to 21 demonstrations.

Difficulties in procuring CO₂, service company dispositions, and a lack of operator interest resulted in only 19 events being executed. The unexpended funds were returned to the DOE. These difficulties would likely have been less of an encumbrance had a service company with a nationwide sales group been involved. The small Appalachian-based service company that provided the blender did not have the resources to provide services in the western U.S. on a regular basis, and there were also reluctances by the larger service companies with pumping equipment in the western U.S. to provide a seamless field experience for the operator.

The contract also specified that each demonstration group of Candidate Wells was to include a minimum of three wells. By design this requirement was to enable the statistical confidence in the results to be elevated.

III. BACKGROUND

The first demonstrations of the CO₂/Sand stimulation process were initiated through a DOE sponsored project and were conducted in eastern Kentucky's Big Sandy gas field in January, 1993. Significant successes resulted in that considerably larger gas volumes were produced from wells which were stimulated with the liquid-free CO₂/Sand stimulation process than from nearby wells which had been hydraulically fractured with other treatment types namely, N₂ gas and especially N₂ foam. The five year per well incremental benefit (two stages) of the production from the CO₂/Sand stimulations resulted in an improvement of 135.4 MMcf over that from N₂ foam stimulations and 110.4 MMcf improvement over N₂ gas stimulations.

Because of these favorable responses the DOE solicited other liquid sensitive reservoirs in the western U.S. to further apply the CO₂/Sand technology. The subject contract and this Report are the results of that solicitation.

IV. IDENTIFICATION AND SELECTION OF CANDIDATE WELLS

There were a total of 15 groups which preliminary information was submitted to the DOE for review and comment. Of those 8 complete Candidate Well packages were upon DOE request further prepared and resubmitted. Five of those well groups were approved for treatment. There were 7 rejected by the DOE, and 3 from which the operator elected not to participate.

Submittals	No
Preliminary Proposals	15
Rejected by DOE	-4
	11
Operator Withdrew	-3
Formal Proposals	8
Rejected by DOE	-3
Executed	5

The DOE approvals of these 5 groups have resulted in 19 Stages (16 wells) being stimulated with the CO₂/Sand process with cost shared participation under the subject contract.

Pkg						DOE				
#	Opr	Form	Depth	County	St	?	#	Stg	Date	Status
1A	UPR	Canyon	6,700	Crockett	TX	Y	3	6	Dec-95	Executed
1B	UPR	Canyon	7,300	Crockett	TX	Y	3	3	Dec-95	Executed
2	Amoco	Fruitland	2,100	San Juan	NM	Y	3	3	Jan-96	Executed
3	Chevron	Wolfcamp	9,500	Terrel	TX		2	2	Aug-97	DOE-Rej
4	Ultra Petr	Lance	12,500	Sublette	WY		3	15	Feb-98	DOE-Rej
5	WBI	Phillips	2,200	Phillips	MT	Y	3	3	May-98	Executed
6	WBI	Eagle	1,400	Fallon	MT		3	3	May-98	OP-Withdrew
7	Ocean Engy	Eagle	1,400	Blaine	MT	Y	4	4	Sep-02	Executed
	Evergreen	Niobrara	1,600	Yuma	CO		2	2		DOE-Rej
	Thermo CoGn	Niobrara	1,600	Cheyene	KS		2	2		DOE-Rej
	Amoco	Mary Lee	2,200	Tuscaloosa	AL		8	8		OP-Withdrew
	Cedar Ridge	Fruitland	2,200	LaPlata	CO		3	3		OP-Withdrew
	Chandler	Mancos	2,400	Blanco	CO		3	3		DOE-Rej
	Crescendo				TX		1	1		DOE-Rej
	Burlington	Lewis Sh	3,800	San Juan	NM		6	6		DOE-Rej

V. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation of the CO₂/sand stimulations was done through the comparison of the five-year cumulative produced gas volumes from the Candidate Wells which were stimulated with CO₂/sand with that from nearby Control Wells which had been stimulated with other processes. These other stimulation processes included nitrogen (N₂) foam, and gelled water processes.

The wells with the larger projected five-year cumulative produced gas volumes, after the flush production was removed, were considered to be superior.

A. Mathematical Analog of Production Data

The procedure to remove the flush production volumes utilizes a fit of a mathematic equation of the later time production, and then utilizing that relationship to extrapolate the early production if the flush production rates had not occurred.

There were some instances where the flush production volumes were minimal which reinforces the benefit of being able to more acutely focus in on the reservoir characteristics through the elimination of this bias. This process can also provide a significant benefit when there is missing production data.

C. Missing Data

This process can also provide a significant benefit when there is missing production data.

D. Examples

The following examples demonstrate the procedure utilized to remove the gas produced during the flush production period which in this case lasted approximately 13 months. The actual produced gas volume was 41 MMcf while the projected volume was 23 MMcf or a difference of 18 MMcf. The projected five year cumulative production is 92 MMcf whereas the actual production volume measured was 110 MMcf.

In the second example there was no production data available for the first 29 months, additionally the available data included two shut in periods which are followed by flush production periods. By utilizing a mathematic fit of the steady state production data a realistic projection of the production resulted. The limited data set was then utilized, and the bias resulting from the flush production periods following the shut in periods was removed.

In removing the effects of the flush production volume a more realistic assessment of the response to the different stimulation types resulted. The production plots for each well including the actual and projected values are included in this report.

VI. CO₂/SAND STIMULATION TREATMENTS

A. Design

A stimulation design was prepared and presented to the operators. Because of prior successes in placing full blender volumes, it was concluded that the first effort would be to attempt a maximum quantity of 47,500 lbs. This recommended stimulation design was;

PROPPANT FLUID SCHEDULE					
	Cum (bbl)	Stage (bbl)	Proppant (ppg)	Proppant (lb)	Cum (lb)
Stage					
Hole Fill (Liquid CO ₂)	53	53		0	0
Pad (Liquid CO ₂)	190	115		0	2310
Start Sand	55	55	1.0	2,310	2,310
Increase Sand	110	55	2.0	4,620	6,930
Increase Sand	165	55	3.0	6,930	13,860
Increase Sand	383	218	3.5	32,046	45,906
Flush (Liquid CO ₂)	615	44		0	45,906
	Total	615			

TREATMENT FLUID REQUIREMENTS						
	Hole +	Prop	Flush	Tot Pumped	Bottom	Total
Liquid CO ₂ (bbl)	168	403	44	615	10	625
CO ₂ (T)						120
Nitrogen (Mscf)						74

VII. DOE APPROVALS

A formal submittal package was prepared for each of the 7 groups and submitted to the DOE for consideration. After their review and some additional information provided, some of the treatments were approved for the cost-shared demonstration.

VIII. FIELD ACTIVITIES

A. Preparations

Preparations for the field activities included perforating the Candidate Wells and the placement of two 60 to 80 ton CO₂ storage vessels on the location and then filling them with liquid CO₂ during the 24 hour period prior to the treatment.

B. Stimulations

A summary of the perforation, stimulation specifics (volumes, rates, pressures) for all of the Candidate Wells is presented in the Final Report for each group.

IX. IS THE PROPOSED RESERVOIR LIKELY TO BENEFIT FROM THE CO₂/SAND TECHNOLOGY?

Because the CO₂/sand stimulation utilizes CO₂ as the working fluid which is pumped as a liquid and subsequently vaporizes at formation temperature and flows from the reservoir as a gas, no liquid remains behind and the gas can flow from the reservoir unimpeded.

X. OPERATORS

The following questions were considered by each of the operators, and each of the test areas provided or afforded:

- A. An interest in CO₂/Sand technology?
- B. An adequate test opportunity?
- C. A presently active drilling program?
- D. A future for successful results? Is the operator likely to continue implementing this technology without DOE cost support?
- E. An interest in DOE cost-supported participation?
- F. Share production data for five years?

G. Letter of Intent

The operator provided a letter of intent agreeing to:

1. Provide legitimate well opportunities for three mutually agreed upon wells,
2. Provide acceptable background information on the nearby wells including the drilling, completion, and production specifics,
3. Bear the normal additional expenses of cement bond logging, perforating, bull dozers, and other normally occurring expenses associated with stimulation events,
4. Participate in the demonstration project and the anticipated treatments specifics, and
5. Provide the production and flowing pressure information from the Candidate Wells for five years.

XI. TEST AREAS

A. TEST AREA #1 – Crockett Co, Tx – Package #'s 1A & 1B - 9 Stages / 6 Wells

1. Location

Two Test Areas:

1A – Block NG (Montgomery)

1B - Block MM (Hoover-Hatton)

The first demonstrations under the contract were executed in December, 1995 in two characteristically separate groups each containing three wells.

They are situated in the Val Verde Basin of South Texas in Crockett County near the town of Ozona, and produced from the Canyon Sands at depths ranging from 6,428 to 7,420 feet. The production is primarily gas with minimal condensate - approximately one barrel per million cubic feet of gas (1 bbl/MMcf).

The major differences between the two areas, 1A-Block NG (Montgomery) and 1-BBlock MM (Hoover-Hatton) are that the Canyon Sand interval in Block NG contains an increased pay thickness.

2. Operator

The operator was at the time was Union Pacific Resources (UPR) formerly Union Pacific Resources Corporation (UPRC). UPR has since been purchased by Anadarko Petroleum.

3. Reservoir

The target formations are the Canyon Sands which are complex deep water turbidite deposits that contain numerous gas productive members. They are approximately 1,200 feet thick and contain eight individual sand members which are designated A (shallowest) through H, and some may not be present in offset wells. Consequently the perforated intervals vary and ranged in depth from 6,428 to 7,420 feet in the Candidate Wells. Because of this variation, the per-well reserves can vary considerably within an area and range from 0.2 to 1.2 billion cubic feet (Bcf) of gas.

4. Producing Horizon

The Canyon Sands are known for the capillary retention of liquids and these Candidate Wells were considered to be good candidates for demonstrating the liquid-free CO₂/Sand technology. Historically, a number of these sand members were stimulated and the production co-mingled.

The unique combination of the zones within individual wells complicated attempts at fracture analysis. Numerous studies performed by UPR were unsuccessful in identifying a relationship between treatment size (proppant volume) and the post-fracture well performance.

5. Test Area #1A - Block NG (Montgomery) - Two Stage Completions

Block NG occupies approximately four sections and contained seventeen active wells. The three Candidate Wells were completed in the C (Lower) & E (Middle) Sands and were stimulated with two stage CO₂/sand treatments.

The reservoir pressure was about 50% of the original (when they were drilled on 320 acre spacing) and the estimated ultimate recoveries (EUR's) generally range between 1,500 and 4,500 MMcf.

a. Permeability

The permeability's range from 0.001 to in excess of 0.10 millidarcy.

b. Reservoir Pressure and Temperature

The reservoir temperatures and pressures were:

Well	Press (psig)	Temp (°F)	Total Depth (ft)
Hoover 7C-7	760*	155	7,585**
Hatton 8C-4	760*	181	7,613
Hatton 13-14	760*	182	7,515
* Calculated			
** The total depths are deeper than the lowermost perforation; for instance the deepest perforation in the Hoover 7C-7 well is 7,420 feet			

A review of the phase behavior at these temperatures and pressures confirmed that the CO₂ would vaporize under these conditions. A phase diagram for each well group was prepared and is not included here, but accompanies the report for that group

c. Sensitivity to Stimulation Liquids

The wells in these areas require some time to clean up following the liquid based stimulations and appeared to be excellent candidate opportunities for this technology.

The Canyon Sands are known for the capillary retention of liquids, and each of the two groups of three Candidate Wells were considered to be viable opportunities for demonstrating the liquid-free CO₂/Sand technology. Primarily, because of the suspicion that formation damage was resulting from the formations sensitivity to stimulation liquids, and also through the interest that UPR indicated in the process and their ability to effectively evaluate the results through their in-house knowledge and large data set.

d. Control Wells

There were 7 Control Wells:

	Well	Pmt # 42-105-	5 Yr Prod (MMcf)
		xxxx	
1	Montgomery 02-17	10786	1,695.2
2	Montgomery 01-17	10785	1,100.2
3	Montgomery 03-15	30742	814.4
4	Montgomery 07-16	31725	662.0
5	Montgomery 04-15	31021	510.9
6	Montgomery 05-18	31727	370.8
7	Montgomery 01-16	10101	65.8

e. Candidate Wells

There were three Candidate Wells. They were infill wells which were drilled on 40 acre spacing and the initial plan was to stimulate them with conventional stimulations with an anticipated performance of approximately 70% that of the 80 acre wells drilled previously.

	Well	Pmt # 42-105-	5 Yr Prod (MMcf)
		xxxx	
1	Montgomery 13-18	36988	26.7
2	Montgomery 12-18	36989	120.8
3	Montgomery 14-18	36987	153.6

(1) Stimulation #1 - Candidate Well # 1 – Montgomery 13-18 (36988)

(a) Stage #1

A total of 24,200 pounds of sand were placed in zone, in the first stage. The maximum acceptance sand concentrations were unknown and screened out as the 3.0 ppg sand concentration started into the formation.

(b) Stage #2

The treatment consisted of 26,100 lbs of proppant were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 40.0 barrels per minute and 5,230 psi respectively. It screened out with 20,800 pounds of proppant in zone for an average in zone proppant concentration of 1.37 ppg.

(2) Stimulation #2 - Candidate Well #2 – Montgomery 12-18 (36989)

(a) Stage #1

The first stage was stimulated with 25,000 lbs of proppant pumped at an average rate and pressure of 40.0 barrels per minute. The treatment screened out with 10,400 pounds of proppant in zone for an average in zone proppant concentration of 0.73 ppg. The treatment was compromised by significant CO₂ leaks around the piston rod packings. The leakage was estimated to be at least five (5) barrels per minute. The resultant injection rate after the leaks would be 35 barrels per minute and is believed to be the explanation for the screen out.

(b) Stage #2

The second stage treatment consisted of 20,700 lbs of proppant pumped at an average rate and pressure of 43.0 barrels per minute. The in zone proppant volume was estimated 19,800 pounds.

(3) Stimulation #3 - Candidate Well #3 -- Montgomery 14-18 (36987)

(a) Stage #1

11,500 lbs of proppant were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 39.6 barrels per minute and 5,590 psi respectively. The treatment had to be temporarily discontinued after pumping 39 barrels of CO₂ because of a leaking wellhead isolation tool. The pumping was halted and the pressure bled from the well head to replace a leaking element. The pumping was resumed after approximately two hours. The in zone proppant volume was an estimated 8,100 pounds.

(b) Stage #2

The treatment consisted of 13,700 lbs of proppant pumped at an average rate and pressure of 43.0 barrels per minute and 5,100 psi respectively. The in zone proppant volume was estimated 12,900 pounds.

(4) Stimulation Summary

Summary							
Well	St	Sand (sacks)		Max Tr Press (psi)	Avg Rate (BPM)	Sand Conc	
		Pumped	In-Zone			Max	Avg
M#13	1	265	242	6,200	47.0	3.0	2.0
M#13	2	261	208	5,796	40.0	3.0	1.5
M#12	1	250	104	6,500	40.0	2.0	1.4
M#12	2	207	198	6,100	43.0	2.0	1.6
M#14	1	115	81	5,590	39.6	2.0	0.9
M#14	2	137	129	5,600	43.0	2.0	1.2

f. Results

(1) Production Comparisons

(a) Summary – Control Wells

The five year cumulative production volumes from the seven Control Wells ranged from 65.8 to 1,695.2 MMcf and averaged 745 MMcf.

Production - Canyon Sands (E & C)
Crockett Co, TX - Block NG (Montgomery) - Secs 15, 16, 17, 18
7 Wells - 14 Stages
Stimulation: Gelled Water - w/100,000 - 200,000 lbs Proppant/Stg

(b) Summary – Candidate Wells

The five year cumulative production from the three Candidate Wells ranged between 26.7 and 153.6 MMcf and averaged 100.4 MMcf.

(c) Summary Control and Candidate Wells

The projected five year cumulative production from the Candidate Wells averaged 100.4 MMcf while that from the seven Control Wells averaged 745.0 MMcf or 7.4 times that from the wells stimulated with the liquid CO₂/sand process.

Average Production - Canyon Sands (E & C)
Crockett Co, TX - Block NG (Montgomery) - Secs 15, 16, 17,18
10 Wells - 17 Stages
Stim: Gelled H₂O (7 wells) w/100,000 - 200,000 lbs Prop/Stg
CO₂/Sand (3 wells) w/ 8,100 - 20,800 lbs Prop/Stg

g. Conclusions - Test Area #1A

- (1) The liquid CO₂/sand stimulations were somewhat successfully pumped in the Canyon Sands. Although it had not been conclusively established that they could be successfully pumped they were, but at considerably reduced proppant volumes than the design.

- (2) The production from the three Candidate Wells was considerably less than that from the Control Wells.

The projected five year cumulative production averaged 100.4 MMcf while that from the seven Control Wells averaged 745.0 MMcf or 7.4 times that from the wells stimulated with the liquid CO₂/sand process.

- (3) These poor responses from the wells stimulated with the CO₂/sand process are unquestionably related to a number of factors regarding the formation characteristics of permeability, and pressure, but to a larger extent to the reduced proppant volumes placed by the liquid-free treatments

The conventional stimulations in both Test Areas #'s, 1A & 1B were stimulated with either borate cross-linked guar gum or HPC gels containing 100-200 thousand pounds of 20/40 mesh proppant whereas the proppant volumes placed with the liquid CO₂/Sand process were much less.

The proppant volumes in the liquid CO₂/sand treatments ranged from 8,100 to 24,200 pounds per stage. If the lowest volume, 8,100 pounds is removed, the five stage range was 10,400 to 24,200 and averaged

17,600 pounds or only 9 to 18 percent of that placed in the conventional treatments.

The actual volumes placed in zone were:

Stage 1			
Well	Pumped (K lbs)	Removed from well (K lbs)	Net in zone (K lbs)
Montgomery 13-18	26.5	2.3	24.2
Montgomery 12-18	25.0	14.6	10.4
Montgomery 14-18	11.5	3.4	8.1

Stage 2			
Well	Pumped (K lbs)	Removed from well (K lbs)	Net in zone (K lbs)
Montgomery 13-18	26.1	5.3	20.8
Montgomery 12-18	20.7	0.9	19.8
Montgomery 14-18	13.7	0.8	12.9

And, the ability to place the design quantities was obviously limited by

- (a) The reduced pump rate of 40 barrels per minute, which was driven by a maximum tubular strength limitation of 6,500 psi.
- (b) High leak off rates into the formation.
- (c) In retrospect the inability of Halliburton to provide the design pump rate primarily because of the significant CO₂ leaks and the utilization of small diameter plungers compromised the ability to place proppant.

h. Significant equipment problems with CO₂ leakage around the piston rods was experienced. There were twelve Halliburton pumpers and the leakage became so severe that they were not visible from the blender operators position. They were shut down and partially remediated.

i. Costs

The costs for the CO₂/sand stimulations (6 wells - 9 stages) was \$407,462 or \$45,274 per stage. Cost advantages resulted from a major reduction in pumping costs through the utilization of a locally available service company, Halliburton Energy Services (HES). The original bid was much greater and also required a significant mobilization charge. To a lesser extent, a cost savings for CO₂ of \$7,380 was realized by utilizing another supplier.

j. Well specific data

Well	Pmt # 42-105-	5 Yr Prod Proj't'd	Stim
	xxxx		Type, Sxs, Bbls
Montgomery 02-17	10786	1,695.2	
Montgomery 01-17	10785	1,100.2	
Montgomery 03-15	30742	814.4	
Montgomery 07-16	31725	662.0	
Montgomery 04-15	31021	510.9	
Montgomery 05-18	31727	370.8	
Montgomery 14-18	36987	153.6	CO ₂ 81, 635 CO ₂ 129, 538
Montgomery 12-18	36989	120.8	CO ₂ 104, 630 CO ₂ 198, 604
Montgomery 01-16	10101	65.8	
Montgomery 13-18	36988	26.7	CO ₂ 242, 588 CO ₂ 208, 583

6. Test Area #1B - Block MM (Hoover-Hatton) – Single Stage Completions

Block MM has approximately the same areal extent and the productive intervals are the lower G & H Canyon Sand intervals.

The previous spacing was 80 acres which was, at the time, reduced to 40 subject to a pending request. There were 25 producing wells in Block MM. Four CO₂/Sand stimulation sites were offered.

a. Control Wells

There were 10 Control Wells:

	Well	Pmt # 42-105-	5 Yr Prod Proj't'd
		XXXX	
1	Hatton 03-13	32174	434.2
2	Hoover 04-07	34267	332.5
3	Anderson 01-14	32307	292.5
4	Hatton 01-14	32124	187.0
5	Hatton 02-08	32004	163.1
6	Hatton 04-08	32260	161.3
7	Hatton 03-14	32182	146.5
8	Hatton 01-08	32003	131.4
9	Hatton 02-13	32165	91.6
10	Hatton 01-13	32143	62.8

b. Candidate Wells

The three Candidate Wells and ten Control Wells were situated in test area #1B and all were completed in the G & H Sands and stimulated with a single stage CO₂/sand treatment. The reservoir pressure was approximately 80 to 90% of the original and the EUR's have to exceed 300 million cubic feet of gas equivalence (300 MMcf) to meet the operators minimum economic hurdle.

	Well	Pmt # 42-105-	5 Yr Prod Proj't'd
		XXXX	
1	Hatton 13-14	36848	35.6
2	Hatton 7C-7	36960	89.9
3	Hatton 8C-4	36991	44.6

(1) Stimulation #1 - Candidate Well #1 - Hatton 13-14 (36848)

A total of 13,900 lbs of proppant were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 34.0 (39-5) barrels per minute and 6,600 psi respectively.

The pumping operation was terminated because of a screen out. It was being pumped at 39 bpm and a good deal of CO₂ leakage around the piston rod packings (12 pumps) reduced the injection rate by an estimated 5 bpm resulting in an actual through-wellhead rate of 34 bpm. The in zone proppant volume was estimated 5,600 pounds.

(2) Stimulation #2 - Candidate Well #2 - Hatton 7C-7 (36960)

A total of 11,200 lbs of proppant were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 39.5 barrels per minute and 5,800 psi respectively. The in zone proppant volume was estimated 10,200 pounds.

(3) Stimulation #3 - Candidate Well #3 - Hatton 8C-4 (36991)

A total of 14,000 lbs of proppant were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 40.0 barrels per minute and 5,800 psi respectively. The in zone proppant volume was estimated 11,700 pounds.

(4) Stimulation Summary

Well	Sand (sacks)		Max Tr Press	Avg Rate	Sand Conc	
	Pumped	In-Zone	Psi	BPM	Max	Avg
13-14	139	56	7,400*	39.0	2.0	1.1
7C-7	112	102	6,050	39.5	1.0	0.8
8C-4	140	117	6,250	40.0	2.0	1.0
* Well equipped with P-110 casing						

c. Results

(1) Production Comparisons

(a) Summary – Control Wells

The five year cumulative production from the ten Control Wells ranged between 62.8 and 434.2 MMcf and averaged 200.3 MMcf.

Production - Canyon Sands (G & H)
Crockett Co, TX - Block MM (Hatton)- Sec's 8, 13 & 14
10 Wells - 10 Stages
Stimulation: Gelled Water - w/100,000 - 200,000 lbs Proppant/Stg

(b) Summary – Candidate Wells

The five year cumulative production from the three Candidate Wells ranged between 35.6 and 89.9 MMcf and averaged 56.7 MMcf.

(c) Summary Control and Candidate Wells

The production from the three Candidate Wells was considerably less than that from the Control Wells. The projected five year cumulative production ranged from 35.6 to 89.9 MMcf and averaged 56.7 MMcf. That from the ten Control Wells ranged from 62.8 to 434.2 MMcf and averaged 200.3 MMcf or 3.5 times that from the wells stimulated with the liquid CO₂/sand process.

Average Production - Canyon Sands (G & H)

Crockett Co, TX - Block MM (Hatton)- Sec's 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, & 13

10 Wells - 10 Stages

Stimulation: Gelled Water (7 wells) - w/100,000 - 200,000 lbs Proppant/Stg

CO₂/Sand (3 wells) - w/5,600 - 11,700 lbs

d. Conclusions - Test Area #1B

- (1) Liquid CO₂/sand stimulations were somewhat successfully pumped in the Canyon Sands. Although it had not been conclusively established that they could be successfully pumped they were, but at considerably reduced proppant volumes than the design.
- (2) The production from the three Candidate Wells was considerably less than that from the Control Wells.

The projected five year cumulative production averaged 56.7 MMcf while that from the ten Control Wells averaged 200.3 MMcf or 3.5 times that from the wells stimulated with the liquid CO₂/sand process.

- (3) These poor responses from the wells stimulated with the CO₂/sand process are unquestionably related to a number of factors regarding the formation characteristics of permeability, and pressure, but to a larger extent to the reduced proppant volumes placed by the liquid-free treatments
- (4) The proppant volumes placed were much less than the design and ranged from 5,600 to 11,700 pounds or approximately twelve percent of that placed in conventional treatments. The actual volumes placed in zone were:

	Pumped	Removed from well	Net in zone
Well	(K lbs)	(K lbs)	(K lbs)
Hatton 13-14	1.39	8.3	5.6
Hoover 7C-7	11.2	1.0	10.2
Hatton 8C-4	14.0	2.3	11.7

And, the ability to place the design quantities was obviously limited by

- (5) The reduced pump rate of 40 barrels per minute, which was driven by a maximum well head pressure of 6,500 psi.
 - (a) High leak off rates into the formation.

After the tubing was installed, the production levels would not support the additional expense of CO₂/Sand stimulations, even if the well with poor geology, 13-14, is eliminated.

e. Costs

The costs for the CO₂/sand stimulations (6 wells - 9 stages) was \$407,462 or \$45,274 per stage. Cost advantages resulted from a major reduction in pumping costs through the utilization of a locally available service company, Halliburton Energy Services (HES). The original bid was much greater and also required a significant mobilization charge. To a lesser extent, a cost savings for CO₂ of \$7,380 was realized by utilizing another supplier.

f. Well Specific Data

Well	Pmt # 42-105-	5 Yr Prod Proj	5 Yr Prod Actual	Prod Mo	Stim
	Xxxx	(MMcf)	(MMcf)		Type, Sxs, Bbls
Hatton 03-13	32174	434.2	449.6		
Hoover 04-07	34267	332.5	255.7		
Anderson 01-14	32307	292.5	173.0	40	
Hatton 01-14	32124	187.0	199.4		
Hatton 02-08	32004	163.1	166.9		
Hatton 04-08	32260	161.3	150.1		
Hatton 03-14	32182	146.5	160.0		
Hatton 01-08	32003	131.4	109.7		
Hatton 02-13	32165	91.6	89.9		
Hatton 7C-7	36960	89.9	79.1	46	CO ₂ 102, 640
Hatton 01-13	32143	62.8	65.3		
Hatton 8C-4	36991	44.6	44.3	45	CO ₂ 117, 659
Hatton 13-14	36848	35.6	23.8	45	CO ₂ 56, 466

7. Conclusions Test Areas 1A & 1B

a. With one exception, all nine stages, six on the Montgomery lease and three on the Hatton leases were rate-limited to approximately 40-43 barrels per minute because of the maximum allowable wellhead treating pressures of approximately 6,200 psi. Forty barrels per minute is approaching the minimum injection rates to reliably transport 20/40 size sand proppant.

b. The production from the Candidate Wells was disappointingly low:

(1) Test Area #1A - Block NG (Montgomery)

The projected five year cumulative production averaged 100.4 MMcf while that from the seven Control Wells averaged 745.0 MMcf or 7.4 times that from the wells stimulated with the liquid CO₂/sand process.

(2) Test Area #2 Block MM (Hoover)

The projected five year cumulative production averaged 56.7 MMcf while that from the ten Control Wells averaged 200.3 MMcf or 3.5 times that from the wells stimulated with the liquid CO₂/sand process.

(3) These poor responses from the wells stimulated with the CO₂/sand process are unquestionably related to a number of factors regarding the formation characteristics of permeability, and pressure, but to a larger extent to the reduced proppant volumes placed by the liquid-free treatments

(4) The placed proppant volumes with the CO₂/sand process were much lower than the design volumes:

(a) Test Area #1A - Block NG (Montgomery)

The proppant volumes placed were much less than the design and ranged from 8,100 to 24,200 pounds per stage. If the lowest volume, 8,100 pounds is removed, the five stage range was 10,400 to 24,200 and averaged 17,600 pounds or approximately twelve percent of that placed in conventional treatments.

The actual volumes placed in zone were:

Stage 1			
	Pumped	Removed from well	Net in zone
Well	(K lbs)	(K lbs)	(K lbs)
Montgomery 13-18	26.5	2.3	24.2
Montgomery 12-18	25.0	14.6	10.4
Montgomery 14-18	11.5	3.4	8.1

Stage 2			
	Pumped	Removed from well	Net in zone
Well	(K lbs)	(K lbs)	(K lbs)
Montgomery 13-18	26.1	5.3	20.8
Montgomery 12-18	20.7	0.9	19.8
Montgomery 14-18	13.7	0.8	12.9

i) The treatments are summarized

Well	Stg	Sand (sacks)		Max Tr Press	Avg Rate	Sand Conc (lb/gal)	
		Pumped	In-Zone	Psi	BPM	Max	Avg
M#13	1	265	242	6,200	47.0	3.0	2.0
M#13	2	261	208	5,796	40.0	3.0	1.5
M#12	1	250	104	6,500	40.0	2.0	1.4
M#12	2	207	198	6,100	43.0	2.0	1.6
M#14	1	115	81	5,590	39.6	2.0	0.9
M#14	2	137	129	5,600	43.0	2.0	1.2

(b) Test Area #2 Block MM (Hoover)

The proppant volumes placed were much less than the design and ranged from 5,600 to 11,700 pounds or approximately twelve percent of that placed in conventional treatments. The actual volumes placed in zone were:

	Pumped	Removed from well	Net in zone
Well	(K lbs)	(K lbs)	(K lbs)
Hatton 13-14	1.39	8.3	5.6
Hoover 7C-7	11.2	1.0	10.2
Hatton 8C-4	14.0	2.3	11.7

(5) The ability to place the design quantities was obviously limited by:

- (a) The reduced pump rate of 40 barrels per minute, which was driven by a maximum well head pressure of 6,500 psi.
- (b) High leak off rates into the formation.
 - i) The treatments are summarized

	Sand (sacks)		Max Tr Press	Avg Rate	Sand Conc (lb/gal)	
Well	Pumped	In-Zone	Psi	BPM	Max	Avg
Hatton 13-14	139	56	7,400	39.0	2.0	1.1
Hoover 7C-7	112	102	6,050	39.5	1.0	0.8
Hatton 8C-4	140	117	6,250	40.0	2.0	1.0

- (6) The costs for the CO₂/sand stimulations (6 wells - 9 stages) was \$407,462 or \$45,274 per stage. Cost advantages resulted from a major reduction in pumping costs through the utilization of a locally available service company, Halliburton Energy Services (HES). The original bid was much greater and also required a significant mobilization charge. To a lesser extent, a cost savings for CO₂ of \$7,380 was realized by utilizing another supplier.

- (7) In retrospect the inability of Halliburton to provide the design pump rate primarily because of the significant CO₂ leaks and the utilization of small diameter plungers compromised the ability to place proppant.

Significant equipment problems with CO₂ leakage around the piston rods was experienced. There were twelve Halliburton pumpers and the leakage became so severe that they were not visible from the blender operators position. They were shut down and partially remediated.

- (8) Summarizing, the conclusion is that fracture lengths longer than those which can be generated with CO₂/Sand stimulations are required in this area. It is too "tight".

- (9) The production from only one well, Montgomery #14, exceeded the economic hurdle rate, the others are significantly below the economic rate, the conclusion is that larger fracture lengths than can be generated with CO₂/Sand stimulations are required in this area. It is too "tight".

B. TEST AREA #2 – San Juan Co, NM - Package # 2 – 3 Stage / 3 Wells

1. Location

Northeast New Mexico near the town of Blanco.

The Candidate Well(s) are completed in the Fruitland Coals which are an Upper Cretaceous sequence of interbedded sandstones, siltstones, shale, and coal which lie a depth of 2,000-2,500 feet in the Test Area. The coals have thicknesses of 36-60 feet, and the basal coal, Cahn, is 45 to 60 feet thick, and is the most productive. It along with other overlying coal members were stimulated. The treated intervals ranged from 120 to 180 feet.

The Candidate Wells were considered to provide a good opportunity to demonstrate the CO₂/Sand stimulation process in a liquid-sensitive reservoir where the capillary retention of stimulation liquids was known to be detrimental to gas production. And,

if the treatments turned out to be successful, then the marginal nature of this portion of this reservoir (Type III) would become more economically attractive.

2. Operator – Amoco Production

In 1995 Amoco Production Company (Amoco) - now BP - had an active drilling program in the Fruitland Coals in San Juan County, New Mexico and indicated a strong interest in participating in the DOE's cost shared demonstration project to evaluate the potential of the liquid-free, CO₂/Sand stimulation technology.

3. Reservoir

The Fruitland Coal wells on the Fairway are in an area designated as Type I and typically produce up to 1,000 Mcf per day along with 10-50 barrels of water (GLR = 20-100 Mcf/bbl) from the reservoir at a pressure of 600-800 psi. To the north of the Fairway in the Type II area the wells produce gas at 0-500 Mcf per day and 10-50 barrels of water (GLR = 25-50 Mcf/bbl).

Type	Location	Reservoir Pressure		Gas prod	Water	GLR
		P _{original}	P _{now}	Mcf/d	Bwpd	Mcf/bbl
I	Fairway (FW)	1000	600-800	>1000	10-50	20-100
II	NE of FW	1000	600-800	0-500	10-20	25-50
III	SW of FW (Target)	500	500	0-250	1-2	125-250

4. Producing Horizon - Type III Area

In the Type III area southwest of the Fairway where the Candidate Wells are situated, the production is typically 0-250 Mcf per day and is essentially water free. The wells can produce 1-2 barrels of liquid daily (GLR = 165 Mcf/bbl), sometimes mostly condensate which may originate in the underlying Pictured Cliff Sandstone(PC).

5. Reservoir Pressure and Temperature

The reservoir pressure and temperature in the area where the Candidate Wells are situated is approximately 500 psi and 102 degrees Fahrenheit respectively.

	Temp	Total Depth
Well	(°F)	(ft)
Florance GCL-1	N/R	2,206
Florance Q-1	105	2,264
Riddle I-1	101	2,277

A review of the phase behavior at these temperatures and pressures confirmed that the CO₂ would vaporize under these conditions. A phase diagram for each well group was prepared and is not included here, but accompanies the report for that group

6. Control Wells

There were 6 Control Wells

	Well	Pmt # 30-045-	5 Yr Prod Proj't'd
		XXXX	
1	Federal 32-17	28472	445.2
2	Sharp	21160	378.7
3	Federal 23-17	28471	266.6
4	Federal 42-16	28337	199.8
5	Federal 28-08-30	28863	81.8
6	Grambling A	21041	15.6

- a. The five year cumulative production from the six Control Wells ranged between 15.6 and 445.2 MMcf and averaged 231.3 MMcf.

Production - Fruitland Coal
San Juan Co, NM -- 28 - 08 Sec's 20 & 29
6 Wells - 6 Stages
Stimulation: N₂ Foam - 1 Stage

7. Candidate Wells

There were three Candidate Wells.

			1 st Yr Dly
Well*	Lease	Pmt #	Prod (Mcf/d)
3	Florance GCL1	29336	140
4	Florance Q1	29328	150
2	Riddle I1	29345	110

a. Perforation Strategy

The perforation placements were identified from the electric logs and positioned at the coal intervals which have lower bulk densities. The accompanying electric logs (Figures 7 to 9) indicate this placement technique.

Well	Interval (ft)	Perfs
Riddle I-1	120	200
Florance GCL-1	180	316
Florance Q-1	158	288

b. Stimulations

(1) Candidate Well #1 - Florance GCL-1 (29336)

A total of 9,800 lbs of proppant were pumped in 137 bbls of CO₂ at an average rate and pressure of 55.8 barrels per minute and 2,226 psi respectively. The well screened out with 7,500 lbs of proppant through the perforations. The in zone proppant volume was estimated 7,500 pounds.

(2) Candidate Well #2 – Florance Q-1 (29345)

An effort to increase the placed volume included increasing the pad volume from 90 to 148 barrels along with an increase in the initial sand concentration from 1.0 to 1.5 pounds per gallon (ppg). A total sand-laden CO₂ volume of 101 bbls was pumped which was less than the 137 pumped in the first well treated, Candidate Well #2, Florance GCL-1.

A total of 6,200 lbs of proppant was pumped at an average rate and pressure of 55.8 barrels per minute and 2,145 psi respectively. The maximum sand concentration was 1.9 lbs per gal, and averaged 1.5. The in zone proppant volume was estimated 4,800 pounds.

(3) Candidate Well #3 - Riddle I-1 (29328)

The treatment was modified and it was considerably more successful in that 130 sacks of sand were placed in zone.

A total of 15,200 lbs of proppant was pumped at an average rate and pressure of 50.0 barrels per minute and 2,517 psi respectively.

The increased sand volume which was placed in this well is likely result of:

- (a) The reduced number of perforations 200 vs. 288 and 316 in the other two Candidate Wells
- (b) The introduction of a 20 bbl 0.5ppg sand slug in the middle of the pad
- (c) Maintaining a reduced sand concentration of 0.75 ppg.

c. Stimulation Summary

- (1) All three wells screened out and the treatments were terminated. Following the screen out of the first treatment the pad volume was increased from 90 to 148 bbls and the starting sand concentration increased from 1.0 to 1.5 ppg yet a lesser in zone proppant volume resulted. This response indicates that increasing the pad volume provides no benefit, and that the ability to transport sand at concentrations of 1.0 ppg or greater is unlikely.
- (2) The largest sand volume was placed in the third treatment, Riddle I-1 which included a 20bbl - 0.5ppg sand slug in the pad and a reduced sand concentration of 0.75 ppg.
- (3) A contributing factor is believed to be the large number of perforations (200 to 316).
- (4) The "in-zone" sand volumes and other specifics were:

Well	Perfs	Sand (sacks)		Max Tr Press	Avg Rate	Sand Conc (lb/gal)	
		Pumped	In-Zone	Psi	BPM	Max	Avg
Riddle I-1	200	152	130	4,702	50.0	1.9	0.8
Florance GCL-1	316	98	75	3,576	55.8	2.5	1.6
Florance Q-1	288	62	48	4,100	55.8	1.9	1.5

- (5) There was inter-zonal communication between the Fruitland Coal and the Pictured Cliff Sandstone.

When stimulating all three of the Candidate Wells there were increases in production and/or casing pressure in the offset wells (on the same location) as the CO₂ treatments were being pumped.

These offset wells were completed in the Pictured Cliff Sandstone, but not the Fruitland Coals.

(a) Florance GCL-1

The casing pressure in the offset well increased from 148 to 185 psi, and the production increased from 158 to 165 Mcf per day indicating the communication with the Candidate Well.

(b) Florance Q-1

The casing pressure in the offset well increased from 144 to 160 psi, and the production increased from 130 to 138 Mcf per day indicating the communication with the Candidate Well.

(c) Riddle I-1

The casing pressure in the offset well increased from 127 to 460 psi, and the production increased from 190 to 420 Mcf per day indicating the communication with the Candidate Well. Additionally, a gas sample was obtained following the treatment and was reported to contain 44% CO₂, indicating communication between these formations. The offset well was perforated in the basal section (Cahn) of the Fruitland Coal. The Candidate Well was not.

8. Results

a. Production Comparisons

(1) Summary – Control Wells

The five year cumulative production from the six Control Wells ranged between 15.6 and 445.2 MMcf and averaged 231.3 MMcf.

(2) Production Summary – Candidate Wells

The five year cumulative production from the three Candidate Wells ranged between 65.3 and 141.9 MMcf and averaged 91.3 MMcf.

Production - Fruitland Coal
San Juan Co, NM -- 28 - 08 Sec's 20 & 29
3 Wells - 3 Stages
Stimulation: CO₂/Sand - 1 Stage - w/4,800 - 13,000 lbs

(3) Summary Control and Candidate Wells

The five year cumulative production volumes from the three Candidate Wells ranged from 65.3 to 141.9 averaging 91.3 MMcf or 39 percent that of the six Control Wells.

These poor responses from the wells stimulated with the CO₂/sand process are unquestionably related to a number of factors regarding the formation characteristics of permeability and pressure, but to a larger extent to the reduced proppant volumes placed by the liquid-free treatments. In the test area, the conventionally stimulated wells were stimulated with 70-75q nitrogen foam containing 250,000 pounds of sand, or The proppant volumes placed were much less than the design and ranged from 4,800 to 13,000 pounds and averaged 8,433 lbs or approximately three percent (3%) of that placed in conventional treatments.

Final Report - Grp #'s 1A & 1B (Crockett Co, TX), Grp #2 (San Juan Co, NM), Grp #5 (Phillips Co, MT), Grp #7 (Blaine Co, MT)
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

b. Costs

(1) Projected

The projected costs for stimulating these wells with 120 tons of liquid CO₂ and 40,320 pounds of sand were:

Wells	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
Totals	\$178,340	\$236,200

(2) Actual

The actual costs for the CO₂/sand stimulations were:

01/22/96	Cost Summary			Page 1 of 1
Number	Riddle I-1	Florance GCL #1	Florance Q-1	
Pumping \$(UWS)	19,660	19,139	16,791	
N2 (HES)	1,695	3,632	2,044	
Sand (HES)	2,046	891	705	
Misc	<u>23,401</u>	<u>23,661</u>	<u>19,540</u>	66,603
CO2 (BOC)	6,654	7,447	8,186	
CO2-Portables (BOC)	1,200	1,200	1,200	
Mob (BOC)	2,000	2,000	2,000	
Blender (UWS)	6,000	6,000	6,000	
Tube Trailer (UWS)	<u>5,500</u>	<u>5,500</u>	<u>5,500</u>	
	21,354	22,147	22,886	66,386
Mob,Per Diem (UWS)	2,080	9,600		
Trucking		2,840		
Mob,Per Diem (UWS)				
Misc	<u>2,080</u>	<u>12,440</u>	<u>0</u>	14,520
Total	46,835	58,248	42,426	147,509

c. Conclusions

- (1) The projected five year cumulative production ranged from the three Candidate Wells ranged from 65.3 to 141.9 MMcf and averaged 91.3 MMcf while that from the six Control Wells ranged between 15.6 and 445.2 MMcf averaging 231.3 MMcf or 2.5 times that from the wells.

- (2) The cost of the conventional treatments was not disclosed but it is evident that the inability to place increased proppant volumes with the liquid CO₂/sand process irrespective of the cost resulted in a significant advantage of the conventional treatments because of the larger production rates.
- (3) These poor responses from the wells stimulated with the CO₂/sand process are unquestionably related to a number of factors regarding the formation characteristics of permeability, and pressure, but to a larger extent to the reduced proppant volumes placed by the liquid-free treatments

d. Well specific data

Well	Pmt # 30-045-	5 Yr Prod Projt'd	Stim
	xxxx		Type, Sxs, Bbls
Federal 32-17	28472	445.2	
Sharp	21160	378.7	
Federal 23-17	28471	266.6	
Federal 42-16	28337	199.8	
Florance GCL 1	29336	141.9	CO ₂ 75, 227
Federal 28-08-30	28863	81.8	
Florance Q1	29345	66.6	CO ₂ 48, 249
Riddle I-1	29328	65.3	CO ₂ 130, 513
Grambling A	21041	15.6	

The cost of the liquid CO₂ treatments averaged \$49,170 per well (1 stage), and the five year cumulative production averaged 91.3MMcf or \$0.54 per MCF. The stimulation costs for the conventional treatments was not disclosed by Amoco.

The placed proppant volumes obtained in the liquid CO₂ treatments was only on the order of three percent (3%) of that placed with conventional treatments, and although the production from the liquid CO₂ stimulations averaged 39 percent of that from the conventionally stimulated wells suggesting that production parity could be obtained if larger proppant volumes were pumped with the CO₂/sand treatments, this ability is presently considered to be unrealistic.

C. TEST AREA #3 - Phillips Co, Mt - Package # 5 – 3 Stages / 3 Wells

1. Location

The fourth group of wells to be treated are situated within the Williston Basin in Phillips County near the town of Saco in north-central Montana.

The test area was located in the northern most segments of WBI's Bowdoin Dome drilling boundaries and is approximately rectangular with dimensions of 2-1/2 by 3 miles. It is nine miles northwest of the town of Saco and three miles north of the Nelson reservoir. It includes seven sections within townships 32N and 33N and Range 32E. It included the three Candidate Wells, #'s 1019, 1020, and 1021, and at the time of the test, sixteen Control Wells consisting of nine existing wells and seven new wells all of which were stimulated with nitrogen Foam.

2. Operator

Fidelity Exploration & Production Co (formerly Williston Basin Interstate Pipeline Company (WBI) - subsidiaries of MDU Resources) was the operator of a large number of wells in the Bowdoin Dome in Phillips County, Montana.

3. Reservoir

The Phillips Sands constitute a volumetric drive reservoir with minimal water production. The in-place gas reserves range from 30 to 60 Mcf per acre foot which results in calculated producible reserves within the test area ranging between 175 and 400 MMcf per well. The annual decline rates range from 15 to 20 percent following a two to three month period of higher rate "flush production". Typical water production rates are as much as, but generally less than one barrel per month. The water is discharged into and quickly evaporates from an earthen pit. The majority of the pits show little if any indication of ever containing produced water. Within the test area the reservoir pressure, as measured by shut-in wellhead pressures ranges from 287 to 396 psi

4. Producing Horizon

The Bowdoin Dome is within the Williston Basin and is centered in Phillips County, Montana, approximately 50 miles west of the Ft. Peck Indian Reservation. It has been producing natural gas in commercial quantities since the 1920's from several Upper Cretaceous age formations, the Lower Phillips Sandstone being the deepest.

It along with the Upper Phillips are the producing formations in the three Candidate Wells which are the focus of this demonstration. These wells produced from the Phillips Sandstone, a shallow (1,200 ft), lower pressure (300 psi) Upper Cretaceous formation that was suspected of being damaged by conventional N₂ Foam stimulation procedures.

It had been estimated that 81% of the spent stimulation liquids remain in the Phillips and that these liquids could be damaging the reservoir and reducing the gas producing potential.

a. Reservoir Pressure and Temperature

Generally the reservoir pressure and temperature are 300 psi and 70°F and the pipeline pressure is approximately 100 psi.

b. Gas properties

The gas composition is 93% methane, 6% nitrogen, and 1% other gases, which results in a biogenic gas with a calorific value of 950 BTU per cubic foot.

c. Sensitivity to Stimulation Liquids

The Control Wells were stimulated with 65 quality nitrogen Foam. Because of the liquid sensitive nature, lower pressure of these formations, and the reduced volume of the stimulation load water returned, which has been estimated to be 81%, it was suspected that the advantages of a liquid-free stimulation could result in an economic benefit.

5. Control Wells

The production projections were based on the observations made from the produced volumes from the nearby Control Wells which were all perforated in both the Upper and Lower Phillips Sand members-Cumulative for Months 2 through 13.

Control Wells (N ₂ Foam)								
Existing Wells (Stimulated Prior to 07/98)								
Well #	Twp	Rge	Sec	Quad	API #	Cum Prod (MMcf)		
					25-071-	Month 2	Month 13	Month 2-13
972	33N	32E	27	NW	22267	1.046	25.433	24.387
973	33N	32E	32	SE	22268	1.187	80.759	79.572
974	33N	32E	33	NE	22269	0.874	55.875	55.001
976	33N	32E	35	NW	22272	0.441	56.654	56.213
990	32N	32E	02	NW	22275	12.699	83.790	71.091
991	32N	32E	01	NE	22279	9.158	63.894	54.736
997	33N	32E	32	NE	22287	?????	32.568	32.568
1000	32N	32E	02	SE	22283	10.880	71.401	60.521
1002	33N	32E	33	SE	22288	9.671	66.678	57.007
							Avg (n=8)	57.316

6. Candidate Wells

The Candidate Wells were selected on the basis of their representative nature and position within the field, distance from an established reservoir boundary, and their proximity to conventionally stimulated Control Wells.

There was no difficulty encountered in placing the smaller proppant in the first treatment and, as planned, efforts were made to obtain 12/20 proppant which was being stored nearby and at the time being utilized by another service company in the execution of the N₂ Foam stimulations on other WBI wells. Unfortunately, although the proppant was available and dedicated to WBI, the other service company, Halliburton Energy Services would not make it available presumably because the CO₂/sand stimulations were being performed by a competing service company, Canadian Fracmaster.

The conventional stimulations utilize approximately the same proppant volume as that for a CO₂/sand treatment although of a larger size (12/20 vs. 20/40). The similarities of the proppant volumes resulted in a like comparison of the production resulting from the two stimulation types.

It should be noted that upon review and comparison of the production histories that there is a question as to whether the production rates from the CO₂/sand stimulations would have been greater and especially more variable if the larger proppant had been used.

7. Success criteria

Upon review of the production responses from the conventionally stimulated wells drilled prior to July, 98 it was agreed that, based upon the available information, the criteria success would be realized if the cumulative production for months 2 through

13 would be 50 MMcf if they were conventionally stimulated with nitrogen Foam and 40,000 pounds of proppant.

By mutual agreement it was agreed that this should serve as the measure by which the evaluation of the CO₂/sand stimulations would be judged.

	Cum Prod Months 2-13
Well #	(MMcf)
1019	50
1020	50
1021	50

8. Stimulations

a. Stimulation #1 – Well # 1021 (Candidate Well #1)

The first well stimulated with CO₂/sand was well #1021. It was stimulated with 44,100 lbs of 20/40 API specification proppant and 103 tons of liquid CO₂. The treatment consisted of a total of 536 Barrels of liquid CO₂ pumped at an average rate of 45.3 barrels per minute and an average pressure of 943 psi and a maximum of 1740 psi. The treatment design was to intentionally under flush to provide a proppant packed fracture to the well bore and an estimated quantity of 700 lbs was left in the casing - leaving an in-zone total of 43,400 lbs.

b. Stimulation #2 – Well # 1020 (Candidate Well #2)

The second well stimulated with CO₂/sand was well #1020. It was stimulated with 44,100 lbs of 20/40 API specification proppant and 86 tons of liquid CO₂. The treatment consisted of a total of 447 Barrels of liquid CO₂ pumped at an average rate of 45.9 barrels per minute and an average pressure of 870 psi and a maximum of 1,363 psi. An in-zone total of 43,400 lbs of proppant was placed.

c. Stimulation #3 – Well # 1019 (Candidate Well #3)

The third well stimulated with CO₂/sand was well #1019. It was stimulated with 32,100 lbs of 20/40 API specification proppant and 62 tons of liquid CO₂. The treatment consisted of a total of 321 barrels of liquid CO₂ pumped at an average rate of 40.9 barrels per minute and an average pressure of 754 psi and a maximum, at screen out, of 2,886 psi.

This last treatment did screen out as the sand concentration was increased and the sand concentration at the perforations was 5.2 ppg - the recorded sand loading at the surface was 8.2 pounds per gallon at the tail end of the treatment. This design was intentional to determine the maximum sand acceptance loading. In reality, without being able to discern it, it appears that the likely maximum sand concentration of approximately 5 ppg was approached during the first treatment. An estimated quantity of 4,400 lbs (300 ft) was left in the well bore above the perforations.

9. Costs

a. Conventional Stimulation

The cost of typical nitrogen foam stimulation in July 1998, at the time of the test was \$18,500 including nitrogen. The cost was reported earlier as \$25,000 which included \$5,000 for nitrogen and was initially used to project the required ratio for an economic success.

b. CO₂/Sand Stimulation

The projected costs for stimulating these wells with CO₂/sand was:

Equipment	\$16,053.79
Materials	35,957.65
CO ₂	incl
	52,011.44
Computer Control	1,080.00
Report	427.50
	53,518.94
3 Wells	160,556.82
Mobilization	17,500.00
	178,056.82
Per Well (÷ 3)	59,352.27
Cost to WBI	29,676.14
Cost to DOE	29,676.13
	\$59,352.27

c. Projected vs. Actual

The actual costs for the treatments was less than projected primarily because of reduced CO₂ volumes as a result of the accelerated sand schedules.

Costs	Stimulation	Isolation Tool	Total
Projected	178,056.82	6,333.00	184,389.82
Actual	161,871.10	6,543.00	168,414.10
Differences	(16,185.72)	210.00	(15,975.72)

10. Results

a. Production Comparisons

It was readily apparent that the cumulative gas production for months two through thirteen from all of the new wells, drilled within the control area in 1998 were less than those drilled previously. Consequently the production has been tabulated in three stimulation type groups:

- (1) N₂ Foam - Pre July 1998 (Control Wells)
- (2) N₂ Foam - July 1998 (Control Wells)
- (3) CO₂/Sand - July 1998 (Candidate Wells)

The average cumulative gas productions from each of these groups has been plotted and it dramatically indicates the superiority of the production from the pre 98 wells.

The cumulative production averages from both of the 98 Control (Group 2) and Candidate Wells (Group 3) are identical and considerably less than those drilled prior to 98 (Group 1).

It was determined later that the reduced production from the wells completed after 1998 was a result of reduced well spacing and reduced reservoir pressure.

A potential explanation is that the larger proppant size, 12/20 and greater sand concentration, 12 pounds per gallon utilized on the N₂ Foam stimulations may be offsetting proppant embedment? That is, that the smaller proppant (20/40) and the reduced proppant loading utilized for the CO₂/sand stimulations was resulting in a smaller propped fracture width.

11. Proppant size

Because there is some question as to whether the size of the proppant utilized in the stimulations may impact the production rates a review of the different size proppants used in twenty wells within the Bowdoin Field was made. The cumulative production was compared by utilizing the following information:

Number of Wells			
	Proppant Size		
Stim Type	08/16	12/20	20/40
N ₂ Foam:	8	9	
CO ₂ /Sand:			3

12. Conclusions

- a. Full proppant volume (40,000 pound) CO₂/sand stimulations were easily executed in the Phillips Sand in the Phillips Co, Montana test area
- b. The maximum sand concentration for CO₂/sand stimulations being pumped at 40 barrels per minute is approximately 5 pounds per gallon. The first well stimulated (1019) accepted 5.9 ppg without any indications of rejection. For

design purposes a maximum proppant loading for 40,000 lbs of 20/40 mesh proppant pumped at 40 bpm is 5 ppg.

- c. The criteria for success was that the cumulative production from months two through thirteen had to exceed 50 MMcf. This hurdle was based on the production from other nearby wells which were drilled prior to 1998 and also perforated in both the Upper and Lower Phillips Sandstone members. Only one of the ten wells stimulated in 1998, 1013 met this success criteria.
- d. The twenty-four month cumulative production volumes from the wells stimulated with the liquid-free CO₂/sand process are essentially the same as that from the Control Wells treated with N₂ Foam and utilizing the same 40,000 pound proppant volume.
- e. There is a suspicion that the wells which were stimulated with CO₂/sand are being choked by limited conductivity in the hydraulically created fracture, probably as a consequence of the smaller proppant size used (20/40 vs. 12/20). This is based on the observation of the nearly identical monthly production volumes from all three Candidate Wells. And, also on the production comparisons of twenty nearby wells which utilized larger proppant.

D. TEST AREA #4 - Blaine Co, Mt - Package # 7 - 4 Stages / 4 Wells

1. Location

Blaine County is situated in north-central Montana and is bounded on the north by Saskatchewan. The Tiger Ridge Field where the demonstration tests were located is north of the Bear Paw Mountains within Township 30N-Range 18E near the town of Havre.

2. Operator

Ocean Energy, Inc. (Ocean) was the largest gas producing company in Montana and was the operator of record for approximately 650 producing gas wells in the north-central area of the state, southeast of Havre

3. Reservoir

a. Porosity Permeability, Thickness, and EUR

The porosity ranges from 15 to 25 percent with permeability's ranging from 10 to 60 md and the completed thickness for both the Upper and Middle Eagle

Sands approaches 100 feet, depending on the gas/water contact. The newer wells produce approximately 150 Mcf daily and have EUR's on the order of 400 MMcf. Older wells which were drilled at virgin pressure had EUR's ranging generally up to 2BCF.

b. Reservoir Pressure and Temperature

The lower pressure reservoir portions where the Candidate Wells are located are in the Tiger Ridge field which is north of the Bear Paw mountains. This lower pressure section has been extensively drilled, and is now pressure depleted (225 psi). It generally will not clean up following the liquid-based stimulation treatments. Whereas the areas south of the Bear Paw mountains have significantly greater pressure, 500 psi, and can be successfully stimulated with nitrogen foam.

The reservoir pressure as measured by shut-in wellhead pressures in the Candidate Wells ranges from 175 to 297 psi in the test area:

Well	S - #	Pi (Psi)
T30N-R18E		
S-B Ranch	02-05	N/A
Blackwood	06-09	222
Kane	05-08	175
Kane	05-05	297
Kane	04-12	204
S-B Ranch	02-11	225

And, the reservoir temperature is approximately 70 degrees F.

c. Gas Properties

The gas composition is made up of methane, ethane, and nitrogen. There are no sulfur gases nor carbon dioxide present:

Component	Mol pct
C ₂ H ₄	96.5
C ₃ H ₈	0.5
CO ₂	0.0
N ₂	3.0
Sulfur Compounds	0.0
Total	100.0

which results in a biogenic gas with a calorific value of 983 BTU per cubic foot (wet basis).

4. Producing Horizon

These wells produce from a shallow, 1,500 to 2,000 feet Upper Cretaceous formation (Eagle Sandstone) which in certain pressure depleted segments of the Tiger Ridge field is irreversibly damaged by the liquids used in conventional nitrogen foam stimulations.

5. Sensitivity to Stimulation Liquids

This reduced pressure, relatively* dry gas reservoir has a long history of being successfully stimulated with conventional water-based stimulations. Unfortunately, because of the reduced reservoir pressure, the spent stimulation liquids remain in the formation for an extended period and thereby reduce the permeability to gas. The sensitivity of this reservoir to liquids is a consequence of the inability of the reduced pressure to displace the stimulation liquids as opposed to the more conventional conditions of formations reactivity such as swelling shale.

* The completion practices are to perforate the Upper Eagle and the Middle Eagle Sand above any liquid as indicated by the electric logs. The wells do produce very slight volumes of water which are lifted with velocity strings, and any entrained liquid is carried in the gas and does not collect in the separators nor is there any liquid in the tanks.

6. Control Wells

There were no Control Wells included in this effort because the Candidate Wells were actively producing wells which enabled both the pre- and post-stimulation production rates to be measured and compared.

This approach is unique to this effort because in the past the producing wells had been previously stimulated with liquid-based treatments and the reservoir was considered to be damaged by these stimulation liquids. Consequently, the CO₂/Sand stimulations had to be performed in new, unstimulated wells and, the existing previously stimulated wells served as the Control Wells to which the production responses were compared.

This approach in measuring the pre- and post-stimulation response from wells which have never been stimulated is superior to that which utilized the Control Wells because the well specific variables of porosity, thickness, etc. are eliminated.

7. Candidate Wells

There were four Candidate Wells. They are listed in the order considered by Ocean to provide the greatest opportunity to demonstrate and evaluate the effectiveness of the CO₂/Sand stimulation technology, that is, the S-B Ranch 02-05 is considered to be the most desirable for stimulation. (Ultimately Blackwood 06-09 had the largest incremental improvement of 54.1 MMcf following 22 producing months following the stimulation).

Well						Stim Type	Rem	Skin	Prod	Pi
T30N-R18E	S - #	Upr Eagle Perfs	Mid Eagle Perfs	Lwr Eagle Perfs	PB Req'd	Sxs, Bbls	MMcf		Mcf/d	Psi
S-B Ranch	02-05	1120-1202 1134-1197w/12	1222-1260 1220- 1261w/ 8	1283-1290 None	No	None	484.345	TBD	35	170
Kane	05-08	1359-1334 1362-1380w/22	1436-1502 1388-1408w/ 26	1515-1538 None	Yes@1420	None	359.000	+2.00	100	175
Kane	05-05	1094-1142 1110-1136w/42	1168-1233 1170-1220w/ 74	1283-1290 None	Yes@1150	None	96.700	+12.9	60	297
Blackwood	06-09	1142-1188 1144-1147w/20	1241-1288 1156-1162w/ 18	1302-1328 None	No	None	986.500	+2.83	220	222

a. Completion

The completion technique was to set and cement casing, generally 4-1/2 in, through the Eagle Sands, run electric logs to determine the gas/water contact, and perforate above it. Generally, the Upper Eagle and upper section of the Middle Eagle were perforated. No stimulations were generally performed because the reservoir pressure (225 psi) was insufficient to expel the spent stimulation liquids

b. Perforation Strategy

The design criteria was to limit the number of perforations to a maximum of 40. Because of the large number of perforations in three of the Candidates, and the associated concern regarding an insufficient transport velocity, the design included temporarily plugging-off the lower perforations during the stimulation.

Well							Total Perfs
T30N-R18E	S - #	Upr Eagle Perfs	Mid Eagle Perfs	Lwr Eagle Perfs	PB Req'd	Add'l Perfs	During Stim
S-B Ranch	02-05	1120-1202 1134-1197w/12	1222-1260 1220-1261w/ 8	1283-1290 None	No	20	40
Kane	05-08	1359-1334 1362-1380w/48	1436-1502 1388-1408w/ 34	1515-1538 None	Yes@1420	-34	48
Kane	05-05	1094-1142 1110-1136w/42	1168-1233 1170-1220w/ 74	1283-1290 None	Yes@1150	-74	42
Blackwood	06-09	1142-1188 1144-1147w/20	1241-1288 1156-1162w/ 18	1302-1328 None	No	0	38

c. Production Review and Projections

All four of the proposed Candidate Wells produce from both the Upper and Middle Eagle Sand members. None were perforated in the Lower Eagle. Three of the Candidate Wells contained a large number of perforations which were considered to be too many and for the CO₂/Sand process.

This was because the proppant transport rate into the individual perforations would be insufficient to transport the proppant and would increase the likelihood of a screen out.

The wells were rank-ordered by Ocean in their recommended sequence which was believed to provide the most benefit. This rank ordering results in the plugging of the Lower Eagle Sand in the wells which are ranked 3, 4, and 5, which almost dictates that at least one of the three Candidates will require plugging of the Middle Eagle and treating the Upper sand member only.

Well						Prod
T30N-R18E	S - #	Upr Eagle Perfs	Mid Eagle Perfs	Lwr Eagle Perfs	PB Req'd	(Mcf/d)
S-B Ranch	02-05	1120-1202 1134-1197w/12	1222-1260 1220-1261w/ 8	1283-1290 None	No	35
Kane	05-08	1359-1334 1362-1380w/22	1436-1502 1388-1408w/ 26	1515-1538 None	Yes@1420	100
Kane	05-05	1094-1142 1110-1136w/42	1168-1233 1170-1220w/ 74	1283-1290 None	Yes@1150	60
Blackwood	06-09	1142-1188 1144-1147w/20	1241-1288 1156-1162w/ 18	1302-1328 None	Yes	220

In order to properly measure the production response associated with the CO₂/Sand treatment, a producing period sufficient to eliminate the production from the un stimulated interval (Middle Eagle) was agreed to.

Ocean installed the temporary plugs immediately before the stimulation and then removed it after 22 months following the CO₂/Sand stimulation. This procedure allowed for the stimulation of only the Upper Eagle while comparing the post-stimulation production from both the Upper and Middle Sands.

The production histories for the Candidate Wells were plotted and accompanied the submittal package to the DOE. The production rates for each well was identified, and used as an input to determine the minimum annual post-stimulation production necessary to achieve an economic success.

8. Success Criteria

The evaluation was conducted within a controlled setting to enable an objective assessment of the production responses resulting from these stimulations to be made. The Candidate Wells had been completed in the target formation and were selected on the basis of their upside potential for production rate improvement, a commercial

Final Report - Grp #'s 1A & 1B (Crockett Co, TX), Grp #2 (San Juan Co, NM), Grp #5 (Phillips Co, MT), Grp #7 (Blaine Co, MT)
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

volume of remaining reserves, and mechanical suitability for this demonstration (number of perforations & tubing diameter). The proposed Candidates had a sufficient background production history to provide the basis for comparing the post-stimulation production rates following the CO₂/Sand stimulations.

The completion, remaining production, and some reservoir properties of the Candidate Wells were obtained and are summarized as:

Well	S - #	T	Upr Eagle	Mid Eagle	Lwr Eagle	PB Req'd	H ₂ O	Stim Type	Rem	Skin	Prod	Pi	P*
		°F	Perfs	Perfs	Perfs		Lvl	Sxs, Bbls	MMcf		Mcf/d	Psi	Psi
<u>30N-R18E</u>													
-B Ranch	02-05	72	1120-1202 1134-1197w/12	1222-1260 1220-1261w/ 8	1283-1290 None	No	TBD	None	484.345	TBD	35	170	TBD
Kane	05-08	72	1359-1334 1362-1380w/22	1436-1502 1388-1408w/ 26	1515-1538 None	Yes@1420	TBD	None	359.000	+2.00	100	175	95
Kane	05-05	72	1094-1142 1110-1136w/42	1168-1233 1170-1220w/ 74	1283-1290 None	Yes@1150	TBD	None	96.700	+12.9	60	297	83.5
Blackwood	06-09	72	1142-1188 1144-1147w/20	1241-1288 1156-1162w/ 18	1302-1328 None	No	TBD	None	986.500	+2.83	220	222	114

The criteria for success has been developed for each Candidate Well and was based on the following assumptions:

- An economic success required that the cost benefit associated with the production rates resulting from the CO₂/Sand stimulations will have to exceed the pre-stimulation production revenues by a discounted cash flow which equals or exceeds the cost of the treatment
- Capital cost for the CO₂/Sand stimulation treatment: \$86,000. This was a previous estimate which was at the time considered to likely be greater than the actual cost. In that event the production hurdle rates will be recalculated using the actual treatment cost.

- c. Market price: \$2.50/dth – fixed
- d. Calorific value: 1000 BTU/CF
- e. Discount rate: 25%
- f. Production decline rate: Variable and driven by the production projections supplied by Ocean.
 The evaluation was not further burdened by the operating expenses because they are presently being incurred and would be the same irrespective of the treatment.

These inputs were used to determine the following total uninterrupted and unencumbered minimum annual production volumes as indicated below, necessary for an economic success.

The methodology was to project the production from the historical production rates for each well, and then to add an incremental production rate to compensate for the cost of the treatment. The total of these two components, the projected production rate and the incremental value to offset the stimulation cost, equals the minimum total production rate required for an economic success.

The individual production projections and the incremental rates necessary to provide the discounted cash flow have been calculated on an annual basis, for five years and are included in the individual well sections, and are summarized:

T30N-R18E		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	Total
Well	# - S	(MMcf)	(MMcf)	(MMcf)	(MMcf)	(MMcf)	(MMcf)
From:		06/01/02	06/01/03	06/01/04	06/01/05	06/01/06	06/01/02
Through:		05/31/03	05/31/04	05/31/05	05/31/06	05/31/07	05/31/07
S-B Ranch	02-05	25,199	21,421	18,208	15,474	13,153	93,455
Kane	05-08	47,626	42,501	37,927	33,845	30,203	192,102
Kane	05-05	33,063	24,485	18,134	13,428	9,944	99,054
Blackwood	06-09	90,383	85,593	81,057	76,761	72,692	406,486

Ocean concurred that these production projections will serve as the basis for establishing the success criteria, and if the actual production volumes from these Candidate Wells exceed these tabulated annual production volumes, subject to adjustments for any non-producing intervals, then Ocean agreed that the CO₂/Sand stimulation process will have resulted in an economic benefit.

9. Stimulations

a. Stimulation #1 – S-B Ranch 02-05 (25-041-22955) (Candidate Well # 1)

A total of 10,300 lbs of proppant and 432 bbls (83 Tons) of CO₂ were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 37.8 barrels per minute and 2,318 psi respectively.

The treatment screened out at a sand concentration of 2.4 ppg with 1,800 lbs of proppant in the wellbore leaving 8,500 lbs of proppant in-zone.

b. Stimulation #2 – Kane 05-08 (25-041-22279) (Candidate Well # 2)

A total of 27,300 lbs of proppant and 835 bbls (161 Tons) of CO₂ were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 31.0 barrels per minute and 3,032 psi respectively. The in zone proppant volume was estimated 24,900 pounds.

c. Stimulation #3 - Kane 05-05 (25-041-22557) (Candidate Well # 3)

A total of 23,800 lbs of proppant and 815 bbls (157 Tons) of CO₂ were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 46.0 barrels per minute and 2,581 psi respectively. The in zone proppant volume was estimated 21,800 pounds.

d. Stimulation #4 – Blackwood 06-09 (25-041-22161) (Candidate Well # 4)

A total of 10,600 lbs of proppant and 633 bbls (122 Tons) of CO₂ were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 20.0 barrels per minute and 3,321 psi respectively. The in zone proppant volume was estimated 10,400 pounds.

e. Stimulation Summary

The stimulation specifics of the four Candidate Wells are summarized:

Well	# - S	CO ₂	Sand (lbs)		Max Tr	Avg Rate	Sand Conc	
		Bbls	Pumped	In-Zone	Psi	BPM	Max	Avg
S-B Ranch	02-05	432	10,300	8,500	3,115	37.8	2.4	1.2
Kane	05-08	835	27,300	24,900	3,147	31.0	2.3	1.0
Kane	05-05	815	23,800	21,800	3,495	46.0	2.4	0.9
Blackwood	06-09	633	10,600	10,400	3,408	20.0	1.3	0.6

10. Results

a. Production Comparisons - Pre and Post Stimulation

(1) Pre-Stimulation

The pre-stimulation production from the four Candidate Wells was extrapolated to project the future production, and these projections served as the basis to which the production following the stimulations was compared. The projected post-stimulation volumes ranged from 14.7 to 92.7 MMcf and averaged 41.4 MMcf through July, 2004.

(2) Post-Stimulation

Ocean failed to provide the production data as per contract and it was obtained from public data sources (through July, 2004). The public data is reported on a monthly basis and does not include the number of producing days and therefore the production comparisons do not take into account any non-production times which results in the incremental improvements being reduced. There were known instances of non-producing periods exceeding two weeks in one of the wells and also other non-producing time intervals for all four Candidates as well.

The post-stimulation volumes for an unknown of producing days ranged from 21.5 to 146.8 MMcf and averaged 60.8 MMcf through July, 2004.

(3) Incremental Production Improvement

The incremental production improvements irrespective of the unknown number of producing days mentioned above ranged from 3.1 to 54.1 MMcf and averaged 19.5 MMcf through July, 2004.

Through July 2004

TwP/Rge	T30N/R18E	T30N/R18E	T30N/R18E	T30N/R18E	Totals
Co/St	Blaine/Mt	Blaine/Mt	Blaine/Mt	Blaine/Mt	
Field	Tiger Ridge	Tiger Ridge	Tiger Ridge	Tiger Ridge	
API Number (25-005-xxxxx)	22955	22279	22557	22161	
Surface	S-B Ranch	Kane	Kane	Blackwood	
Sec-#	02-05	05-08	05-05	06-09	
Subsequent to Bridge Plug Removal*					
Actual Post-stim Cum (MMcf)	28.5	46.4	21.5	146.8	243.2
Proj Cum (based on pre-stim prod) MMcf)	14.7	39.6	18.4	92.7	165.4
Incremental Prod Increase (MMcf)	13.8	6.8	3.1	54.1	77.8

11. Costs - Projected vs. Actual

The actual and projected costs for stimulating the four Candidate Wells were similar:

Actual Cost (\$US)	63,189
Projected Cost (\$US)	62,421
Difference (\$US)	768
Percent (%)	1.2

12. Conclusions

The production through July 2004 (22 months) results in the following observations:

- a. CO₂/Sand stimulations can be successfully pumped in the Eagle Sands.

One well, S-B 02-05 screened out with 8,500 lbs of 20/40 sand proppant in zone. The total pumped CO₂ volume was 432 Bbls. Subsequently the pad volume was increased and the wells were treated with available CO₂ volumes.

- b. The in-zone placement of proppant was proportional to the pumped CO₂ volume:

Well	# - S	CO ₂	Sand (lbs)		Sand Conc	
		Bbls	Pumped	In-Zone	Max	Avg
S-B Ranch	02-05	432	10,300	8,500	2.4	1.2
Kane	05-08	835	27,300	24,900	2.3	1.0
Kane	05-05	815	23,800	21,800	2.4	0.9
Blackwood	06-09	633	10,600	10,400	1.3	0.6

- c. All four Candidate Wells had production improvements which through July, 2004 (22 months following the stimulation) ranged from 3.1 to 54.1 MMcf and averaged 19.5 MMcf. The total incremental improvement is 77.8 MMcf.

Twp/Rge	T30N/R18E	T30N/R18E	T30N/R18E	T30N/R18E	Totals
Co/St	Blaine/Mt	Blaine/Mt	Blaine/Mt	Blaine/Mt	
Field	Tiger Ridge	Tiger Ridge	Tiger Ridge	Tiger Ridge	
Surface	S-B Ranch	Kane	Kane	Blackwood	Total
Sec-#	02-05	05-08	05-05	06-09	
Subsequent to Bridge Plug Removal*					
Actual Post-stim Cum (MMcf)	28.5	46.4	21.5	146.8	243.2
Proj Cum (based on pre-stim prod) (MMcf)	14.7	39.6	18.4	92.7	165.4
Incremental Prod Increase (MMcf)	13.8	6.8	3.1	54.1	77.8

- d. One well, Blackwood 06-09, accounts for the majority – 70% (54.1/77.8) of the incremental production increase.

- e. When compared with the criteria for success only one of the four Candidate Wells, Blackwood 06-09 exceeded the production criteria.

Surface	S-B Ranch	Kane	Kane	Blackwood	Total
Sec-#	02-05	05-08	05-05	06-09	
Yr 1					
Production (MMcf)	17.7	35.4	16.3	103.4	172.8
Success Criteria (MMcf)	<u>25.2</u>	<u>47.6</u>	<u>33.1</u>	<u>90.4</u>	<u>196.3</u>
Difference (MMcf)	-7.5	-12.2	-16.8	13.0	-23.5
Yr 1 + 10 Months (Through July 2004)					
Production (MMcf)	28.5	61.0	28.8	194.2	312.5
Success Criteria (MMcf)	<u>43.1</u>	<u>83.0</u>	<u>53.5</u>	<u>161.7</u>	<u>341.3</u>
Difference (MMcf)	-14.6	-22.0	-24.7	32.5	-28.8

- f. When comparing the success criteria for the group of four Candidate Wells the actual production volumes are less than the established success criteria by approximately 25 MMcf.

- g. The economic benefit derived from the liquid CO₂/sand stimulations based on a net of \$3.50/Mcf after 22 producing months exceeded the total treatment costs by \$19,500.

Surface	S-B Ranch	Kane	Kane	Blackwood	Total
Sec-#	02-05	05-08	05-05	06-09	
Subsequent to Bridge Plug Removal*					
Actual Post-stim Cum (MMcf) 22 Months	28.5	46.4	21.5	146.8	243.2
Proj Cum (based on pre-stim prod) (MMcf)	<u>14.7</u>	<u>39.6</u>	<u>18.4</u>	<u>92.7</u>	<u>165.4</u>
Incremental Prod Increase (MMcf)	13.8	6.8	3.1	54.1	77.8
Incremental Revenue Improvement @ \$3.50/Mcf (\$M)	48.3	23.8	10.9	189.4	272.3
Stimulation Cost (\$M)	<u>63.2</u>	<u>63.2</u>	<u>63.2</u>	<u>63.2</u>	<u>252.8</u>
Improvement (\$M)	-14.9	-39.4	-52.3	126.2	19.5

XII. CONCLUSIONS

A. Test Area #1 - Crockett Co, Tx - Package #'s 1A & 1B - 9 Stages / 6 Wells

1. With one exception, all nine stages, six on the Montgomery lease and three on the Hatton leases were rate-limited to approximately 40-43 barrels per minute because of the maximum allowable wellhead treating pressures.. Forty barrels per minute is approaching the minimum injection rates to reliably transport 20/40 size sand proppant.
 2. The production from the Candidate Wells was disappointingly low:
 - a. Test Area #1A - Block NG (Montgomery)

The projected five year cumulative production averaged 100.4 MMcf while that from the seven Control Wells averaged 745.0 MMcf or 7.4 times that from the wells stimulated with the liquid CO₂/sand process.
 - b. Test Area #1A Block MM (Hoover)

The projected five year cumulative production averaged 56.7 MMcf while that from the ten Control Wells averaged 200.3 MMcf or 3.5 times that from the wells stimulated with the liquid CO₂/sand process.
- (1) These poor responses from the wells stimulated with the CO₂/sand process are unquestionably related to a number of factors regarding the formation characteristics of permeability, and pressure, but to a larger extent to the reduced proppant volumes placed by the liquid-free treatments.
 - (2) The placed proppant volumes with the CO₂/sand process were much lower than the design volumes.

c. Test Area #1B - Block MM (Hoover)

- (1) The proppant volumes placed were much less than the design and ranged from 5,600 to 11,700 pounds or approximately twelve percent of that placed in conventional treatments.
 - (2) The ability to place the design quantities was obviously limited by:
 - (a) The reduced pump rate of 40 barrels per minute, which was driven by a maximum well head pressure of 6,500 psi.
 - (b) High leak off rates into the formation.
 - (3) The costs for the CO₂/sand stimulations (6 wells - 9 stages) was \$407,462 or \$45,274 per stage. Cost advantages resulted from a major reduction in pumping costs through the utilization of a locally available service company, Halliburton Energy Services (HES). The original bid was much greater and also required a significant mobilization charge. To a lesser extent, a cost savings for CO₂ of \$7,380 was realized by utilizing another supplier.
3. Summarizing, the conclusion is that fracture lengths longer than those which can be generated with CO₂/Sand stimulations are required in this area. It is too "tight".

B. Test Area #2 - San Juan Co, NM - Package # 2 - 3 Stage / 3 Wells

1. The projected five year cumulative production ranged from the three Candidate Wells ranged from 65.3 to 141.9 MMcf and averaged 91.3 MMcf while that from the six Control Wells ranged between 15.6 and 445.2 MMcf averaging 231.3 MMcf or 2.5 times that from the wells.

2. These poor responses from the wells stimulated with the CO₂/sand process are unquestionably related to a number of factors regarding the formation characteristics of permeability, and pressure, but to a larger extent to the reduced proppant volumes placed by the liquid-free treatments

C. Test Area #3 - Phillips Co, Mt - Package # 5 – 3 Stages / 3 Wells

1. Full proppant volume (40,000 pound) CO₂/sand stimulations were easily executed in the Phillips Sand in the Phillips Co, Montana test area
2. The production from the Candidate Wells failed to meet those required by the criteria for success.
3. The twenty-four month cumulative production volumes from the wells stimulated with the liquid-free CO₂/sand process are essentially the same as that from the Control Wells treated with N₂ Foam and utilizing the same 40,000 pound proppant volume.
4. There is a suspicion that the wells which were stimulated with CO₂/sand are being choked by limited conductivity in the hydraulically created fracture, probably as a consequence of the smaller proppant size used (20/40 vs. 12/20). This is based on the observation of the nearly identical monthly production volumes from all three Candidate Wells. And, also on the production comparisons of twenty nearby wells which utilized larger proppant.

D. Test Area #4 - Blaine Co, Mt - Package # 7 – 4 Stages / 4 Wells

1. CO₂/Sand stimulations can be successfully pumped in the Eagle Sands.
2. The in-zone placement of proppant was proportional to the pumped CO₂ volume:

3. All four Candidate Wells had production improvements which through July, 2004 (22 months following the stimulation) ranged from 3.1 to 54.1 MMcf and averaged 19.5 MMcf. The total incremental improvement is 77.8 MMcf.
4. One well, Blackwood 06-09, accounts for the majority – 70% (54.1/77.8) of the incremental production increase.
5. When compared with the criteria for success only one of the four Candidate Wells, Blackwood 06-09 exceeded the production criteria.
6. When comparing the success criteria for the group of four Candidate Wells the actual production volumes are less than the established success criteria by approximately 25 MMcf.
7. The economic benefit derived from the liquid CO₂/sand stimulations based on a net of \$3.50/Mcf after 22 producing months exceeded the total treatment costs by \$19,500.

XIII. DELIVERABLES

- A. Draft and final NEPA Report, described in Task 4 - Submitted
- B. Phase I Topical Report described in Task 3, including market assessment and commercialization plan - Submitted
- C. Criteria for implementation of the technology, and wells-of-opportunity recommendations as required in Task 1 - Submitted
- D. General field test plan and individual test plans as required under Task 4 and Task 5, respectively - Submitted
- E. Stimulation treatment data as required in Task 6 - Submitted
- F. 5-year production and pressure data as required in Task 7 – Submitted where available

- G. Post-frac summaries of well treatment, pressure testing, and flow performance as required under Task 7 – Submitted
- H. Annual topical report(s) as required for Phase II - Submitted
- I. Phase II final report described in Task 7 – This document
- J. Production and Pressure Records
The production and pressure records have been plotted and included in the four Final Reports which have been submitted for each approved well group, and summarized in this Report..
- K. Well Data
The well data for both the Control and Candidate Wells were included with the submittal packages, and in the four Final Reports which have been submitted for each approved well group, and summarized in this Report..
- L. Final Reports
 - 1. Final Report – This document
 - 2. Pkgs # 1A and # 1B – Submitted
 - 3. Package # 5 – Submitted
 - 4. Package # 7 – SubmittedThese reports include all of the well specific information on all of the wells.

This completes the efforts to summarize the specifics and findings of these demonstrations of the liquid-free stimulation process. More detailed well-specific information, i.e., production plots, figures, logs, etc. relative to these efforts accompany the individual reports for each group.

Respectfully Submitted,

Raymond L. Marza, P.E.
Project Manager

**FIELD TESTING AND OPTIMIZATION OF CO₂/SAND FRACTURING
TECHNOLOGY**

**Group #'s 1A & 1B (Crockett Co, TX) – December 1995 – Six Wells - Single & Two-Stage
Treatments - UPR**

Final Report

**By
RAYMOND L. MAZZA**

**Period of Performance
October 1, 1994 – November 30, 2004**

**Worked Performed Under Contract No.: DE-AC21-94MC31199
“Field Testing and Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”**

**For:
U. S. Department of Energy
National Energy Technology Laboratory
Morgantown, West Virginia**

**By:
Petroleum Consulting Services
Canton, Ohio**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	DISCLAIMER.....	1
I.	ABSTRACT.....	2
II.	INTRODUCTION.....	2
III.	BACKGROUND.....	3
IV.	METHODOLOGY.....	5
V.	GEOLOGY.....	6
VI.	FIELD.....	6
VII.	RESERVOIR.....	8
	A. Reservoir Pressure and Temperature.....	8
	B. Sensitivity to Stimulation Liquids.....	10
VIII.	CONVENTIONAL STIMULATION TREATMENTS.....	10
IX.	CO ₂ /SAND STIMULATIONS.....	11
	A. Design.....	11
	B. Proppant Size.....	14
	C. Treatment Volume.....	14
	D. Treatment Volume Comparison - Conventional vs. CO ₂ /Sand.....	15
	E. Perforation Strategy.....	16
X.	PRE-TEST CONCLUSIONS.....	16
XI.	CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS.....	17
XII.	IS THE PROPOSED RESERVOIR LIKELY TO BENEFIT FROM THE CO ₂ /SAND TECHNOLOGY?.....	18
	A. Operator.....	18
	1. Interest in CO ₂ /Sand technology?.....	18
	2. Adequate test opportunity?.....	18
	3. Presently active drilling program?.....	19
	4. Control wells - Is there a sufficient number to define a normal response?.....	19
	5. Is there a future for successful results? Is the operator likely to continue implementing this technology without DOE cost support?.....	19
	6. Interest in DOE cost-supported participation?.....	20
	7. Share production data for five years?.....	20
	8. Letter of Intent.....	20
XIII.	NEPA COMPLIANCES.....	23
XIV.	DOE APPROVALS.....	23

TABLE OF CONTENTS

XV.	TEST AREAS – TWO TEST AREAS – BLOCK NG and BLOCK MM	23
A.	Test Area #1 - Block NG (Montgomery) - Two Stage Completions	25
1.	Control Wells - 7 Wells	26
a.	Control Well # 1 – Montgomery 02-17 (10786).....	26
b.	Control Well # 2 – Montgomery 01-17 (10785).....	27
c.	Control Well # 3 – Montgomery 03-15 (30742).....	28
d.	Control Well # 4 – Montgomery 07-16 (31725).....	29
e.	Control Well # 5 – Montgomery 04-15 (31021).....	30
f.	Control Well # 6 – Montgomery 05-18 (31727).....	31
g.	Control Well # 7 – Montgomery 01-16 (10101).....	32
h.	Summary – Control Wells	33
2.	Candidate Well Selection - Three Wells.....	34
a.	Candidate Well #1 – Montgomery 13-18 (36988).....	34
b.	Candidate Well #2 – Montgomery 12-18 (36989).....	37
c.	Candidate Well #3 - Montgomery 14-18 (36987).....	39
3.	Field Activities	41
a.	Preparations	41
(1)	Wellhead isolation tool	41
b.	Stimulations	41
(1)	Candidate Well #1 – Montgomery 13-18 (36988)	47
(a)	Stage #1	47
(b)	Stage #2.....	48
(2)	Candidate Well #2 – Montgomery 12-18 (36989)	55
(a)	Stage #1.....	55
(b)	Stage #2.....	56
(3)	Candidate Well #3 -- Montgomery 14-18 (36987).....	62
(a)	Stage #1.....	62
(b)	Stage #2.....	68
(c)	Stimulation Summary	74
c.	Post Stimulation	74
(1)	Flow Back Procedures.....	74
(2)	Cleaning Frac Sand from the Well Bore	74
(3)	Tubing Installation	75
4.	Results - Production Comparisons.....	76
a.	Candidate Well #1 – Montgomery 13-18 (36988).....	76
b.	Candidate Well #2 – Montgomery 12-18 (36989).....	77
c.	Candidate Well #3 -- Montgomery 14-18 (36987)	78
d.	Summary – Candidate Wells	79
e.	Production Comparisons – Summary.....	80
5.	Conclusions - Test Area #1	81

TABLE OF CONTENTS

B.	Test Area #2 - Block MM (Hoover-Hatton).....	84
1.	Control Wells - 10 Wells.....	84
a.	Control Well # 1 - Hatton 03-13 (32174).....	85
b.	Control Well # 2 - Hoover 04-07 (34267).....	86
c.	Control Well # 3 - Anderson 01-14 (32307).....	87
d.	Control Well # 4 - Hatton 01-14 (32124).....	88
e.	Control Well # 5 - Hatton 02-08 (32004).....	89
f.	Control Well # 6 - Hatton 04-08 (32260).....	90
g.	Control Well # 7 - Hatton 03-14 (32182).....	91
h.	Control Well # 8 - Hatton 01-08 (32003).....	92
i.	Control Well # 9 - Hatton 02-13 (32165).....	93
j.	Control Well #10 - Hatton 01-13 (32143).....	94
2.	Summary - Control Wells.....	95
3.	Candidate Well Selection - Three Wells.....	96
a.	Candidate Well #1 - Hatton 13-14 (36848).....	97
b.	Candidate Well #2 - Hatton 7C-7 (36960).....	98
c.	Candidate Well #3 - Hatton 8C-14 (36991).....	99
4.	Field Activities	100
a.	Stimulations.....	100
	(1) Candidate Well #1 - Hatton 13-14 (36848).....	103
	(2) Candidate Well #2 - Hatton 7C-7 (36960).....	109
	(3) Candidate Well #3 - Hatton 8C-4 (36991).....	115
	(4) Stimulation Summary.....	121
b.	Post Stimulation.....	121
	(1) Flow Back Procedures.....	121
	(2) Cleaning Frac Sand from the Well Bore	122
	(3) Tubing Installation	122
5.	Results - Production Comparisons.....	123
a.	Candidate Well #1 - Hatton 13-14 (36848).....	123
b.	Candidate Well #2 - Hatton 7C-7 (36960).....	125
c.	Candidate Well #3 - Hatton 8C-14 (36991).....	126
d.	Summary - Candidate Wells	127
e.	Production Comparisons - Summary.....	128
6.	Conclusions - Test Area #2	130
XVI.	COSTS	133
A.	Projected	133
B.	Actual	134
C.	Projected vs. Actual.....	134
XVII.	CONCLUSIONS - TEST AREAS 1 AND 2	135

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
(Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

DISCLAIMER

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

ABSTRACT

The demonstration of a 100% liquid free CO₂/sand stimulation process was executed on six wells (nine stages) in the Canyon Sands in Crockett Co, Texas. The process is unique in that because CO₂ is the only fluid which enters the formation and requires a specialized closed system, pressurized blender to mix up to 45,000 pounds of proppant with the CO₂. The CO₂ vaporizes at reservoir conditions and leaves a liquid-free proppant pack. Because the Canyon Sands in this area were known to be liquid sensitive, the application of the liquid-free process could result in an economic benefit. The reduced proppant volume (45,000 vs. 100 to 200,000 pounds) from that of the conventional water-based stimulations was recognized, however the reduction in formation damage from retained liquids may have resulted in a net benefit.. The design pump rates could not be achieved because of pressure limitations on the tubulars and therefore a considerable reduction in placed proppant volumes resulted. The production responses were disappointingly low as a consequence of the inability to place sufficient proppant volumes.

I. ABSTRACT

The demonstration of a 100% liquid free CO₂/sand stimulation process was executed on six wells (nine stages) in the Canyon Sands in Crockett Co, Texas. The process is unique in that because CO₂ is the only fluid which enters the formation and requires a specialized closed system, pressurized blender to mix up to 45,000 pounds of proppant with the CO₂. The CO₂ vaporizes at reservoir conditions and leaves a liquid-free proppant pack. Because the Canyon Sands in this area were known to be liquid sensitive, the application of the liquid-free process could result in an economic benefit. The reduced proppant volume (45,000 vs. 100 to 200,000 pounds) from that of the conventional water-based stimulations was recognized, however the reduction in formation damage from retained liquids may have resulted in a net benefit.. The design pump rates could not be achieved because of pressure limitations on the tubulars and therefore a considerable reduction in placed proppant volumes resulted. The production responses were disappointingly low as a consequence of the inability to place sufficient proppant volumes.

II. INTRODUCTION

The first demonstrations under the contract were executed in December, 1995 in two characteristically separate groups each containing three wells. They all produce from the Canyon Sands at depths ranging from 6,428 to 7,420 feet in the Val Verde Basin of South Texas. The production is primarily gas with minimal condensate - approximately one barrel per million cubic feet of gas (1 bbl/MMcf).

A total of nine stimulations were performed in six Candidate Wells, three two-stage (Block NG), and three single-stage treatments (Block MM). All six wells are situated in Crockett County near the town of Ozona and are operated by Union Pacific Resources (UPR) formerly Union Pacific Resources Corporation (UPRC). They have since been purchased by Anadarko Petroleum.

III. BACKGROUND

In 1923 World Oil Co., owned by Chester R. Bunker, Ft. Worth publisher and printer, began drilling on the L. P. Powell ranch. Work progressed slowly, depending on the availability of money, under the direction of superintendent Mickey Green and the tool pusher known only as "Dangerous Dan." The wildcat operation proved successful in the spring of 1925, when the first well (10 mi. NW) came in at a depth of 2647 feet and began producing 25 barrels of oil a day. The strike opened up the World pool, more commonly known as the Powell Field, which is still yielding oil. Eventually 180 wells were drilled by a number of companies on Powell's 9260 acre ranch.

The Powell No. 1 was the beginning of a vital new industry for Crockett County, which was primarily a ranching area before 1925. The next important strike occurred in the Crockett Field in 1938. In 1975 there were over 2,000 producing oil and gas wells in the county.

The Ozona field was initially developed in the 1960s on 320 acre spacing which was later reduced to 160, then 80, and eventually 40 acres. UPR acquired in excess of 1,000 of 1,500 wells and 100,000 net acres in April, 1994, and had drilled more than 300 wells on 80 acre spacing since the acquisition. In late 1995 approvals were obtained to drill on 40 acre spacing in the majority of the field, resulting in an additional 400 to 600 wells planned for 1996-97.

The infill wells, drilled on 80 acre spacing had reduced pressures, 50 to 80 percent of those drilled on the 320 acre spacing, consequently the recoverable reserves were also reduced.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

The majority of the wells have tubing to remove liquids. There were no separators nor tanks and there was reportedly no produced water (some of the Candidate Wells were found to produce water), only condensate at approximately one barrel per million cubic feet of gas (1 bbl/MMcf). The gas and associated liquid is pipelined to a central stripping/compressor facility several miles distant. There are no separators nor pipeline drips.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The produced gas volumes from the Candidate Wells were compared with that from the Control Wells to determine if there was a benefit from the liquid-free stimulations over that of the other stimulation types: borate cross linked or HPC gel containing 100-200 thousand pounds of 20/40 mesh proppant.

The evaluation of the produced gas was made through the use of later-time production rates which is the basis for back-extrapolation to the earlier times in the producing life. This technique results in an uninterrupted production sequence, and thereby eliminates the unknowns associated with shut-ins, missing data, higher production rates resulting from the pressure build-up associated with shut-ins, etc. It also, and perhaps more significantly enables an unencumbered assessment to be made in that it removes the bias created by the higher rate “flush” production rates frequently recorded early in the producing life. The flush production is a result draining the more permeable portions of the formation which can be increased by the presence of natural fractures. Because these fractures are of unknown volume the flush production associated with them cannot be determined. By removing this bias the stimulation response to the unfractured portions can be evaluated, and an objective assessment of the reservoir response to the different stimulation techniques will at least not be biased by the flush production.

The projected five-year, steady-state cumulative gas volumes from the Candidate Wells were compared with those from the Control wells, and those with the larger cumulative produced gas volumes were considered to be superior.

V. GEOLOGY

The Canyon Sands are complex deep water turbidite deposits that contain numerous gas productive members with perforated intervals ranging in depth from 6,428 to 7,420 feet in the Candidate Wells. The Canyon Sands interval is approximately 1,200 feet thick and contain eight individual sand members which are designated A (shallowest) through H, and some may not be present in offset wells. Consequently the perforated intervals vary. Because of this variation the per-well reserves can vary considerably within an area and range from 0.2 to 1.2 billion cubic feet (Bcf) of gas. The permeability's range from 0.001 to in excess of 0.10 millidarcy.

Historically, a number of these sand members were stimulated and the production co-mingled. The unique combination of the zones within individual wells complicated attempts at fracture analysis. Numerous studies performed by UPR were unsuccessful in identifying a relationship between treatment size (proppant volume) and the post-fracture well performance.

The Canyon Sands are known for the capillary retention of liquids and these Candidate Wells were considered to be good candidates for demonstrating the liquid-free CO₂/Sand technology.

VI. FIELD

Two separate areas were treated, Block NG, were stimulated in the lower (E) and middle (C) Canyon Sand members with two stage treatments, and Block MM 18 miles to the northwest with single stage treatments in lower G & H Canyon Sand intervals.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
(Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Map 2

UNION PACIFIC RESOURCES

FORMATION: CANYON SANDS

DEPTH: 6700 - 7000 FT

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

VII. RESERVOIR

A. Reservoir Pressure and Temperature

Well	Press (psig)	Temp (°F)	Total Depth (ft)
Hatton 13-14	760*	182	7,515**
Hoover 7C-7	760*	155	7,585
Hatton 8C-4	760*	181	7,613
* Calculated			
** The total depths are deeper than the lowermost perforation; for instance the deepest perforation in the Hoover 7C-7 well is 7,420 feet.			

The pipeline pressure is approximately 500 psi. A review of the phase behavior at these temperatures and pressures confirmed that the CO₂ would vaporize under these conditions.

The accompanying pressure-enthalpy diagram indicates the projected states of the CO₂ during the pumping, flow back, and producing events. The CO₂ will readily vaporize under these conditions and will require $-176 \times (10)^3$ BTUs per ton.

Pt # Location	Press (psi)	Temp (°F)	State	Density (lb/cuft)	Enthalpy BTU/lbm
PUMPING*					
1 Well head	6,200	0	SC	67.11	-3,900
2 Perfs	9,550	91	SC	64.52	-3,864
NOT PUMPING					
3 Perfs***	7,000	91	SC	62.50	-3,862
4 Formtn***	6,000	136	SC	55.87	-3,840
5 Formtn	900	181	SH	4.14	-3,750
6 Perfs	760	181	SH	5.88	-3,747
7 Well head	550	150	SH	4.17	-3,752
* Pumping through 4.50 in casing at 40 bbls per min					
** Heat gain through casing at 40 bbls per min = $278(10)^3$ BTUs (68 BTU/sqft @ LMDT = 67°F)					
*** At the instant that the pumping is terminated $-3,840 - (-3,752) = -88$ BTU/lb = $-176(10)^3$ BTU/ton					

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

B. Sensitivity to Stimulation Liquids

The wells in these areas require some time to clean up following the liquid based stimulations and appeared to be excellent candidate opportunities for this technology.

The Canyon Sands are known for the capillary retention of liquids, and each of the two groups of three Candidate Wells were considered to be viable opportunities for demonstrating the liquid-free CO₂/Sand technology. Primarily, because of the suspicion that formation damage was resulting from the formations sensitivity to stimulation liquids, and also through the interest that UPR indicated in the process and their ability to effectively evaluate the results through their in-house knowledge and large data set.

VIII. CONVENTIONAL STIMULATION TREATMENTS

The wells in both areas were being stimulated with either borate cross-linked guar gum or HPC gels containing 100-200 thousand pounds of 20/40 mesh proppant, either Brady or Ottawa sand. Previously the treatments consisted of gelled water with sand concentrations of up to 4 pounds per gallon (ppg) or gelled acids with sand concentrations up to 3 ppg.

There were no known CO₂ based stimulations when initially proposed. However, just prior to the liquid CO₂/sand treatments performed under this demonstration effort one of the initially proposed Candidate Wells, Hatton #3-17 was stimulated by UPR, without DOE involvement, with 577 bbls (107 tons) of liquid CO₂ and because the response was so robust UPR withdrew it from the offering. Hatton 7C-7 was substituted for it.

IX. CO₂/SAND STIMULATIONS

The normal field procedure was to complete the wells with 2-7/8 inch production tubulars. However, for the purposes of this evaluation, the DOE approved Candidate Wells were completed with 4-1/2 inch production casing to enable the greater pumping rates, 40-55 barrels per minute, to be achieved without the excessive friction pressure drops associated with the smaller diameter tubulars.

A. Design

Once the project began it became obvious that the injection rates would be limited to approximately 40 barrels per minute because of maximum allowable treating pressures of 6,000 to 6,500 psi.

The individual well treatment designs were based upon sand acceptance concentrations in the offset wells and could be modified as the treatment sequence progressed. The objective being to place the maximum sand volumes. The maximum proppant concentrations at the 40 bpm pump rates were found to be less than 3 pounds per gallon.

An increase in the design CO₂ volume from 120 to 140 tons was a result of the displacement volume of 106 barrels (20.8 tons) to reach the completion interval at approximately 7,000 feet.

The stimulation designs were developed from the observed pressure-injection history for well 13-17, which was stimulated with CO₂ only and which also had 4-1/2 inch casing, as did the Candidate Wells.

The data was plotted in three representations because a log-log plot of the data was very non-linear. The first explanation considered was that it was because of differing densities

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

experienced from the heat loss during the initial cooling of the tubulars. The densities for each rate at approximated temperatures which were time and heat transfer rate dependent were calculated and the log-log plot recreated and it was still found to be considerably non-linear.

In an effort to utilize this empirical pressure data it was plotted on linear, log-linear, and log-log presentations and the results compared. A review of the data indicated a considerable range of pressures when the injection rates exceed forty (40) barrels per minute.

Rate (BPM)	Pressure (Psi)		Pressure (Psi)	Pressure (Psi)
	Linear		Log-Lin	Log-Log
	Min	Max		
20	3,900	3,900	3,900	3,900
25	4,350	4,350	4,200	4,300
30	4,600	4,750	4,950	4,800
35	5,000	5,250	5,500	5,000
40	5,400	5,750	6,200	5,500
45	5,800	6,350	7,100	6,000
50	6,200	6,800	8,100	6,200
55	6,600		9,500	6,700
60				7,100

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Based on these observations, the following injection rates were predicted for various wellhead treating pressures:

Wellhead Pressure (Psi)	Min		Max	
	Rate (BPM)	(HHP)	Rate (BPM)	(HHP)
4,000	21.1	(2,069)	21.7	(2,127)
5,000	30.5	(3,738)	35.0	(4,289)
6,000	38.6	(5,676)	47.5	(6,985)
6,500	41.7	(6,643)	53.8	(8,571)

And, the projected pump rate ranges for various horsepower's were:

HHP	Min BPM	Max BPM
3,600	29.7	30.8
4,800	34.9	37.4
6,000	39.6	42.9
6,643	41.7 (max press)	45.6
7,200	N/A	48.4

The conclusions from these projections were that:

1. Up to 6,104 horsepower would be required to obtain an injection rate of forty barrels per minute — which was considered to be a minimum rate to achieve a reasonable fracture extension and transport velocities.
2. The wellhead treating pressures for these conditions were estimated to be up to 6,226 psi.
3. Utilizing the maximum wellhead treating pressure of 6,500 psi. The corresponding minimum pump rate and horsepower requirements would be:

Min BPM	HHP
41.7	6,642

If the well was to treat at the lower pressure scenario then the pump rate at the maximum horsepower was estimated to be 48.4 bpm.

Summarizing, the pump rate was anticipated to range from 41.7 to 48.4 barrels per minute depending upon either maximum allowable pressure limitations for the former or maximum available horsepower for the latter.

The actual treating pressures were very close to those projected as can be seen in the following summaries.

Once the project began it became obvious that the injection rates would be limited to approximately 40 barrels per minute because of maximum allowable treating pressures of 6,000 to 6,500 psi.

B. Proppant Size

20/40 (USS) sand proppant was currently being utilized in the conventional treatments and successful in the CO₂/sand stimulations, and on that basis was proposed in the design

C. Treatment Volume

The treatments were designed to consist of 140 tons of CO₂ per stage and are projected to yield a net of 439 barrels (85 tons) of CO₂ in-zone along with 37,654 pounds of 20/40 proppant per stage. The individual well treatment designs were developed based upon sand acceptance concentrations in the offset wells and were modified as the treatment sequence progressed, the objective being to place the maximum sand volumes. The increase in the CO₂ volume from 120 to 140 tons was due to the displacement volume of 106 barrels (20.8 tons) to reach the completion interval at approximately 7,000 feet. Thereby more CO₂ was available to stimulate the formation and to transport proppant.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

The recommended stimulation design was:

Proppant Fluid Schedule					
	Cum Fluid	Stage Fluid	Proppant Conc	Proppant Stage	Cum Proppant
	(Bbl)	(Bbl)	(ppg)	(lb)	(lb)
Stage					
Hole Fill (Liquid CO ₂)	55	55		0	0
Pad (Liquid CO ₂)	135	135		0	0
Start (20/40 Sand)	205	70	1.0	2,940	2,940
Increase (20/40 Sand)	245	40	2.0	3,360	6,300
Increase (20/40 Sand)	465	220	3.0	27,720	34,020
Flush (Liquid CO ₂)	575	55		0	34,020
	Total	575			

Treatment Fluid Requirements						
	Hole + Pad	Prop	Flush	Tot pmpd	Bottoms	Total
Liq CO ₂ (Bbl)	190	330	55	615	10	625
CO ₂ (T)						120
N ₂ (Mscf)						74

D. Treatment Volume Comparison - Conventional vs. CO₂/Sand

The design volumes of the liquid CO₂ /sand stimulations was 575 Barrels of liquid CO₂ and 34,020 pounds of 20/40 mesh proppant, as compared to the conventional treatments which contain 100 to 200,000 pounds of 20/40 proppant. The proppant volume utilized in the CO₂/sand treatments - if it were all to be placed - would be 17 to 34 percent of that normally pumped.

Because of the liquid sensitive nature of the Canyon Sands the results from these reduced proppant volumes could potentially result in an improvement in gas production rates because of the absence of the liquid induced formation damage which accompanied the conventional water based treatments.

E. Perforation Strategy

The perforation placements are in the individual sand members as indicated on the accompanying electric logs.

X. PRE-TEST CONCLUSIONS

- A. The Canyon Sands were known to be liquid sensitive and to sometimes require extended clean up periods, and therefore were considered to be potential candidates for the liquid-free CO₂/sand stimulation technique,
- B. Studies conducted by UPR indicated that smaller treatment volumes resulted in improved production rates, which further supported the view that the larger stimulation liquid volume probably results in a larger percentage of liquid remaining in the reservoir; although the treatment volume is larger so thereby is the resultant damage.
- C. If the damage created by these liquids could be avoided then the reservoir could potentially respond favorably to smaller treatments.
- D. The fracturing gradients were reviewed and found to be on the order of 0.7 psi per foot and resultantly considered to be viable candidates,
- E. The leak off of the CO₂ to the formation at the higher permeability's was considered to constitute a potential screen out risk,
- F. The pump rate limitations dictated by the working pressure of the tubulars, 6,500 psi was predicted to limit the injection rate to approximately 40 barrels per minute. The preferred design for the permeability, formation thickness, and number of perforations would have been on the order of 55 bpm.

G. The predictably higher treating pressures were known to significantly increase the horsepower costs.

XI. CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS

The production histories for both blocks were reviewed and the economic hurdle rates projected for each. The minimum production rates for an economic success of these treatments are based upon the reservoir pressure and the additional expense associated with the CO₂/Sand stimulations.

Area	1 (Montgomery)	2 (Hoover-Hatton)
Block	NG	MM
Stages/well	2	1
Treatment Costs		
CO ₂ /Sand (\$)	82,684	41,509
Conventional (\$)	40,000	21,000
Increase (\$)	42,684	20,509
Incremental Prod		
Req'd @ i=15% (Mcf/d)	25	12
Presently (Mcf/d)	150-200	125-180
Min Req'd - 1 st Mo w/ CO ₂ /Sand (Mcf/d)	175-225	137-192

The minimum production rates for an economic success of the CO₂/Sand stimulations technology were:

Block	
NG	MM
175-225 Mcfd	125-180 Mcfd

UPR initially estimated that an increase in production rate of approximately 20 percent will be required to offset the additional costs of the CO₂/Sand stimulation. On this basis, a production rate of 137 to 192 Mcfd would be required to demonstrate superiority of CO₂/Sand stimulation treatments over nitrogen foam stimulations in this area.

XII. IS THE PROPOSED RESERVOIR LIKELY TO BENEFIT FROM THE CO₂/SAND TECHNOLOGY?

A. Operator

1. Interest in CO₂/Sand technology?

UPRC was interested in identifying a stimulation technique which would reduce or eliminate the liquid damage to the Canyon Sands and, in addition to stimulating 12 stages with CO₂/Sand they also elected other types of stimulation treatments - three wells with CO₂ only, and four with Econofracs which utilized 10 to 25 pounds of linear gels per thousand gallons of water and transporting 1-2 pounds per gallon of sand.

2. Adequate test opportunity?

The question was: Would a non-damaging stimulation having a shorter propped length be more effective than a longer hydraulically created fracture that utilizes a formation damaging liquid? Ultimately, the answer was no.

The possibility of stimulating this liquid sensitive reservoir with the non-damaging CO₂/Sand stimulation process was viewed as an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of a non-damaging, but shorter fracture length stimulation. The potential that the non-damaging treatment could perhaps provide an increase in overall economics was a determining element in the decision to participate in the program. i.e., could a smaller treatment (shorter fracture length) created with a non-damaging fluid result in an increased production rate over that which resulted in longer fracture lengths and liquid damage?

Ultimately, the answer was no.

3. Presently active drilling program?

When the review of the potential Candidate Wells began, UPR had eight rigs drilling the 6,500 feet deep Canyon horizon, and were planning to drill over 600 wells during the 1995-1997 time period.

4. Control wells - Is there a sufficient number to define a normal response?

UPRC had digitized over 600 well logs and conducted reservoir simulation and analytical drainage area studies on more than 500 wells. They had also conducted numerous pre- and post-fracture build up tests, conducted in-situ stress tests, and have estimated the reserves for at least 1,500 Canyon Sand wells. This familiarity enabled an objective assessment of the different stimulation types to be rendered.

5. Is there a future for successful results? Is the operator likely to continue implementing this technology without DOE cost support?

The Canyon Sands were being actively drilled with the more recent developments in areas of reduced porosity, permeability, and reservoir pressure which resulted from the closer well spacing. These "tighter and reduced reservoir pressure" areas were anticipated to be compromised by the retention of the liquids used in hydraulic fracturing and the potential for increased gas recovery which could result from the non-damaging stimulation was considered to be significant.

UPSIDE - Future Activities if an Economic Success were to be Realized

If the CO₂/Sand stimulation technology proved to be successful in increasing the EUR's over other stimulation treatment types, then a significant upside would be created because of the areal extent of the impacted area and UPRC's immediate development drilling plans. They were actively drilling the Canyon Sands

formation in Crockett County, Texas - SW Ozona Field and considered them to be ideal candidates for the CO₂/Sand demonstrations.

6. Interest in DOE cost-supported participation?

An interest in participating with the DOE on a cost shared basis to evaluate this technology was related. At the time they planned to drill approximately 300 wells per year for the following two to three years, and had seven to eight drilling rigs operating in this area.

7. Share production data for five years?

UPRC agreed to share the data. In actuality they did not. UPR was later purchased by Anadarko and the production data was obtained from public data sources.

8. Letter of Intent

A Letter of Intent was prepared and executed (LOI).

- To provide legitimate candidate well opportunities for six mutually agreed upon wells,
- To provide acceptable background information on the nearby control wells including the drilling, completion, and production specifics,
- To bear the normal additional expenses of cement bond logging, perforating, bull dozers, and other normally occurring expenses associated with stimulation events,
- Participating in the demonstration project and the anticipated treatments specifics, and
- To provide the production information for five years.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Letter of Intent
 (p. 1 of 2)

Operator: Union Pacific Resources Co (UPRC)
 Candidate Wells: Crockett County, Texas
 Target Formation: Canyon Sands

Block MM (Hoover Hutton)

	Sec	1/4	OF	1/4	Sands	Stages	1st Mo Prod*
1. 7C-7 (exch for 13-17)	7	SE		SE	G & H	1	137-192 Mofd
2. 6C-4	8	SW		SE	" " "	1	" " "
3. 13-14	13	SW		NW	" " "	1	" " "
13-17	13	SW		NE	" " "	N/A	

Block NG (Montgomery)

1. 12	18	Irregular		C & E	2	175-225 Mofd
2. 13	18	" "		" " "	2	" " "
3. 15	18	" "		" " "	2	" " "
					9	

* Minimum 1st month average production required from CO₂/sand stimulations to constitute an economic success over that from conventional stimulations, with nitrogen foam.

The U. S. Department of Energy will, subject to their approvals, agree to provide cost-shared funding for the stimulation of these candidate wells with Fracmaster's closed system blender for CO₂/sand treatments, if certain criteria are met. UPRC agrees to bear the remaining expenses.

The project entails demonstrating the process in a controlled environment where sufficient background production information from nearby wells can be used to compare the production results with those of this demonstration project.

The design of the stimulation treatments is to consist of approximately 140 tons of carbon dioxide and 25,000 to 45,000 pounds of sand pumped at injection rates of 35 to 60 barrels per minute, and to consist of up to three (3) single-stage treatments (Block MM), and up to three (3) two-stage treatments (Block NG).

UPRC agrees to operate these wells with wellhead pressures similar to those of the control wells to enable a meaningful comparison of the production from the candidate wells with that of the nearby offset control wells. The purpose is to effect a quantitative comparison of the effectiveness of the liquid-free CO₂/sand stimulation with that of nitrogen foam.

The six (6) candidate wells will be available for stimulation treatments by the second week of December, 1995.

The wells will be turned in line shortly after treatment, and the production will be forwarded to PCS on a monthly basis to enable an evaluation of the CO₂ treatments to be made. DOE is requesting monthly production data on these

Final Report - Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
(Crockett County, Texas) - December 1995 - Single and Two Stage Treatments
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Letter of Intent
(p. 2 of 2)

wells for a minimum of five (5) years following turn-in, including monthly copies of the meter run readings and third party integration statements. They are to be forwarded monthly to Petroleum Consulting Services.

Sand, if any, will be removed from the wellbore at operator's expense, immediately following the stimulation.

The DOE requires the following:

1. Executed Letter of intent	This document
2. A map of the candidate well and nearby offsetting wells -	Satisfied
3. Electric logs	Control and candidate wells
4. Cumulative production data	Control and candidate wells
5. Monthly pipeline pressure data	Control and candidate wells
6. Stimulation records tabular and strip charts	Control and candidate wells
7. Well completion reports	Control and candidate wells

The DOE, subject to their approval, will, through the contractor, Petroleum Consulting Services, pay for one-half (1/2) of the costs of the stimulations, including the service company charges for product (CO₂, sand), services, and mobilization. This is to be accomplished by an invoice from UPRC to PCS for one-half (1/2) of the total stimulation costs which includes all discounts.

UPRC hereby indicates an intention to enter into a 50/50 cost-shared participation of the stimulation expenses for these candidate wells, subject to DOE approvals.

UPRC agrees to bear the remaining expenses of these treatments and any remaining activities, i.e., those expenses normally associated with these treatments: cement bond log, perforating, dozers, service rigs, etc.

If these conditions are satisfactory, please acknowledge by signing below, and returning this document to:

Petroleum Consulting Services
P. O. Box 35833
Canton, Ohio 44735
(216) 499-3823 (216) 499-2280 (fax)

Date:

Signed:

Dec. 8, 1995

R. J. Hill
Company Officer

Title: W. TX. DEVELOPMENT MGR.

Witness: Craig J. Galt

XIII. NEPA COMPLIANCES

A NEPA questionnaire was prepared and submitted for the Candidate Wells. Conversations with UPRC's environmental compliance personnel and the specifics of land use, air quality, water resources/water quality, solid waste and hazardous materials, impact on vegetation and animals, aesthetics, historical/cultural resources, transportation, energy requirements, environmental restoration and/or waste management, and worker health and safety have been identified and responded to.

XIV. DOE APPROVALS

The six Candidate Wells, three in Block NG and three in Block MM, were submitted (05/06/95) and approved for treatment by the DOE (12/06/95) and were stimulated in December, 1995.

XV. TEST AREAS -- TWO TEST AREAS -- BLOCK NG and BLOCK MM

There were demonstration areas proposed, and approved for the liquid CO₂/sand stimulation process. Each contained three wells and, although both groups were producing from the Canyon Sands interval, there were distinctly different reservoir characteristics.

The major differences between the two study areas, Block NG (Montgomery) and Block MM (Hoover Hatton) are that the Canyon Sand interval in Block NG contained an increased pay thickness, and was consequently stimulated with two stage stimulations.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

N

UNION PACIFIC RESOURCE CO.

SOUTHWEST OZONA
 BLOCK MM
 CO₂ FRACTURE STIMULATION TEST AREA

CRAIG CIPOLLA 4/19/95

JMS Scale 1:24000.

**Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B - (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”**

Because all of the wells are situated in Crockett County, Texas the API well identification numbers are all prefixed with 42-105. For instance the API number for the Hatton 03-13 is 42-105-32174

A. Test Area #1 - Block NG (Montgomery) - Two Stage Completions

Block NG occupies approximately the same areal extent and contained seventeen active wells. The three Candidate Wells were completed in the C (Lower) & E (Middle) Sands and stimulated with two stage CO₂/sand treatments. The reservoir pressure was about 50% of the original (when they were drilled on 320 acre spacing) and the estimated ultimate recoveries (EUR's) generally range between 1,500 and 4,500 MMcf.

1. Control Wells - 7 Wells

- a. Control Well # 1 – Montgomery 02-17 (10786) – Projected 5 Yr Prod
 1,695.2 MMcf

Montgomery #2 (10786) Crockett Co, TX
Block NG - Sec 17

- b. Control Well # 2 – Montgomery 01-17 (10785) – Projected 5 Yr Prod
 1,100.2 MMcf

Montgomery #1 (10785) Crockett Co, TX
Block NG - Sec 17

- c. Control Well # 3 – Montgomery 03-15 (30742) – Projected 5 Yr Prod
 814..4 MMcf

Montgomery #3 (30742) Crockett Co, TX
Block NG - Sec 15

- d. Control Well # 4 – Montgomery 07-16 (31725) – Projected 5 Yr Prod
 662.0 MMcf

Montgomery #7 (31725) Crockett Co, TX
Block NG - Sec 16

- e. Control Well # 5 – Montgomery 04-15 (31021) – Projected 5 Yr Prod
 510.9 MMcf

Montgomery #4 (31021) Crockett Co, TX
Block NG - Sec 15

- f. Control Well # 6 – Montgomery 05-18 (31727) – Projected 5 Yr Prod
 370.8 MMcf

Montgomery #5 (31727) Crockett Co, TX
Block NG - Sec 18

- g. Control Well # 7 – Montgomery 01-16 (10101) – Projected 5 Yr Prod 65.8
 MMcf

Montgomery #1 (10101) Crockett Co, TX
Block NG - Sec 16

h. Summary – Control Wells

The five year cumulative production volumes from the seven Control Wells ranged from 65.8 to 1,695.2 MMcf and averaged 745 MMcf.

2. Candidate Well Selection - Three Wells

The Candidate Wells in Block NG are the: Montgomery #13-18, 12-18, and 14-18. They were each stimulated with two stages, as is the general practice, to complete the two main pay intervals, the lower (E) and middle (C) zones. The anticipated production was 150-200 Mcfd. The reservoir pressures had been observed to vary between 1000 and 2000 psi.

The Candidate Wells were infill wells which were drilled on 40 acre spacing and the initial plan was to stimulate them with conventional stimulations with an anticipated performance of approximately 70% that of the 80 acre wells drilled previously.

a. Candidate Well #1 – Montgomery 13-18 (36988)

The electric log indicating the perforated intervals follows below.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

b. Candidate Well #2 – Montgomery 12-18 (36989)

The electric log indicating the perforated intervals follows below.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

c. Candidate Well #3 - Montgomery 14-18 (36987)

The electric log indicating the perforated intervals follows below.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

3. Field Activities

a. Preparations

The wells were prepared for the CO₂/sand stimulations. Two 70 ton CO₂ storage vessels were delivered and filled prior to the treatments

(1) Wellhead isolation tool

On the morning of the treatments, a wellhead isolation tool was run to comply with the pressure rating of the wellhead valving etc.

b. Stimulations

These three Candidate wells were the first to be treated as each was stimulated with two stages with the per stage design being the same as those presented above.

The sand schedule evolved during these treatments where it became evident that a maximum injection rate – as had been predicted (see above) of approximately 40 barrels per minute would be achievable at maximum attainable wellhead treating pressures (6,000-6,500 psi), and that the maximum acceptance sand concentrations for these rates is less than 3 pounds per gallon (ppg).

Three of the six stages screened out; both stages in the Montgomery #13 because the sand concentrations were too great, and also the first in the Montgomery #12.

Montgomery #13 was the first well treated and the maximum acceptance sand concentrations were unknown at the outset. The first stage was treated and screened out as the 3.0 ppg sand concentration started into the

formation – 24,200 pounds of sand were placed in zone. Prior to stimulating the second stage, the treating equipment was moved to the Montgomery #12 where the first stage was treated and screened out with 10,400 pounds in zone. The reason for the screen out is believed to be because of reduced injection rates.

The per stage placed proppant volumes ranged from 8,100 to 24,200 pounds. If the lowest volume, 8,100 pounds is removed, the five stage range was 10,400 to 24,200 and averaged 17,600 pounds or approximately twelve percent of that placed in conventional treatments.

A summary of the perforation, stimulation specifics (volumes, rates, pressures) for all three of the Candidate wells is presented and the individual job summary logs and rate-pressure-sand concentration plots for each well are also included as noted below.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

=====

PETROLEUM CONSULTING SERVICES
 P.O. BOX 35833
 CANTON, OH 44735
 (216) 499-3823

=====

STIMULATION SUMMARY - FIRST STAGE

DATE: 12/29/95

PAGE 1 OF 4

	MNTGMRY12	MNTGMRY13	MNTGMRY14
WELL:	MNTGMRY12	MNTGMRY13	MNTGMRY14
TARGET:	L CANYON	L CANYON	L CANYON
SEC/BLK:	18/NG	18/NG	18/NG
SURVEY:	GC & SF RR	GC & SF RR	GC & SF RR
F?L/F?L:	2720N/1850W	1030S/1870W	478N/2078W
CO/ST:	CROCKETT/TX	CROCKETT/TX	CROCKETT/TX
PMT #(42-105)	36989	36988	36987
OPERATOR:	UPRC	UPRC	UPRC
ELEV GL:	2452	2470	2431
TOT DPTH:	7043	6998	7043
COMPLETED:			
STIMULATED:	12/12/95	12/12/95	12/13/95
PERFS:	25	27	27
TOP:	6577	6725	6655
BOT:	6589	6738	6668
INTERVAL:	12	13	13
ACID(GAL):	0	0	0
CO2(BBLS):	630	588	635
(TONS):	104	105	98
TOTAL:	150	187	146
PAD(BBLS):	190	155	185
SL(BBLS):	430	313	322
FLUSH(BBLS):	10	120	128
PMP(BBLS):	630	588	635
SAND(SXS):	250	265	115
IN WELL:	146	23	34
NET(SXS):	104	242	81
MESH:	20/40	20/40	20/40
N2 (MCF):	102	150	69
RATE(BPM)			
AVG:	40.0	47.0	39.6
MAX:	44.0	50.0	40.6
PRESS(PSI)			
AVG:	5900	5200	5590
MAX:	6500	6200	6678
SND CONC(PPG)			
AVG:	1.4	2.0	0.9
MAX:	2.0	3.0	2.0
HORSEPOWER			
AVG:	5784	6000	5706
MAX:	7000	7600	6453

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

12/29/95		PAGE 2 OF 4	

WELL:	MNTGMRY12	MNTGMRY13	MNTGMRY14

BRK DWN(PSI):			
PRE ISIP(PSI)	5609	6012	5142
RATE(BPM):	46.6	29.1	40.7
ISIP(PSI):	2137	1971	2358
GRAD(PSI/FT):	0.32	0.29	0.35
F(PSI/100FT):	53	60	42
10 MIN(PSI):			2373

AVG SC X SL=	250	265	115
PRESS AT PERFS			
@MAX P(PSI)	9268	8876	9282
@AVG P(PSI)	8557	7861	7876
AVG(PSI):	8913	8369	8579
LIQ(PSI/FT):	0.41	0.40	0.37
SG:	0.95	0.92	0.85
CO2 YLD(BBL/T	5.8	5.3	6.4

PRESS:			
OPN FLO:			

TIL:			
MCFD			
AVG:			
RECENT:			
FROM:			

	SCREENOUT	SCREENOUT	SD @39BBLs
	w/104 SXS	w/241 SXS	CSG SVR LK
	IN ZONE	IN ZONE	RPR LK RSME TRTMNT
	AVG SC IN	AVG SC IN	
	ZONE=0.73	ZONE=1.83	

PUMPING(\$)	13000	13000	26000
N2	1624	3549	1659
SAND	3183	2345	1782
MISC	810	8127	476
	-----	-----	-----
	18617	27021	29917

CO2	9750	12155	9490
CO2-PORTABLES	200	200	200
BLENDER	6000	6000	6000
LISC FEE	5000	5000	5000
TUBE TRLR	5500	5500	5500
	-----	-----	-----
	26450	28855	26190
MOB,PDIEM:	2984	4583	2984
TRCKNG			
MISC	545	583	545
	-----	-----	-----
TOT	48596	61042	59636

\$/SK	201	587	246

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

=====

PETROLEUM CONSULTING SERVICES
 P.O. BOX 35833
 CANTON, OH 44735
 (216) 499-3823

=====

STIMULATION SUMMARY - SECOND STAGE

DATE: 12/29/95

PAGE 3 OF 4

WELL:	MNTGMRY12	MNTGMRY13	MNTGMRY14
TARGET:	L CANYON	L CANYON	L CANYON
SEC/BLK:	18/NG	18/NG	18/NG
SURVEY:	GC & SF RR	GC & SF RR	GC & SF RR
F?L/F?L:	2720N/1850W	1030S/1870W	478N/2078W
CO/ST:	CROCKETT/TX	CROCKETT/TX	CROCKETT/TX
PMT #(42-105)	36989	36988	36987
OPERATOR:	UPRC	UPRC	UPRC
ELEV GL:	2452	2470	2431
TOT DPTH:	7043	6998	7043
COMPLETED:	0	0	0
STIMULATED:	12/14/95	12/14/95	12/14/95
PERFS:	51	51	40
TOP:	6432	6516	6428
BOT:	6522	6570	6501
INTERVAL:	90	54	73
ACID(GAL):			
CO2(BBLS):	604	583	538
(TONS):	86	92	124
TOTAL:	157	148	190
PAD(BBLS):	195	102	143
SL(BBLS):	307	403	280
FLUSH(BBLS):	102	78	115
PMP(BBLS):	604	583	538
SAND(SXS):	207	261	137
IN WELL:	9	53	8
NET(SXS):	198	208	129
MESH:	20/40	20/40	20/40
N2 (MCF):	102	149	59
RATE(BPM)			
AVG:	43.0	40.0	43.0
MAX:	44.0	44.0	45.5
PRESS(PSI)			
AVG:	5600	5230	5100
MAX:	6100	5796	5432
SND CONC(PPG)			
AVG:	1.6	1.5	1.2
MAX:	2.0	3.0	2.0
HORSEPOWER			
AVG:	5931	5882	6007
MAX:	6147	6470	6357

Final Report -- Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) - December 1995 - Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

12/29/95		PAGE 4 OF 4	

WELL:	MNTGMRY12	MNTGMRY13	MNTGMRY14

BRK DWN(PSI):			
PRE ISIP(PSI)	5850	6100	5850
RATE(BPM);	43.5	42	40
ISIP(PSI):	2254	2300	2177
GRAD(PSI/FT):	0.35	0.35	0.34
F(PSI/100FT):	56	58	57
5 MIN(PSI):	2056	1100	2000

AVG SC X SL=	207	261	137
PRESS AT PERFS			
@MAX P(PSI)	8688	8412	7977
@AVG P(PSI)	8122	7832	8122
AVG(PSI):	8405	8122	8050
LIQ(PSI/FT):	0.39	0.40	0.43
SG:	0.91	0.92	0.99
CO2 YLD(BBL/T	6.8	6.0	4.2

PRESS:			
OPN FLO:			

TIL:	SCREENOUT		
MCFD	w/208 SXS		
AVG:	IN ZONE		
RECENT:	AVG SC IN		
FROM:	ZONE=1.37		

PUMPING(\$)	8667	8667	8667
N2	3224	3549	1659
SAND	2712	4188	1808
MISC	684	4072	3410
	-----	-----	-----
	15287	20476	15544

CO2	10205	9620	12350
CO2-PORTABLES	200	200	200
BLENDER	0	0	0
LISC FEE	5000	5000	5000
TUBE TRLR	2500	2500	2500
	-----	-----	-----
	17905	17320	20050

MOB,PDIEM:			
TRCKNG			
MISC	284	5073	
	-----	-----	-----
TOT	33476	42869	35594

\$/SK	162	164	260

STAGE 1	48596	61042	59636
STAGE 2	33476	42869	35594
	-----	-----	-----
TOT	82072	103911	95230
			281213

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
(Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

(1) Candidate Well #1 – Montgomery 13-18 (36988)

(a) Stage #1

This was the first well treated in the six well group, and 24,200 pounds of sand were placed in zone, in the first stage. The maximum acceptance sand concentrations were unknown and screened out as the 3.0 ppg sand concentration started into the formation.

The well was perforated with 27 holes over a 13 foot interval from 6,725 to 6,738 feet.

The pressurized blender was transported to the well site on the day of the treatment, December 12, 1995 and filled with 20/40 Brady sand. The treatment was then executed, 26,500 lbs of proppant were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 47.0 barrels per minute and 5,200 psi respectively. The maximum sand concentration was 3.0 lbs per gal, and averaged 2.0, the maximum rates and pressures were 50.0 Bpm and 7,600 psi respectively.

The treatment screened out with 24,200 pounds of proppant in zone for an average in zone proppant concentration of 1.83 ppg.

The instantaneous shut in pressure was 1,971 psi which results in a gradient of 0.29 psi/ft.

(b) Stage #2

Prior to stimulating the second stage, the treating equipment was moved to the Montgomery #12 where the first stage was treated at a reduced injection rate because of mechanical problems and screened out with 10,400 pounds of proppant in zone.

An Alpha Oil Tools Big Bore frac plug was set at 6,580 feet and the second stage was perforated with 51 perforations over a 54 foot interval from 6,516 to 6,570.

The pressurized blender was transported to the well site on the day of the treatment, December 14, 1995 and filled with 20/40 Brady sand. The treatment was then executed, 26,100 lbs of proppant were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 40.0 barrels per minute and 5,230 psi respectively.

The treatment screened out with 20,800 pounds of proppant in zone for an average in zone proppant concentration of 1.37 ppg.

The maximum sand concentration was 3.0 lbs per gal, and averaged 1.5, the maximum rates and pressures were 44.0 Bpm and 5,796 psi respectively. The instantaneous shut in pressure was 2,300 psi which results in a gradient of 0.35 psi/ft. The stimulation pressure-rate history plot is below. The in zone proppant volume was estimated 20,800 pounds.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
(Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Montgomery #13

Disregard Procedures dated prior to:

12/11/95

Location	Sec.	Blk	Survey
1030' FSL & 1870' FW	18	NG	GC & SF RR CO

Elevation:	GL - 2470	KB - 2482
------------	-----------	-----------

Service:	Company:	Service Date:
Pump Trucks	Haliburton	12/11/95
Wireline	HLS	12/11/95
Nitrogen	Haliburton	12/11/95
CO ₂	FLOCO ₂	12/11/95
Tree Saver	Guardian Well Services	12/11/95
Frac Equip.	Universal Services	12/11/95

Size/Wt/Grade/Thrd	Set @	PBTD	Mkr Jt	Mkr Jt	Mkr Jt	TOC
4-1/2" 11.6 N-80 8rd	7034	8998	5858			5500

Existing Lower Canyon Perforations: 6725-8738 (27 holes)

Canyon Completion

- (1) MIRU Guardian Well Services. Install casing saver on top of 4-1/2" frac valve. MIRU Haliburton pump trucks and Universal pressurized blender. Frac Lower Canyon with 112 tons CO₂ carrying Ottawa sand as follows:

40 BPM Max Pressure-6500 psig						
Stage	Gals	Beg ppg	End ppg	Stage Sand	Percent	Pmp Time
CO ₂ Pad	6000				27%	3.8
Hold	4000	0.5	0.5	2000	18%	2.4
Hold	4000	1	1	4000	18%	2.4
Hold	8300	2	2	16800	37%	4.9
Flush	4200					2.5
26500 gal frac + flush				22500 lbs 20/4 Ottawa		15.8
22300 gals gel				42 Gross Height		538 lbs/ft
Flare Quality				NA		531 gals/ft

Design Rate - To be pumped at as high a rate as possible and push a 6000 psig treating pressure.

- (2) Remove casing saver. RU WLU. Install 5000# lubricator. RIH & set 4-1/2" Alpha Oil Tools Big Bore Frac Plug at 6580'. Perforate the Upper Canyon using a 3-1/8" NSC phased 120 degrees as follows:

	Top	Btm	SPF	Holes
Perfs	6516	6538	1	21
Perfs	6545	6570	1	26
Total Holes:				47

Perforations per BPS GR/Neutron/Density/Temp. dated 9-24-95.

- (3) RD WLU. With 4-1/2" valve closed, place 3-1/2" frac ball on top of gate. Install casing saver on top of 4-1/2" valve. Open valve and allow ball to fall. Scoop casing saver mandrel thru valve and into casing.
- (4) Frac Upper Canyon with 112 tons CO₂ carrying Ottawa sand as follows:

40 BPM Max Pressure-6500 psig						
Stage	Gals	Beg ppg	End ppg	Stage Sand	Percent	Pmp Time
CO ₂ Pad	6000				27%	3.8
Hold	4000	1	1	4000	18%	2.4
Hold	4000	2	2	8000	18%	2.4
Hold	8300	3	3	24900	37%	4.9
Flush	4100					2.4
26400 gal frac + flush				36900 lbs 20/4 Ottawa		15.7
22300 gals gel				114 Gross Height		324 lbs/ft
Flare Quality				NA		196 gals/ft

Design Rate - To be pumped at as high a rate as possible and push a 6000 psig treating pressure.

- (5) RD Haliburton and Universal. Commence flowback of well on a 12/64" adjustable choke. Flow back at an estimated rate of 1500 to 2000 mcfpd adjusting choke size as necessary. When frac ball reaches surface, close 4-1/2" master valve. NO upper tree, remove ball. NU tree and continue flowback of well to pit until well cleans up.
- (6) Install surface facilities and commence gas sales.

cc: McCollum, Sewell, McDougal, Strickler, Consultants, Well file - Ozona & Ft Worth
c:\complete\montgom13-p02.wk4

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

HALLIBURTON ENERGY SERVICES

ACQUIRE Version 2.1

CUSTOMER AND JOB INFORMATION

Customer	U.P.O.G	Date	14-Dec-1995
Contractor		County	CROCKETT
Lease	MONTGOMERY	Town	
Location	Q20NA	Section	
Formation	UPPER CANYON	Range	
Job Type	CO2	Permit No	
Country	U.S.A.	Well No	13
State	TEXAS	Field Name	

Customer Representative KELLY JAMERSON

Halliburton Operator DALE PUTNAM

Ticket No. 836024.1

STAGE DESCRIPTIONS

PRIME & TEST
 PAD
 .5 PPG 20/40
 1 PPG 20/40
 2 PPG 20/40
 3 PPG 20/40
 FLUSH

WELL CONFIGURATION INFORMATION

Packer Type Depth 0 ft
 Bottom Hole Temp. 91.0 Deg F

PIPE CONFIGURATION

Wellbore Segment	Measured Depth (ft)	TVU (ft)	Casing ID (inch)	Casing OD (inch)	Tubing ID (inch)	Tubing OD (inch)
1	6570	6570	3.950	4.500	0.000	0.000

PERFORATIONS

Perforation Interval	Top (ft)	Bottom (ft)	Shots per (ft)
1	6516	6570	0

REMARKS ABOUT JOB

FRACTURE UPPER CANYON

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – ‘Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology’

 PLAYBACK STRIP CHART
 #####

1. Casing Press	(psi)	
2. Slurry Rate 1	(bpm)	
3. Casing Press	(psi)	Avg for Stg
4. Slurry Rate	(bpm)	Avg for Stg

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Customer: U.P.O.G
 Well Desc: MONTGOMERY 13
 Formation: UPPER CANYON

Date: 14-Dec-1995
 Ticket #: 836024.1
 Job Type: CO2

JOB SUMMARY

JOB START TIME: 07:40:35
 JOB END TIME: 08:02:11
 JOB DURATION: 00:21:36

STAGES AND EVENTS:

Chart	Time	Slurry Rate (bpm)	Slurry Stage Volume (gal)	Casing Press. (psi)	Remark
Event #1	07:40:35	0.00	0	0	Start Job
Stage #1	07:40:39	0.00	0	331	OPEN WELL HEAD
Stage #2	07:40:51	0.00	4074	692	START PAD
Stage #3	07:43:56	34.59	1025	4989	START .5 PPG
Stage #4	07:44:34	38.97	4156	5321	START 1 PPG
Stage #5	07:46:56	42.94	8472	4718	START 2 PPG
Stage #6	07:51:30	42.39	4626	5263	START 3 PP
Event #2	07:54:44	0.00	0	1920	WELL SCREENED OUT
Event #3	07:55:48	0.00	0	1586	LEFT 115 SKS IN CSG
Event #4	07:59:07	0.00	0	1241	AVG RATE 40 BBL/MIN
Event #5	07:59:50	0.00	0	1180	MAX PSI 6900 PSI AVG PSI 600 0 PSI MIN PSI 5400 PSI
Event #6	08:02:11	0.00	0	263	End Job

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Customer: U.P.O.G
 Well Desc: MONTGOMERY 13
 Formation: UPPER CANYON

Date: 14-Dec-1995
 Ticket #: 836024.1
 Job Type: C02

STAGE SUMMARY

Stage Times

Stage	Start Time	End Time	Elapsed Time
1	07:40:39	07:40:51	00:00:12
2	07:40:51	07:43:56	00:03:05
3	07:43:56	07:44:34	00:00:38
4	07:44:34	07:46:56	00:02:22
5	07:46:56	07:51:30	00:04:34
6	07:51:30	08:02:11	00:10:41
Total	07:40:39	08:02:11	00:21:32

AVERAGES OR VOLUMES PER STAGE -- Planned Volume vs. Actual Volume

Stage	Planned Sl Volume (gal)	Slurry Volume (gal)
1	1000	0
2	4200	4074
3	1718	1025
4	4391	4156
5	9166	8472
6	5343	4626
Tot/Avg	25818	22353

AVERAGES OR VOLUMES PER STAGE -- Strip Chart Variables

Stage	Casing Pressure (psi)	Prop Conc Slurry* (lb/gal)	Prop Conc Bottom* (lb/gal)	CO2 Pressure (psi)
1	437	0.06	0.00	1439
2	2566	0.15	0.00	3157
3	5423	0.34	0.10	6095
4	5090	0.78	0.20	5840
5	5173	1.83	1.21	5978
6	2371	2.18	2.04	3236
Tot/Avg	3364	1.33	1.14	4160

*Average based on volume.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Customer: U.P.O.G
 Well Desc: MONTGOMERY 13
 Formation: UPPER CANYON

Date: 14-Dec-1995
 Ticket #: 836024.1
 Job Type: CO2

STAGE SUMMARY

MAXIMUM VALUE PER STAGE -- Strip Chart Variables

Stage	Casing Pressure (psi)	Prop Conc Slurry* (lb/gal)	Prop Conc Bottom* (lb/gal)	CO2 Pressure (psi)
1	576	0.09	0.00	1670
2	5713	0.26	0.00	6214
3	5617	0.50	0.14	6309
4	5386	1.13	0.50	6169
5	5455	2.30	2.21	6175
6	5796	2.59	2.31	6911
Max Job	5796	2.59	2.31	6911

(2) Candidate Well #2 – Montgomery 12-18 (36989)

(a) Stage #1

The first stage treatment in the Montgomery #12 was compromised by significant CO₂ leaks around the piston rod packings. The leakage was estimated to be at least five (5) barrels per minute. The resultant injection rate after the leaks would be 35 barrels per minute and is believed to be the explanation for the screen out.

The well was perforated with 25 holes over a 12 foot interval from 6,577 to 6,589 feet.

The pressurized blender was transported to the well site on the day of the treatment, December 12, 1995 and filled with 20/40 Brady sand. The treatment was then executed, 25,000 lbs of proppant were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 40.0 barrels per minute and 5,900 psi respectively. The maximum sand concentration was 2.0 lbs per gal, and averaged 1.4, the maximum rates and pressures were 44.0 Bpm and 6,500 psi respectively.

The treatment screened out with 10,400 pounds of proppant in zone for an average in zone proppant concentration of 0.73 ppg.

The instantaneous shut in pressure was 2,137 psi which results in a gradient of 0.32 psi/ft

(b) Stage #2

The well was perforated with 51 holes over a 90 foot interval from 6,432 to 6,522 feet.

The pressurized blender was transported to the well site on the day of the treatment, December 14, 1995 and filled with 20/40 Brady sand. The treatment was then executed, 20,700 lbs of proppant were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 43.0 barrels per minute and 5,600 psi respectively. The maximum sand concentration was 2.0 lbs per gal, and averaged 1.6, the maximum rates and pressures were 44.0 Bpm and 6,100 psi respectively. The instantaneous shut in pressure was 2,254 psi which results in a gradient of 0.35 psi/ft. The stimulation pressure-rate history plot is included. The in zone proppant volume was estimated 19,800 pounds.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

HALLIBURTON ENERGY SERVICES

ACQUIRE Version 2.1

CUSTOMER AND JOB INFORMATION

Customer	U.P.O.G	Date	14-Dec-1995
Contractor		County	CROCKETT
Lease	MONTGOMERY	Town	
Location	OZONA	Section	
Formation	UPPER CANYON	Range	
Job Type	CO2	Permit No	
Country	U.S.A.	Well No	12
State	TEXAS	Field Name	

Customer Representative KELLY JAMERSON

Halliburton Operator DALE PUTNAM

Ticket No. 838876.1

STAGE DESCRIPTIONS

PRIME & TEST
 PAD
 .5 PPG 20/40
 1 PPG 20/40
 2 PPG 20/40
 FLUSH

WELL CONFIGURATION INFORMATION

Packer Type Depth 0 ft
 Bottom Hole Temp. 91.0 Deg F

PIPE CONFIGURATION

Wellbore Segment	Measured Depth	TVI	Casing ID	Casing OD	Tubing ID	Tubing OD
Number	(ft)	(ft)	(inch)	(inch)	(inch)	(inch)
1	6522	6522	3.950	4.500	0.000	0.000

PERFORATIONS

Perforation Interval	Top (ft)	Bottom (ft)	Shots per (ft)
1	6432	6522	0

REMARKS ABOUT JOB

FRACTURE UPPER CANYON

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

 PLAYBACK STRIP CHART
 #####

1. Casing Press	(psi)	
2. Slurry Rate 1	(bpm)	
3. Casing Press	(psi)	Avg for Stg
4. Slurry Rate	(bpm)	Avg for Stg

0	1	CASING PRESS	psi	10000
0.00	2	SLURRY RATE 1	bpm	100.00
0.00	3	SAND CONC	lb/gal	10.00
0.00	4	FLUID CONC/BH	lb/gal	10.00
0	5	CO2 PRESS	psi	10000

E2 E1 11:39:54

PAUSE

E7

11:44:45

PAUSE

E9

11:48:58

PAUSE

12:17:03
 641
 0.00
 0
 0.00

12:27:03
 5369
 43.94
 5329
 43.58

12:27:03

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Customer: U.P.O.G
 Well Desc: MONTGOMERY 12
 Formation: UPPER CANYON

Date: 14-Dec-1995
 Ticket #: 838876.1
 Job Type: CO2

JOB SUMMARY

JOB START TIME: 11:38:55
 JOB END TIME: 12:37:03
 JOB DURATION: 00:58:08

STAGES AND EVENTS:

Chart	Time	Slurry Rate (bpm)	Slurry Stage Volume (gal)	Casing Press. (psi)	Remark
Event #1	11:38:55	0.00	0	0	Start Job
Event #2	11:39:01	0.00	0	-9	ON LOC 10:00 AM
Event #3	11:39:39	0.00	0	-9	Start Job
Event #4	11:39:54	0.00	0	-9	Pause
Event #5	11:44:27	0.00	0	103	Resume
Event #6	11:44:31	0.00	0	103	START COOL DOWN
Event #7	11:44:45	0.00	0	106	Pause
Event #8	11:48:48	3.66	0	168	Resume
Event #9	11:48:58	3.76	0	171	Pause
Event #10	12:17:03	0.00	0	641	Resume
Stage #1	12:17:24	11.74	75	669	SKIP
Stage #2	12:17:30	32.10	5524	746	START PAD
Stage #3	12:20:43	40.73	1981	5180	START .5 PPG SAND
Stage #4	12:21:49	41.15	6723	5128	START 1 PPG SAND
Stage #5	12:25:35	44.06	6131	5380	START 2 PPG SAND
Stage #6	12:28:54	43.91	4836	5280	START FLUSH
Event #11	12:31:38	0.00	0	2488	FLUSH COMPLETE
Event #12	12:31:51	0.00	0	2254	ISIP Casing Press 2254 (psi)
Event #13	12:37:03	0.00	0	2377	End Job

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Customer: U.P.O.G
 Well Desc: MONTGOMERY 12
 Formation: UPPER CANYON

Date: 14-Dec-1995
 Ticket #: 838876.1
 Job Type: CO2

STAGE SUMMARY

Stage Times

Stage	Start Time	End Time	Elapsed Time
1	12:17:24	12:17:30	00:00:06
2	12:17:30	12:20:43	00:03:13
3	12:20:43	12:21:49	00:01:06
4	12:21:49	12:25:35	00:03:46
5	12:25:35	12:28:54	00:03:19
6	12:28:54	12:37:03	00:08:09
Total	12:17:24	12:37:03	00:19:39

AVERAGES OR VOLUMES PER STAGE -- Planned Volume vs. Actual Volume

Stage	Planned Slurry Volume (gal)	Slurry Volume (gal)
1	1000	75
2	6000	5524
3	2045	1981
4	7319	6723
5	6547	6131
6	4811	4836
Tot/Avg	27722	25269

AVERAGES OR VOLUMES PER STAGE -- Strip Chart Variables

Stage	Casing Pressure (psi)	Prop Conc Slurry* (lb/gal)	Prop Conc Bottom* (lb/gal)	CO2 Pressure (psi)
1	695	0.45	0.00	1341
2	4491	0.49	0.46	4961
3	5155	0.56	0.48	5398
4	5241	1.05	0.73	5433
5	5303	1.98	1.22	5539
6	3239	0.73	2.06	3382
Tot/Avg	4274	1.05	1.13	4504

*Average based on volume.

Final Report -- Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) -- December 1995 -- Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 -- "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Customer: U.P.O.G
 Well Desc: MONTGOMERY 12
 Formation: UPPER CANYON

Date: 14-Dec-1995
 Ticket #: 838876.1
 Job Type: C02

STAGE SUMMARY

MAXIMUM VALUE PER STAGE -- Strip Chart Variables

Stage	Casing Pressure (psi)	Prop Conc Slurry* (lb/gal)	Prop Conc Bottom* (lb/gal)	CO2 Pressure (psi)
1	726	0.46	0.00	1354
2	5480	0.58	0.48	6068
3	5180	0.76	0.51	5532
4	5623	1.22	1.14	5725
5	5397	2.61	1.84	5664
6	5751	2.41	2.50	5885
Max Job	5751	2.61	2.50	6068

(3) Candidate Well #3 -- Montgomery 14-18 (36987)

(a) Stage #1

The well was perforated with 27 holes over a 13 foot interval from 6,655 to 6,668 feet.

The pressurized blender was transported to the well site on the day of the treatment, December 13, 1995 and filled with 20/40 Brady sand. The treatment was then executed, 11,500 lbs of proppant were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 39.6 barrels per minute and 5,590 psi respectively.

The treatment had to be temporarily discontinued after pumping 39 barrels of CO₂ because of a leaking wellhead isolation tool. The pumping was halted and the pressure bled from the well head to replace a leaking element. The pumping was resumed after approximately two hours.

The maximum sand concentration was 2.0 lbs per gal, and averaged 0.9, the maximum rates and pressures were 40.6 Bpm and 6,453 psi respectively. The instantaneous shut in pressure was 2,358 psi which results in a gradient of 0.35 psi/ft. The stimulation pressure-rate history plot is below. The in zone proppant volume was an estimated 8,100 pounds.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

HALLIBURTON ENERGY SERVICES

ACQUIRE Version 2.1

CUSTOMER AND JOB INFORMATION

Customer	U.P.O.G	Date	13-Dec-1995
Contractor		County	CROCKETT
Lease	MONTGOMERY	Town	
Location	OZONA	Section	
Formation	LOWER CANYON	Range	
Job Type	CO2	Permit No	
Country	U.S.A.	Well No	14
State	TEXAS	Field Name	

Customer Representative KELLY JAMERSON

Halliburton Operator DALE PUTNAM

Ticket No. 838877

STAGE DESCRIPTIONS

PRIME & TEST
 PAD
 PAD
 1 PPG 20/40
 2 PPG 20/40
 FLUSH

WELL CONFIGURATION INFORMATION

Packer Type Depth 0 ft
 Bottom Hole Temp. 91.0 Deg F

PIPE CONFIGURATION

Wellbore Segment Number	Measured Depth (ft)	TVD (ft)	Casing ID (inch)	Casing OD (inch)	Tubing ID (inch)	Tubing OD (inch)
1	6668	6668	3.950	4.500	0.000	0.000

PERFORATIONS

Perforation Interval	Top (ft)	Bottom (ft)	Shots per (ft)
1	6655	6668	0

REMARKS ABOUT JOB

PUMP 140 TONS OF CO2 AND 226 SKS 20/40 OTTOWA AT 50 BBL/MIN AT

APPROXIMATELY 4000 PSI WITH MAXIMUM PSI OF 6000 PSI.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

 PLAYBACK STRIP CHART
 #####

1. Casing Press	(psi)	
2. CO ₂ Rate1(Act)	(bpm)	
3. Casing Press	(psi)	Avg for Stg
4. CO ₂ Rate/Standard	(bpm)	Avg for Stg

PAUSE

PAUSE

PAUSE

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Customer: U.P.O.G
 Well Desc: MONTGOMERY 14
 Formation: LOWER CANYON

Date: 13-Dec-1995
 Ticket #: 838877
 Job Type: CO₂

JOB SUMMARY

JOB START TIME: 08:35:01
 JOB END TIME: 11:10:27
 JOB DURATION: 02:35:26

STAGES AND EVENTS:

Chart	Time	CO ₂ Act Rate (bpm)	CO ₂ Act Stage Volume (gal)	Casing Press. (psi)	Remark
Stage #1	08:35:01	0.00	94	0	Start Job
Event #1	08:40:34	0.00	0	238	Pause
Event #2	08:42:25	5.70	0	1436	Resume
Event #3	08:42:39	2.65	0	1012	Pause
Event #4	08:43:59	0.00	0	195	Resume
Stage #2	08:44:09	0.00	5850	214	start pad
Event #5	08:48:16	0.00	0	2684	TREESAVER LEAKING SHUT DOWN TO REPAIR
Event #6	08:49:18	0.00	0	1534	Resume
Event #7	08:49:24	0.00	0	1538	Pause
Event #8	10:42:44	0.00	0	344	Resume
Stage #3	10:42:48	0.00	6485	560	START PAD
Stage #4	10:48:12	38.66	5477	5734	START .5 PPG SAND
Stage #5	10:51:31	39.94	6753	5685	START 1 PPG 20/40
Stage #6	10:55:29	40.52	1732	5304	START 2 PPG
Stage #7	10:56:31	40.70	5107	5142	START FLUSH
Event #9	10:59:45	0.00	0	2358	ISIP Casing Press 2358 (psi)
Event #10	11:08:41	0.00	0	2373	10 Min Shutin Pres. Casing P ress 2373 (psi)
Event #11	11:10:27	0.00	0	1427	End Job

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Customer: U.P.O.G
 Well Desc: MONTGOMERY 14
 Formation: LOWER CANYON

Date: 13-Dec-1995
 Ticket #: 838877
 Job Type: CO2

STAGE SUMMARY

Stage Times

Stage	Start Time	End Time	Elapsed Time
1	08:35:01	08:44:09	00:09:08
2	08:44:09	10:42:48	01:58:39
3	10:42:48	10:48:12	00:05:24
4	10:48:12	10:51:31	00:03:19
5	10:51:31	10:55:29	00:03:58
6	10:55:29	10:56:31	00:01:02
7	10:56:31	11:10:27	00:13:56
Total	08:35:01	11:10:27	02:35:26

AVERAGES OR VOLUMES PER STAGE -- Planned Volume vs. Actual Volume

Stage	Planned Gs Volume (gal)	CO2 (Act) Volume (gal)
1	1000	94
2	8000	5850
3	8000	6485
4	12547	5477
5	2500	6753
6	5082	1732
7	0	5107
Tot/Avg	37129	31498

AVERAGES OR VOLUMES PER STAGE -- Strip Chart Variables

Stage	Casing Pressure (psi)	Prop Conc Slurry* (lb/gal)	Prop Conc Bottom* (lb/gal)
1	482	0.78	0.00
2	457	0.41	0.00
3	4108	0.37	0.00
4	5722	0.34	0.00
5	5498	0.59	0.00
6	5248	0.79	0.00
7	2886	1.65	0.00
Tot/Avg	1076	0.78	0.00

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
(Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Customer: U.P.O.G
Well Desc: MONTGOMERY 14
Formation: LOWER CANYON

Date: 13-Dec-1995
Ticket #: 838877
Job Type: CO2

STAGE SUMMARY

MAXIMUM VALUE PER STAGE -- Strip Chart Variables

Stage	Casing Pressure (psi)	Prop Conc Slurry* (lb/gal)	Prop Conc Bottom* (lb/gal)
1	1550	0.93	0.00
2	6678	0.53	0.00
3	6255	0.47	0.00
4	5828	1.15	0.00
5	5690	1.01	0.00
6	5362	1.69	0.00
7	5472	1.65	0.00
Max Job	6678	1.69	0.00

(b) Stage #2

The well was perforated with 40 holes over a 73 foot interval from 6,428 to 6,501 feet.

The pressurized blender was transported to the well site on the day of the treatment, December 14, 1995 and filled with 20/40 Brady sand. The treatment was then executed, 13,700 lbs of proppant were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 43.0 barrels per minute and 5,100 psi respectively. The maximum sand concentration was 2.0 lbs per gal, and averaged 1.2, the maximum rates and pressures were 43.0 Bpm and 5,432 psi respectively. The instantaneous shut in pressure was 2,177 psi which results in a gradient of 0.34 psi/ft. The stimulation pressure-rate history plot is below. The in zone proppant volume was estimated 12,900 pounds.

**Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
(Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”**

HALLIBURTON ENERGY SERVICES

ACQUIRE Version 2.1

CUSTOMER AND JOB INFORMATION

Customer	U.P.O.G	Date	14-Dec-1995
Contractor		County	CROCKETT
Lease	MONTGOMERY	Town	
Location	OZONA	Section	
Formation	UPPER CANYON	Range	
Job Type	CO2	Permit No	
Country	U.S.A.	Well No	14
State	TEXAS	Field Name	

Customer Representative KELLY JAMERSON

Halliburton Operator DALE PUTNAM

Ticket No. 838877.1

STAGE DESCRIPTIONS

PRIME & TEST
PAD
.5 PPG 20/40
1 PPG 20/40
2 PPG 20/40
FLUSH

WELL CONFIGURATION INFORMATION

Packer Type Depth 0 ft
Bottom Hole Temp. 91.0 Deg F

PIPE CONFIGURATION

Wellbore	Measured	Casing	Casing	Tubing	Tubing
Segment	Depth	TVL	ID	OD	ID
Number	(ft)	(ft)	(inch)	(inch)	(inch)
1	6501	6501	3.950	4.500	0.000

PERFORATIONS

Perforation	Top	Bottom	Shots per
Interval	(ft)	(ft)	(ft)
1	6428	6501	0

REMARKS ABOUT JOB

FRACTURE UPPER CANYON

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

 PLAYBACK STRIP CHART
 #####

1. Casing Press (psi)
2. Slurry Rate 1 (bpm)
3. Casing Press (psi) Avg for Stg
4. Slurry Rate (bpm) Avg for Stg

0	_____	1	CASING PRESS	psi	_____	10000
0.00	-----	2	SLURRY RATE 1	bpm	-----	100.00
0.00	-----	3	SAND CONC	lb/gal	-----	10.00
0.00	-----	4	FLUID CONC/BH	lb/gal	-----	10.00

E2

16:09:22

PAUSE

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Customer: U.P.O.G
 Well Desc: MONTGOMERY 14
 Formation: UPPER CANYON

Date: 14-Dec-1995
 Ticket #: 838877.1
 Job Type: CO2

JOB SUMMARY

JOB START TIME: 16:09:02
 JOB END TIME: 16:31:59
 JOB DURATION: 00:22:57

STAGES AND EVENTS:

Chart	Time	Slurry Rate (bpm)	Slurry Stage Volume (gal)	Casing Press. (psi)	Remark
Event #1	16:09:02	0.00	0	0	Start Job
Stage #1	16:09:06	4.30	23	1100	PRIME UP
Stage #2	16:09:16	0.18	6092	269	START PAD
Event #2	16:09:22	2.99	0	251	Pause
Event #3	16:12:07	0.00	0	564	Resume
Event #4	16:12:14	5.86	0	603	START PAD
Stage #3	16:15:41	43.55	2257	5198	START .5 PPG
Stage #4	16:16:55	43.30	7656	4917	START 1 PPG
Stage #5	16:21:05	45.10	3428	4972	START 2 PPG
Stage #6	16:22:55	44.20	4811	5214	START FLUSH
Event #5	16:25:54	0.00	0	2177	ISIP Casing Press 2177 (psi)
Event #6	16:31:59	0.00	0	1477	End Job

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Customer: U.P.O.G
 Well Desc: MONTGOMERY 14
 Formation: UPPER CANYON

Date: 14-Dec-1995
 Ticket #: 838877.1
 Job Type: CO2

STAGE SUMMARY

Stage Times

Stage	Start Time	End Time	Elapsed Time
1	16:09:06	16:09:16	00:00:10
2	16:09:16	16:15:41	00:06:25
3	16:15:41	16:16:55	00:01:14
4	16:16:55	16:21:05	00:04:10
5	16:21:05	16:22:55	00:01:50
6	16:22:55	16:31:59	00:09:04
Total	16:09:06	16:31:59	00:22:53

AVERAGES OR VOLUMES PER STAGE -- Planned Volume vs. Actual Volume

Stage	Planned Sl Volume (gal)	Slurry Volume (gal)
1	1000	23
2	6000	6092
3	2045	2257
4	7319	7656
5	6547	3428
6	4808	4811
Tot/Avg	27719	24266

AVERAGES OR VOLUMES PER STAGE -- Strip Chart Variables

Stage	Casing Pressure (psi)	Prop Conc Slurry* (lb/gal)	Prop Conc Bottom* (lb/gal)
1	557	0.03	0.00
2	2649	0.14	0.17
3	5008	0.19	0.15
4	4858	0.85	0.40
5	5100	1.42	0.95
6	2801	0.50	1.29
Tot/Avg	3421	0.62	0.66

*Average based on volume.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
(Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Customer: U.P.O.G
Well Desc: MONTGOMERY 14
Formation: UPPER CANYON

Date: 14-Dec-1995
Ticket #: 838877.1
Job Type: CO2

STAGE SUMMARY

MAXIMUM VALUE PER STAGE -- Strip Chart Variables

Stage	Casing Pressure (psi)	Prop Conc Slurry* (lb/gal)	Prop Conc Bottom* (lb/gal)
1	1100	0.04	0.00
2	5224	0.26	0.24
3	5206	0.38	0.18
4	4999	1.10	1.02
5	5260	1.74	1.02
6	5432	1.68	1.69
Max Job	5432	1.74	1.69

(c) Stimulation Summary

The stimulation specifics are summarized:

Summary							
Well	Stg	Sand (sacks)		Max Tr Press (psi)	Avg Rate (BPM)	Sand Conc (lb/gal)	
		Pumped	In-Zone			Max	Avg
M#13	1	265	242	6,200	47.0	3.0	2.0
M#13	2	261	208	5,796	40.0	3.0	1.5
M#12	1	250	104	6,500	40.0	2.0	1.4
M#12	2	207	198	6,100	43.0	2.0	1.6
M#14	1	115	81	5,590	39.6	2.0	0.9
M#14	2	137	129	5,600	43.0	2.0	1.2

c. Post Stimulation

(1) Flow Back Procedures

The flow back procedure was initiated immediately following the removal of the stimulation hardware. The flow was restricted with a choke to enable the CO₂ vapor to flow safely. The choke size was increased as the pressure diminished and the CO₂ concentration was monitored. Some sand was produced as was expected because of the intentional under flush.

(2) Cleaning Frac Sand from the Well Bore

Following the stimulations the three Candidate wells were all cleaned by jetting the sand from them with nitrogen gas. The three Candidate wells were, as is generally the case with the CO₂/sand stimulations - because of the designed under flush, found to have sand in them above the perforations. The fill up in Montgomery 12-18 (1st stage) was 1,676 feet due to the screen out as was the 2nd stage in Montgomery 13-18; however, the fill up in the other four

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

stages was less than that typically encountered being from three to 14 feet above the lowermost perforation.

Stage 1				
Well	Perf Intvl	Sand Top	Fill-up	Clean Out Depth
	(ft)	(ft)	(ft) (lbs)	(ft)
Montgomery 13-18	6,725 – 6,738	6,724	274 (2,390)	6,998
Montgomery 12-18	6,577 – 6,589	933	1,676 (14,630)	7,043
Montgomery 14-18	6,655 – 6,668	6,657	386 (3,370)	7,043

Stage 2				
Well	Perf Intvl	Sand Top	Fill-up	Clean Out Depth
	(ft)	(ft)	(ft) (lbs)	(ft)
Montgomery 13-18	6,516 – 6,570	6,055	605 (5,280)	6,660
Montgomery 12-18	6,432 – 6,522	6,519	101 (880)	6,620
Montgomery 14-18	6,428 – 6,501	6,498	92 (800)	6,590

(3) Tubing Installation

A 1-1/4 inch coiled tubing was installed for liquid removal. The wells were produced through the tubing, some with intermitters, and no plunger lift hardware was present.

4. Results - Production Comparisons

a. Candidate Well #1 – Montgomery 13-18 (36988)

b. Candidate Well #2 – Montgomery 12-18 (36989)

c. Candidate Well #3 -- Montgomery 14-18 (36987)

d. Summary – Candidate Wells

The five year cumulative production from the three Candidate Wells ranged between 26.7 and 153.6 MMcf and averaged 100.4 MMcf.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

e. Production Comparisons – Summary

The five year cumulative production volumes from the three Candidate Wells ranged from 26.7 to 153.6 MMcf and averaged 100.4 MMcf, or 13 percent that of the ten Control Wells.

Well	Pmt # 42-105-	5 Yr Prod Proj't'd	Stim
	xxxx	(MMcf)	Type, Sxs, Bbls
Montgomery 02-17	10786	1,695.2	
Montgomery 01-17	10785	1,100.2	
Montgomery 03-15	30742	814.4	
Montgomery 07-16	31725	662.0	
Montgomery 04-15	31021	510.9	
Montgomery 05-18	31727	370.8	
Montgomery 14-18	36987	153.6	CO ₂ 81, 635 CO ₂ 129, 538
Montgomery 12-18	36989	120.8	CO ₂ 104, 630 CO ₂ 198, 604
Montgomery 01-16	10101	65.8	
Montgomery 13-18	36988	26.7	CO ₂ 242, 588 CO ₂ 208, 583

These poor responses from the wells stimulated with the CO₂/sand process are unquestionably related to a number of factors regarding the formation characteristics of permeability and pressure, but to a larger extent to the reduced proppant volumes placed by the liquid-free treatments.

Average Production - Canyon Sands (E & C)
Crockett Co, TX - Block NG (Montgomery) - Secs 15, 16, 17,18
10 Wells - 17 Stages
Stim: Gelled H₂O (7 wells) w/100,000 - 200,000 lbs Prop/Stg
CO₂/Sand (3 wells) w/ 8,100 - 20,800 lbs Prop/Stg

5. Conclusions - Test Area #1

- a. The liquid CO₂/sand stimulations were somewhat successfully pumped in the Canyon Sands. Although it had not been conclusively established that they could be successfully pumped they were, but at considerably reduced proppant volumes than the design.

The proppant volumes placed were much less than the design and ranged from 8,100 to 24,200 pounds per stage. If the lowest volume, 8,100 pounds is removed, the five stage range was 10,400 to 24,200 and

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

averaged 17,600 pounds or approximately twelve percent of that placed in conventional treatments.

The actual volumes placed in zone were:

Stage 1			
	Pumped	Removed from well	Net in zone
Well	(K lbs)	(K lbs)	(K lbs)
Montgomery 13-18	26.5	2.3	24.2
Montgomery 12-18	25.0	14.6	10.4
Montgomery 14-18	11.5	3.4	8.1

Stage 2			
	Pumped	Removed from well	Net in zone
Well	(K lbs)	(K lbs)	(K lbs)
Montgomery 13-18	26.1	5.3	20.8
Montgomery 12-18	20.7	0.9	19.8
Montgomery 14-18	13.7	0.8	12.9

- b. The production from the three Candidate Wells was considerably less than that from the Control Wells.

The projected five year cumulative production averaged 100.4 MMcf while that from the seven Control wells averaged 745.0 MMcf or 7.4 times that from the wells stimulated with the liquid CO₂/sand process.

- c. These poor responses from the wells stimulated with the CO₂/sand process are unquestionably related to a number of factors regarding the formation characteristics of permeability, and pressure, but to a larger extent to the reduced proppant volumes placed by the liquid-free treatments

- d. The ability to place the design quantities was obviously limited by
 - (1) The reduced pump rate of 40 barrels per minute, which was driven by a maximum tubular strength limitation of 6,500 psi.
 - (2) High leak off rates into the formation.
- e. The costs for the CO₂/sand stimulations (6 wells - 9 stages) was \$407,462 or \$45,274 per stage. Cost advantages resulted from a major reduction in pumping costs through the utilization of a locally available service company, Halliburton Energy Services (HES). The original bid was much greater and also required a significant mobilization charge. To a lesser extent, a cost savings for CO₂ of \$7,380 was realized by utilizing another supplier.
- f. In retrospect the inability of Halliburton to provide the design pump rate primarily because of the significant CO₂ leaks and the utilization of small diameter plungers compromised the ability to place proppant.
- g. Significant equipment problems with CO₂ leakage around the piston rods was experienced. There were twelve Halliburton pumpers and the leakage became so severe that they were not visible from the blender operators position. They were shut down and partially remediated.

B. Test Area #2 - Block MM (Hoover-Hatton)

Block MM has an areal extent of four sections. The previous spacing was 80 acres which was, at the time, reduced to 40 subject to a pending request. There were 25 producing wells in Block MM. Four CO₂/Sand stimulation sites were offered. In-house electric logs for sixteen were provided.

1. Control Wells - 10 Wells

Production Review and Projections

The production was plotted and the five year production projection exclusive of flush production and non-productive intervals was generated as described under the preceding METHODOLOGY section.

- a. Control Well # 1 - Hatton 03-13 (32174) - Projected 5 Yr Prod 434.2 MMcf

**Hatton #3 (32174) Crockett Co, TX
 Block MM - Sec 13**

- b. Control Well # 2 - Hoover 04-07 (34267) - Projected 5 Yr Prod 332.5 MMcf

**Hoover #4 (34267) Crockett Co, TX
 Block MM - Sec 7**

- c. Control Well # 3 - Anderson 01-14 (32307) - Projected 5 Yr Prod 292.5 MMcf

Anderson #1 (32307) Crockett Co, TX
Block MM - Sec 14

- d. Control Well # 4 - Hatton 01-14 (32124) - Projected 5 Yr Prod 187.0 MMcf

**Hatton #1 (32124) Crockett Co, TX
 Block MM - Sec 14**

- e. Control Well # 5 - Hatton 02-08 (32004) - Projected 5 Yr Prod 163.1 MMcf

Hatton #2 (32004) Crockett Co, TX
Block MM - Sec 8

- f. Control Well # 6 - Hatton 04-08 (32260) - Projected 5 Yr Prod 161.3 MMcf

**Hatton #4 (32260) Crockett Co, TX
 Block MM - Sec 8**

- g. Control Well # 7 - Hatton 03-14 (32182) - Projected 5 Yr Prod 146.5 MMcf

Hatton #3 (32182) Crockett Co, TX
Block MM - Sec 14

- h. Control Well # 8 - Hatton 01-08 (32003) - Projected 5 Yr Prod 131.4 MMcf

**Hatton #1 (32003) Crockett Co, TX
 Block MM - Sec 8**

- i. Control Well # 9 - Hatton 02-13 (32165) - Projected 5 Yr Prod 91.6 MMcf

Hatton #2 (32165) Crockett Co, TX
Block MM - Sec 13

- j. Control Well #10 - Hatton 01-13 (32143) - Projected 5 Yr Prod 65.3 MMcf

Hatton #1 (32143) Crockett Co, TX Block MM - Sec 13

2. Summary – Control Wells

The five year cumulative production from the ten Control Wells ranged between 62.8 and 434.2 MMcf and averaged 200.3 MMcf.

Production - Canyon Sands (G & H) Crockett Co, TX - Block MM (Hatton)- Sec's 8, 13 & 14 10 Wells - 10 Stages Stimulation: Gelled Water - w/100,000 - 200,000 lbs Proppant/Stg

3. Candidate Well Selection - Three Wells

The three Candidate Wells and ten Control Wells situated in test area #2 and all were completed in the G & H Sands and stimulated with a single stage CO₂/sand treatment. The reservoir pressure was approximately 80 to 90% of the original and the EUR's have to exceed 300 million cubic feet of gas equivalence (300 MMcf) to meet the operators minimum economic hurdle.

One of the originally proposed Candidate Wells in Block MM was, because of a robust response to a liquid CO₂ only stimulation, removed at UPRC's request and a replacement substituted.

The originally proposed Candidate Well #3-17 was removed because of its unusually large response to a 577 bbl (107 tons) CO₂ only stimulation. The original plan was to initially treat it with CO₂ only, monitor the production, and then stimulate it with the CO₂/Sand process. Because the production response has been favorable, it was requested that another well, #7C-7, be exchanged for #3-17.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
(Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

a. Candidate Well #1 - Hatton 13-14 (36848)

The electric log indicating the perforated intervals follows below.

b. Candidate Well #2 - Hatton 7C-7 (36960)

The electric log indicating the perforated intervals follows below.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

c. Candidate Well #3 - Hatton 8C-14 (36991)

The electric log indicating the perforated intervals follows below.

4. Field Activities

a. Stimulations

These treatments were performed immediately following those of three other Candidate Wells situated in Block NG (Montgomery) which were each stimulated with two-stage CO₂/sand treatments. During those treatments it became evident that the maximum pumping rate would be 40 barrels per minute as limited by a maximum allowable well head treating pressure of 6,500 psi, and that the maximum sand concentrations for this rate would be less than three pounds per gallon

A summary of the perforation, stimulation specifics (volumes, rates, pressures) for all three of the Candidate wells is below and the individual job summary logs and rate-pressure-sand concentration plots for each well are also included as noted below.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

=====

PETROLEUM CONSULTING SERVICES
 P.O. BOX 35833
 CANTON, OH 44735
 (216) 499-3823

=====

STIMULATION SUMMARY

DATE: 12/29/95 PAGE 1 OF 2

WELL:	HATTON 7C-7	HATTON 8C-4	HATTON 13-14
TARGET:	L CANYON	L CANYON	L CANYON
SEC/BLK:	7/MM	8/MM	13/MM
SURVEY:	T & STL RR	T & STL RR	T & STL RR
F?L/F?L:	430S/330E	660S/2080E	1500N/467W
CO/ST:	CROCKETT/TX	CROCKETT/TX	CROCKETT/TX
PMT #(42-105)	36960	36991	36848
OPERATOR:	UPRC	UPRC	UPRC
ELEV GL:	2409	2375	2378
TOT DPTH:	7585	7613	7525
COMPLETED:	11/03/95	09/19/95	09/04/95
STIMULATED:	12/15/95	12/15/95	12/15/95
PERFS:	63	71	56
TOP:	7224	7164	7153
BOT:	7420	7356	7326
INTERVAL:	196	192	173
ACID(GAL):	0	0	0
CO2(BBLS):	640	659	466
(TONS):	104	125	75
TOTAL:	149	165	119
PAD(BBLS):	198	205	143
SL(BBLS):	315	328	288
FLUSH(BBLS):	127	126	35
PMP(BBLS):	640	659	466
SAND(SXS):	112	140	139
IN WELL:	10	23	83
NET(SXS):	102	117	56
MESH:	20/40	20/40	20/40
N2 (MCF):	104	15	97
RATE(BPM)			
AVG:	39.5	40.0	39.0
MAX:	42.0	42.0	42.0
PRESS(PSI)			
AVG:	5800	5800	6600
MAX:	6050	6250	7400
SND CONC(PPG)			
AVG:	0.8	1.0	1.1
MAX:	1.0	2.0	2.0
HORSEPOWER			
AVG:	5615	5686	6309
MAX:	6228	6434	6794

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

=====			
12/29/95	PAGE 2 OF 2		

WELL:	HATTON 7C-7	HATTON 8C-4	HATTON 13-14

BRK DWN(PSI):			
PRE ISIP(PSI)	6050	5900	6775
RATE(BPM);	42.5	40.5	40.8
ISIP(PSI):	3624	3324	3103
GRAD (PSI/FT)	0.49	0.46	0.43
F(PSI/100FT):	22	24	34
2 MIN(PSI):	3200		
3 MIN(PSI):		3224	

AVG SC*SL(SXS	112	140	139
PRESS AT PERFS:			
@MAX P(PSI)	8847	9137	10370
@AVG P(PSI)	8586	8586	9427
AVG(PSI):	8717	8862	9899
LIQ (PSI/FT):	0.38	0.39	0.40
SG:	0.88	0.90	0.92
CO2 YLD(BBL/T	6.2	5.3	6.2

PRESS:			
OPN FLO:			

TIL:			
MCFD			
AVG:			
RECENT:			
FROM:			

		SCREENOUT	
		w/56 SXS	
		IN ZONE	
		AVG SC IN	
		ZONE=0.69	

PUMPING(\$)	8666	8666	8666
N2	2933	724	2935
SAND	1248	3946	1846
MISC	2447	2638	2481
	15294	15974	15928
			47196

CO2	9685	10725	7735
CO2-PORTABLES	200	200	200
BLENDER	6000	6000	6000
LISC FEE	5000	5000	5000
TUBE TRLR	5500	5500	5500
	26385	27425	24435
			800
MOB,PDIEM:			
TRCKNG			
MISC	79	80	100
	41758	43479	41263
			126500

TOT	41758	43479	41263
			126500

\$/SK	409	372	737

(1) Candidate Well #1 - Hatton 13-14 (36848)

The well was perforated with 56 holes over a 173 foot interval from 7,153 to 7,326 feet.

The pressurized blender was transported to the well site on the day of the treatment, December 15, 1995 and filled with 20/40 Brady sand. The treatment was then executed, 13,900 lbs of proppant were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 34.0 (39-5) barrels per minute and 6,600 psi respectively. The maximum sand concentration was 2.0 lbs per gal, and averaged 1.1, the maximum rates and pressures were 42.0 Bpm and 7,400 psi (screen out) respectively. The instantaneous shut in pressure was 3,103 psi which results in a gradient of 0.43 psi/ft. The stimulation pressure-rate history plot is included.

The pumping operation was terminated because of a screen out. It was being pumped at 39 bpm and a good deal of CO₂ leakage around the piston rod packings (12 pumps) reduced the injection rate by an estimated 5 bpm resulting in an actual through-wellhead rate of 34 bpm. The in zone proppant volume was estimated 5,600 pounds.

**Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
(Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”**

HALLIBURTON ENERGY SERVICES

ACQUIRE Version 2.1

CUSTOMER AND JOB INFORMATION

Customer	U.P.O.G	Date	15-Dec-1995
Contractor		County	CROCKETT
Lease	EH HATTON	Town	
Location	OZONA	Section	
Formation	LOWER CANYON	Range	
Job Type	CO2	Permit No	
Country	U.S.A.	Well No	13-14
State	TEXAS	Field Name	

Customer Representative FRED McDOUGAL

Halliburton Operator DALE PUTNAM

Ticket No. 838878

STAGE DESCRIPTIONS

PRIME & TEST
PAD
.5 PPG 20/40
1 PPG 20/40
2 PPG 20/40
FLUSH

WELL CONFIGURATION INFORMATION

Packer Type Depth 0 ft
Bottom Hole Temp. 91.0 Deg F

PIPE CONFIGURATION

Wellbore Segment Number	Measured Depth (ft)	Casing TVD (ft)	Casing ID (inch)	Casing OD (inch)	Tubing ID (inch)	Tubing OD (inch)
1	7326	7326	3.950	4.500	0.000	0.000

PERFORATIONS

Perforation Interval	Top (ft)	Bottom (ft)	Shots per (ft)
1	7153	7326	0

REMARKS ABOUT JOB

FRACTURE LOWER CANYON

THANK YOU

HALLIBURTON ENERGY FRAC CREW

NOTICE: THIS REPORT IS BASED ON SOUND ENGINEERING PRACTICES, BUT BECAUSE OF VARIABLE WELL CONDITIONS AND OTHER INFORMATION WHICH MUST BE RELIED UPON, HALLIBURTON MAKES NO WARRANTY, EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, AS TO THE ACCURACY OF THE DATA OR OF ANY CALCULATIONS OR OPINIONS EXPRESSED HEREIN. YOU ACKNOWLEDGE THAT HALLIBURTON SHALL NOT BE LIABLE FOR ANY LOSS OR DAMAGE SUSTAINED DUE TO NEGLIGENCE.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

 PLAYBACK STRIP CHART
 #####

1. Casing Press	(psi)	
2. Slurry Rate 1	(bpm)	
3. Casing Press	(psi)	Avg for Stg
4. Slurry Rate	(bpm)	Avg for Stg

0	1	CASING PRESS	psi	10000
0.00	2	SLURRY RATE 1	bpm	100.00
0.00	3	SAND CONC	lb/gal	10.00
0.00	4	FLUID CONC/BH	lb/gal	10.00
0	5	CO2 PRESS	psi	10000

E2

07:25:54

PAUSE.

08:01:49
 419
 0.00
 416
 0.00

08:11:49
 6628
 41.63
 6537

08:16:56

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Customer: U.P.O.G
 Well Desc: EH HATTON 13-14
 Formation: LOWER CANYON

Date: 15-Dec-1995
 Ticket #: 838878
 Job Type: C02

JOB SUMMARY

JOB START TIME: 07:25:28
 JOB END TIME: 08:16:56
 JOB DURATION: 00:51:28

STAGES AND EVENTS:

Chart	Time	Slurry Rate (bpm)	Slurry Stage Volume (gal)	Casing Press. (psi)	Remark
Event #1	07:25:28	0.00	0	0	Start Job
Stage #1	07:25:43	0.00	0	-1	START COOL DOWN
Event #2	07:25:54	0.00	0	-1	Pause
Event #3	08:01:49	0.00	0	419	Resume
Stage #2	08:01:53	0.00	5669	452	START PAD
Stage #3	08:05:29	35.11	2085	6262	START .5 PPG
Stage #4	08:06:50	38.83	6924	6632	START 1 PPG
Stage #5	08:10:59	41.04	3176	6475	START 2 PPG
Stage #6	08:12:48	40.84	1402	6775	START FLUSH
Event #4	08:13:54	0.00	0	3220	SCREENED OUT
Event #5	08:14:11	0.00	0	3103	ISIP Casing Press 3103 (psi)
Event #6	08:14:17	0.00	0	3074	165 SKS SAND PUMPED
Event #7	08:14:35	0.00	0	3059	1400 GAL FLUSH BEFORE SCREEN ED OUT
Event #8	08:16:56	0.00	0	2999	End Job

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Customer: U.P.O.G
 Well Desc: EH HATTON 13-14
 Formation: LOWER CANYON

Date: 15-Dec-1995
 Ticket #: 838978
 Job Type: C02

STAGE SUMMARY

Stage Times

Stage	Start Time	End Time	Elapsed Time
1	07:25:43	08:01:53	00:36:10
2	08:01:53	08:05:29	00:03:36
3	08:05:29	08:06:50	00:01:21
4	08:06:50	08:10:59	00:04:09
5	08:10:59	08:12:48	00:01:49
6	08:12:48	08:16:56	00:04:08
Total	07:25:43	08:16:56	00:51:13

AVERAGES OR VOLUMES PER STAGE -- Planned Volume vs. Actual Volume

Stage	Planned Sl Volume (gal)	Slurry Volume (gal)
1	1000	0
2	6000	5669
3	2045	2085
4	7319	6924
5	6547	3176
6	5280	1402
Tot/Avg	28191	19256

AVERAGES OR VOLUMES PER STAGE -- Strip Chart Variables

Stage	Casing Pressure (psi)	Prop Conc Slurry* (lb/gal)	Prop Conc Bottom* (lb/gal)	CO2 Pressure (psi)
1	416	0.98	0.00	308
2	3022	0.44	0.94	2961
3	6417	0.37	0.46	6362
4	6538	1.10	0.41	6454
5	6620	1.90	1.28	6491
6	3906	0.53	1.24	3673
Tot/Avg	1756	0.92	0.73	1644

*Average based on volume.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Customer:	U.P.O.G	Date:	15-Dec-1995
Well Desc:	EH HATTON 13-14	Ticket #:	838878
Formation:	LOWER CANYON	Job Type:	CO2

STAGE SUMMARY

MAXIMUM VALUE PER STAGE -- Strip Chart Variables

Stage	Casing Pressure (psi)	Prop Conc Slurry* (lb/gal)	Prop Conc Bottom* (lb/gal)	CO2 Pressure (psi)
1	431	0.99	0.00	318
2	6532	0.98	0.97	6657
3	6655	0.51	0.91	6569
4	6663	1.40	1.23	6595
5	6809	2.33	1.33	6657
6	7368	1.39	1.33	6820
Max Job	7368	2.33	1.33	6820

(2) Candidate Well #2 - Hatton 7C-7 (36960)

The well was perforated with 63 holes over a 196 foot interval from 7,224 to 7,420 feet.

The pressurized blender was transported to the well site on the day of the treatment, December 15, 1995 and filled with 20/40 Brady sand. The treatment was then executed, 11,200 lbs of proppant were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 39.5 barrels per minute and 5,800 psi respectively. The maximum sand concentration was 1.0 lbs per gal, and averaged 0.8, the maximum rates and pressures were 42.0 Bpm and 6,228 psi respectively. The instantaneous shut in pressure was 3,624 psi, which results in a gradient of 0.49 psi/ft. The stimulation pressure-rate history plot is included. The in zone proppant volume was estimated 10,200 pounds.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

HALLIBURTON ENERGY SERVICES

ACQUIRE Version 2.1

CUSTOMER AND JOB INFORMATION

Customer	U.P.O.G	Date	15-Dec-1995
Contractor		County	CROCKETT
Lease	HOVER HAT	Town	
Location	OZONA	Section	
Formation	LOWER CANYON	Range	
Job Type	CO2	Permit No	
Country	U.S.A.	Well No	7c #7
State	TEXAS	Field Name	

Customer Representative FRED MCCOUGAL

Halliburton Operator DALE PUTNAM

Ticket No. 838879

STAGE DESCRIPTIONS

PRIME & TEST
 PAD
 .5 PPG 20/40
 1 PPG 20/40
 FLUSH

WELL CONFIGURATION INFORMATION

Packer Type Depth 0 ft
 Bottom Hole Temp. 91.0 Deg F

PIPE CONFIGURATION

Wellbore	Measured	Casing	Casing	Tubing	Tubing
Segment	Depth	TVS	ID	OD	ID
Number	(ft)	(ft)	(inch)	(inch)	(inch)
1	7420	7420	3.950	4.500	0.000

PERFORATIONS

Perforation	Top	Bottom	Shots per
Interval	(ft)	(ft)	(ft)
1	7224	7420	0

REMARKS ABOUT JOB

FRACTURE LOWER CANYON

THANK YOU

HALLIBURTON ENERGY FRAC CREW

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

 PLAYBACK STRIP CHART
 #####

1. Casing Press (psi)
2. Slurry Rate 1 (bpm)
3. Casing Press (psi) Avg for Stg
4. Slurry Rate (bpm) Avg for Stg

0	1	CASING PRESS	psi	10000
0.00	2	SLURRY RATE 1	bpm	100.00
0.00	3	SAND CONC	lb/gal	10.00
0.00	4	FLUID CONC/BH	lb/gal	10.00
0	5	CO2 PRESS	psi	10000

E3

10:38:14

PAUSE

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Customer: U.P.O.G
 Well Desc: HOVER HAT 7c #7
 Formation: LOWER CANYON

Date: 15-Dec-1995
 Ticket #: 838879
 Job Type: C02

JOB SUMMARY

JOB START TIME: 10:37:57
 JOB END TIME: 11:22:03
 JOB DURATION: 00:44:06

STAGES AND EVENTS:

Chart	Time	Slurry Rate (bpm)	Slurry Stage Volume (gal)	Casing Press. (psi)	Remark
Event #1	10:37:57	0.00	0	0	Start Job
Event #2	10:38:01	0.00	0	167	START COOLDOWN
Event #3	10:38:14	0.00	0	172	Pause
Event #4	11:01:09	0.00	0	498	Resume
Stage #1	11:01:11	0.00	0	476	SKIP
Stage #2	11:01:17	0.00	8334	478	START PAD
Stage #3	11:07:46	36.11	5460	5940	START .5 PPG SAND
Stage #4	11:11:05	39.62	7577	5721	START 1 PPG
Stage #5	11:15:40	39.36	5350	5578	START FLUSH
Event #5	11:18:55	0.12	0	3624	ISIP Casing Press 3624 (psi)
Event #6	11:22:03	0.00	0	3089	End Job

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Customer: U.P.O.G
 Well Desc: HOVER HAT 7c #7
 Formation: LOWER CANYON

Date: 15-Dec-1995
 Ticket #: 838879
 Job Type: CO2

STAGE SUMMARY

MAXIMUM VALUE PER STAGE -- Strip Chart Variables

Stage	Casing Pressure (psi)	Prop Conc Slurry* (lb/gal)	Prop Conc Bottom* (lb/gal)	CO2 Pressure (psi)
1	476	0.39	0.00	350
2	5968	0.44	0.34	5985
3	5940	0.63	0.14	5959
4	5757	0.69	0.61	5734
5	6050	0.59	0.63	5989
Max Job	6050	0.69	0.63	5989

(3) Candidate Well #3 - Hatton 8C-4 (36991)

The well was perforated with 71 holes over a 192 foot interval from 7,164 to 7,356 feet.

The pressurized blender was transported to the well site on the day of the treatment, December 15, 1995 and filled with 20/40 Brady sand. The treatment was then executed, 14,000 lbs of proppant were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 40.0 barrels per minute and 5,800 psi respectively. The maximum sand concentration was 2.0 lbs per gal, and averaged 1.0, the maximum rates and pressures were 42.0 Bpm and 6,434 psi respectively. The instantaneous shut in pressure was 3,324 psi which results in a gradient of 0.46 psi/ft. The stimulation pressure-rate history plot is included. The in zone proppant volume was estimated 11,700 pounds.

**Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
(Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”**

HALLIBURTON ENERGY SERVICES

ACQUIRE Version 2.1

CUSTOMER AND JOB INFORMATION

Customer	U.P.O.G	Date	15-Dec-1995
Contractor		County	CROCKETT
Lease	HOVER HAT	Town	
Location	OZONA	Section	
Formation	LOWER CANYON	Range	
Job Type	C02	Permit No	
Country	U.S.A.	Well No	Bc #4
State	TEXAS	Field Name	

Customer Representative FRED MCDOUGAL

Halliburton Operator DALE PUTNAM

Ticket No. 036880

STAGE DESCRIPTIONS

PRIME & TEST
PAD
-5 PPG 20/40
1 PPG 20/40
2 PPG 20/40
FLUSH

WELL CONFIGURATION INFORMATION

Packer Type Depth 0 ft
Bottom Hole Temp. 91.0 Deg F

PIPE CONFIGURATION

Wellbore Segment Number	Measured Depth (ft)	TVD (ft)	Casing ID (inch)	Casing OD (inch)	Tubing ID (inch)	Tubing OD (inch)
1	7356	7356	3.950	4.500	0.000	0.000

PERFORATIONS

Perforation Interval	Top (ft)	Bottom (ft)	Shots per (ft)
1	7164	7356	0

REMARKS ABOUT JOB

FRACTURE LOWER CANYON

THANK YOU

HALLIBURTON ENERGY FRAC CREW

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

 REALTIME STRIP CHART
 #####

1. Casing Press (psi)
 2. Slurry Rate 1 (bpm)
 3. Casing Press (psi) Avg for Stg
 4. Slurry Rate (bpm) Avg for Stg

0	_____	1	CASING PRESS	psi	_____	10000
0.00	_____	2	SLURRY RATE 1	bpm	_____	100.00
0.00	_____	3	SAND CONC	lb/gal	_____	10.00
0.00	_____	4	FLUID CONC/BH	lb/gal	_____	10.00
0	_____	5	CO2 PRESS	psi	_____	10000

E2

13:46:43

PAUSE

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Customer: U.P.O.G
 Well Desc: HOVER HAY 8c #4
 Formation: LOWER CANYON

Date: 15-Dec-1995
 Ticket #: 838880
 Job Type: CO2

JOB SUMMARY

JOB START TIME: 13:46:23
 JOB END TIME: 14:33:21
 JOB DURATION: 00:46:58

STAGES AND EVENTS:

Chart	Time	Slurry Rate (bpm)	Slurry Stage Volume (gal)	Casing Press. (psi)	Remark
Event #1	13:46:23	0.00	0	0	Start Job
Stage #1	13:46:28	0.00	0	156	COOL DOWN PUMPS
Event #2	13:46:42	0.00	0	158	Pause
Event #3	14:11:54	0.00	0	466	Resume
Stage #2	14:11:57	0.00	8595	459	START PAD
Stage #3	14:18:21	37.93	3854	6013	START .5 PPG SAND
Stage #4	14:20:48	36.96	8280	5795	START 1 PPG
Stage #5	14:25:48	40.40	2254	5717	START 2 PPG SAND
Stage #6	14:27:07	40.47	5291	5665	START FLUSH
Event #4	14:30:28	0.00	0	3324	ISIP Casing Press 3324 (psi)
Event #5	14:33:21	0.00	0	3224	End Job

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Customer: U.P.O.G
 Well Desc: HOVER HAT 8c #4
 Formation: LOWER CANYON

Date: 15-Dec-1995
 Ticket #: 838880
 Job Type: C02

STAGE SUMMARY

Stage Times

Stage	Start Time	End Time	Elapsed Time
1	13:46:28	14:11:57	00:25:29
2	14:11:57	14:18:21	00:06:24
3	14:18:21	14:20:48	00:02:27
4	14:20:48	14:25:48	00:05:00
5	14:25:48	14:27:07	00:01:19
6	14:27:07	14:33:21	00:06:14
Total	13:46:28	14:33:21	00:46:53

AVERAGES OR VOLUMES PER STAGE -- Planned Volume vs. Actual Volume

Stage	Planned Slurry Volume (gal)	Slurry Volume (gal)
1	1000	0
2	9000	8595
3	4091	3854
4	8365	8280
5	2182	2254
6	5288	5291
Tot/Avg	29926	28273

AVERAGES OR VOLUMES PER STAGE -- Strip Chart Variables

Stage	Casing Pressure (psi)	Prop Conc Slurry* (lb/gal)	Prop Conc Bottom* (lb/gal)	CO2 Pressure (psi)
1	158	0.01	0.00	161
2	4876	0.08	0.08	4888
3	5859	0.40	0.08	5850
4	5806	0.85	0.51	5742
5	5681	1.35	0.94	5578
6	4493	0.66	1.14	4330
T/Avg	5080	0.56	0.55	5014

*Average based on volume.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Customer: U.P.O.G
 Well Desc: HOVER HAT 8c #4
 Formation: LOWER CANYON

Date: 15-Dec-1995
 Ticket #: 838880
 Job Type: CO2

STAGE SUMMARY

MAXIMUM VALUE PER STAGE -- Strip Chart Variables

Stage	Casing Pressure (psi)	Prop Conc Slurry* (lb/gal)	Prop Conc Bottom* (lb/gal)	CO2 Pressure (psi)
1	461	0.01	0.00	364
2	6268	0.18	0.15	6334
3	6006	0.66	0.12	6006
4	6002	1.09	0.83	5863
5	5722	1.46	1.08	5629
6	5971	1.40	1.44	5826
Max Job	6268	1.46	1.44	6334

(4) Stimulation Summary

One of the three wells (#13-14) screened out and was terminated. It was being pumped at 39 barrels per minute and a good deal of CO₂ leakage around the piston rod packings on the pumps reduced the injection rate. The other two wells were treated without incident and the design sand schedule was achieved, resulting in "in-zone" sand volumes of 5,600, 10,200, and 11,700 pounds, or approximately twelve percent of that placed in conventional treatments.

The following proppant volumes were placed:

Well	Pumped (sacks)	Removed from well (sacks)	Net in zone (sacks)
Hatton 13-14	139	83	56
Hoover 7C-7	112	100	102
Hatton 8C-4	140	23	117

The stimulation treatments are summarized as follows:

Well	Sand (sacks)		Max Tr Press	Avg Rate	Sand Conc	
	Pumped	In-Zone	Psi	BPM	Max	Avg
13-14	139	56	7,400*	39.0	2.0	1.1
7C-7	112	102	6,050	39.5	1.0	0.8
8C-4	140	117	6,250	40.0	2.0	1.0

* Well equipped with P-110 casing

b. Post Stimulation

(1) Flow Back Procedures

The flow back procedure was initiated immediately following the removal of the stimulation hardware. The flow was restricted with a choke to enable the CO₂ vapor to flow safely. The choke size was

increased as the pressure diminished and the CO₂ concentration was monitored. Some sand was produced as was expected because of the intentional under flush.

(2) Cleaning Frac Sand from the Well Bore

Following the stimulations the three Candidate wells were all cleaned by jetting the sand from them with nitrogen gas. The three Candidate wells were as is generally the case with the CO₂/sand stimulations - because of the designed under flush, found to have sand in them above the perforations.

Well	Perf Intvl (ft)	Dpth-Top Prf (ft)	Sand Top (ft)	Fill-up (ft) (lbs)	Clean Out Depth (ft)
Hatton 13-14	7,153 - 7,326	7,153	6,516	147 (8,300)	7,467
Hatton 7C-7	7,224 - 7,420	7,224	7,413	115 (1,000)	7,528
Hatton 8C-14	7,164 - 7,356	7,164	7,349	257 (2,300)	7,613

(3) Tubing Installation

The flowing bottom hole pressures on all three of the CO₂/Sand stimulated wells in the Hoover Hatton area (single stage) were measured. Two of the wells, 7C-7 and 8C-4 had abnormally high flowing bottom hole pressure, 1000-1300 psi. Tubing strings were subsequently planned for these two wells, which were producing at 130 and 70 Mcfd, respectively. The production rates were expected to increase when the tubing is installed. The third well, 13-14, was producing 8 Mcfd and has a flowing bottom hole pressure of 820-850 psi. It was considered as a candidate for re-stimulation but UPRC presently believed that the geology is very poor and that a re-stimulation is unwarranted. The well is between two wells with

reasonably good production, no plans are being made either to install tubing or re-stimulate the well.

The production from wells in the Hoover Hatton area increased approximately 20% following the installation of tubing.

5. Results - Production Comparisons

a. Candidate Well #1 - Hatton 13-14 (36848)

Well 13-14 had poor geology and poor production from the outset.

Apparently tubing was not installed although it was reported to have been.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
(Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Hatton 13-14 was re-stimulated following the May 1996 approval by the DOE. It was stimulated with 584 sacks of sand in 4,238 barrels of gelled water. A previously unstimulated uphole Canyon Sand interval was also included in the treatment. Immediately prior to the stimulation, the total depth was 7,246 ft. Evidently 37 of the 57 perforations in the previously treated interval had been covered with sand since January 1996.

b. Candidate Well #2 - Hatton 7C-7 (36960)

c. Candidate Well #3 - Hatton 8C-14 (36991)

d. Summary – Candidate Wells

The five year cumulative production from the three Candidate Wells ranged between 35.6 and 89.9 MMcf and averaged 56.7 MMcf.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

e. Production Comparisons – Summary

The production from the three Candidate Wells was considerably less than that from the Control Wells. The projected five year cumulative production ranged from 35.6 to 89.9 MMcf and averaged 56.7 MMcf. That from the ten Control wells ranged from 62.8 to 434.2 MMcf and averaged 200.3 MMcf or 3.5 times that from the wells stimulated with the liquid CO₂/sand process.

Well	Pmt # 42-105- Xxxx	5 Yr Prod Proj (MMcf)	5 Yr Prod Actual (MMcf)	Prod Mo	Stim Type, Sxs, Bbls
Hatton 03-13	32174	434.2	449.6		
Hoover 04-07	34267	332.5	255.7		
Anderson 01-14	32307	292.5	173.0	40	
Hatton 01-14	32124	187.0	199.4		
Hatton 02-08	32004	163.1	166.9		
Hatton 04-08	32260	161.3	150.1		
Hatton 03-14	32182	146.5	160.0		
Hatton 01-08	32003	131.4	109.7		
Hatton 02-13	32165	91.6	89.9		
Hatton 7C-7	36960	89.9	79.1	46	CO ₂ 102, 640
Hatton 01-13	32143	62.8	65.3		
Hatton 8C-4	36991	44.6	44.3	45	CO ₂ 117, 659
Hatton 13-14	36848	35.6	23.8	45	CO ₂ 56, 466

The poor responses from the wells stimulated with the CO₂/sand process are unquestionably related to a number of factors regarding the formation characteristics of permeability, and pressure, but to a larger extent to the reduced proppant volumes placed by the liquid-free treatments.

A UPR Inter-Office Correspondence (09/18/96) related:

“... A final review of the CO₂ + sand (no water) fracture treatments indicated that these treatments under perform water-based fluids. The three wells stimulated with CO₂ fracture treatments produced an average of 12.7 MMCF in six months, compared to 17.2 MMCF for offset wells (about 35% more than the CO₂ wells). EURs for the CO₂ wells averaged 111 MMCF compared to 233 MMCF for offset wells. Initial production from the wells stimulated using CO₂ was encouraging (115 MCFD vs. 123 MCFD), but production declined rapidly. Therefore, it is recommended that all CO₂ wells be re-fractured and/or re-completed into upper Canyon zones and commingled.”

“The average EUR for wells drilled in 1994-96 is 306 MMCF (excluding CO₂ wells) compared to 593 MMCF for older wells. The decline in EUR is primarily due to offset well drainage. The results from 1-stage and 2-stage fracture treatments showed almost identical results (EUR's of 305 vs. 307 MMCF). This may be due to poor zone selection (one stage isn't contributing), cross-flow, increased liquid loading, etc. Additional work is planned to better define the effects of staging....”

Average Production - Canyon Sands (G & H)
Crockett Co, TX - Block MM (Hatton)- Sec's 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, & 13
10 Wells - 10 Stages
Stimulation: Gelled Water (7 wells) - w/100,000 - 200,000 lbs Proppant/Stg
CO₂/Sand (3 wells) - w/5,600 - 11,700 lbs

6. Conclusions - Test Area #2

- a. Liquid CO₂/sand stimulations were somewhat successfully pumped in the Canyon Sands. Although it had not been conclusively established that they could be successfully pumped they were, but at considerably reduced proppant volumes than the design.
- b. The production from the three Candidate Wells was considerably less than that from the Control Wells.

The projected five year cumulative production averaged 56.7 MMcf while that from the ten Control wells averaged 200.3 MMcf or 3.5 times that from the wells stimulated with the liquid CO₂/sand process.

- c. These poor responses from the wells stimulated with the CO₂/sand process are unquestionably related to a number of factors regarding the formation characteristics of permeability, and pressure, but to a larger extent to the reduced proppant volumes placed by the liquid-free treatments
- d. The proppant volumes placed were much less than the design and ranged from 5,600 to 11,700 pounds or approximately twelve percent of that placed in conventional treatments. The actual volumes placed in zone were:

	Pumped	Removed from well	Net in zone
Well	(K lbs)	(K lbs)	(K lbs)
Hatton 13-14	1.39	8.3	5.6
Hoover 7C-7	11.2	1.0	10.2
Hatton 8C-4	14.0	2.3	11.7

And, the ability to place the design quantities was obviously limited by

- (1) The reduced pump rate of 40 barrels per minute, which was driven by a maximum well head pressure of 6,500 psi.
- (2) High leak off rates into the formation.

After the tubing was installed, the production levels would not support the additional expense of CO₂/Sand stimulations, even if the well with poor geology, 13-14, is eliminated.

- e. The costs for the CO₂/sand stimulations (6 wells - 9 stages) was \$407,462 or \$45,274 per stage. Cost advantages resulted from a major reduction in pumping costs through the utilization of a locally available service company, Halliburton Energy Services (HES). The original bid was much greater and also required a significant mobilization charge. To a lesser extent, a cost savings for CO₂ of \$7,380 was realized by utilizing another supplier.
- f. In retrospect the inability of Halliburton to provide the design pump rate primarily because of the significant CO₂ leaks and the utilization of small diameter plungers compromised the ability to place proppant.

Significant equipment problems with CO₂ leakage around the piston rods was experienced. There were twelve Halliburton pumpers and the leakage became so severe that the pumpers were obscured from the blender operators position. They were shut down and partially remediated.

XVI. COSTS

A. Projected

The estimated stimulation costs were significantly greater than those budgeted \$45,274 vs. 67,055. The increases are due primarily to:

1. Higher horsepower requirements

The subject wells were projected to require greater pumping horsepower, 6,643-7,200 rather than the 4,000 utilized in the budget which adds an additional \$10,414-13,000 per stage.

2. Full horsepower charge for both stages.

Canadian Fracmaster was unwilling to provide the pumping for the second stage except for full single stage cost which was projected to add an additional \$33,840 to the second stage treatment.

3. Mobilization costs - Universal Well Services was unwilling to involve any third party pumping service companies. They were willing to transport their pumping equipment from the eastern U.S. per their schedule, or to utilize Canadian Fracmaster's pumping equipment. A complete frac spread from Universal would only be made available in the spring, during their slow period.

They were willing to involve Canadian Fracmaster with equipment mobilized from Red Deer, Alberta. Universal was willing to provide two (2) pump trucks, the blender, and a frac van to be used in conjunction with Canadian Fracmaster's hardware pump trucks (1,800 HHP each).

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Under both scenarios the mobilization costs were expensive and only become reasonable if they were amortized over a number of stimulation events.

The mobilization costs for the subject wells were estimated at \$24,000 which included mobilization only from Grand Junction, Colorado, providing that the treatments could be scheduled to complement Canadian Fracmaster's scheduled trip to Grand Junction. Otherwise, an additional \$35,640 would be required.

The cost of CO₂/Sand stimulations was estimated to be \$44,000 greater than conventional treatments.

Wells	Stages	Stim Cost (\$)	Contingencies (\$)	Est DOE Cost (\$)
6	9	191,164	15,000	= \$206,164

B. Actual

The Halliburton invoices were reviewed and approved. The final approval costs were:

	UPRC to Pay	UPRC Net	PCS Net
Halliburton	\$158,070.67	\$ 80,208.05	\$ 77,862.62
Flo CO ₂	97,380.00	48,690.00	48,690.00
Universal	132,350.05	66,175.03	66,175.03
Guardian	19,661.53	19,661.53	0.00
Total	\$407,462.25	\$214,734.61	\$192,727.65

C. Projected vs. Actual

The estimated cost for stimulating the wells (6 wells - 9 stages) was reduced from \$609,445 to \$407,462. The reduction was due primarily to a major reduction in pumping costs which resulted from the utilization of a locally available service company, Halliburton Energy Services (HES). The original bid was much greater and also required a significant mobilization charge. To a lesser extent, a cost savings for CO₂ of \$7,380 was realized by utilizing another supplier.

The Department of Energy (DOE) cost-shared portion was 50% of the stimulation costs and the operator, UPRC, was responsible for the remaining 50%.

XVII. CONCLUSIONS – TEST AREAS 1 AND 2

- A. With one exception, all nine stages, six on the Montgomery lease and three on the Hatton leases were rate-limited to approximately 40-43 barrels per minute because of the maximum allowable wellhead treating pressures of approximately 6,200 psi. Forty barrels per minute is approaching the minimum injection rates to reliably transport 20/40 size sand proppant.
- B. The production from the Candidate Wells was disappointingly low:
 - 1. Test Area #1 Block NG (Montgomery)
The projected five year cumulative production averaged 100.4 MMcf while that from the seven Control wells averaged 745.0 MMcf or 7.4 times that from the wells stimulated with the liquid CO₂/sand process.
 - 2. Test Area #2 Block MM (Hoover)
The projected five year cumulative production averaged 56.7 MMcf while that from the ten Control wells averaged 200.3 MMcf or 3.5 times that from the wells stimulated with the liquid CO₂/sand process.
- C. These poor responses from the wells stimulated with the CO₂/sand process are unquestionably related to a number of factors regarding the formation characteristics of permeability, and pressure, but to a larger extent to the reduced proppant volumes placed by the liquid-free treatments

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

D. The placed proppant volumes with the CO₂/sand process were much lower than the design volumes:

1. Test Area #1 Block NG (Montgomery)

The proppant volumes placed were much less than the design and ranged from 8,100 to 24,200 pounds per stage. If the lowest volume, 8,100 pounds is removed, the five stage range was 10,400 to 24,200 and averaged 17,600 pounds or approximately twelve percent of that placed in conventional treatments.

The actual volumes placed in zone were:

Stage 1			
	Pumped	Removed from well	Net in zone
Well	(K lbs)	(K lbs)	(K lbs)
Montgomery 13-18	26.5	2.3	24.2
Montgomery 12-18	25.0	14.6	10.4
Montgomery 14-18	11.5	3.4	8.1

Stage 2			
	Pumped	Removed from well	Net in zone
Well	(K lbs)	(K lbs)	(K lbs)
Montgomery 13-18	26.1	5.3	20.8
Montgomery 12-18	20.7	0.9	19.8
Montgomery 14-18	13.7	0.8	12.9

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

The treatments are summarized

Well	Stg	Sand (sacks)		Max Tr Press	Avg Rate	Sand Conc (lb/gal)	
		Pumped	In-Zone	Psi	BPM	Max	Avg
M#13	1	265	242	6,200	47.0	3.0	2.0
M#13	2	261	208	5,796	40.0	3.0	1.5
M#12	1	250	104	6,500	40.0	2.0	1.4
M#12	2	207	198	6,100	43.0	2.0	1.6
M#14	1	115	81	5,590	39.6	2.0	0.9
M#14	2	137	129	5,600	43.0	2.0	1.2

2. Test Area #2 Block MM (Hoover)

The proppant volumes placed were much less than the design and ranged from 5,600 to 11,700 pounds or approximately twelve percent of that placed in conventional treatments. The actual volumes placed in zone were:

Well	Pumped (K lbs)	Removed from well (K lbs)	Net in zone (K lbs)
Hatton 13-14	1.39	8.3	5.6
Hoover 7C-7	11.2	1.0	10.2
Hatton 8C-4	14.0	2.3	11.7

And, the ability to place the design quantities was obviously limited by

- (1) The reduced pump rate of 40 barrels per minute, which was driven by a maximum well head pressure of 6,500 psi.
- (2) High leak off rates into the formation.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

The treatments are summarized

Well	Sand (sacks)		Max Tr Press	Avg Rate	Sand Conc (lb/gal)	
	Pumped	In-Zone	Psi	BPM	Max	Avg
Hatton 13-14	139	56	7,400	39.0	2.0	1.1
Hoover 7C-7	112	102	6,050	39.5	1.0	0.8
Hatton 8C-4	140	117	6,250	40.0	2.0	1.0

- E. The costs for the CO₂/sand stimulations (6 wells - 9 stages) was \$407,462 or \$45,274 per stage. Cost advantages resulted from a major reduction in pumping costs through the utilization of a locally available service company, Halliburton Energy Services (HES). The original bid was much greater and also required a significant mobilization charge. To a lesser extent, a cost savings for CO₂ of \$7,380 was realized by utilizing another supplier.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

=====

PETROLEUM CONSULTING SERVICES
 P O BOX 35833
 CANTON, OHIO 44735-5833
 (216) 498-3823

=====

COST DETAIL

12/18/95

WELL:	M12	M13	M14	7C-7	8C-4	13-14	
STAGE:	1	1	1	1	1	1	
DATE:	12/12/95	12/12/95	12/13/95	12/15/95	12/15/95	12/15/95	
HES							
PUMPING:	13000.00	13000.00	26000.00	8666.66	8666.66	8666.66	
SAND:	3182.50	2345.43	1782.20	1247.54	3946.30	1845.85	
DRAYAGE:	653.12	110.00	365.75	653.12		653.12	
WASH:	30.00	280.25					
MISC:		3682.20	110.00	1733.50	2637.14	1827.50	
TOT	16865.62	19417.88	28257.95	12380.82	15250.10	12983.13	
STAGE:	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	
DATE:	12/14/95	12/14/95	12/14/95				
HES							
PUMPING:	8666.66	8666.66	8666.66				
SAND:	2711.49	4188.17	1807.66				
DRAYAGE:	556.46	859.51	867.34				
WASH:		98.75					
MISC:		11222.25	3362.50				
TOT	11934.61	25035.34	14704.16				
N2							
STAGE:	1 & 2	1 & 2	1 & 2	1	1	1	
N2:	3248.00	4774.40	2048.00	1684.00	240.00	1552.00	
PMPNG:	285.00	285.00	885.00	985.00	28.50	885.00	
ADD'L PMPNG:	1600.00	800.00					
MISC:	255.00	1240.00	285.50	283.50	455.00	397.50	
TOT	5388.00	7099.40	3318.50	2932.50	723.50	2934.50	
TOT HES	34189.23	51552.62	46280.61	15293.32	15973.60	15927.63	179218.01

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Six Candidate Wells - Group #'s 1A & 1B -
 (Crockett County, Texas) – December 1995 – Single and Two Stage Treatments
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

FLOC02							
STAGE 1							
CO2:	9490.00	10335.00	12155.00	9685.00	10725.00	7735.00	
PRTBLES:	200.00	200.00	200.00	200.00	200.00	200.00	
MISC:	545.00	582.50	545.00	80.00	80.00	100.00	
STAGE 2							
CO2:	10270.00	10790.00	10790.00				
PRTBLES:	200.00	200.00	200.00				
MISC:	545.00	582.50	545.00				
TOT	21250.00	22690.00	24435.00	9985.00	11005.00	8035.00	97380.00
UWS							
STAGE 1							
BLENDER:	8000	6000	6000	6000	6000	6000	
LISC FEE:	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	
TUBE TRLR:	5600	5600	5600	5600	5600	5600	
MI&P DIEM:	2984	4583	2984			800	
STAGE 2							
BLENDER:	0	0	0				
LISC FEE:	5000	5000	5000				
TUBE TRLR:	2500	2500	2500				
TOT	26984.00	28583.00	26984.00	16500.00	16500.00	17300.00	132851.00
TOTALS							409447.01
HES							
PUMPNG:	21666.66	21666.66	34666.66	8666.66	8666.66	8666.66	
SAND:	5893.99	6533.60	3586.66	1247.54	3946.30	1845.85	
DRAYAGE:	1209.58	969.51	1233.09	653.12	0.00	653.12	
WASH:	30.00	378.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
MISC:	0.00	14904.45	3472.50	1793.50	2637.14	1827.50	
N2:	3248.00	4774.40	2048.00	1664.00	240.00	1552.00	
PMPNG:	285.00	285.00	985.00	985.00	28.50	985.00	
ADD'L PMPNG:	1600.00	800.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
MISC:	255.00	1240.00	285.50	283.50	455.00	397.50	
	34188.23	51552.62	46280.61	15293.32	15973.60	15927.63	
FLOC02							
CO2:	19760.00	21125.00	22945.00	9685.00	10725.00	7735.00	
PRTBLES:	400.00	400.00	400.00	200.00	200.00	200.00	
MISC:	1090.00	1165.00	1090.00	80.00	80.00	100.00	
	21250.00	22690.00	24435.00	9965.00	11005.00	8035.00	
UWS							
	26984.00	28583.00	26984.00	16500.00	16500.00	17300.00	
TOT	82422.23	102825.62	97899.61	41758.32	43478.60	41262.63	409447.01

- F. In retrospect the inability of Halliburton to provide the design pump rate primarily because of the significant CO₂ leaks and the utilization of small diameter plungers compromised the ability to place proppant.

Significant equipment problems with CO₂ leakage around the piston rods was experienced. There were twelve Halliburton pumpers and the leakage became so severe that they were not visible from the blender operators position. They were shut down and partially remediated.

- G. Summarizing, the conclusion is that fracture lengths longer than those which can be generated with CO₂/Sand stimulations are required in this area. It is too "tight".

- H. The production from only one well, Montgomery #14, exceeded the economic hurdle rate, the others are significantly below the economic rate, the conclusion is that larger fracture lengths than can be generated with CO₂/Sand stimulations are required in this area. It is too "tight".

This concludes the project effort for the demonstrations of the liquid CO₂/sand stimulations in 6 wells (9 stages) operated by Union Pacific in The Canyon Sands in the Ozona field (Crocket Co, Texas). They are now owned and operated by Anadarko Petroleum. The conclusions indicate that because of the inability to place adequate proppant volumes that the results are an economic failure, and that there is little likelihood of practically placing increased proppant volumes.

FIELD TESTING & OPTIMIZATION OF CO₂/SAND FRACTURING TECHNOLOGY
Group #2 – San Juan Co, NM – January 1996 – Three Wells – Single Stage Treatments – Amoco

Final Report

By
RAYMOND L. MAZZA

Period of Performance
October 1, 1994 – November 30, 2004

Work Performed Under Contract No.: Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199
“Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

For:
U. S. Department of Energy
National Energy Technology Laboratory
Morgantown, West Virginia

By
Petroleum Consulting Services
Canton, Ohio

Table of Contents

DISCLAIMER.....	1
I. ABSTRACT.....	2
II. INTRODUCTION	2
III. BACKGROUND.....	3
IV. METHODOLOGY.....	4
A. Mathematical Analog of Production Data.....	4
B. Missing Data.....	5
C. Examples	6
V. PRODUCING HORIZON.....	8
VI. FIELD	9
A. Type III Area.....	9
B. Pipeline pressure	9
VII. RESERVOIR.....	9
A. Reservoir Pressure and Temperature	9
VIII. CO ₂ CHARACTERISTICS	10
IX. CONVENTIONAL STIMULATION TREATMENTS.....	11
X. IS THE PROPOSED RESERVOIR LIKELY TO BENEFIT FROM THE CO ₂ /SAND TECHNOLOGY?.....	11
A. OPERATOR.....	11
1. Interest in CO ₂ /sand technology?.....	11
2. Adequate test opportunity?.....	11
3. Presently active drilling program?	11
4. Is there a future for successful results? Is the operator likely to continue implementing this technology without DOE cost support?	12
5. Interest in DOE cost-supported participation?	12
6. Share production data for five years?.....	12
B. Letter of Intent	12
XI. NEPA COMPLIANCES	15

Table of Contents

XII.	TEST AREA.....	15
A.	Control Wells – 6 Wells	17
1.	Production Review and Projections	17
a.	Control Well # 1 – Federal 32-17 (28472)	17
b.	Control Well # 2 - Sharp (21160)	18
c.	Control Well # 3 - Federal 23-17 (28471).....	19
d.	Control Well # 4 – Federal 42-16 (28337)	20
e.	Control Well # 5 – Federal 28-08-30 (28863)	21
f.	Control Well # 6 – Grambling A (21041).....	22
2.	Summary – Control Wells.....	23
B.	Candidate Wells – 3 Wells.....	24
1.	Electric Logs.....	26
a.	Candidate Well # 1 - Florance GCL-1 (29336)	26
b.	Candidate Well # 2 – Florance Q-1 (29345).....	26
c.	Candidate Well # 3 – Riddle I-1 (29328)	26
2.	Completion.....	26
3.	Perforation Strategy	27
XIII.	CO ₂ /SAND STIMULATION TREATMENTS.....	34
A.	Design	34
B.	Fracturing Gradient.....	34
C.	Hydrostatic Pressure	35
D.	Friction Pressure	35
E.	Treating Pressure	35
F.	Sand Schedule	36
G.	Proppant Size	36
H.	Treatment Volume	36
I.	Recommended Design.....	37
J.	Treatment Volume Comparison - Conventional vs CO ₂ /Sand	37
XIV.	CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS.....	38
XV.	PRE-TEST CONCLUSIONS.....	38
XVI.	DOE APPROVALS	39

Table of Contents

XVII. FIELD ACTIVITIES	39
A. Preparations.....	39
B. Comments.....	39
C. Stimulations.....	40
1. Florance GCL-1 (29336) -- Candidate Well # 1	40
2. Florance Q-1 (29345) -- Candidate Well #2.....	43
3. Riddle I-1 (29328) -- Candidate Well #3.....	46
4. Stimulation Summary	49
D. Inter-zonal Communication between the Fruitland Coal and the PC Sandstone.....	50
1. Florance GCL-1	51
2. Florance Q-1	52
3. Riddle I-1	53
E. Post Stimulation.....	54
1. Flow Back Procedures.....	54
2. Cleaning Frac Sand from the Well Bore.....	54
XVIII. RESULTS.....	54
A. Production Review -- Candidate Wells.....	54
1. Florance GCL 1 (29336) -- Candidate Well # 1	54
2. Florance Q1 (29345) -- Candidate Well #2	55
3. Riddle I-1 (29328) -- Candidate Well # 3.....	56
B. Production Summary -- Candidate Wells.....	57
C. Production Comparisons -- Control and Candidate Wells.....	58
D. Conclusions	59
XIX. COSTS	60
A. Projected	60
B. Actual.....	61
XX. CONCLUSIONS.....	61

DISCLAIMER

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

ABSTRACT

The demonstration of a 100% liquid free CO₂/sand stimulation process was executed on three wells (three stages) in the Fruitland Coal in San Juan Co, New Mexico. The process is unique in that because CO₂ is the only fluid which enters the formation, it requires a specialized closed system, pressurized blender to mix up to 45,000 pounds of proppant with the CO₂. The CO₂ vaporizes at reservoir conditions and leaves a liquid-free proppant pack. The reduced proppant volume (45,000 vs. 250,000 pounds) from that used with the conventional water-based stimulations was recognized; however, the reduction in formation damage from retained liquids could have resulted in a net benefit.

The three Candidate Wells were selected and stimulated with CO₂/Sand in January 1996. The wells had limited sand volumes placed and have not produced at economic rates. The production from all three has been generally lower than that from conventionally stimulated wells. The limited placement of sand is suspected of being a result of the very large number of perforations, approximately 300 which reduced the transport velocity; and additional testing with significantly fewer perforations is recommended.

I. ABSTRACT

The demonstration of a 100% liquid free CO₂/sand stimulation process was executed on three wells (three stages) in the Fruitland Coal in San Juan Co, New Mexico. The process is unique in that because CO₂ is the only fluid which enters the formation, it requires a specialized closed system, pressurized blender to mix up to 45,000 pounds of proppant with the CO₂. The CO₂ vaporizes at reservoir conditions and leaves a liquid-free proppant pack. The reduced proppant volume (45,000 vs. 250,000 pounds) from that used with the conventional water-based stimulations was recognized; however, the reduction in formation damage from retained liquids could have resulted in a net benefit.

The three Candidate Wells were selected and stimulated with CO₂/Sand in January 1996. The wells had limited sand volumes placed and have not produced at economic rates. The production from all three has been generally lower than that from conventionally stimulated wells. The limited placement of sand is suspected of being a result of the very large number of perforations, approximately 300 which reduced the transport velocity; and additional testing with significantly fewer perforations is recommended.

II. INTRODUCTION

In 1995 Amoco Production Company (Amoco) - now BP - had an active drilling program in the Fruitland Coals in San Juan County, New Mexico and indicated a strong interest in participating in the DOE's cost shared demonstration project to evaluate the potential of the liquid-free, CO₂/Sand stimulation technology.

The Candidate Wells were considered to provide a good opportunity to demonstrate the CO₂/Sand stimulation process in a liquid-sensitive reservoir where the capillary retention of stimulation liquids was known to be detrimental to gas production.

If the treatments turned out to be successful, then the marginal nature of this portion of this reservoir (Type III) would become more economically attractive.

III. BACKGROUND

The wells producing from the Fruitland Coals in San Juan County (Figure 1) which are located on the "Fairway" are very prolific gas producers and are designated as Type I. The Candidate Wells which were offered by Amoco were situated southwest of the "Fairway" in an economic "fringe" area where the coals are designated as Type III where the reservoir pressure is lower, the formations are dry, and the clean up time from the conventional nitrogen foam stimulations is longer.

Figure 1

[illegible]

The Type III Fruitland Coals are liquid free, except for some occasional condensate production, which may reside in the Pictured Cliff Sandstone (PC) which is subjacent to the basal coal member. The Fruitland Coal interval in other areas is water productive and produces both gas and formation water in significant volumes. In the area of the Candidate Wells the coals are dry and have lower permeability, and therefore were considered to be good candidates for the liquid free CO₂/Sand stimulation process.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation of the CO₂/Sand stimulations was affected through the comparison of the five-year cumulative produced gas volumes from the Candidate Wells which were stimulated with CO₂/Sand with that from nearby Control Wells which had been stimulated with other processes. These other stimulation processes included N₂ foam, and gelled water.

The wells with the larger projected five-year cumulative produced gas volumes, after the flush production was removed, were considered to be superior.

A. Mathematical Analog of Production Data

The procedure to remove the flush production volumes utilizes a fit of a mathematic equation of the later time production, and then utilizing that relationship to extrapolate the early production as if the flush production rates had not occurred.

There were some instances where the flush production volumes were minimal which reinforces the benefit of being able to more acutely focus in on the reservoir characteristics through the elimination of this bias. This process can also provide a significant benefit when there is missing production data.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (San Juan County, New Mexico) – January 1996 – Single Stage Treatments - Amoco
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

B. Missing Data

This process can also provide a significant benefit where there is missing production data. Also, in instances where there is only a very limited knowledge of the early production histories or where there is co-metered gas production can benefit as well.

C. Examples

The following examples demonstrate the procedure utilized to remove the gas produced during the flush production period which in this case lasted approximately 13 months.

The actual produced gas volume was 41 MMcf while the projected volume was 23 MMcf or a difference of 18 MMcf. The projected five year cumulative production is 92 MMcf whereas the actual production volume measured was 110 MMcf.

In the second example there was no production data available for the first 29 months, additionally the available data included two shut in periods which are followed by flush production. By utilizing a mathematic fit of the steady state production data a realistic projection of the early time production resulted. The limited data set was then utilized, and the bias resulting from the flush production periods following the shut in periods was removed.

In removing the effects of the flush production volume a more realistic assessment of the response to the different stimulation types resulted. The production plots for each well including the actual and projected values are included in this report.

V. PRODUCING HORIZON

The Fruitland Coals are an Upper Cretaceous sequence of interbedded sandstones, siltstones, shale, and coal which lie a depth of 2,000-2,500 feet in the Test Area (Figure 2). The coals have thicknesses of 36-60 feet, and the basal coal, Cahn, is 45 to 60 feet thick, and is the most productive. It along with other overlying coal members were stimulated. The treated intervals ranged from 120 to 180 feet.

Figure 2

LEGEND	
A	AQUIFER
D	DISPOSAL HORIZON
●	OIL
*	OIL & GAS
⊛	GAS

INTERGRAPH

Amoco Production Company
 Southern Division

GEOLOGIC COLUMN

Northern San Juan Basin
 La Plata Co., Colo.

VI. FIELD

The Fruitland Coal wells on the Fairway are in an area designated as Type I and typically produce up to 1,000 Mcf per day along with 10-50 barrels of water (GLR = 20-100 Mcf/bbl) from the reservoir at a pressure of 600-800 psi. To the north of the Fairway in the Type II area the wells produce gas at 0-500 Mcf per day and 10-50 barrels of water (GLR = 25-50 Mcf/bbl).

A. Type III Area

In the Type III area southwest of the Fairway where the Candidate Wells are situated, the production is typically 0-250 Mcf per day and is essentially water free. The wells can produce 1-2 barrels of liquid daily (GLR = 165 Mcf/bbl), sometimes mostly condensate which may originate in the underlying Pictured Cliff Sandstone(PC).

Type	Location	Reservoir Pressure		Gas prod	Water	GLR
		P _{original}	P _{now}	Mcf/d	Bwpd	Mcf/bbl
I	Fairway (FW)	1000	600-800	>1000	10-50	20-100
II	NE of FW	1000	600-800	0-500	10-20	25-50
III	SW of FW (Target)	500	500	0-250	1-2	125-250

B. Pipeline pressure

The pipeline pressure ranges between 125 and 150 psi which was the pressure at which the Candidate Wells were initially producing. Well head compressors were subsequently installed and the flowing pressure was reduced to approximately 10 psi.

VII. RESERVOIR

A. Reservoir Pressure and Temperature

The reservoir pressure and temperature in the area where the Candidate Wells are situated is approximately 500 psi and 102 degrees Fahrenheit respectively.

	Temp	Total Depth
Well	(°F)	(ft)
Riddle I-1	101	2,277
Florance GCL-1	N/R	2,206
Florance Q-1	105	2,264

VIII. CO₂ CHARACTERISTICS

The accompanying pressure-enthalpy diagram (Figure 3) indicates the projected states of the CO₂ during the pumping, flow back, and producing events. The CO₂ will readily vaporize under these conditions and will require $-286(10)^3$ BTUs per ton.

Pt # Location	Press (psi)	Temp (°F)	State	Density (lb/cuft)	Enthalpy BTU/lbm
PUMPING*					
1 Well head	2,200	0	SC	64.94	-3,905
2 Perfs	3,600	20*	SC	64.52	-3,864
NOT PUMPING					
3 Perfs***	1,000	20	SC	62.50	-3,893
4 Formtn***	750	75	SH	10.00	-3,785
5 Formtn	500	103	SH	4.55	-3,746
6 Perfs	26	103	SH	3.33	-3,756
7 Well head	15	75	SH	0.20	-3,750
* Pumping through 4.50 in casing at 40 bbls per min (residence time = 0.85 min)					
** Heat gain through casing at 40 bbls per min = $88(10)^3$ BTU/min (apx 40 BTU/sqft @ LMDT = 73°F)					
*** At the instant that the pumping is terminated					
$-3893 - (-3750) = -143$ BTU/lb = $-286(10)^3$ BTU/ton

Figure 3

IX. CONVENTIONAL STIMULATION TREATMENTS

In the test area, the wells are typically stimulated with 70-75q nitrogen foam. The sizes are typically 900 barrels and 250,000 pounds of sand.

X. IS THE PROPOSED RESERVOIR LIKELY TO BENEFIT FROM THE CO₂/SAND TECHNOLOGY?

The Fruitland coals in the Type III section have less production potential than Types I and II and are marginally economic with conventional treatments. The potential for improvement was considered to be significant for two primary reasons. The preferential adsorptive capabilities of carbon dioxide over that of methane, and that the benefit of a liquid-free treatment. That is, benefits would result from the liquid free stimulation in a liquid sensitive reservoir, and the CO₂ would displace the methane and enhance the production as well.

A. OPERATOR

1. Interest in CO₂/sand technology?

Amoco was interested in improving the producing potential of the Fruitland coal in the Type III area, and elected to participate in the demonstration.

2. Adequate test opportunity?

The proposed Candidate Wells provided an adequate test opportunity to demonstrate and to evaluate the process. The available production data was utilized to generate projections from which a criteria for success was developed.

3. Presently active drilling program?

Amoco had an active drilling program.

4. Is there a future for successful results? Is the operator likely to continue implementing this technology without DOE cost support?

Yes, if the technology proved to be economically supportable then Amoco had sufficient acreage and infrastructure to support additional CO₂/sand stimulation activity.

5. Interest in DOE cost-supported participation?

Amoco indicated a strong interest in the demonstration of the process, provided Candidate Well opportunities with background production information from nearby Control Wells, and executed a Letter of Intent.

6. Share production data for five years?

Amoco agreed to share the production data for the five year period following the stimulations.

B. Letter of Intent

A Letter of Intent was prepared and executed (Figure 4). It addressed, and Amoco agreed, to the following:

1. To provide legitimate Candidate Well opportunities for three mutually agreed upon wells,
2. To provide acceptable background information on the nearby Control Wells including the drilling, completion, and production specifics,
3. To bear the normal additional expenses of cement bond logging, perforating, bull dozers, and other normally occurring expenses associated with stimulation events,
4. Participating in the demonstration project and the anticipated treatments specifics, and
5. To provide the production information for five years.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (San Juan County, New Mexico) – January 1996 – Single Stage Treatments - Amoco
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Figure 4 (p. 1 of 2)

WGL
~~Letter of Intent~~
(p. 1 of 2)

Operator: Amoco Production Company (Amoco)
Candidate Wells: San Juan County, New Mexico T28N-R08W
Target Formation: Fruitland Coals

There were six (6) candidate wells proposed in the original submittal (07/02/95). Wells #1 and 5 have been eliminated. One was determined to be on an Indian burial ground and the other would require additional time for partner approvals. The ~~four~~ ^{three} remaining candidate wells are:

Well*	Lease	Sec	Quad	Thickness	1st Yr Dly Prod (Mcf/d)	Pmt #	Casing
2	Riddle II	20	NE	52	150	TBD	4-1/2
3	Florance GCL1	20	SW	63	140	TBD	4-1/2
4	Florance Q1	29	NE	60	110	TBD	4-1/2
6	Story D2	27	NE	48	75	TBD	3-1/2 PB

*Designations assigned in the original submittal (07/02/95) *WGL*

The U. S. Department of Energy will, subject to their approvals, agree to provide cost-shared funding for the stimulation of these candidate wells with Universal Well Service's closed system blender for CO₂/sand treatments, if certain criteria are met. Amoco agrees to bear the remaining expenses.

The project entails demonstrating the process in a controlled environment where sufficient background production information from nearby wells can be used to compare the production results with those of this demonstration project.

The design of the stimulation treatments is to consist of approximately 120 tons of carbon dioxide and 25,000 to 45,000 pounds of sand pumped at injection rates of 35 to 60 barrels per minute, and to consist of up to four ^{single stage} *WGL* single-stage treatments.

Amoco agrees to operate these wells with wellhead pressures similar to those of the control wells to enable a meaningful comparison of the production from the candidate wells with that of the nearby offset control wells. This will probably necessitate the installation of wellhead compressors similar to those installed on the offset wells. The purpose is to effect a quantitative comparison of the effectiveness of the liquid-free CO₂/sand stimulation with that of nitrogen foam.

^{three (3)} *WGL* The ~~four~~ (4) candidate wells will be available for stimulation treatments by the second week of January, 1996.

The wells will be turned in line shortly after treatment, and the production will be forwarded to PCS on a monthly basis to enable an evaluation of the CO₂ treatments to be made. DOE is requesting monthly production data on these wells for a minimum of five (5) years following turn-in, including monthly copies of the meter run readings and third party integration statements. They are to be forwarded monthly to Petroleum Consulting Services.

Final Report - Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (San Juan County, New Mexico) - January 1996 - Single Stage Treatments - Amoco
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 4 (p. 2 of 2)

~~Letter of Intent~~ ^{AGREEMENT}
(p. 2 of 2)

Sand, if any, will be removed from the wellbore at operator's expense, immediately following the stimulation.

The DOE requires the following:

1. Executed Letter of intent This document
2. A map of the candidate well and nearby offsetting wells -
Satisfied
3. Electric logs ~~for~~ Control and candidate wells
4. Cumulative production data ~~for~~ Control and candidate wells
5. Monthly pipeline pressure data Control and candidate wells
6. Stimulation records tabular and strip charts Control and candidate wells
7. Well completion reports Control and candidate wells

The DOE, subject to their approval, will, through the contractor, Petroleum Consulting Services, pay for one-half (1/2) of the costs of the stimulations, including the service company charges for product (CO₂, sand), services, and mobilization. This is to be accomplished by an invoice from Amoco to PCS for one-half (1/2) of the total stimulation costs which includes all discounts.

Amoco hereby indicates an intention to enter into a 50/50 cost-shared participation of the stimulation expenses for these candidate wells, subject to DOE approvals.

Amoco agrees to bear the remaining expenses of these treatments and any remaining activities, i.e., those expenses normally associated with these treatments: cement bond log, perforating, dozers, service rigs, etc.

If these conditions are satisfactory, please acknowledge by signing below, and returning this document to:

Petroleum Consulting Services
P. O. Box 35833
Canton, Ohio 44735
(216) 499-3823 (216) 499-2280 (fax)

Date:

Signed:

H. G. Rowe
Company Officer

Title: ATTORNEY-IN-FACT

Witness: _____

XI. NEPA COMPLIANCES

A NEPA questionnaire was prepared for the Candidate Wells. Conversations were held with Amoco's environmental compliance personnel and the specifics of land use, air quality, water resources/water quality, solid waste and hazardous materials, impact on vegetation and animals, aesthetics, historical/cultural resources, transportation, energy requirements, environmental restoration and/or waste management, and worker health and safety were identified and responded to.

Subsequently, the NEPA approval was granted.

XII. TEST AREA

The test area is situated in San Juan Co, New Mexico in Township 28N, Range 8W which is southeast of the town of Blanco along Canyon Largo (Figure 5). It initially consisted of six Control Wells and the six potential Candidate Wells.

Figure 5

A. Control Wells – 6 Wells

1. Production Review and Projections

The production was plotted and the five year production projection exclusive of flush production and non-productive intervals was generated as described under the preceding METHODOLOGY section.

a. Control Well # 1 – Federal 32-17 (28472) – Projected 5 Yr Prod 445.2 MMcf

b. Control Well # 2 - Sharp (21160) – Projected 5 Yr Prod 378.7 MMcf

Sharp 28-08-18
(21160) San Juan Co, NM

c. Control Well # 3 - Federal 23-17 (28471) – Projected 5 Yr Prod 266.6 MMcf

d. Control Well # 4 – Federal 42-16 (28337) – Projected 5 Yr Prod 199.8 MMcf

Federal 42-16
 (28337) San Juan Co, NM

- e. Control Well # 5 – Federal 28-08-30 (28863) – Projected 5 Yr Prod 81.8 MMcf

Federal 28-08-30
 (28863) San Juan Co, NM

f. Control Well # 6 – Grambling A (21041) – Projected 5 Yr Prod 15.6 MMcf

Grambling A 28-08-8
 (21041) San Juan Co, NM

2. Summary – Control Wells

The five year cumulative production from the six Control Wells ranged between 15.6 and 445.2 MMcf and averaged 231.3 MMcf.

B. Candidate Wells – 3 Wells

Initially there were six proposed Candidate Wells, all located in T28N-R8W. The projected thickness of the basal section of Fruitland Coal (Cahn seam) and first year production are:

Well #	Sec	Quad	1 st Yr Mcfd	Thickness (ft)
1	19	NE	225	55
2	20	NE	150	52
3	20	SW	140	63
4	29	NE	175	60
5	32	NE	100	47
6	27	NE	75	48

Wells #1 and 5 were eliminated. One was determined to be on an Indian burial ground and the other would require additional time for partner approvals. The four remaining Candidate Wells were:

Well*	Lease	Sec	Quad	Thickness	1 st Yr Dly Prod (Mcfd)	Pmt #	Casing
2	Riddle I1	20	NE	52	150	29328	4-1/2
3	Florance GCL1	20	SW	63	140	29336	4-1/2
4	Florance Q1	29	NE	60	110	29345	4-1/2
6	Storey D2	27	NE	48	75	TBD	3-1/2 PB

*Designations assigned in the original submittal (07/02/95)

Figure 6 identifies the position of these wells (green circles) with respect to other Fruitland Coal wells, designated by the smaller circles (red). Additionally, there are other non-Fruitland Coal producers designated by small plus (+) symbols. These wells produce from either the Pictured Cliff Sandstone, the Mesa Verde, or in some instances, the Dakota Sandstone.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (San Juan County, New Mexico) – January 1996 – Single Stage Treatments - Amoco
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Figure 6

The well with the 3.50 inch casing, Storey D2, was a Dakota plug back (TD = 7,105 ft) and had the least potential for gas production of any of the six (6) originally proposed wells. With conventional treatments, it was estimated to deliver 75 Mcfd during the first year, or one-half the rate of the well with the greatest projected potential. Additionally because of the increased friction associated with the smaller casing Well #6 was eliminated leaving three Candidate Wells: Riddle I-1, Florance GCL-1, and Florance Q-1

1. Electric Logs

a. Candidate Well # 1 - Florance GCL-1 (29336)

The electric log indicating the perforated intervals follows below.

b. Candidate Well # 2 – Florance Q-1 (29345)

The electric log indicating the perforated intervals follows below.

c. Candidate Well # 3 – Riddle I-1 (29328)

The electric log indicating the perforated intervals follows below.

2. Completion

The completions involved running geophysical logs to identify potential gas bearing intervals prior to installing steel casing and cementing it across the Fruitland Coals. The casing was then perforated at specific depths which had been identified on the logs, and then hydraulically stimulated. The stimulation treatments were generally with nitrogen foam containing 250,000 pounds of 20/40 sized sand proppant which was pumped through the perforations.

Amoco's practices utilized a large number of perforations which in the three Candidate Wells ranged from 200 to 316 over intervals of 120 to 180 feet. Typically the stimulations were N₂ foam with viscosities on the order of 300 cp as compared to

liquid CO₂ with 0.1 cp. This large number of perforations significantly reduced the transport velocity, and compromised the ability to transport proppant.

Typically 30 perforations are used with the CO₂/sand treatments. The resultant perforation transport velocity being 158 feet per second (fps). With 258 perforations, the average for the Candidate Wells, the velocity diminished to 18.4 fps which is much less than the settling velocity.

It was therefore predictable that the ability to transport proppant with liquid CO₂ at the reduced flow rate resulting from the large number of perforations would be very unlikely.

The knowledge of the placement of this large number of perforations was not conveyed to the contractor until the equipment was on location and the preparations to initiate the pumping operations nearly complete.

3. Perforation Strategy

The perforation placements were identified from the electric logs and positioned at the coal intervals which have lower bulk densities. The accompanying electric logs (Figures 7 to 9) indicate this placement technique.

Well	Interval (ft)	Perfs
Riddle I-1	120	200
Florance GCL-1	180	316
Florance Q-1	158	288

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (San Juan County, New Mexico) – January 1996 – Single Stage Treatments - Amoco
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Figure 7 – Florance GCL-1 (p. 1 of 2)

HALLIBURTON

HALLIBURTON		DUAL SPACED NEUTRON LOG																																																																	
COMPANY AMOCO PRODUCTION CO. WELL FLORANCE GAS COM "L" NO. 1 FIELD PICTURED CLIFFS COUNTY SAN JUAN STATE N.M.	COMPANY <u>AMOCO PRODUCTION CO.</u> WELL <u>FLORANCE GAS COM "L" NO. 1</u> FIELD <u>PICTURED CLIFFS</u> COUNTY <u>SAN JUAN</u> STATE <u>N.M.</u> API No. <u>N/A</u> Location <u>N/A</u> Sect <u>20A</u> Twp <u>28N</u> Rge <u></u>																																																																		
Permanent Datum <u>GROUND</u> Elev. <u>N/A</u> Log measured from <u>K.B.</u> <u>12</u> ft. above perm. datum Drilling measured from <u>K.B.</u>		Elev. : <u>K.B.</u> <u>D.F.</u> <u>G.L.</u>																																																																	
Date @ Time Logged <u>1-10-96 @ 12:00</u> Run No. <u>ONE</u> Depth - Driller <u>N/A</u> Depth - Logger <u>2205</u> Bottom - Logged Interval <u>2200</u> Top - Logged Interval <u>1200</u> Max. rec. temp., deg F. <u>N/A</u>		Type fluid in hole <u>WATER</u> Density of Fluid <u>N/A</u> Fluid Level <u>FULL</u> Cement Top Est. Logged <u>N/A</u> Equipment / Location <u>50623 / FARM</u> Recorded by <u>GILLINGHAM</u> Witnessed by <u>L HUMPHREY</u>																																																																	
CEMENTING DATA Surface String Date/Time Cemented Primary/Squeeze Expected Compressive Strength <u>psi@ hrs</u> Cement Volume Cement Type / Weight Formulation MUD Type / MUD Wgt.		Protection String Production String Liner String String String String String String String																																																																	
BOREHOLE RECORD <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th>RUN No.</th> <th>Bit</th> <th>From</th> <th>To</th> </tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> </table>		RUN No.	Bit	From	To																													CASING & TUBING RECORD <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th>Size</th> <th>Wgt.</th> <th>From</th> <th>To</th> </tr> <tr><td>7.0</td><td> </td><td>SURF.</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>4.5</td><td> </td><td>SURF.</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> </table>		Size	Wgt.	From	To	7.0		SURF.	N/A	4.5		SURF.	N/A																				
RUN No.	Bit	From	To																																																																
Size	Wgt.	From	To																																																																
7.0		SURF.	N/A																																																																
4.5		SURF.	N/A																																																																

Figure 7 – Florance GCL-1 (p. 2 of 2)

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (San Juan County, New Mexico) – January 1996 – Single Stage Treatments - Amoco
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Figure 8 – Florance Q-1 (p. 1 of 2)

WALKED

HALLIBURTON		SPECTRAL DENSITY DUAL SPACED NEUTRON	
COMPANY AMOCO PRODUCTION CO. WELL FLORENCE Q #1 FIELD FRUITLAND COAL COUNTY SAN JUAN STATE NM	COMPANY AMOCO PRODUCTION COMPANY		
	WELL FLORENCE Q #1		
	FIELD FRUITLAND COAL		
	COUNTY SAN JUAN STATE NM		
	COUNTY SAN JUAN STATE NM API NO N/A LOCATION SECT 29 TWP 28N RGE 08W		
			OTHER SERVICES MRI MICROLOG
PERMANENT DATUM G.L. ELEV. 5822		ELEV. : K.B. 5830	
LOG MEASURED FROM K.B. OR 8 FT. ABOVE PERM DATUM		D.F. 5829	
DRILLING MEASURED FROM KELLY BUSHING		G.L. 5822	
DATE	01-05-96		
RUN NO.	ONE		
DEPTH-DRILLER	2252		
DEPTH-LOGGER	2264		
BTM. LOG INTER	2230		
TOP LOG INTER	262		
CASING DRILLER	7.0 @ 250		
CASING-LOGGER	262		
BIT SIZE	6.25		
TYPE FLUID IN HOLE	LSND		
DENS. : VISC.	9.2 : 60		
PH. : FLUID LOSS	8.0 : 5.0		
SOURCE OF SAMPLE	FLOWLINE		
RM @ MEAS. TEMP.	1.82 @ 44		
RMF @ MEAS. TEMP.	1.36 @ 44		
RMC @ MEAS. TEMP.	2.27 @ 44		
SOURCE RMF:RMC	CALC : CALC		
RM @ BHT	0.83 @ 105		
TIME SINCE CIRC	4 HOURS		
TIME ON BOTTOM	10:45	01-05-96	
MAX REC TEMP.	105 @ T.D		
EQUIP : LOCATION	51943:FARM		
RECORDED BY	MATT BREWER		
WITNESSED BY	S. CATHINGS		

Figure 8 – Florance Q-1 (p. 2 of 2)

Figure 9 – Riddle I-1 (p. 1 of 2)

TOLD HERE

SERVICE TICKET NO.: 849788				API SERIAL NO.: SAME		PGM VERSION: 2.72			
CHANGE IN MUD TYPE OR ADDITIONAL SAMPLES				RESISTIVITY SCALE CHANGES					
DATE/SAMPLE NO.	/ /	!	/ /	!	TYPE LOG	DEPTH	SCALE UP HOLE	SCALE DOWN HOLE	
DEPTH-DRILLER									
TYPE FLUID									
IN HOLE									
WENS, ! VISC									
PH ! FLUID LOSS									
SOURCE OF SAMPLE					RESISTIVITY EQUIPMENT DATA				
IN E MEAS TEMP	e		e		RUN NO	TOOL TYPE & NO	PAD TYPE	TOOL POS. OTHER	
RHF E MEAS TEMP	e		e		N/A	WRI GA875		FREE	
RHC E MEAS TEMP	e		e						
SOURCE: RHF:RHC									
PH E BHT	NA	e	e						
RHF E BHT	NA	e	e						
RHC E BHT	NA	e	e						

EQUIPMENT DATA									
GAMMA		ACOUSTIC		DENSITY		NEUTRON			
RUN NO.	ONE	RUN NO.		RUN NO.	ONE	RUN NO.	ONE		
SERIAL NO.	B10B582	SERIAL NO.		SERIAL NO.	RED	SERIAL NO.	B10B78		
SDSL NO.	NCRT	MODEL NO.		MODEL NO.	BOLT-A	MODEL NO.	DBM		
PARAMETER	3.625	NO. OF CENT.		DIAMETER.	4.58	DIAMETER	2.625		
DETECTOR	5-1	SPRING		NO. OF CENT.		NO. OF CENT.			

Figure 9 – Riddle I-1 (p. 2 of 2)

XIII. CO₂/SAND STIMULATION TREATMENTS

A. Design

The stimulation designs were developed from the observed pressure-injection history for nitrogen foam stimulations on wells approximately seven miles distant.

The current practice was to complete the wells with 2-7/8 inch production tubulars. However, for the purposes of this evaluation, three of the initially offered Candidate Wells were completed with 4-1/2 inch production casing, and one, a plug back, Storey D2, with 3-1/2 inch tubulars. Because of the concerns of excessive friction pressures in the smaller diameter casing in the Storey D2 it was rejected leaving three Candidate Wells all with 4-1/2 inch casing.

The larger diameter tubulars enabled greater pumping rates, 40-55 barrels per minute, to be achieved without the excessive pressure drops resulting from the increased friction associated with the smaller diameter casing.

B. Fracturing Gradient

The fracturing gradient was estimated from wells located in the same township (28N) within seven miles of the Candidate Wells, three were situated approximately seven miles east of the Candidate Wells, where the Fruitland Coal is at a depth of approximately 3,200 feet. Fracturing pressure gradient information was also obtained from another well located approximately 1.2 miles west of the Candidate Wells, where the coal lies at a depth of approximately 2,100 feet.

The individual well depths and instantaneous shut-in pressures are tabulated and plotted, and the fracturing gradient for the Candidate Wells is projected to be 0.67 psi per foot or at a bottom hole pressure of 1,742 psi.

C. Hydrostatic Pressure

The hydrostatic wellhead pressure for 2,600 feet of liquid CO₂ with a bottom hole pressure of 1,742 psi was projected to be 1,379 psi.

D. Friction Pressure

The friction pressure drops in the tubulars (2,600 ft) and the perforations were estimated as follows:

Friction Pressure (psi)			
Injection Rate (bpm)	40	50	60
Diameter (in) 3.5	2,771	3,771	4,783
4.5	1,105	1,334	1,461

E. Treating Pressure

The estimated treating pressures and the associated horsepower requirements were tabulated and are also presented graphically. It is clearly evident that the smaller diameter 3.50 inch tubular will require significant additional horsepower over that of those wells equipped with 4.5 inch casing.

At a minimum recommended pumping rate of 40 barrels per minute (bpm) the 3.50 inch tubular requires 4,069 hydraulic horsepower as compared to 2,435 for the larger diameter casing. The incremental cost for the additional horsepower was estimated at \$4.65 per horsepower to be \$7,598.

The wellhead treating pressures and horsepower requirements were then estimated to be:

Wellhead Treating Pressure/HHP			
(psi)			
Injection Rate (bpm)	40	50	60
Diameter (in) 3.5	4,150/4,069	5,150/6,311	6,162/9,062
4.5	2,484/2,435	2,713/3,325	2,840/4,176

F. Sand Schedule

The treatments were to consist of 120 tons of CO₂ per stage and were projected to yield a net of 500 barrels (96 tons) of CO₂ in-zone along with 40,320 pounds of 20/40 proppant per stage.

The individual well treatment designs were developed based upon sand acceptance concentrations in the offset wells, and the intention was to modify them as the treatment sequence progressed, the objective being to place the maximum sand volumes. With this in mind full blender volumes of 47,500 lbs of proppant were loaded

G. Proppant Size

20/40 (USS) sand proppant was successful in the previous stimulations, and on that basis was proposed in the design

H. Treatment Volume

The Control Wells utilized 250,000 lbs of proppant which was placed with N₂ foam stimulations, and it was obvious that placing the largest proppant volume would be the objective.

I. Recommended Design

The recommended stimulation design for the first Candidate Well was:

PROPPANT FLUID SCHEDULE					
	Cum Fluid	Stage Fluid	Proppant Conc	Proppant Stage	Cum Proppant
	(bbl)	(bbl)	(ppg)	(lb)	(lb)
Stage					
Hole Fill (Liquid CO ₂)	30	30		0	0
Pad (Liquid CO ₂)	120	90		0	0
Start (20/40 Sand)	190	70	1.0	2,940	2,940
Increase (20/40 Sand)	230	40	2.0	3,360	6,300
Increase (20/40 Sand)	500	270	3.0	34,020	40,320
Flush (Liquid CO ₂)	525	25		0	
Total		525			40,320

TREATMENT FLUID REQUIREMENTS						
	Hole +	Prop	Flush	Tot	Bottoms	Total
Liq CO ₂	120	380	25	525	10	535
CO ₂ (T)						103
N ₂ (Mscf)						61

The plan was to determine the sand acceptance rates, and then to modify the sand schedule accordingly. All of the treatments were to include 120 tons of CO₂ on site which after cool down and bottoms would provide approximately 525 bbls of CO₂ for the stimulation.

J. Treatment Volume Comparison - Conventional vs CO₂/Sand

In actuality only limited proppant volumes were placed. All of the treatments were terminated prior to the maximum proppant volume being pumped. One screened out and the proppant concentrations on the other two were reduced as it became evident that the acceptance rate was less than the design. This reduced acceptance rate is believed to be a consequence of the large number of perforations (200 to 316) which significantly reduced the transport velocity.

XIV. CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS

Amoco reviewed the production data from the offset wells, and their Oklahoma based statistician indicated that the following comparisons are valid for a bimodal distribution. This relation results in a statistically defensible comparison between the Control Well population (n = 9 wells) with a large standard deviation, 56%, and the Candidate Well population (n = 6 wells).

Population	Control	Candidate
Mean (Mcf/d)	104	135
Std Deviation (%)	56	56
n	9	6

Using this criteria the production from CO₂/sand stimulated Candidate Wells must be greater than 135 Mcfd to be statistically significant.

This was considered to be a realistic goal for the Candidate Wells and to be reasonably attainable. The multiplier for the increased cost of the treatments should be approximately 20% of the well cost resulting in an economically defensible hurdle rate of 162 Mcfd, which was considered to be reasonable.

XV. PRE-TEST CONCLUSIONS

The three Candidate Well sites offered by Amoco were considered to provide a meaningful opportunity for demonstrating and evaluating the CO₂/Sand stimulation technology. In addition, Amoco was very interested in this area in terms of understanding the geology, reservoir, and completion techniques, and it was considered likely that if the technology proved successful that additional exploitation would occur.

In retrospect it is now concluded that this endeavor was an attempt to apply the technology where there was little promise for conventional stimulation treatments.

XVI. DOE APPROVALS

A submittal package (#2) was prepared and submitted to the DOE for consideration. After their review and some additional information provided, the treatments were approved for a cost-shared demonstration.

XVII. FIELD ACTIVITIES

A. Preparations

The wells were perforated during the week prior to the treatments, CO₂ was procured and the service company mobilization, from Pennsylvania with support from Canadian Fracmaster pump trucks from Edmonton, Alberta initiated.

B. Comments

The sand schedule evolved during these treatments where it became apparent that only limited sand volumes would be placed with the proposed schedule. The first two (2) wells treated (Florance GCL-1 and Florance Q-1) screened out with 75 and 48 sacks of sand, respectively, through the perforations.

Both wells exhibited immediate wellhead pressure decays to approximately 300 psi following the treatments, indicating a very high rate of leak off. The conclusions following these treatments were that:

1. The high leak off rates combined with the numerous individual coal members perforated were resulting in low transport velocities and minimum induced fracture widths.
2. The ability to place sand into subsequently initiated fractures, i.e., fractures not initiated at the beginning of the treatment when the sand concentrations were either low or non-existent, was impossible because there was no pad liquid ahead of the higher concentration - sand laden slurry.

It should also be recognized that the pressure decay at the end of the third treatment was much slower than that observed on the first two wells, suggesting considerably reduced leak off into a less permeable formation.

C. Stimulations

1. Florance GCL-1 (29336) -- Candidate Well # 1

The Florance GCL-1 was the first well stimulated. It had been perforated previously with 316 holes over a 180 foot interval from 1,931 to 2,111 feet.

The pressurized blender was transported to the well site on the day of the treatment, January 16, 1996 and filled with 20/40 sand. The treatment was then executed. A pad volume of 90 bbls was pumped prior to initiating sand proppant at 1.0 ppg. 9,800 lbs of proppant were pumped in 137 bbls of CO₂ at an average rate and pressure of 55.8 barrels per minute and 2,226 psi respectively.

The well screened out with 7,500 lbs of proppant through the perforations.

The maximum sand concentration was 2.5 lbs per gal, and averaged 1.6, the maximum rates and pressures were 60.2 Bpm and 3,576 psi respectively. The treatment was halted when the treatment screened out at a wellhead pressure of 3,576 psi. The stimulation pressure-rate history plot is included (Figures TBD and TBD). The in zone proppant volume was estimated 7,500 pounds.

Figure 10 – Florance GCL-1

AMOCO

Date: 12/16/95
 Lease: FLORANCE
 Formation: FRUITLAND COAL
 Well: GCL-1
 Treatment: CO₂ / Sand Frac through 4.5" casing

Cumulative Clean Volume BBLs	Stage Clean Volume BBLs	Sand Concentration PPG	Stage Slurry Volume BBLs	Cumulative Slurry Volume BBLs	Cumulative Sand SKS
90	90	PAD	90	90	0
130	40	1	42	132	17
227	97	2	106	238	98

*** SHUT DOWN, MAXIMUM PRESSURE. ***

Breakdown Pressure	1650 PSI	ISIP (End of Job)	PSI
Max. Pressure	3576 PSI	Max. Rate	60.2 BPM
Avg. Pressure	2226 PSI	Avg. Rate	55.8 BPM
Max. Horsepower	4497 HHP	Max. Sand Conc.	2.5 PPG
Avg. Horsepower	4139 HHP	Avg. Sand Conc.	2.4 PPG
Total Proppant	98 SKS	Prop. Type	20/40
Total Clean CO ₂	227 BBLs		

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (San Juan County, New Mexico) – January 1996 – Single Stage Treatments - Amoco
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Figure 11 – Florance GCL-1

2. Florance Q-1 (29345) – Candidate Well #2

The Florance Q-1 was the second well to be stimulated. It had been perforated previously with 288 holes over a 158 foot interval from 1,962 to 2,120 feet.

An effort to increase the placed volume included increasing the pad volume from 90 to 148 barrels along with an increase in the initial sand concentration from 1.0 to 1.5 pounds per gallon (ppg). A total sand-laden CO₂ volume of 101 bbls was pumped which was less than the 137 pumped in the first well treated, Candidate Well #2, Florance GCL-1.

The pressurized blender was moved to the well site on the day of the treatment, January 16, 1996 and filled with 20/40 sand. The treatment was then executed, 6,200 lbs of proppant were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 55.8 barrels per minute and 2,145 psi respectively. The maximum sand concentration was 1.9 lbs per gal, and averaged 1.5, the maximum rates and pressures were 60.2 Bpm and 4,100 psi respectively. The treatment was halted when the treatment screened out at a wellhead pressure of 4,100 psi. The stimulation pressure-rate history plot is included (Figures 12 and 13). The in zone proppant volume was estimated 4,800 pounds.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (San Juan County, New Mexico) – January 1996 – Single Stage Treatments - Amoco
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Figure 12 – Florance Q-1

AMOCO

Date: 12/16/95
Lease: FLORANCE
Formation: FRUITLAND COAL
Well: Q-1
Treatment: CO₂ / Sand Frac through 4.5" casing

Cumulative Clean Volume BBLS	Stage Clean Volume BBLS	Sand Concentration PPG	Stage Slurry Volume BBLS	Cumulative Slurry Volume BBLS	Cumulative Sand SKS
150	150	PAD	150	150	0
249	99	1.5	105	255	62

*** SHUT DOWN, MAXIMUM PRESSURE. ***

Breakdown Pressure	2150 PSI	ISIP (End of Job)	PSI
Max. Pressure	4100 PSI	Max. Rate	60.2 BPM
Avg. Pressure	2145 PSI	Avg. Rate	55.8 BPM
Max. Horsepower	4228 HHP	Max. Sand Conc.	1.9 PPG
Avg. Horsepower	2934 HHP	Avg. Sand Conc.	1.49 PPG
Total Proppant	62 SKS	Prop. Type	20/40
Total Clean CO₂	249 BBLS		

Figure 13 – Florance Q-1

3. Riddle I-1 (29328) -- Candidate Well #3

The Riddle I-1 was the third well stimulated. It had been perforated previously with 200 holes over a 120 foot interval from 2,150 to 2,270 feet.

The treatment was modified and it was considerably more successful in that 130 sacks of sand were placed in zone.

The design was recommended by Amoco and included a pad volume similar in size to the first treatment (88 vs. 90), but also included a 20 barrel "slug" of 0.5 ppg sand in the middle of it. Additionally, the sand concentrations were lower at the outset 0.5ppg and averaged, 1.0 ppg or less, throughout the majority of the treatment. The results were improved in that 13,000 lbs were placed in zone

The pressurized blender was transported to the well site on the day of the treatment, January 17, 1996 and filled with 20/40 sand. The treatment was then executed, 15,200 lbs of proppant were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 50.0 barrels per minute and 2,517 psi respectively. The maximum sand concentration was 1.9 lbs per gal, and averaged 0.8, the maximum rates and pressures were 56.0 Bpm and 4,702 psi respectively. The treatment was halted when the treatment screened out at a wellhead pressure of 4,702 psi. The stimulation pressure-rate history plot is included (Figures 14 and 15). The in zone proppant volume was estimated 13,000 pounds.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (San Juan County, New Mexico) – January 1996 – Single Stage Treatments - Amoco
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Figure 14 – Riddle I-1

AMOCO

Date: 12/17/96
Lease: RIDDLE
Formation: FRUITLAND COAL
Well: I-1
Treatment: CO₂ / Sand Frac through 4.5" casing

Cumulative Clean Volume BBLS	Stage Clean Volume BBLS	Sand Concentration PPG	Stage Slurry Volume BBLS	Cumulative Slurry Volume BBLS	Cumulative Sand SKS
70	70	PAD	70	70	0
358	288	0.5	295	364	60
393	35	1	36	400	75
509	116	1.5	126	526	148
513	4	FLUSH	4	530	148

*** SHUT DOWN, MAXIMUM PRESSURE. ***

Breakdown Pressure	2365 PSI	ISIP (End of Job)	1300 PSI
Max. Pressure	4702 PSI	Max. Rate	56 BPM
Avg. Pressure	2517 PSI	Avg. Rate	50 BPM
Max. Horsepower	4228 HHP	Max. Sand Conc.	1.9 PPG
Avg. Horsepower	3076 HHP	Avg. Sand Conc.	0.8 PPG
Total Proppant	152 SKS	Prop. Type	20/40
Total Clean CO₂	513 BBLS		

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (San Juan County, New Mexico) – January 1996 – Single Stage Treatments - Amoco
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Figure 15 – Riddle I-1

The increased sand volume which was placed in this well is likely a result of:

- a. The reduced number of perforations 200 vs. 288 and 316 in the other two Candidate Wells
- b. The introduction of a 20 bbl 0.5ppg sand slug in the middle of the pad
- c. Maintaining a reduced sand concentration of 0.75 ppg.

Note: The offset well to the Riddle II is completed in the PC Sandstone which underlies the Fruitland Coals. A gas sample was obtained following the treatment and was reported to contain 44% CO₂, indicating communication between these formations. The offset well was perforated in the basal section (Cahn) of the Fruitland Coal. The Candidate Well was not.

4. Stimulation Summary

All three wells screened out and the treatments were terminated. Following the screen out of the first treatment the pad volume was increased from 90 to 148 bbls and the starting sand concentration increased from 1.0 to 1.5 ppg yet a lesser in zone proppant volume resulted. This response indicates that increasing the pad volume provides no benefit, and that the ability to transport sand at concentrations of 1.0 ppg or greater is unlikely.

The largest sand volume was placed in the third treatment, Riddle I-1 which included a 20bbl - 0.5ppg sand slug in the pad and a reduced sand concentration of 0.75 ppg.

A contributing factor is believed to be the large number of perforations (200 to 316).

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (San Juan County, New Mexico) – January 1996 – Single Stage Treatments - Amoco
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

The "in-zone" sand volumes and other specifics were:

Well	Perfs	Sand (sacks)		Max Tr Press	Avg Rate	Sand Conc (lb/gal)	
		Pumped	In-Zone	Psi	BPM	Max	Avg
Florance GCL-1	316	98	75	3,576	55.8	2.5	1.6
Florance Q-1	288	62	48	4,100	55.8	1.9	1.5
Riddle I-1	200	152	130	4,702	50.0	1.9	0.8

D. Inter-zonal Communication between the Fruitland Coal and the PC Sandstone.

When stimulating all three of the Candidate Wells there were increases in production and/or casing pressure in the offset wells (on the same location) as the CO₂ treatments were being pumped.

These offset wells were completed in the Pictured Cliff Sandstone, but not the Fruitland Coals.

1. Florance GCL-1

The casing pressure in the offset well increased from 148 to 185 psi, and the production increased from 158 to 165 Mcf per day indicating the communication with the Candidate Well (Figure 16).

Figure 16 – Florance GCL-1

Within 50' of Florance GCL L#1

3. Riddle I-1

The casing pressure in the offset well increased from 127 to 460 psi, and the production increased from 190 to 420 Mcf per day indicating the communication with the Candidate Well (Figure 18). Additionally, a gas sample was obtained following the treatment and was reported to contain 44% CO₂, indicating communication between these formations. The offset well was perforated in the basal section (Cahn) of the Fruitland Coal. The Candidate Well was not.

Figure 18 -- Riddle I-1

Within 50' of Riddle I-1

E. Post Stimulation

1. Flow Back Procedures

The wells were flowed back on 0.25 - 0.50 inch chokes and the wellhead pressure decayed to 70 - 80 psi in the Florance wells, the Riddle I1 decayed to 20 - 30 psi.

2. Cleaning Frac Sand from the Well Bore

All three wells have sand above the perms which was cleaned out without introducing any liquid

XVIII. RESULTS

A. Production Review – Candidate Wells

1. Florance GCL 1 (29336) -- Candidate Well # 1

2. Florance Q1 (29345) -- Candidate Well #2

Florance Q 1
 (29345) San Juan Co, NM
 Stimulated w/CO₂ (4,800 lbs 20/40)

3. Riddle I-1 (29328) -- Candidate Well # 3

Riddle I 1
 (29328) San Juan Co, NM
 Stimulated w/CO₂ (13,000 lbs 20/40)

B. Production Summary – Candidate Wells

The five year cumulative production from the three Candidate Wells ranged between 65.3 and 141.9 MMcf and averaged 91.3 MMcf.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (San Juan County, New Mexico) – January 1996 – Single Stage Treatments - Amoco
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

C. Production Comparisons – Control and Candidate Wells

The five year cumulative production volumes from the three Candidate Wells ranged from 65.3 to 141.9 averaging 91.3 MMcf or 39 percent that of the six Control Wells.

Well	Pmt # 30-045-	Sec	Oper	5 Yr Prod Projt'd	5 Yr Prod Actual	Prod Mo	Stim
	xxxx				MMcf		Type, Sxs, Bbls
Federal 32-17	28472	17K	Richards	445.2	365.4		
Sharp	21160	08W	SG Intrs	378.7	377.3		
Federal 23-17	28471	17G	Richards	266.6	224.6		
Federal 42-16	28337	21H	Richards	199.8	187.6		
Florance GCL 1	29336	20	BP	141.9	138.7		CO ₂ 75, 227
Federal 28-08-30	28863	30	SG Intrs	81.8	52.7		
Florance Q1	29345	29	BP	66.6	62.4		CO ₂ 48, 249
Riddle I-1	29328	20	BP	65.3	67.1		CO ₂ 130, 513
Grambling A	21041	21H	Brngtn	15.6	3.4	8	

These poor responses from the wells stimulated with the CO₂/sand process are unquestionably related to a number of factors regarding the formation characteristics of permeability and pressure, but to a larger extent to the reduced proppant volumes placed by the liquid-free treatments.

D. Conclusions

1. The projected five year cumulative production ranged from the three Candidate Wells ranged from 65.3 to 141.9 MMcf and averaged 91.3 MMcf while that from the six Control Wells ranged between 15.6 and 445.2 MMcf averaging 231.3 MMcf or 2.5 times that from the wells.

2. These poor responses from the wells stimulated with the CO₂/sand process are unquestionably related to a number of factors regarding the formation characteristics of permeability, and pressure, but to a larger extent to the reduced proppant volumes placed by the liquid-free treatments

XIX. COSTS

A. Projected

The projected costs for stimulating these wells with 120 tons of liquid CO₂ and 40,320 pounds of sand were:

Wells	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
Totals	\$178,340	\$236,200

And, DOE's 50% obligation would be:

\$ 89,170	\$118,100
-----------	-----------

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (San Juan County, New Mexico) – January 1996 – Single Stage Treatments - Amoco
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

B. Actual

The actual costs for the CO₂/sand stimulations were:

01/22/96	Cost Summary			Page 1 of 1
Number	Riddle I-1	Florance GCL #1	Florance Q-1	
Pumping \$(UWS)	19,660	19,139	16,791	
N ₂ (HES)	1,695	3,632	2,044	
Sand (HES)	2,046	891	705	
Misc	23,401	23,661	19,540	66,603
CO ₂ (BOC)	6,654	7,447	8,186	
CO ₂ -Portables (BOC)	1,200	1,200	1,200	
Mob (BOC)	2,000	2,000	2,000	
Blender (UWS)	6,000	6,000	6,000	
Tube Trailer (UWS)	5,500	5,500	5,500	
	21,354	22,147	22,886	66,386
Mob,Per Diem (UWS)	2,080	9,600		
Trucking				
Mob,Per Diem (UWS)		2,840		
Misc	2,080	12,440	0	14,520
Total	46,835	58,248	42,426	147,509

XX. CONCLUSIONS

A. The production from the Candidate Wells was disappointingly low:

The projected five year cumulative production ranged from the three Candidate Wells ranged from 65.3 to 141.9 MMcf and averaged 91.3 MMcf while that from the six Control Wells ranged between 15.6 and 445.2 MMcf averaging 231.3 MMcf or 2.5 times that from the wells stimulated with the liquid CO₂/sand process.

B. These poor responses from the wells stimulated with the CO₂/sand process are unquestionably related to a number of factors regarding the formation characteristics of permeability, and pressure, but to a larger extent to the reduced proppant volumes placed by the liquid-free treatments.

C. The placed proppant volumes with the CO₂/sand process were much lower than the design volumes:

The proppant volumes placed were much less than the design and ranged from 4,800 to 13,000 pounds and averaged 8,433 lbs or approximately three percent (3%) of that placed in conventional treatments.

The actual volumes placed in zone were:

	Pumped	Removed from well	Net in zone
Well	(K lbs)	(K lbs)	(K lbs)
Florance GCL-1	9,800	2,300	7,500
Florance Q-1	6,200	1,400	4,800
Riddle I-1	15,200	2,200	13,000

D. The ability to place the design quantities was obviously limited by

1. Number of perforations

Amoco's practices included utilizing a large number of perforations which in the three Candidate Wells ranged from 200 to 316 over intervals of 120 to 180 feet.. This large number significantly reduced the transport velocity.

Typically 30 perforations are used with the CO₂/sand treatments.

Because of the low viscosity of the CO₂ of approximately 0.1 centipoise (cp), as compared to the N₂ foam with a viscosity of 300 to 500 cp combined with the

drastically reduced transport velocity rendered impossible the ability to transport proppant with the CO₂.

2. High leak off rates into the formation.

High leak off rates were known to exist because of the very rapid reduction in wellhead pressure at the termination of the pumping operation. This pressure reduction from 1,200 to 1,600 to 400 psi within a few seconds is greater than the friction pressure and reveals this high leak off rate characteristic of the coal.

- E. The benefit of the 20 barrel, 0.5 ppg "slug" of sand in the middle of the pad is significant.

A "pillar" type frac where the sand laden volumes are interspersed with clean CO₂ volumes to provide additional pad volumes for previously uninitiated fractures should be considered.

- F. The sand concentration throughout the majority of the treatment should be maintained at 1.0 ppg or less, excepting possibly at the end of the treatment.

- G. Consideration should be given to pumping treatments with larger CO₂ volumes at reduced sand concentrations. Because the CO₂ is non-damaging, there would be no fluid retention penalty with the larger volume

- H. There was communication between the three Candidate Wells and nearby wells completed in different formations. There was communication between the Candidate Wells which were completed in the Fruitland Coals with nearby (50 feet) wells which were completed in the underlying Pictured Cliff sandstone. There were increases in production and casing pressure recorded in the pumping of the treatments in all three of the Candidate Wells.

- I. The costs for the CO₂/sand stimulations (3 wells - 3 stages) was \$147,509 or \$49,170 per stage.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (San Juan County, New Mexico) – January 1996 – Single Stage Treatments - Amoco
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

J. The treatments are summarized:

Well	Sand (lbs)		Max Tr Press	Avg Rate	Sand Conc (lb/gal)	
	Pumped	In-Zone	Psi	BPM	Max	Avg
Florance GCL-1	9,800	7,500	3,576	55.8	2.5	1.6
Florance Q-1	6,200	4,800	4,100	55.8	1.9	1.5
Riddle I-1	15,200	13,000	4,702	50.0	1.9	0.8

This concludes the project effort for the demonstrations of the liquid CO₂/sand stimulations in 3 wells (3 stages) which were operated by Amoco (now BP) and completed in the Fruitland Coal in the San Juan Basin. The Three Candidate Wells are situated in San Juan Co, New Mexico in the Type III area. The conclusions indicate that, because of the inability to place adequate proppant volumes, the results are economically unattractive, and that there is little likelihood of practically placing increased proppant volumes.

FIELD TESTING & OPTIMIZATION OF CO₂/SAND FRACTURING TECHNOLOGY
Group #5 -- Phillips Co, Montana -- July 1998 -- Single Stage Treatments -- WBI

Final Report

By
RAYMOND L. MAZZA

Period of Performance
October 1, 1994 - November 30, 2004

Worked Performed Under Contract No.: DE-AC21-94MC31199
"Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

For:
U. S. Department of Energy
National Energy Technology Laboratory
Morgantown, West Virginia

By
Petroleum Consulting Services
Canton, Ohio

Table of Contents

	DISCLAIMER	1
I.	ABSTRACT.....	2
II.	INTRODUCTION.....	2
III.	BACKGROUND.....	4
IV.	GEOLOGY	7
	A. Stratigraphy.....	9
V.	RESERVOIR	10
	A. Reservoir Pressure and Temperature.....	10
	B. Gas Properties	13
	C. Sensitivity to Stimulation Liquids.....	13
	D. Estimated Ultimate Gas Recovery (EUR) & Production - Months 2-13	13
VI.	IS THE PROPOSED RESERVOIR LIKELY TO BENEFIT FROM THE CO ₂ /SAND TECHNOLOGY?.....	14
VII.	OPERATOR	14
VIII.	TEST AREA	14
	A. Candidate Well Selection.....	17
	B. Control Wells	22
	1. Production Review and Projections	22
	2. Treatment Volume.....	23
	3. Cost	23
	C. CO ₂ /Sand Stimulation Treatments.....	23
	1. Design	23
	a. Proppant Size.....	23
	b. Treatment Volume	24
	D. Treatment Volume Comparison - Conventional vs CO ₂ /Sand	25
IX.	STIMULATION CHECK LIST.....	26
X.	PERFORATION STRATEGY	28
XI.	CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS	31
XII.	PRE-TEST CONCLUSIONS.....	32
XIII.	LETTER OF INTENT	34
XIV.	DOE APPROVALS.....	40

Table of Contents

XV.	FIELD ACTIVITIES.....	44
A.	Preparations	44
B.	Wellhead Isolation Tool.....	44
C.	Stimulations	44
1.	Stimulation #1 - Well 1021	48
2.	Stimulation #2 - Well 1020	51
3.	Stimulation #3 - Well 1019	54
D.	Post Stimulation	57
1.	Flow Back Procedures.....	57
2.	CO ₂ Concentrations	57
3.	Cleaning Frac Sand from the Well Bore.....	58
4.	Pressure Measurement and Drawdown Testing	59
E.	Tubing Installation	60
XVI.	COSTS	64
A.	Wellhead Isolation Tool.....	64
B.	Pumping Services.....	64
1.	Projected.....	64
2.	Actual.....	65
3.	Projected vs Actual	65
XVII.	RESULTS.....	66
A.	Production Comparisons.....	66
Group #1- Pre July 1998 (Control Wells).....		66
Group #2 - July 1998 (Control Wells).....		67
Group #3- July 1998 (Candidate Wells).....		71
B.	Production Comparisons-Projected vs Actual	77
C.	Production Comparisons Beyond 13 Months.....	78
XVIII.	PROPPANT SIZE	78
XIX.	CONCLUSIONS.....	83
XX.	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	86

DISCLAIMER

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

ABSTRACT

Three candidate wells located in Phillips County, Montana were stimulated under the subject contract with the CO₂/sand stimulation process in July 1998. The wells are situated in the Bowdoin Dome and produce from the Upper Cretaceous Phillips sand at a depth of approximately 1,100 feet. The wells are operated by WBI and are typically stimulated with Nitrogen (N₂) foam containing 40,000 lbs of 12/20 proppant, and have Estimated Ultimate Recoverable reserves (EUR's) ranging from 175 to 400 MMcf, and produce no water or other liquids. There is a period of reduced production rate immediately following the stimulation which was believed to be a result of the retention of the spent stimulation liquids thereby supporting the potential benefit of the liquid-free CO₂/sand. Additionally, the maximum size of the CO₂/sand treatments is the same as that conventionally used, 40,000 lbs, which would complement the comparison of the liquid-free treatments with those conventionally used.

There were eight nearby control wells which were used to compare the production results from the candidate wells. The treatments were successfully executed and utilized 20/40 proppant in a cost-shared demonstration with WBI. The production results were disappointing in that they were essentially the same as those from conventional stimulations. There is a suspicion that the use of the smaller 20/40 proppant may serve as an impediment as it has been demonstrated that the conventional N₂ foam stimulations result in greater production rates when the larger 12/20 proppant is used then when 20/40 is employed. The basis for this concern is contained within.

The cost of the conventional stimulations is \$18,500 and the cost of the CO₂/sand stimulations averaged \$53,957 which would require an increase in production rate of 2.9 times.

I. ABSTRACT

Three candidate wells located in Phillips County, Montana were stimulated under the subject contract with the CO₂/sand stimulation process in July 1998. The wells are situated in the Bowdoin Dome and produce from the Upper Cretaceous Phillips sand at a depth of approximately 1,100 feet. The wells are operated by WBI and are typically stimulated with Nitrogen (N₂) foam containing 40,000 lbs of 12/20 proppant, and have Estimated Ultimate Recoverable reserves (EUR's) ranging from 175 to 400 MMcf, and produce no water or other liquids. There is a period of reduced production rate immediately following the stimulation which was believed to be a result of the retention of the spent stimulation liquids thereby supporting the potential benefit of the liquid-free CO₂/sand. Additionally, the maximum size of the CO₂/sand treatments is the same as that conventionally used, 40,000 lbs, which would complement the comparison of the liquid-free treatments with those conventionally used.

There were eight nearby control wells which were used to compare the production results from the candidate wells. The treatments were successfully executed and utilized 20/40 proppant in a cost-shared demonstration with WBI. The production results were disappointing in that they were essentially the same as those from conventional stimulations. There is a suspicion that the use of the smaller 20/40 proppant may serve as an impediment as it has been demonstrated that the conventional N₂ foam stimulations result in greater production rates when the larger 12/20 proppant is used then when 20/40 is employed. The basis for this concern is contained within.

The cost of the conventional stimulations is \$18,500 and the cost of the CO₂/sand stimulations averaged \$53,957 which would require an increase in production rate of 2.9 times.

II. INTRODUCTION

The fourth group of wells to be treated are situated within the Williston Basin on the Bowdoin Dome, a basement driven pop up event in north-central Montana. Three candidate wells in Phillips County near the town of Saco were selected on the basis production projections from

conventionally stimulated offset control wells and, then they were hydraulically fractured with CO₂/sand in July, 1998 . Approximately 40,000 pounds of 20/40 sand proppant, the maximum quantity was placed in two and 38,600 lbs in the third.

The wells in the test area produce from the Phillips Sandstone, a low-pressure, nearly dry-gas formation which produces an immeasurable quantity of water primarily as a vapor. There is no water present in the surface facilities. They generally have estimated ultimate recoverable reserves (EUR's) ranging from 175 to 400 MMcf and are typically stimulated with nitrogen (N₂) Foam and 40,000 lbs of sand proppant.

On the basis of the time required to reach maximum production rates following the foam stimulations, although not unreasonable, the Phillips was suspected to be damaged by the stimulation liquids. Because of this lengthened clean up behavior and the suspicion that the spent stimulation liquids were the root cause of the suspected damage, it was agreed that the utilization of the liquid-free CO₂/sand stimulation could potentially provide a significant benefit and that production rate increases could possibly result.

The CO₂/sand stimulations utilize approximately the same proppant volume and because no spent stimulation liquids remain were considered to be undamaged by the retained fracturing liquids. It was anticipated that because of the similar proppant quantity of the two treatment types that the length of the induced fracture should be approximately the same. The hydraulic fractures generated with the CO₂/sand process were expected to be more productive primarily because of the similar lengths and the reduced impediment to gas flow.

The results have been disappointing in that the twenty-four month cumulative gas production from the three candidate wells stimulated with CO₂/sand have not out performed the seven control wells which were stimulated with N₂ Foam nor have they been any worse. The cumulative productions are essentially identical.

Based on observations of the production behaviors, a potential explanation of this unexpected response is suspected to be a consequence of the smaller size proppant used in the CO₂/sand stimulations. The three candidate wells utilized 20/40 mesh and the control wells employed larger 12/20 size proppant. Of interest is the observation that the cumulative production from the wells with the larger proppant have, as is generally the case, significant variations while that from the wells with the smaller size proppant do not. Their performance is essentially identical and without variation. This is a unique and unexpected response and there exists a reasonable anticipation that the gas production rates from the wells which are stimulated with the liquid-free CO₂/sand process would be improved if a larger proppant size were utilized. This recommendation is not without risk. It should be recognized that while there was no difficulty encountered in placing the smaller and conventionally used proppant size with the less viscous CO₂, it may be found to be difficult with the larger proppant. Conversations with experienced operations personnel very familiar with this technology have indicated that larger 12/20 proppant, has been successfully placed in the same formations in southern Alberta. Therefore, this potential for stimulating wells in the Bowdoin Field with CO₂ and the larger size proppant exists

III. BACKGROUND

Fidelity Exploration & Production Co (formerly Williston Basin Interstate Pipeline Company (WBI) - subsidiaries of MDU Resources) is the operator of a large number of wells in the Bowdoin Dome in Phillips County, Montana. These wells produce from the Phillips Sandstone, a shallow (1,200 ft), lower pressure (300 psi) Upper Cretaceous formation that was suspected of being damaged by conventional N₂ Foam stimulation procedures. WBI was both interested in determining if a production improvement would result from the CO₂/sand stimulation process, and in participating with the DOE in a cost-shared demonstration and evaluation of this technology.

The production response characteristics of this formation and offering were considered to be a viable opportunity to evaluate the benefits of the CO₂/sand stimulation technology, primarily because of the absence of produced liquids of significance from the Phillips Sandstone and, also

because the conventional treatments as well as the CO₂/sand process utilize the same quantity proppant, 40,000 pounds.

It had been estimated that 81% of the spent stimulation liquids remain in the Phillips and that these liquids could be damaging the reservoir and reducing the gas producing potential.

The Bowdoin Dome is within the Williston Basin and is centered in Phillips County, Montana, approximately 50 miles west of the Ft. Peck Indian Reservation (Map 1). It has been producing natural gas in commercial quantities since the 1920's from several Upper Cretaceous age formations, the Lower Phillips Sandstone being the deepest. It along with the Upper Phillips are the producing formations in the three candidate wells which are the focus of this demonstration.

Map 1

It should be pointed out that in this demonstration, that for the first time, only the Upper Phillips Sandstone was perforated in all of the wells drilled in 1998, 99, and 2000 programs. This decision was based on the results of a tracer survey study which indicated a benefit to this strategy. A discussion of the evaluation and conclusions follows in the PERFORATION STRATEGY section (9).

IV. GEOLOGY

The Phillips Sandstone is within the Greenhorn sequence of the Colorado group and can be considered as a traditional sand reservoir, there are two members, both an Upper and a Lower Phillips Sandstone. The shallower Bowdoin Sandstone (Carlile sequence) can contain as many as three benches and is also productive. It is overlain by the Martin Sandstone, which is a zone contained within the Niobrara sequence (Figure 1). The Niobrara is rich in organic materials and is self-sourcing. It can be analogized to "a big pile of mud with silt and sand stringers" and is a likely source of the gas contained in the Bowdoin and Phillips sands.

Figure 1

SERIES	STAGE	SOUTHEAST ALBERTA	WEST AND SOUTHWEST SASKATCHEWAN	NORTH-CENTRAL AND EAST MONTANA, SOUTH-WEST NORTH DAKOTA
UPPER CRETACEOUS	65m.y. 65m.y.	WILLOW CREEK	FRENCHMAN	HELL CREEK
	MAESTRICHTIAN	ST. MARY RIVER	BATTLE	FOX HILLS
	70m.y. 70m.y.	MOON RIVER Sandstone	WHITEMUD	
		BEARPAW	EASTEND	BEARPAW
	CAMPANIAN	OLDMAN	BEARPAW	JUDITH RIVER
		FOREMOST	BELLY RIVER	FAIRMAN Sandstone
		PACOWEY	LEA PARK	CLAGGETT
	82m.y. 78m.y.	DEADHORSE		
		WILK	MILE RIVER	CAMMON
	SANTONIAN	ALBERTA		TOLEDOAN
	86m.y. 82m.y.	FIRST WHITE-SPECKLED SHALE	FIRST WHITE-SPECKLED SHALE	WABIA
		MEDICINE HAT	MEDICINE HAT	NIOBARA
LOWER CRETACEOUS	CONIACIAN	UNASSIGNED non-CRETACEOUS SHALE	UNASSIGNED non-CRETACEOUS SHALE	
	87m.y. 86m.y.	TURONIAN		CARLILE
	90m.y. 87m.y.	SECOND WHITE-SPECKLED SHALE	SECOND WHITE-SPECKLED SHALE	GREENHORN
		CENOMANIAN		BELLE FOURCHE
	94m.y. 100m.y.	ALBIAN		MOWAT

A. Stratigraphy

The Phillips has a repeating coarsening upward sequence and is readily identifiable on electric logs (Figure 2). At least two of the cycles are present and productive. The cleaner portion of the cycle is shown to consist of very fine quartzose sandstone with laminae of clay. The upper cycle generally has the larger porosity of the two.

Figure 2

V. RESERVOIR

The Phillips Sands constitute a volumetric drive reservoir with minimal water production. The in-place gas reserves range from 30 to 60 Mcf per acre foot which results in calculated producible reserves within the test area ranging between 175 and 400 MMcf per well. The annual decline rates range from 15 to 20 percent following a two to three month period of higher rate "flush production". Typical water production rates are as much as, but generally less than one barrel per month. The water is discharged into and quickly evaporates from an earthen pit. The majority of the pits show little if any indication of ever containing produced water.

Within the test area the Phillips Sandstone lies at depths ranging from 1100 to 1200 feet. The thickness varies from 80 to 105 feet, the porosities range from 18 to 21 percent and the permeability ranges from 0.5 to 5.0 md. Copies of the electric logs are attached.

The formation water salinity can range from 100 to 10,000 mg/l. Within WBI's operations the salinities range from 800 to 8,000 mg/l. And, it is not uncommon for offset wells to have largely different salinities, these differences do not appear to be related to the gas production. Perhaps the evaporation of the minimal water production prior to obtaining the water samples may be an explanation for the large variations in the measured salinity.

A. Reservoir Pressure and Temperature

Generally the reservoir pressure and temperature are 300 psi and 70° F and the pipeline pressure is approximately 100 psi.

Within the test area the reservoir pressure, as measured by shut-in wellhead pressures ranges from 287 to 396 psi (Figure 3).

Final Report - Group #5 - Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) - July 1998 - Single Stage Treatments - WBI
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 3

PETROLEUM CONSULTING SERVICES
P O BOX 35833
CANTON, OHIO 44735-5833
(330) 499-3823

RESERVOIR INFORMATION

OPERATOR: WILLISTON BASIN INTERSTATE PIPELINE 05/11/98
FIELD: BOWDOIN DOME TARGET: PHILLIPS SAND CO/ST: PHILLIPS/MT

ABANDONMENT PRESSURE (PSIG): 100

WELL	COMP	ELEV SURF	ELEV KB	TOTAL DEPTH	DEPTH TOP	ELEV SUB	DEPTH BOT	THICK	POR	RESVR IN PL	RCVBL	EUR	DRNGE	MAX	GOTHFML
		(GLM)	(KBM)	(KBM)	(KBM)	(FT)	(KBM)	(FT)	(PCT)	PRESS	RESR	RSRVS	ESTMT	TEMP	GRAD
					PHILPS	SEA	PHILPS			(PSIG)	(A)	(A)	(MMCF (ACRES)	(F)	(D/100FT)
972	Sep-94	2308	2313	1280	1018	1294	1086	67	18.6%	396	15	11	200	97	2.9
973	Sep-94	2341	2346	1280	1022	1324	1110	88	20.0%	308	17	12	350	74	1.1
974	Sep-94	2353	2358	1267	1046	1312	1126	80	20.4%	293	15	10	300	73	1.0
976	Sep-94	2212	2217	1204	900	1317	988	88	20.4%	287	16	11	250	72	1.0
980	Sep-95	2271	2277	1225	946	1331	1036	90	21.3%	??	??	??	300	82	1.8
991	Sep-95	2274	2280	1225	955	1325	1050	95	21.0%	??	??	??	275	83	1.9
987	Jul-96	2382	2389	1250	1076	1313	1181	105	20.4%	333	22	16	175	72	1.0
1000	Sep-95	2258	2264	1250	928	1336	1018	90	20.1%	??	??	??	??	86	2.1
1002	Sep-95	2306	2312	1250	1008	1304	1092	84	20.1%	??	??	??	??	84	1.9

Final Report - Group #5 – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) – July 1998 – Single Stage Treatments – WBI
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

The CO₂ will readily vaporize under these conditions, approximately 25.6MM BTUs per 100 tons of liquid CO₂ are required (Figure 4).

Figure 4

B. Gas Properties

The gas composition is 93% methane, 6% nitrogen, and 1% other gases, which results in a biogenic gas with a calorific value of 950 BTU per cubic foot.

C. Sensitivity to Stimulation Liquids

The control wells were stimulated with 65 quality nitrogen Foam. Because of the liquid sensitive nature, lower pressure of these formations, and the reduced volume of the stimulation load water returned, which has been estimated to be 81%, it was suspected that the advantages of a liquid-free stimulation could result in an economic benefit.

D. Estimated Ultimate Gas Recovery (EUR) & Production - Months 2-13

The oldest control wells had, at the time of the test preparation, been producing for three years and were projected to have EURs ranging from 175 to 350 MMCF.

It was later observed that both the control and candidate wells stimulated in 1998 would all have lower production rates and consequently reduced EUR's than those of wells which had been drilled prior to 98.

It was also agreed that the success criteria would be to compare the cumulative gas production volumes for producing months two through thirteen. Within the test area the gas productions for months two through thirteen from the eight well control group the ranged between 24.2 and 71.1 MMcf, averaging 57.3 MMcf. However, it was subsequently determined that the production from the wells conventionally stimulated with N₂ foam at the time of the test in 1998 also had significantly lower production rates. The production for months two through thirteen from the seven new wells stimulated with N₂ foam in July 1998 ranged from 16.6 to 54.7 MMcf, averaging 33.1 MMcf. Had this been known at the time, the criteria for success would have been reduced.

VI. IS THE PROPOSED RESERVOIR LIKELY TO BENEFIT FROM THE CO₂/SAND TECHNOLOGY?

Because the CO₂/sand stimulation utilizes CO₂ as the working fluid which is pumped as a liquid and subsequently vaporizes at formation temperature and flows from the reservoir as a gas, no liquid remains behind and the gas can flow from the reservoir unimpeded.

Because of the absence of produced liquids from the Phillips Sandstone in this area, where it had been estimated that 19% of the spent stimulation liquids remain in this “slow to clean up” reservoir and also because of the similarity of the proppant volumes, 40,000 pounds for both the N₂ Foam and the CO₂/sand stimulation types that the reservoir would benefit from the CO₂/sand stimulation.

VII. OPERATOR

WBI indicated an interest in the process and was fully supportive with the demonstration of the liquid-free stimulation technology. They provided and ensured an excellent test opportunity and were, and are, in a position to derive a significant economic benefit from a successful result. They continue to have an active drilling program and could employ any beneficial results in their upcoming activities.

They requested DOE cost-shared support and agreed to share the production data from both the control and candidate wells for five years.

VIII. TEST AREA

The test area is located in the northern most segments of WBI's Bowdoin Dome drilling boundaries and is approximately rectangular with dimensions of 2-1/2 by 3 miles. It is nine miles northwest of the town of Saco and three miles north of the Nelson reservoir. It includes seven sections within townships 32N and 33N and Range 32E (Map 2).

Final Report - Group #5 - Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) - July 1998 - Single Stage Treatments - WBI
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Map 2

Final Report - Group #5 - Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) - July 1998 - Single Stage Treatments - WBI
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

It includes the three candidate wells, #'s 1019, 1020, and 1021, and at the time of the test, sixteen control wells consisting of nine existing wells and seven new wells all of which were stimulated with nitrogen Foam (Map 3).

Map 3

A. Candidate Well Selection

The candidate wells were selected on the basis of their representative nature and position within the field, distance from an established reservoir boundary, and their proximity to conventionally stimulated control wells.

They were selected to provide a reasonable distance from an established dry hole area to the north and, also such that they would be surrounded by representative, commercially viable control wells.

The candidate wells are located 1 to 1-1/2 miles south of the dry hole area, and are positioned such that there are a number of representative wells between the test area and this northern field terminus. This area of uneconomic reserves north of the test area was previously identified and established as a field boundary. The wells drilled north of this boundary (604, 607, 608, and 695) were abandoned as non-commercial. They confirmed the presence northern edge of an up- thrown block and of the presence of a tear fault having approximately 25 feet of vertical displacement (Map 2).

The Phillips in the northernmost group of active wells, 972 has the lowest sub-sea elevation (1924 ft), the thinnest section (67 ft), and a reduced EUR (200 MMcf) and was considered to be indicative of the reduced potential near this northern field boundary.

The initial proposal, Package #5, included three candidate wells, 1015, 1017, and 1019. Contour maps were then constructed from the control well data: the projected sand thickness, porosity, average daily production, and the cumulative production for months two through thirteen (Maps 4-7).

Map 5

Map 6

Map 7

After reviewing these contour maps, two of the wells, 1015 and 1017 were rejected as being influenced by the thinning of the sand, reduced cumulative production, and porosity reduction, presumably resulting from the influence of the tear fault. They were replaced by wells 1020, and 1021. The result being that wells 1019, 1020, and 1021 were chosen as the candidate wells. A revised submittal package, #5A was prepared and submitted to the DOE for consideration.

The projected values for both the rejected and candidate wells were:

Well #:	1015	1017	1019	1020	1021	1022
Status	Rej	Rej	Cand	Cand	Cand	Extra
Sand Thickness (Ft)	88	73	82	90	100	100
Porosity (%)	20.1	19.5	20.7	21.0	19.5	19.5
Avg Daily Prod (Mcf/d)	100	75	100	110	125	90
Cum Prod Mo 2-13 (MMcf)	32	42	54	45	54	45

B. Control Wells

1. Production Review and Projections

The production projections were based on the observations made from the produced volumes from the nearby control wells which were all perforated in both the Upper and Lower Phillips Sand members-Cumulative for Months 2 through 13:

Control Wells (N ₂ Foam)								
Existing Wells (Stimulated Prior to 07/98)								
Well #	Twp	Rge	Sec	Quad	API #	Cum Prod (MMcf)		
					25-071-	Month 2	Month 13	Month 2-13
972	33N	32E	27	NW	22267	1.046	25.433	24.387
973	33N	32E	32	SE	22268	1.187	80.759	79.572
974	33N	32E	33	NE	22269	0.874	55.875	55.001
976	33N	32E	35	NW	22272	0.441	56.654	56.213
990	32N	32E	02	NW	22275	12.699	83.790	71.091
991	32N	32E	01	NE	22279	9.158	63.894	54.736
997	33N	32E	32	NE	22287	?????	32.568	32.568
1000	32N	32E	02	SE	22283	10.880	71.401	60.521
1002	33N	32E	33	SE	22288	9.671	66.678	57.007
							Avg (n=8)	57.316

2. Treatment Volume

The typical nitrogen Foam treatment includes 40,000 pounds of 12/20 sand as the proppant.

3. Cost

The cost of typical nitrogen Foam stimulation in July 1998, at the time of the test was \$18,500 including nitrogen. The cost was reported earlier as \$25,000 which included \$5,000 for nitrogen and was initially used to project the required ratio for an economic success.

C. CO₂/Sand Stimulation Treatments

1. Design

a. Proppant Size

The proppant size utilized with the CO₂/sand stimulations was 20/40 which is conventionally used with the lower viscosity of the liquid CO₂. Consideration was given to utilizing 20/40 for the first treatment and if the sand placement progressed smoothly, which it did to then utilize the larger 12/20 proppant for the remaining treatment(s).

There was no difficulty encountered in placing the smaller proppant in the first treatment and, as planned, efforts were made to obtain 12/20 proppant which was being stored nearby and at the time being utilized by another service company in the execution of the N₂ Foam stimulations on other WBI wells. Unfortunately, although the proppant was available and dedicated to WBI, the other service company, Halliburton Energy Services would not make it available presumably because the CO₂/sand stimulations were being performed by a competing service company, Canadian Fracmaster.

b. Treatment Volume

The conventional stimulations utilize approximately the same proppant volume as that for a CO₂/sand treatment although of a larger size (12/20 vs 20/40). The similarities of the proppant volumes resulted in a like comparison of the production resulting from the two stimulation types.

It should be noted that upon review and comparison of the production histories that there is a question as to whether the production rates from the CO₂/sand stimulations would have been greater and especially more variable if the larger proppant had been used.

Because the production responses from the three CO₂/sand stimulations lack any variability and are essentially identical, it is suspected that the production is limited by the proppant pack conductivity which is suspicioned to be reduced by the embedment of the smaller diameter proppant into the Phillips Sandstone.

Various stimulation designs were prepared by Canadian Fracmaster and presented to WBI. The result being that the design which included the largest proppant volume was selected.

The proposed design included 44,100 pounds of 20/40 sand proppant and 542 barrels (104 tons) of liquid CO₂ pumped at 38 barrels per minute. A maximum sand concentration of 5 pounds per gallon and a wellhead pressure of 977 psi was projected.

The recommended stimulation design was:

PROPPANT FLUID SCHEDULE					
	Cum (bbl)	Stage (bbl)	Proppant (ppg)	Proppant (lb)	Cum (lb)
Stage					
Hole Fill (Liquid CO ₂)	25.0	25.0			
Pad (Liquid CO ₂)	190.0	165.0			
Start (20/40 Sand)	220.0	30.0	0.8	1,000	1,000
Increase (20/40 Sand)	260.0	40.0	1.7	2,850	3,850
Increase (20/40 Sand)	410.0	150.0	2.5	15,750	19,600
Increase (20/40 Sand)	587.0	177.0	3.3	24,500	44,100
Flush (Liquid CO ₂)	606.0	19.0			

TREATMENT FLUID REQUIREMENTS						
	Hole	Pad	Prop	Flush	Bottoms	Total
Liquid CO ₂ (bbl)	25.0	165.0	397.0	19.0	189.0	795.0
Nitrogen (SCF)						199,148

D. Treatment Volume Comparison - Conventional vs CO₂/Sand

The treatments typically consist of 18,500 gallons of 65 quality nitrogen Foam which requires approximately 6,500 gallons of water and chemicals. The nitrogen component is pressure dependent and is approximately 75 Mcf. The breakdown pressure is generally 1000 psi and the treatments are generally pumped at 30 barrels per minute at a wellhead pressure of 750 psi. The sand concentration is progressively increased to 12 pounds per gallon at the end of the treatment to completely pack the fractures near the well bore. This procedure has been introduced by Halliburton Energy Services as an outgrowth of a study and has resulted in improved production rates.

IX. STIMULATION CHECK LIST

A stimulation check list was developed early in the selection and test design process to capture the reservoir, production, stimulation, etc. specifics (Figure 5).

Figure 5 (p. 1 of 2)

PETROLEUM CONSULTING SERVICES (330) 499-3823 (330) 499-2280 (fax)	
CO ₂ /SAND STIMULATION CHECKLIST p. 1 of 2	
Date 05/13/98	
Formation: <u>Phillips Sand</u>	Operator: <u>Williston Basin Intrst Ppln Co.</u>
Geologic Era: <u>Upper Cret</u>	<u>P. O. Box 131</u>
County: <u>Phillips</u>	<u>Glendive, MT 59330</u>
State: <u>Montana</u>	
Field: <u>Bowdoin Dome</u>	POC: <u>Dennis Zander (406) 359-7200</u>
Basin: <u>Williston</u>	<u>Fax (406) 359-7273</u>

1. Reservoir	
a. Depth (ft):	<u>1100</u>
b. Thickness (ft):	<u>100</u>
c. Porosity (%):	<u>18-21</u>
d. Permeability (md):	<u>0.5-5.0</u>
e. Pressure (psig):	<u>300</u>
f. Temp (deg F):	<u>70</u>
g. Well Spacing (A):	<u>160</u>
2. Production	
a. Natural	
i. Gas (MMcf/d):	<u>15</u>
ii. Oil (BO/d):	<u>0</u>
b. Post-Stimulation - Current Technology	
i. Gas (MMcf/d):	<u>210</u>
ii. Oil (BO/d):	<u></u>
3. Completion:	
4. Frac Length Required (ft):	<u>150 (model)</u>
5. Frac Gradient (psi/ft):	<u>0.68</u>
6. Frac Type (Gel Wtr, Foam, etc) - Present Technology	<u>N2 Foam</u>
a. Breakdown Acid:	<u>None</u>
b. Foam Quality:	<u>65</u>
c. Breakdown Pressure (psi):	<u>1000</u>
d. Liquid Volume (bbls):	<u>155</u>
e. Sand Placed (sxs):	<u>400</u>
f. Rate (bpm):	<u>30</u>
g. Sand Conc (ppg):	<u>Ramp to 12</u>
h. Avg Treating Pressure (psi):	<u>750</u>
i. Max Treating Pressure (psi):	<u>2500</u>
j. ISIP (psi):	<u>500</u>
k. Costs (\$M)	
i. Service Company:	<u>19</u>
ii. CO ₂ (\$/ton): BOC Gases from Cheyenne (675 mi)	<u>145>245 w/mob</u>
iii. Tanks w/ Trucking:	<u>0</u>
iv. Service Rig:	<u>0</u>
v. Load Water Disposal:	<u>0</u>
vi. Pit - Earthwork, Liner:	<u>0</u>

Final Report - Group #5 - Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) - July 1998 - Single Stage Treatments - WBI
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 5 (p. 2 of 2)

PETROLEUM CONSULTING SERVICES
 (330) 499-3823
 (330) 499-2280 (fax)

CO₂/SAND STIMULATION CHECKLIST
 p. 2 of 2

Date 05/13/98

Formation: Upper Judith River Operator: Williston Basin Intrst Ppln Co

7. Load Water	
a. Vol Returned (bbls)/%:	<u>30(19%)</u>
b. Time Required (days):	<u>1</u>
c. Vol Retained (bbls):	<u>125</u>
8. Casing - Candidate Wells	
a. Dia (in):	<u>4.5</u>
b. Weight (lb/ft):	<u>10.5</u>
c. Grade:	<u>J-55</u>
d. MWP (psi):	<u>TED</u>
9. Perforations - Candidate Wells	
a. Depth (ft):	<u>1200</u>
b. Number:	<u>120-285</u>
10. Calorific Value (dth/cuft):	<u>955</u>
11. Pipeline Pressure (psi):	<u>100</u>
12. Allowable CO ₂ concentration in Sales Line (%):	<u>2% Tariff</u>
13. Gas Transporter:	<u>WBI</u>
14. Gas Purchaser:	<u>Market</u>
a. Purchase Price (\$/dth):	<u>1.28</u>
15. EUR with Current Tech	
a. Gas (MMcf):	<u>300</u>
b. Oil (MBO):	<u>N/A</u>
16. NPV with Current Tech (\$M):	<u>161</u>
17. Predict Required EUR for Candidate Wells:	<u> </u>
18. Predict Required NPV for Candidate Wells (\$M):	<u> </u>
19. Comments:	
Dirty Sandstone
Drilled w/ fresh water polymer - Cannot air drill because of water
bearing uphole zone
Available to stimulate in July	

05/13/98

X. PERFORATION STRATEGY

The perforating practices employed in this test were changed from those used previously.

Based on the results of tracer surveys, it had been determined, prior to 1998 that the conventional practice of perforating both the Upper and Lower members of the Phillips Sandstone is superfluous and starting in 1998 it was decided to perforate only the Upper member.

The prior strategy had been to perforate both the Upper and Lower Phillips Sand members and then to hydraulically stimulate them both with a single stage treatment. This procedure had been under review for some time and new information became available to support that:

- A. The majority, if not all, of the stimulation treatment enters the Upper Phillips member and very little, if any, enters the Lower Phillips. Also, if these two intervals are individually stimulated there is no apparent production benefit.
- B. Even with a delayed second stage stimulation, the addition of the Lower Phillips does not increase the gas production rate. This subsequent stimulation of the Lower Phillips did not result in any additional gas production benefit.

These conclusions are based upon radioactive tracer studies on four wells, #'s 985, 995, 997, and 999, which indicated that the Lower Phillips member is untreated, and also the ineffectiveness of a delayed stimulation of the Lower Phillips in a non-traced well, #984. The radioactive tracer logs and the production histories were included with the submittal packages and are summarized in the accompanying well specifics

Well #	
985	Both the Upper and Lower Phillips Sandstone were treated in June 1996 with a single stage stimulation which included radioactive tracer materials. <u>A tracer log indicated that the entire treatment entered the Upper Phillips.</u>
995	Both the Upper and Lower Phillips Sandstone were treated with a single stage stimulation which included radioactive tracer materials in June, 96. <u>A tracer log indicated that the entire treatment entered the Upper Phillips.</u> Additionally, following 11 months of production the Upper Phillips was isolated with a packer and the Lower Phillips was stimulated with 41,000 lbs of proppant, which was pumped through tubing. <u>There was no increase in production.</u>
997	Both the Upper and Lower Phillips Sandstone were treated with a single stage stimulation which included radioactive tracer materials in June 1996. <u>A tracer log indicated that the entire treatment entered the Upper Phillips.</u> Additionally, following 11 months of production the Upper Phillips was isolated with a packer and the Lower Phillips was stimulated with 41,300 lbs of proppant, which was pumped through tubing. <u>There was no increase in production.</u>
999	Both the Upper and Lower Phillips Sandstone were treated in June, 96 with a single stage stimulation which included radioactive tracer materials. <u>A tracer log indicated that there was practically no entry into the Lower Phillips Sandstone</u>

C. Conclusions

1. There is no additional production derived from wells perforated in both the Upper and Lower Phillips Sandstone and then stimulated with a single stage treatment.
2. Where both the upper and lower sand members are perforated and then stimulated with a single stage treatment, the fracturing treatment enters only the upper member.

3. If these two intervals are individually stimulated there is no apparent production benefit.

In a single well test which had been stimulated in and which was producing solely from the Upper Phillips, there was no additional gas production contributed from the Lower Phillips following the subsequent stimulation (through tubing) of it.

4. The better perforation strategy is to perforate and stimulate only the Upper Phillips Sandstone.
5. It was determined as an outcome of the tracer study that if the Lower Phillips is treated separately, no production advantage is realized. The present view is that if a stimulation is initiated in the Upper sand that it grows downward into the Lower member, because it cannot penetrate the more competent overlying Greenhorn formation. And, if the Lower Phillips is selectively stimulated, that the fracture grows upward into the Upper Phillips. Therefore, the current thinking is that the maximum production benefit is achieved by perforating and stimulating only the Upper Phillips Sandstone. These findings have been recently confirmed and are the basis for perforating all of the wells drilled in the Bowdoin Dome Field, since 1998.

D. Results

As a result of these findings, all of the 20 wells drilled in 1998 were perforated and stimulated only in the Upper Phillips Sandstone. Additionally, all of the subsequent Bowdoin Dome Field wells have been perforated and treated only in the Upper Phillips Sandstone.

E. Concerns Regarding the Number of Perforations

The large number of perforations in the candidate was a concern in that they may result in reduced proppant transport as a consequence of diminished velocities.

This concern was discussed with Canadian Fracmaster because of their familiarity with other successful treatment procedures in the area. They provided assurances that they have executed numerous treatments in very similar zones in southern Alberta which were treated through a large number of perforations and did not experience any unusual difficulty in placing the design proppant volumes. They did not have any concerns regarding the number of perforations proposed.

The treatments went smoothly and there were no problems encountered in placing proppant and no pressure increases were experienced in the first two treatments as the sand concentrations were increased to a maximum of 5.9 and 4.9 ppg respectively.

The last treatment did screen out as the sand concentration was increased. The sand concentration at the surface was 8.2 ppg and the concentration at the perforations was 5.2 pounds per gallon at the tail end of the treatment. This design was intentional to determine the maximum sand acceptance loading. In reality, without being able to discern it, it appears that the likely maximum sand concentration of approximately 5 ppg was approached during the first treatment.

XI. CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS

Upon review of the production responses from the conventionally stimulated wells drilled prior to July, 98 it was agreed that, based upon the available information, the success criteria would be realized if the cumulative production for months 2 through 13 would be 50 MMcf if they were conventionally stimulated with nitrogen foam and 40,000 pounds of proppant.

By mutual agreement between all parties it was agreed that this should serve as the measure by which the evaluation of the CO₂/sand stimulations would be judged.

	Cum Prod Months 2-13
Well #	(MMcf)
1019	50
1020	50
1021	50

However as noted above, it was subsequently determined - as the production from the project wells became available, that the cumulative gas production for months two through thirteen from all of the wells stimulated in July 1998 - both control and candidates - was lower than these projections. Seven of these new wells, in the test area were conventionally stimulated with N₂ Foam and the two through thirteen month cumulative production from those wells ranged from 16.6 to 54.7 MMcf with an average of 33.1 MMcf, which was much less than the anticipated 50 MMcf.

XII. PRE-TEST CONCLUSIONS

The three candidate wells, 1019, 1020, and 1021 would provide an objective opportunity to demonstrate the CO₂/sand stimulation technology in a controlled experimental environment.

- A. The wells have estimated ultimate recoveries (EURs) ranging from 175 to 350 MMcf,
- B. That the cumulative productions for months two through thirteen represented a realistic assessment,
- C. That because of the conventional practices for the Bowdoin Field wells of employing stimulation treatments with 40,000 lbs of proppant that they did not require lengthy

fracture extensions, and therefore were a good "fit" from a comparative job size viewpoint.

- D. Based on estimates of a 19% retention of spent stimulation liquids and a belief that the clean up period was being lengthened by this liquid that the reservoir was probably suffering from the damage resulting from the retained stimulation liquids,
- E. The projected cumulative production for months 2 through 13 for the candidate wells, if they were conventionally treated with nitrogen Foam was estimated to be 50 MMcf. This served as the basis for comparing the effectiveness of the CO₂/sand technology.

As mentioned above it was subsequently determined that the cumulative gas production volumes from the wells treated in July 1998 were found to be significantly lower than that from the pre-98 wells .

- F. The size of the Control Well data set was increased from 8 to 15 by including new wells: #s 1013, 1014, 1017, 1018, 1020, 1021, & 1022. Some of the originally proposed Candidate Wells were rejected by the DOE and two of the previously identified Control Wells, 1020 & 1021 became Candidate Wells.
- G. The cost of the CO₂/sand stimulations was projected to be 140% greater than that for the current practices: \$59,995 vs \$25,000 (including \$5,000 for N₂)*. This cost differential dictates an un-discounted 1.4 fold increase in the production rate.

*It has been subsequently determined that the cost of a N₂ Foam stimulation including the nitrogen in July 1998, at the time of the demonstration was \$18,500. This would result in a required un-discounted 1.6 fold increase in the production rate - if the actual cost of the CO₂/sand stimulation, excluding mobilization were employed [1-(48,124/18,500)].

- H. The stimulation costs were burdened by an unexpectedly large cost for CO₂. The distance to the CO₂ supply points is significant and results in an unusually large cost.

It was anticipated that if the production responses from the candidate wells substantiated the cost of the CO₂/sand stimulations, then the increased local demand for CO₂ would ultimately result in a cost reduction and further improve the economics of the non-damaging process.

- I. To prevent the possibility of standby charges, \$10,000 per day, four on-site portable storage units were utilized.

- J. WBI controls a significant reservoir position and, if the benefits of CO₂/sand stimulations were economically supported, then they would likely continue these efforts. The 1998 drilling program included 20 new wells.

At the time, there were an additional 65 Bowdoin Dome wells planned which subsequently have been drilled.

- K. The Phillips Sand wells were being completed in a 300 psi reservoir and were reportedly returning only a small portion of the stimulation liquids, they were estimated to be 1,260 gallons or 19 percent. This retained stimulation liquid could be inhibiting the gas production from this thick, low permeability gas reservoir, although there is no obvious difference in the gas production from the wells completed when the reservoir was at a higher pressure.

XIII. LETTER OF INTENT

A letter of intent which identified the candidate wells, specified the criteria for success, and the required responses of all parties was developed and executed. It was then forwarded to the DOE for consideration with the proposal package (Figure 6).

Final Report - Group #5 - Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) - July 1998 - Single Stage Treatments - WBI
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 6 (p. 1 of 5)

PETROLEUM CONSULTING SERVICES

P.O. Box 35833
 Canton, Ohio 44735
 (330) 499-3823

June 14, 1998

Mr. Dennis Zander - Staff Engineer
 c/o Mr. Don Brutlag - Superintendent
 Gas Production and Storage
 Williston Basin Interstate Pipeline Co.
 P. O. Box 131
 Glendive, MT 59330

Via Fax (406) 359-7273

Re: CO₂/Sand Stimulations - DOE Cost-Shared Demonstration - Letter of Intent
 - Liability Release

Dear Don,

I spoke with Dennis on Friday and relayed the latest from Fracmaster. Following a review of CO₂/sand stimulations in the Milk River formation approximately 150 miles northwest of Saco, it appeared that the CO₂ requirements and therefore the stimulation costs could be reduced. Dennis relayed that he will be away for the next two weeks and will be in touch, but that I should forward the Letter of Intent and Liability Release to you for processing - they are attached. Please see that they are executed as quickly as possible and return them to me. My fax number is (330) 499-2280.

Additionally, I've had several conversations with Mr. John Edwards at Fracmaster regarding these modifications since my conversation with Dennis on Friday afternoon, and received a revised cost proposal from him yesterday. Dennis should have received a fax also. Let me know if you need a copy and I'll fax you one. The details are:

PROPPANT FLUID SCHEDULE

Stage	Cum Fluid (bbl)	Stage Fluid (bbl)	Proppant Conc (ppg)	Proppant Stage (lb)	Cum Proppant (lb)
Hole Fill (Liquid CO ₂)	25.0	25.0			
Pad (Liquid CO ₂)	190.0	165.0			
Start (20/40 Sand)	220.0	30.0	0.8	1,000	1,000
Increase (20/40 Sand)	260.0	40.0	1.7	2,850	3,850
Increase (20/40 Sand)	410.0	150.0	2.5	15,750	19,600
Increase (20/40 Sand)	587.0	177.0	3.3	24,500	44,100
Flush (Liquid CO ₂)	758.0	19.0			

TREATMENT FLUID REQUIREMENTS

	Hole	Pad	Prop	Flush	Bottoms	Tot
Liquid CO ₂ (bbl)	25.0	165.0	422.0	19.0	189.0	820.0
Nitrogen (SCF)						19,415.0

Final Report - Group #5 - Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) - July 1998 - Single Stage Treatments - WBI
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 6 (p. 2 of 5)

ltr: Mr. Dennis Zander c/o Mr. Don Brutag; 06/14/98
CO₂/Sand Stimulations - DOE Cost-Shared Demonstration - Letter of Intent -
Liability Release
p. 2 of 2

The resultant costs for stimulating these wells with the CO₂/sand technology are:

Equipment	\$16,053.79
Materials	36,957.65
CO ₂	<u>incl</u>
	53,011.44
Computer Control Center	1,080.00
Report	<u>427.50</u>
	54,518.94
3 wells (x3)	163,556.82
Mobilization	<u>17,500.00</u>
	181,056.82
 Per well (+3)	 60,352.27
 Cost To WBI	 30,176.14
Cost To DOE	<u>30,176.13</u>
	\$60,352.27

Additionally, Fracmaster is projecting a wellhead treating pressure of 1293 psi and therefore the 3000 psi working pressure control valves should be more than sufficient. That is, there is no need to procure 5000 psi hardware.

I have prepared a revised proposal, which was finished this afternoon and will hand deliver it to the DOE at Morgantown in the morning. I have scheduled a meeting to discuss these revisions and feel that the plans to CO₂/sand stimulate the week of July 13th are realistic. A copy of the revised proposal is being forwarded to your offices via overnight delivery.

I'm planning to arrive in Saco on July 8th to observe a few foam fracs and to finalize details with Fracmaster, and will coordinate these plans with Dennis.

I have prepared a prognosis for these treatments per your request and, now that I know the projected wellhead treating pressures, will complete it and get it to you.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Raymond L. Mazza

attachments
Letter of Intent - 3 pp
Liability Release - 1 pp
Package 5A Dialog - 7 pp

Final Report - Group #5 - Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) - July 1998 - Single Stage Treatments - WBI
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 6 (p. 3 of 5)

Letter of Intent
 (p. 1 of 3)

June 15, 1998

Operator: Williston Basin Interstate Pipeline Co (WBI)
 A subsidiary of MDU Resources Group

Candidate Wells: Bowdoin Dome - Phillips Co, Montana

Well #	Twp	Rge	Sec	Quad	API No 25-071-	Status	Treat
1019	33N	32E	34	SE	TBD	New	July 98
1020	32N	32E	01	NW	TBD	New	July 98
1021	32N	32E	12	NW	TBD	New	July 98

Target Formation: Phillips Sands

Production Projections - Cumulative for Months #2 through 13:

Well #	MMcf
1019	50
1020	50
1021	50

Control Wells:

Well #	Twp	Rge	Sec	Quad	API No 25-071-	Status	Treat
972	33N	32E	27	NW	22267	Existing	N/A
973	33N	32E	32	SE	22268	Existing	N/A
974	33N	32E	33	NE	22269	Existing	N/A
976	33N	32E	35	NW	22272	Existing	N/A
990	32N	32E	02	NW	22275	Existing	N/A
991	32N	32E	01	NE	22279	Existing	N/A
997	33N	32E	32	NE	22287	Existing	N/A
1000	32N	32E	02	SE	22283	Existing	N/A
1002	33N	32E	33	SE	22288	Existing	N/A
1013	32N	32E	03	NW	TBD	New	July 98
1014	33N	32E	31	NE	TBD	New	July 98
1015	33N	32E	29	NW	TBD	New	July 98
1016	33N	32E	28	SE	TBD	New	July 98
1017	33N	32E	27	SW	TBD	New	July 98
1018	33N	32E	34	NE	TBD	New	July 98
1022	32N	32E	12	NE	TBD	New	July 98
1023	32N	32E	13	SE	TBD	New	July 98

The liquid CO₂/proppant stimulation process is beneficial in reservoirs that are liquid sensitive. This is because the process utilizes liquid carbon dioxide (CO₂) as a treating fluid to both fracture the reservoir strata and to transport proppant, the liquid CO₂ vaporizes following the stimulation and a completely dry fracturing treatment results.

The U. S. Department of Energy will, subject to their approvals, agree to provide cost-shared funding for the stimulation of these candidate wells with Fracmaster's closed system blender for liquid CO₂/proppant treatments, if certain criteria are met. WBI agrees to bear the remaining expenses.

Figure 6 (p. 4 of 5)

Letter of Intent
p. 2 of 3

June 15, 1998

The project entails demonstrating the liquid CO₂/proppant process in a controlled environment where sufficient background production information from nearby wells can be used to compare the production results with the CO₂/proppant technology.

The design of the stimulation treatments is to consist of approximately 120 tons of liquid carbon dioxide and up to 44,000 pounds of 20/40 sand proppant pumped at injection rates of 50 to 60 barrels per minute, and to consist of a single-stage treatment.

Because the liquid-free CO₂/proppant process provides a completely dry stimulation it is imperative that liquids not be introduced into the wellbore following these treatments. WBI agrees to make every effort to avoid "killing" these wells with water and will only kill a well in the event of an environmental or safety emergency. In the event of the need to introduce water into the well, WBI will immediately notify Petroleum Consulting Services (PCS) prior to the treatment, if possible.

The candidate wells will be turned in line shortly after stimulation and will be operated at wellhead pressures of 120 psi or less. This is to enable a meaningful comparison of the technologies to be made.

WBI agrees to provide monthly production (gas, oil, and water) and pressure data for both the candidate and the control wells for a period of five (5) years. The monthly production information, including any recordings, shall be forwarded to PCS.

Proppant, if any, will be removed from the wellbore at the operator's expense. No liquids will be circulated for the clean-out unless written approval is obtained from the DOE.

The DOE, subject to their approval of the submitted information, which includes:

1. Letter of intent	This document
2. A map of the candidate well and nearby offsetting wells	
3. Electric logs	Control and candidate wells
4. Cumulative production data	Control and candidate wells
5. Monthly pipeline pressure data	Control and candidate wells
6. Stimulation records tabular and strip charts	
	Control and candidate wells
7. Well completion reports	Control and candidate wells
8. Description of the field activity	Candidate Wells
9. Schedule for treating the candidate wells	October 17 th and 18 th
10. Liability Release (PCS)	Attached

Will, through the contractor, Petroleum Consulting Services, pay for one-half (1/2) of the costs of the stimulations, including the service company charges for product (CO₂, proppant), services, and mobilization.

WBI hereby indicates an intention to enter into a 50/50 cost-shared participation of the stimulation expenses for these candidate wells, subject to DOE approvals.

Final Report - Group #5 - Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) - July 1998 - Single Stage Treatments - WBI
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 6 (p. 5 of 5)

Letter of Intent
(p. 3 of 3)

June 15, 1998

WBI agrees to bear the remaining expenses of these treatments and any remaining activities, i.e., those expenses normally associated with these treatments: cement bond log, perforating, dozers, service rigs, etc.

If these conditions are satisfactory, please acknowledge by signing below, and returning this document to:

Petroleum Consulting Services
P. O. Box 35833
Canton, Ohio 44735
(330) 499-3823 (330) 499-2280 (fax)

Date:

6/17/98

Signed:

Larry J. Fenneman
Company Officer

Title: Vice President - Operations

Witness:

Don Burtlag

XIV. DOE APPROVALS

The DOE, upon review of the initial proposal package(#5), and the subsequent response to their interrogatory questions which involved the substitution of two of the initially proposed candidate wells (Two of the wells, 1015 and 1017 were rejected as being influenced by the thinning of the sand, reduced cumulative production, and porosity reduction resulting from the influence of the tear fault), and the re submittal of an amended proposal(#5A) agreed and returned a written approval (Figure 7) of the test and the associated expenditures.

Final Report - Group #5 - Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) - July 1998 - Single Stage Treatments - WBI
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 7 (p. 1 of 3)

PETROLEUM CONSULTING SERVICES

P.O. Box 35833
Canton, Ohio 44735
(330) 499-3823

June 25, 1998

Mr. Dennis Zander - Staff Engineer
Gas Production and Storage
Interstate Pipeline Co.
P. O. Box 131
Glendive, MT 59330

Via FAX: (406) 359-7273

Re: CO₂/Sand Stimulation - DOE Approval of Cost-Shared Project

Dear Mr. Zander,

I have received written approval from the DOE (attached) to proceed with the CO₂/Sand stimulation project for the three candidate wells; 1019, 1020, and 1021. The wells are to be completed in the Upper Phillips only as. The DOE has agreed to pay for one-half of the stimulation costs as described in the Letter of Intent providing that the provisions are satisfied.

The approved cost reimbursements are based upon the following costs:

Location	<u>Saco</u>
County	Phillips
Stage(s)	1
Depth(ft)	1591
Horsepower(HHP)	1806
CO ₂ Supply Point	Medicine Hat, Albta
Requirement(tons)	151
Distance(mi)	310
Delivered Cost(\$/2000lbs)	200
Cost-per stage(\$)	30,200.00
Cost-per well (\$)	30,200.00
Equipment-per well	16,053.79
Proppant-Delivered(\$)	6,757.65
CO ₂	30,200.00
Computer Control Center	1,080.00
Report	<u>427.50</u>
	54,518.94
3 wells (x3)	163,556.82
Mobilization	<u>17,500.00</u>
	\$181,056.82

Final Report - Group #5 - Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) - July 1998 - Single Stage Treatments - WBI
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 7 (p. 2 of 3)

ltr: Mr. Dennis Zander; 06/25/98
CO₂/Sand Stimulation - DOE Approval of Cost-Shared Project
p. 2 of 2

Per well (+3)	60,352.27
Total Cost To WBI	90,528.41
Total Cost To DOE	<u>90,528.41</u>
	\$181,056.82

* Charges per day - based on 2 stages per day

My present plans are to arrive in Billings on Wednesday, July 8th and to meet with you and John Edwards to discuss the operational details and to make plans for stimulating the three candidate wells starting Monday, July 13th. I know that you are scheduled to be in the field executing the foam fracs on the other wells. Please let me know where it would be convenient to meet.

Sincerely,

attachments:
DOE Approval (1 pp)

Raymond E. Mazza
Project Manager

Final Report - Group #5 - Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) - July 1998 - Single Stage Treatments - WBI
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 7 (p. 3 of 3)

**U. S. Department of Energy
Federal Energy Technology Center**

3610 Collins Ferry Road
P.O. Box 880
Morgantown, WV 26507-0880

626 Cochran's Mill Road
P.O. Box 10940
Pittsburgh, PA 15236-0940

June 25, 1998

Mr. Ray Mazza, President
Petroleum Consulting Services
P.O. Box 35833
Canton, OH 44735

Re: Approval of DOE Cost-Shared Participation in Stimulating Three Williston Basin Interstate (WBI) Wells with CO₂/Sand.

Dear Mr. Mazza:

Approval is granted for participation in the Upper Phillips Sand Project in Phillips County, Montana. As stated in the letter of intent, DOE will pay for 50 per cent of the stimulation invoice costs. The three wells approved for CO₂/Sand stimulation are (WBI numbers): 1019, 1020, and 1021.

WBI must provide all the flow down deliverables in the signed letter of intent. Following stimulation, WBI must provide monthly production data as specified in the letter of intent.

DOE is eager to test the potential of this new fracturing process in increasing gas production rates as well possibly increasing overall reserves at this field site. If successful, we would encourage their adoption and use of this process as the method of choice in their future well drilling and stimulation programs in this area.

Sincerely,

Albert B. Yost II
Project Manager/COR

XV. FIELD ACTIVITIES

A. Preparations

Preparations for the field activities included perforating the candidate wells and the placement of two 70 ton CO₂ storage vessels on the location and then filling them with liquid CO₂ during the 24 hour period prior to the treatment.

B. Wellhead Isolation Tool

On the morning of the treatments, a wellhead isolation tool was run to comply with the pressure rating of the wellhead valving etc.

C. Stimulations

A summary of the perforation, stimulation specifics (volumes, rates, pressures), and cost information for all three wells is presented (Figure 8) and the individual job summary logs and rate-pressure-sand concentration plots for each well are also included as noted below.

Final Report - Group #5 - Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) - July 1998 - Single Stage Treatments - WBI
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 8 (p. 1 of 3)

PETROLEUM CONSULTING SERVICES
P.O. BOX 35833
CANTON, OH 44735
(330) 499-3823

STIMULATION SUMMARY - ONE STAGE

DATE: 07/16/98 PAGE 1 OF 3

WELL:	1019	1020	1021
TARGET:	U PHILLIP	U PHILLIPS	U PHILLIPS
SEC/TWP/R	34/33N/32E	01/32N/32E	12/32N/32E
F7L/F7L:	1630S/144E	1600N/1600	1065N/1361E
CO/ST:	PHILLIPS/	PHILLIPS/M	PHILLIPS/MT
PMT #/25-07	22460	22454	22244
OPERATOR	WBI	WBI	WBI
ELEV GL:	2290	2277	2273
TOT DPTH:	1250	1224	1220
COMPLTED	06/09/98	06/07/98	06/06/98
STIMULATE	07/16/98	07/15/98	07/14/98

PERFS:	40	40	40
TOP:	984	975	970
BOT:	994	985	980

INTERVAL:	10	10	10
-----------	----	----	----

ACID(GAL):	0	0	0
CO2(BBLS):	321	447	536
(TONS):	62	86	103
(MMCF):	1.1	1.5	1.8

CLDWN&LOSS			
(TONS):	23	27	36

TOTAL	====	====	====
(TONS):	85	113	140
INV(TONS):	84	113	138

BOT(TONS)	59	30	5
-----------	----	----	---

PAD(BBLS):	16	15	14
SL(BBLS):	305	420	510
FLUSH(BBL):	0	13	13

PMP(BBLS):	321	447	536
------------	-----	-----	-----

SAND(SXS):	430	441	441
IN WELL:	44	7	7

NET(SXS):	386	434	434
-----------	-----	-----	-----

MESH:	20/40	20/40	20/40
-------	-------	-------	-------

N2 (MCF):	101	134	159
RATE(BPM)			

A'	40.9	45.9	45.3
M	42.1	47.2	45.9

PRESS(PSI)			
A'	754	870	943
M	2886	1363	1740

Figure 8 (p. 2 of 3)

07/16/98		PAGE 2 OF 3		
WELL:	1019	1020	1021	
SND CONC(PPG)				
A'	3.4	2.5	2.1	
M	8.2	4.9	5.9	
HORSEPOWER				
A'	756	979	1046	
M	2981	1577	1959	
PRESS AT PERFS:				
@BREAKDOWN(Psi)		1363	1856	
GRAD(Psi/FT):		1.40	1.91	
@AVG P(P)	422	541	650	
@MAX P(P)	N/A	-120	1447	
@ISIP(Psi)	N/A	638	564	
GRAD(Psi/F	N/A	0.65	0.58	
BRK DWN(F	1450	1363	1856	
PRE ISIP(Psi):		972	860	
RATE(BPM):		46	44	
ISIP(Psi):	N/A	174	102	
F(Psi/100FT	N/A	81	78	
1 MIN(Psi):	276	174		
2 MIN(Psi):		160		
2 MIN(Psi):		174		
15 MIN(Psi)	261	218	247	
PRESS:				
OPN FLO:				
TIL:				

Final Report - Group #5 - Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) - July 1998 - Single Stage Treatments - WBI
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 8 (p. 3 of 3)

07/16/98					PAGE 3 OF 3	
WELL:	1019	1020	1021			
0						
PUMPING(\$	17,133	17,133	17,134	51,400		
N2	incl	incl	incl			
N2-MILEAGE	incl	incl	incl			
N2-TRANSP	incl	incl	incl			
N2-PUMPIN	incl	incl	incl			
SAND *	2,932	2,933	2,933	8,797		
SAND-MILE	3,825	3,825	3,825	11,475		
	23,890	23,891	23,891	71,672		
CO2 *	16,800	22,560	27,640	67,000		
CO2-TRANS	5,700			5,700	CO2 RETURNED	
CO2-PORTA	incl	incl	incl			
BLENDER	incl	incl	incl			
LISC FEE						
TUBE TRLR	incl	incl	incl			
CO2-MILEA	incl	incl	incl			
	22,500	22,560	27,640	72,700		
MOBILIZATI	5,833	5,833	5,833	17,500		
TRCKNG						
TREE SAVE	2,181	2,181	2,181	6,543		
MISC						
TOTAL	54,404	54,465	59,546	168,415	168,415	
\$/SK	141	125	137			
SCREENOUT						
@7.5PPG,						
STARTED @6.5PPG						
(5.2PPG @ PERFS)						
44 SXS IN CSG						
FILL UP=300 FT						

1. Stimulation #1 - Well 1021

The first well stimulated with CO₂/sand was well #1021. It was stimulated with 44,100 lbs of 20/40 API specification proppant and 103 tons of liquid CO₂ on July 14th, 1998. The treatment consisted of a total of 536 Barrels of liquid CO₂ pumped at an average rate of 45.3 barrels per minute and an average pressure of 943 psi and a maximum of 1740 psi and was pumped through 40 perforations in the 4-1/2 in casing located between depths of 970 and 980 feet.

The breakdown pressure was 1856 psi and the fracturing gradient was 0.51 psi/ft. The sand proppant was pumped at an average sand concentration of 2.1, and a maximum of 5.9 lbs/gal. At the termination of the pumping activity the instantaneous shut in pressure was 102 psi. The treatment design was to intentionally under flush to provide a proppant packed fracture to the well bore and an estimated quantity of 700 lbs was left in the casing - leaving an in-zone total of 43,400 lbs. The tabulated Frac Treatment Report and plotted information summarizing these activities is presented in Figures 9 and 10.

Figure 9

2. Stimulation #2 - Well 1020

The second well stimulated with CO₂/sand was well #1020. It was stimulated with 44,100 lbs of 20/40 API specification proppant and 86 tons of liquid CO₂ on July 15th, 1998. The treatment consisted of a total of 447 Barrels of liquid CO₂ pumped at an average rate of 45.9 barrels per minute and an average pressure of 870 psi and a maximum of 1363 psi and was pumped through 40 perforations in the 4-1/2 in casing located between depths of 975 and 985 feet.

The breakdown pressure was 1363 psi and the fracturing gradient was 0.42 psi/ft. The sand proppant was pumped at an average sand concentration of 2.5, and at a maximum of 4.9 lbs/gal. At the termination of the pumping activity the instantaneous shut in pressure was 174 psi. The under flush proppant quantity was 700 lbs resulting in an in-zone total of 43,400 lbs. The tabulated Frac Treatment Report and plotted information summarizing these activities is presented in Figures 11 and 12.

Figure 11

Final Report - Group #5 - Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) - July 1998 - Single Stage Treatments - WBI
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 12

FRAC TREATMENT REPORT

OWNER: Williston Basin Interstate		SERVICE ORDER NO: 99944		DATE: 7/14/95	
ADDRESS: P.O. Box 131		JOB TYPE: 20.0 Tonne Liquid CO ₂ Frac			
CITY: Glendive, MT		WELL NAME AND NO.: WBI Federal			
59330-0131		LOCATION: 1020			
		FLUID TYPE: Liquid CO ₂		PROGRAM NO: WFM025	
	O.D.	WT.	Depth	Vol.	Max.
Tubing					
Casing	4.5	10.50	875.0	15.78	4378.9
Total				15.78	
Packer Depth	N/A	ft	PBD	1146.0	ft
Formation Treated: Eagle/Phillips					
PERFORATIONS	From	To	Zone Treated	SPF	
INTERVALS	975.0	985.0	x	4	
FLUSH FLUID DENSITY				9.02	lb/gal
ESTIMATED SAND TOP:				950.0	feet
FRACTURE GRADIENT:				0.42	psi/ft
BREAKDOWN PRESSURE:				1363.3	psi
Instantaneous Shut In Pressure:				174.0	psi
ONE Minute Shut In Pressure:				174.0	psi
15 Minute Shut In Pressure:				217.5	psi
		MIN.	MAX.	AVE.	UNITS
PRESSURE		754.2	1363.3	870.2	psi
RATE		25.2	47.2	45.8	bbbl/min
HORSEPOWER		465	1577	878	hp
AVAILABLE hp			5830	3	Units
		PROPPANT DATA			
		PROPPANT	PUMPED	MESH	CONC.
		AGENTS	lbs		START
		Sand	44,090	20/40	0
					END
					IN FORM.
					CONC. @
					PERFS
					TOTAL PROP (lb)
					USED
					FORM.
					44090
					43429
TIME	PRESS. Psi	STAGE VOLUMES bbl			RATE bbl/min
	Casing	Cum Fluid	Fluid	Slurry	Downhole
					Downhole
					Arrived at location
					7:00 Hours
					Left Location at
					17:00 Hours
REMARKS:					
12:39:43	116.0				Start hole fill. (Liquid CO ₂)
12:40:33	1363.3	14.5	14.5	25-48.0	Hole full, start pad. (Liquid CO ₂)
12:42:23	1073.2	94.4	79.9	46.0	0-2.37 Pad away, start sand stage #1.
12:43:38	971.7	138.4	44.0	46.0	2.37 Sand stage #1 away, start sand stage #2.
12:47:43	783.2	301.9	103.6	46.0	2.37-4.9 Sand stage #2 away, start sand stage #3.
12:48:53	841.2	333.4	31.5	46.0	4.9 Sand away, start flush. (Liquid CO ₂)
12:52:08	871.7	434.0	100.6	46.0	4.9-0 Flush away stop pumps.
12:52:38	1000.7		12.6		
VOLUME PUMPED 446.6 bbl Pressure test surface lines to: 4350.0 Psi Annular relief valve: N/A Psi					
VOLUME IN FORMATION 444.3 bbl Maximum treating pressure: 3770.0 Psi Held annulus at: N/A Psi					
FRACMASTER REPRESENTATIVE			CUSTOMER REPRESENTATIVE		
Gord Milgate			Dennis Zander /Ray Mazza		

3. Stimulation #3 - Well 1019

The third well stimulated with CO₂/sand was well #1019. It was stimulated with 32,100 lbs of 20/40 API specification proppant and 62 tons of liquid CO₂ on July 16th, 1998. The treatment consisted of a total of 321 barrels of liquid CO₂ pumped at an average rate of 40.9 barrels per minute and an average pressure of 754 psi and a maximum, at screen out, of 2,886 psi and was pumped through 40 perforations in the 4-1/2 in casing located between depths of 984 and 994 feet.

The breakdown pressure was 1450 psi and the fracturing gradient was undetermined because of the abnormally high pressure at the end of the treatment due to the screen out. The tabulated Frac Treatment Report and plotted information summarizing these activities are presented in Figures 13 and 14. The sand proppant was pumped at an average sand concentration of 3.4, with a maximum of 8.2 lbs/gal. At the termination of the pumping activity the pressure was 2886 psi. An estimated quantity of 4,400 lbs (300 ft) was left in the well bore above the perforations.

The quantity of CO₂ employed in the Candidate Wells was reduced as the treatments progressed and it was learned that proppant could be placed with lesser volumes. The initial design was modified towards the end of the sand schedule to determine if the sand acceptance concentration could be increased. As the treatments progressed it was learned that much higher than projected sand concentrations could be pumped and therefore the sand placement required lesser CO₂ volumes, and that reduced treatment costs would be realized.

Figure 13

This last treatment did screen out as the sand concentration was increased and the sand concentration at the perforations was 5.2 ppg - the recorded sand loading at the surface was 8.2 pounds per gallon at the tail end of the treatment. This design was intentional to determine the maximum sand acceptance loading. In reality, without being able to discern it, it appears that the likely maximum sand concentration of approximately 5 ppg was approached during the first treatment.

D. Post Stimulation

1. Flow Back Procedures

The flow back procedure was initiated immediately following the removal of the stimulation hardware. The flow was restricted with a choke to enable the CO₂ vapor to flow safely. The choke size was increased as the pressure diminished and the CO₂ concentration was monitored. Some sand was produced as was expected because of the intentional under flush.

2. CO₂ Concentrations

The CO₂ concentrations were monitored following the stimulations and they diminished to a plateau of approximately 5.5%. Two of the wells reached this level during the third day and the other, #1021 by the sixth - or possibly the fifth (no measurement was taken that day). As would be expected, the CO₂ concentration during the flow back was related to the CO₂ volume.

CO ₂ Concentrations During Flowback											
Well	Stimulated	CO ₂ (l) Tons	CO ₂ (v) MMcf	Day #2	Day #3	Day #4	Day #5	Day #6	Day #7	Day #8	Day #9
1021	07/14/98	103	1.77			10.0		5.0		5.5	5.6
1020	07/15/98	86	1.48		5.0		2.6		3.6	5.5	
1019	07/16/98	62	1.07	6.3		2.3		5.5	5.5		

3. Cleaning Frac Sand from the Well Bore

WBI's standard operating procedures immediately following the stimulation are to confirm that the well bore is free of any frac sand or other debris.

This activity is generally achieved by circulating air with some minor volume of surfactant through coiled tubing which is run to a depth below the perforations.

Following the stimulations both the candidate and control wells were all cleaned in this manner. The three candidate wells were as is generally the case with the CO₂/sand stimulations - because of the designed under flush, were found to have sand in them across the perforations. It was circulated from the well bore to a total depth considerably below the perforated interval.

Well	Perf Intvl (ft)	Depth-Top Perf (ft)	Sand Top (ft)	Fill-up (ft)	Clean Out Depth (ft)
1019	984-994	984	984	0	1148
1020	975-985	975	984	9	1156
1021	970-980	970	970	0	1165

It is note worthy that the sand left in the well bores was produced during the flow back. There was very little sand found above the top perforation in any of the wells, including the well which did screen out, 1019 which had an estimated 300 feet of sand in it.

After being placed in production the candidate wells did temporarily produce some minor volumes of sand. It is suspected that this small quantity is from loose sand either within or near the well bore.

4. Pressure Measurement and Drawdown Testing

Prior to being placed in production each well was isochronously back pressure tested (four point) with one-hour flow periods and a then a stabilized flow obtained - in approximately 20 hrs. The results were:

Well	Initial Well Head Pressure	AOF	@ Hrs	n	Gas Vented	Drawdown	Stim Type
	(psia)	(Mscfd)			(Mscf)	(%)	
1013	251.8	835	24	1.05	835	30.0	N ₂ Foam
1014	348.2	400	24	1.03	393	45.0	N ₂ Foam
1015	234.0	830	22	1.30	561	33.7	N ₂ Foam
1017	342.6	420	20	1.40	420	33.5	N ₂ Foam
1018	252.2	1018	20	1.15	743	38.3	N ₂ Foam
1019	228.6	800	20	1.30	487	33.6	CO ₂ /Sand
1020	206.4	630	20	1.25	476	30.0	CO ₂ /Sand
1021	214.4	900	20	0.88	541	34.0	CO ₂ /Sand
1022	240.5	1070	20	1.50	782	31.6	N ₂ Foam
1023							N ₂ Foam

Because of the lower than anticipated production test results and a suspicion that possibly the extent of draw down may be a contributing factor, they were retested to determine if the tests were representative.

Well	Initial Well Head Pressure	AOF	@ Hrs	n	Gas Vented	Drawdown	Stim Type
	(psia)	(Mscfd)			(Mscf)	(%)	
1019	249.5	660	21	0.81	415	40.8	CO ₂ /Sand
1020	231.8	840	21	1.02	545	35.9	CO ₂ /Sand
1021	234.1	780	24	0.87	548	36.3	CO ₂ /Sand

There were some changes, probably as note worthy as any, is the observation that the initial wellhead pressure was greater than it had been for the first test. This is difficult to explain because there was no liquid introduced into the reservoir, other than the CO₂ which may not have totally vaporized at the time of the first test.

However, if it did remain the low viscosity would not be expected to significantly reduce the reservoir pressure.

E. Tubing Installation

Initial attempts to install 1.75 inch poly tubing (ID = 1.125in) in the three candidate wells immediately following the stimulations was unsuccessful because the production rate was too great. Consequently, the three wells which were stimulated with CO₂/sand produced for nine months without tubing whereas the other wells produced with tubing installed - to remove any liquids. There was a concern that the production from the untubed candidate wells may have been restricted and thereby influencing the production comparisons. WBI's field practices include the installation of tubing.

The three wells 1019, 1020, and 1021 were checked for sand bridges, liquid fill up, etc with coiled tubing and plastic poly-tubing was then installed in each on July 23, 1999.

The production response for the remainder of the month was monitored and two of the three wells returned to their original production rate. Plots summarizing the production rates both before and after the tubing installation are attached. (Figures 15-17). One of the wells, #1020, initially appeared to be producing at a higher rate. Subsequent monitoring indicated that the production rate may have been improved by a statistically insignificant value (Figure 16).

Figure 15

Figure 16

Figure 17

The installation of tubing in two of the wells stimulated with CO₂/sand, #1019 and #1021 did not improve the production rate, and therefore the production rate data is considered valid and that an objective comparison of the two stimulation types can be made for these two wells. The production rate from the only other well stimulated with CO₂/sand, #1020 may have been slightly improved but so slightly that no, if any economic benefit resulted.

XVI. COSTS

A. Wellhead Isolation Tool

After discussing the CO₂/sand stimulations with Fracmaster, WBI concluded that a wellhead isolation tool should also be incorporated with the treatments. Upon WBI's request the DOE was requested to bear one-half of the cost of the wellhead isolation tool services.

After discussions with the DOE they concurred and agreed to bear one-half of the cost. A Canadian company familiar with sealing at the colder than normal temperatures, of the liquid CO₂ was contacted and the scheduling arranged by Fracmaster. The projected cost of the wellhead isolation services was \$6,343.00 as a minimum, and included as many as three wells.

B. Pumping Services

1. Projected - The projected costs for stimulating these wells with CO₂/sand was:
- 2.

Equipment	\$16,053.79
Materials	35,957.65
CO ₂	incl
	52,011.44
Computer Control	1,080.00
Report	427.50
	53,518.94
3 Wells	160,556.82
Mobilization	17,500.00
	178,056.82
Per Well (÷ 3)	59,352.27
Cost to WBI	29,676.14
Cost to DOE	29,676.13
	\$59,352.27

Presuming that no standby charges were incurred, then the charge for stimulating the three candidate wells was projected to be \$178,056.82 [(3x53,518.94) + 17,500.00].

Excluding any subsistence charges, the cost to the project for the CO₂/sand stimulations, excluding the well head isolation tool was projected to be \$89,028.42 for both WBI and the DOE or \$29,676.14 per well — or a total projected per-well cost of \$59,352.27.

3. Actual

The actual costs for the CO₂/sand stimulations were:

Well	Stimulation	Isolation Tool	Total
1019	52,223.00	2,181.00	54,404.00
1020	52,283.33	2,181.00	54,464.33
1021	57,364.77	2,181.00	59,545.77
Totals	161,871.10	6,543.00	168,414.10

4. Projected vs Actual

The actual costs for the treatments was less than projected primarily because of reduced CO₂ volumes as a result of the accelerated sand schedules.

Costs	Stimulation	Isolation Tool	Total
Projected	178,056.82	6,333.00	184,389.82
Actual	161,871.10	6,543.00	168,414.10
Differences	(16,185.72)	210.00	(15,975.72)

XVII. RESULTS

A. Production Comparisons

The twenty-four month production is plotted for the ten new wells, 1013 through 1023 - excluding 1016 which was not drilled (Figures 18-27 - following their respective tables below) and tabulated and compared with the previously drilled control wells as follows.

It is readily apparent that the cumulative gas production for months two through thirteen from all of the new wells, drilled within the control area in 1998 are less than those drilled previously. Consequently the production has been tabulated in three stimulation type groups:

1. N₂ Foam - Pre July 1998 (Control Wells)
2. N₂ Foam - July 1998 (Control Wells)
3. CO₂/Sand - July 1998 (Candidate Wells)

Group #1- Pre July 1998 (Control Wells)

Control Wells (N ₂ Foam)								
Existing Wells (Stimulated Prior to 07/98)								
Well #	Twp	Rge	Sec	Quad	API #	Cum Prod (MMcf)		
					25-071-	Month 2	Month 13	Month 2-13
972	33N	32E	27	NW	22267	1.046	25.433	24.387
973	33N	32E	32	SE	22268	1.187	80.759	79.572
974	33N	32E	33	NE	22269	0.874	55.875	55.001
976	33N	32E	35	NW	22272	0.441	56.654	56.213
990	32N	32E	02	NW	22275	12.699	83.790	71.091
991	32N	32E	01	NE	22279	9.158	63.894	54.736
997	33N	32E	32	NE	22287	?????	32.568	32.568
1000	32N	32E	02	SE	22283	10.880	71.401	60.521
1002	33N	32E	33	SE	22288	9.671	66.678	57.007
							Avg (n=8)	57.316

Final Report - Group #5 – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) – July 1998 – Single Stage Treatments – WBI
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Group #2 - July 1998 (Control Wells)

New Wells (N ₂ Foam) (Stimulated 07/98)								
Well #	Twp	Rge	Sec	Quad	API #	Cum Prod (MMcf)		
					25-071-	Month 2	Month 13	Month 2-13
1013	32N	32E	03	NW	22441	12.659	67.343	54.684
1014	33N	32E	31	NE	22451	5.605	27.293	21.688
1015	33N	32E	29	NW	22452	6.671	36.595	29.924
1016	33N	32E	28	SE	Not Drld			
1017	33N	32E	27	SW	22450	4.402	20.957	16.555
1018	33N	32E	34	NE	22459	8.691	41.413	32.722
1022	32N	32E	12	NE	22445	10.701	53.952	43.251
1023	32N	32E	13	SE	22446	8.447	41.093	32.646
							Avg (n=7)	33.067

Final Report - Group #5 - Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) - July 1998 - Single Stage Treatments - WBI
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Well #1014 - Phillips Sand
 25-071-22451 Phillips Co, Mt

Well #1015 - Phillips Sand
 25-071-22452 Phillips Co, Mt

Final Report - Group #5 - Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) - July 1998 - Single Stage Treatments - WBI
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Well #1017 - Phillips Sand
 25-071-22450 Phillips Co, Mt

Well #1018 - Phillips Sand
 25-071-22459 Phillips Co, Mt

Final Report - Group #5 – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) – July 1998 – Single Stage Treatments – WBI
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Well #1022 - Phillips Sand
 25-071-22445 Phillips Co, Mt

Well #1023 - Phillips Sand
 25-071-22446 Phillips Co, Mt

Final Report - Group #5 – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) – July 1998 – Single Stage Treatments – WBI
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”

Group #3- July 1998 (Candidate Wells)

Candidate Wells (CO ₂ /Sand)(Stimulated 07/98)								
Well #	Twp	Rge	Sec	Quad	API #	Cum Prod (MMcf)		
					25-071-	Month 2	Month 13	Month 2-13
1019	33N	32E	34	SE	22460	5.473	40.178	34.705
1020	32N	32E	01	NW	22454	6.601	40.376	33.775
1021	32N	32E	12	NW	22244	5.164	36.520	31.356
							Avg (n=3)	33.270

Final Report - Group #5 - Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) - July 1998 - Single Stage Treatments - WBI
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Well #1020 - Phillips Sand
 25-071-22454 Phillips Co, Mt

Well #1021 - Phillips Sand
 25-071-22444 Phillips Co, Mt

The average cumulative gas productions from each of these groups has been plotted (Figure 28) and it dramatically indicates the superiority of the production from the pre 98 wells. The cumulative production averages from both of the 98 Control (Group 2) and Candidate wells (Group 3) are identical and considerably less than those drilled prior to 98 (Group 1).

It was determined later that the reduced production from the wells completed after 1998 was a result of reduced well spacing and reduced reservoir pressure.

Figure 28

Some possible explanations as to why the production from the newer wells was less than that from the wells drilled prior to 1998 are:

- The reservoir pressure has diminished.
- The revised perforation strategy has resulted in the reduction in the cumulative production.

The production for groups 1-3 are also plotted as follows:

- Group 2 (N₂ Foam stimulated Candidate Wells drilled in 1998) - Figure 29

- Group 3 (CO₂/sand stimulated Control Wells drilled in 1998) - Figure 30

It is perhaps more apparent from these plots then it is from the tabulated data that:

- There is considerably more variance in the cumulative production volumes from the wells stimulated with N₂ Foam (Figure 29) then there is for the wells stimulated with CO₂/sand (Figure 30).

This is an unexpected and unusual occurrence. In the past it has been observed that the wells which have been stimulated with CO₂/sand had significant variances in the production rate while the foam stimulated wells sometimes had practically no variance. This response was suspected to be a result of trapped stimulation liquids which were inhibiting the production. The good news is that because there is a

large production variance from the wells which were stimulated with foam there is probably very limited, if any liquid phase trapping.

The thing that's difficult to understand is that there is practically no production variance between the three CO₂/sand stimulated wells.

A potential explanation is that the larger proppant size, 12/20 and greater sand concentration, 12 pounds per gallon utilized on the N₂ Foam stimulations may be offsetting proppant embedment? That is, that the smaller proppant (20/40) and the reduced proppant loading utilized for the CO₂/sand stimulations was resulting in a smaller propped fracture width.

- The production rate from the wells stimulated with CO₂/sand is essentially the same from all three wells.

The wells stimulated with CO₂/sand have always had significant variations in production, while those stimulated with foam have not sometimes they are essentially the same - especially in lower pressure reservoirs.

It is considered to be so unlikely that all three of the wells stimulated with CO₂/sand should have production rates that are essentially the same that it is suspected that these wells are influenced by some production limiting mechanism.

Some thoughts were:

- There could be sand or other blockages in the well bore?
The well bores were subsequently checked and determined to be unobstructed. It was therefore suspected that the lack of variation in the cumulative production responses is a result of limited conductivity in the hydraulic fracture.

- That the larger proppant size and concentration utilized on the foam stimulations may be offsetting proppant embedment?

The proppant size used on all seven of the N₂ Foam stimulations on the Control wells was the same size, 12/20 whereas the CO₂/sand stimulations utilized only the smaller 20/40 proppant

B. Production Comparisons-Projected vs Actual

The pre-test cumulative production projections were compared with the actual amounts and in all instances the actual production for months two through thirteen were considerably less than that projected. There does not appear to be any correlation between the stimulation type and these differences.

Well #	Cum Prod 2-16 (MMcf)	Projected (MMcf)	Diff (%)	StimType
1015	29.9	42	-29%	N ₂ Foam
1017	16.6	42	-60%	N ₂ Foam
1019	34.7	54	-36%	CO ₂ /Sand
1020	33.8	45	-25%	CO ₂ /Sand
1021	31.4	54	-42%	CO ₂ /Sand
1022	32.6	45	-28%	N ₂ Foam
		Avg	-32%	

Well 1017 has the most drastic deviation between the actual and projected. It was one of the originally proposed candidate wells and was rejected primarily because of the projected reduction in sand thickness. It is also the most northerly well of the group and closest to the known dry hole area near the reservoir boundary. (Refer to the section on the Candidate Well Selection.)

Other observations were:

- The monthly production rates from both the control wells (N₂ Foam) and the candidate wells (CO₂/sand) readily cleaned up following the stimulation, and specifically that the wells stimulated with N₂ Foam did not exhibit a reduced production rate or slow clean up period.

- o Both groups of wells, control and candidate generally experienced a five month period of higher “flush production” rates.

C. Production Comparisons Beyond 13 Months

The 24 month cumulative production history is consistent with that reported earlier. The table is rank-ordered for the 2-13 month cumulative production volume. The initial observations continue to be substantiated although the top three cumulative production wells are now all N₂ Foam stimulations. Well #1023 has been moved up from the sixth best producer to third. Also, the production from two of the CO₂/sand stimulations, wells 1019 & 1020 have exchanged the third and fourth positions.

Cumulative Production (MMcf)					
Well #	Mo 2	Mo 13	Mo 2-13	Mo 24	Stim Type
1013	12.659	67.343	54.684	113.436	N ₂ Foam
1022	10.701	53.952	43.251	90.090	N ₂ Foam
1019	5.473	40.178	34.705	68.727	CO ₂ /Sand
1020	6.601	40.376	33.775	71.940	CO ₂ /Sand
1018	8.691	41.413	32.722	68.653	N ₂ Foam
1023	8.447	41.093	32.646	70.728	N ₂ Foam
1021	5.164	36.520	31.356	63.800	CO ₂ /Sand
1015	6.671	36.595	29.924	61.165	N ₂ Foam
1014	5.605	27.293	21.688	45.973	N ₂ Foam
1017	4.402	20.957	16.555	36.275	N ₂ Foam

XVIII. PROPPANT SIZE

Because there is some question as to whether the size of the proppant utilized in the stimulations may impact the production rates a review of the different size proppants used in twenty wells within the Bowdoin Field was made. The cumulative production was compared by utilizing the following information:

Number of Wells			
Proppant Size			
Stim Type	08/16	12/20	20/40
N ₂ Foam:	8	9	
CO ₂ /Sand:			3

The twenty month cumulative production was plotted for each of these three groups:

- Average cumulative production from all three proppant sizes - Figure 31

Final Report - Group #5 - Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) - July 1998 - Single Stage Treatments - WBI
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 - "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

- 08/16 - Figures 32 and 33

- 12/20 - Figures 34 and 35

○ 20/40 - Figure 36

It is evident from these plots that:

- The cumulative production averages of the wells stimulated with 08/16 and 12/20 are identical (Figure 31),
- The cumulative production average of the three wells stimulated with 20/40 is obviously less than that of the two groups which employed the larger proppant sizes (Figure 31),

There are only three wells in this group and they were also the only ones which were stimulated with CO₂/sand.

- The variance in the cumulative productions from the three wells stimulated with 20/40 (Figure 36) is much less, it is essentially non-existent than that of the wells in the other two groups (Figures 32-35).

XIX. CONCLUSIONS

- A. Full proppant volume (40,000 pound) CO₂/sand stimulations were easily executed in the Phillips Sand in the Phillips Co, Montana test area.
- B. The maximum sand concentration for CO₂/sand stimulations being pumped at 40 barrels per minute is approximately 5 pounds per gallon. The first well stimulated (1019) accepted 5.9 ppg without any indications of rejection. For design purposes a maximum proppant loading for 40,000 lbs of 20/40 mesh proppant pumped at 40 bpm is 5 ppg.
- C. The criteria for success was that the cumulative production from months two through thirteen had to exceed 50 MMcf. This hurdle was based on the production from other nearby wells which were drilled prior to 1998 and also perforated in both the Upper and Lower Phillips Sandstone members.

Only one of the ten wells stimulated in 1998, 1013 met this success criteria, and it was conventionally treated.

D. The twenty-four month cumulative production volumes from the wells stimulated with the liquid-free CO₂/sand process are essentially the same as that from the control wells treated with N₂ Foam and utilizing the same 40,000 pound proppant volume.

E. The well which was stimulated first, 1021 and consequently had the largest CO₂ volume pumped in it, is the poorest producer of the three candidate wells. Some possible explanations are:

1. The geology is poorer,
2. The reservoir pressure is lower,

The initial shut in well head pressures measured before the wells were turned in line is essentially equal and is not considered to be an explanation of the production variations.

Well	Initial Well Head Press (Psia)
1019	228.6
1020	206.4
1021	214.4

3. The larger CO₂ volume resulted in a reduced proppant pack conductivity.

F. There is a suspicion that the wells which were stimulated with CO₂/sand are being choked by limited conductivity in the hydraulically created fracture, probably as a consequence of the smaller proppant size used (20/40 vs 12/20). This is based on the observation of the nearly identical monthly production volumes from all three candidate wells. And, also on the production comparisons of twenty nearby wells which utilized larger proppant.

It would be anticipated that there should be some variation in the production rates between these wells as there are in the other wells within the field. It is possible that all three of these candidate wells have identical reservoirs but it is a unique and unexpected response.

- All three wells were subsequently checked for well bore obstructions by running coiled tubing in them they and were found to be absent of any debris.

There was no sand nor liquids present above the perforated interval - there was a small quantity of fresh water below the perforations. It was therefore concluded that if there is a production limiting mechanism that it must be upstream of the perforations.

- Tubing was installed in all three candidate wells and the gas production rates did not change nor was there any liquid production observed. The conclusion is that there is no production impediment caused by liquids or other mechanical obstructions within the well bore, and if there is a limiting mechanism that it must lie within the fracture or reservoir.

- G. The size of the proppant differed between the two stimulation types. The N₂ Foam stimulations utilized 12/20 sand and the CO₂/sand stimulations incorporated smaller 20/40 sand proppant. The intention was to utilize the smaller proppant on the first CO₂/sand stimulation and if no resistance to sand placement was encountered to then utilize the larger 12/20 proppant size. Upon successful placement of the 20/40 in the first CO₂/sand stimulation unsuccessful attempts were made to procure 12/20 proppant. The larger proppant was locally present but made unavailable by a competing service company.
- H. The wells within the test area which were stimulated prior to 1998 have greater monthly production rates. There are some possible explanations:

- The geology is poorer. This is considered the least likely explanation because of the number of wells drilled and the resulting knowledge of the reservoir character.
 - The reservoir pressure has diminished.
 - The practice of stimulating only the Upper Phillips Sand member is not accessing all of the available gas reserves.
- I. The monthly production rates from both the control wells (N₂ Foam) and the candidate wells (CO₂/sand) readily cleaned up following the stimulation, and specifically that the wells stimulated with N₂ Foam did not exhibit a reduced production rate or slow clean up period.
- J. Both groups of wells, control and candidate generally experienced a five month period of higher “flush production” rate.

XX. RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. Identify and execute other CO₂/sand candidate well opportunities in the Phillips Sandstone near the test area and to utilize 12/20 proppant.

Conversations with Canadian Fracmaster personnel indicate that similar formations within 150 miles of the test area have been sometimes successfully - but not always - stimulated with CO₂/sand treatments which utilized 12/20 proppant.

- B. Attempt to determine an explanation as to why the cumulative production volumes from the wells stimulated in 1998 are less than those completed earlier.
- C. Identify the lowest landed cost for reliably delivered CO₂.

**Final Report - Group #5 – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Three Candidate Wells (Phillips Co, Montana) – July 1998 – Single Stage Treatments – WBI
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 – “Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology”**

This report has been prepared as a summary of the CO₂/sand stimulation demonstrations in the Phillips Sandstone in Phillips County, Montana in July 1998. It is considered to be complete and to fairly represent and assess the activities, results, and conclusions of these efforts.

DEFAULT

AITH .004

FN:5

FIELD

13-JUN-1998 20:26

1356.0 FT

137.5 FT

Output DLIS Files

DEFAULT

AITH .006

FN:5

FIELD

13-JUN-1998 21:36

1356.0 FT

138.0 FT

OP System Version: 7C0-712

DBM

Well #1015

p. 1 of 2

PIP SUMMARY

Time Mark Every 60 S

Productibility
From DPHI to SPHI

Gas
From DT to TNPH

Well # 1015

SP (SP)
(MV)

20

Tool/Tot.
Drag
From D3T
to STIA

0.6

Env.Corr.Thermal Neutron Porosity (TNPH)
(V/V)

0

Gamma Ray (GR)
(GAPI)

200

Cable
Drag
From STIA
to STIT

200

Delta-T (DT)
(US/F)

100 0.6

Sonic Porosity (SPHI)
(V/V)

0

Caliper (CALI)
(IN)

14

Stuck
Stretch
(STIT)
0 (F) 50

0.6

Density Porosity (DPHI)
(V/V)

0

Casing-

200

STIA
STIT

SP

TNPH

SPHI

Well
1015

Well #1015
p. 2 of 2

1100

1200

9p

STIA
STIT

TPH

SPH

Output DLIS Files

DEFAULT

AITH .004

FN:3

FIELD

13-JUN-1998 20:26

1356.0 FT

138.0 FT

Integrated Hole/Cement Volume Summary

Hole Volume = 263.38 F3

Cement Volume = 132.34 F3 (assuming 4.50 IN casing O.D.)

Computed from 1350.0 FT to 164.0 FT using data channel(s) CALI

Well #1015

p. 1 of 2

OP System Version: 7C0-712

DBM

PIP SUMMARY

- └ Integrated Hole Volume Minor Pip Every 10 F3
- └ Integrated Hole Volume Major Pip Every 100 F3
 - └ Integrated Cement Volume Minor Pip Every 10 F3
 - └ Integrated Cement Volume Major Pip Every 100 F3

Time Mark Every 60 S

			Tension (TENS) (LBF)	
			10000	
			AIT-H 90 Inch Investigation (AHT90)	
			0.2	(OHMM) 200
			AIT-H 60 Inch Investigation (AHT60)	
			0.2	(OHMM) 200
			AIT-H 30 Inch Investigation (AHT30)	
			0.2	(OHMM) 200
			AIT-H 20 Inch Investigation (AHT20)	
			0.2	(OHMM) 200
			AIT-H 10 Inch Investigation (AHT10)	
			0.2	(OHMM) 200

1000

Well
1015

1100

1200

Well #1015
p. 2 of 2

WELL # 1017

Reducibility
From DPHI to SPHI

Gas
From DT to TNPH

Well #1017
p. 1 of 2

1000
WELL
#1017

1100

Well # 1017

Gamma Ray (GR)
(GAPI)

200

Cable
Drag
From STIA
to STIT

0.2

AIT-H 20 Inch Investigation (AHT20)
(OHMM)

2000

Well #1017
p. 1 of 2

SP (SP)
(MV)

20

Stuck
Stretch
(STIT)
(F) 50

0.2

AIT-H 10 Inch Investigation (AHT10)
(OHMM)

2000

Well #1017

Well #1017
p. 2 of 2

1000

1100

1200

6P

STIA
STIT

TENS

Input DLIS Files

DEFAULT	AITH .005	FN:4	FIELD	11-JUN-1998 02:34	1284.0 FT	124.5 FT
---------	-----------	------	-------	-------------------	-----------	----------

Output DLIS Files

DEFAULT	AITH .006	FN:5	FIELD	11-JUN-1998 03:20	1284.0 FT	125.0 FT
---------	-----------	------	-------	-------------------	-----------	----------

OP System Version: 7C0-712
DBM

PIP SUMMARY

Time Mark Every 60 S

Productivity
From DPHI to SPHI

WELL # 1018

SP (SF)
(V/V)

YCSH101
Drag
From DST 10.5
to STIA

Encl. Corr. Thermal Neutron Porosity (TNPH)
(V/V)

Gamma Ray (GR)
(GAPI)

Cable
Drag
From STIA 200
to STHT

Delta-T (DT)
(UCRP)

Sonic Porosity (SPHI)
(V/V)

Caliper (CALI)
(V/V)

Stick
Stretch
(STH)
(F) 80

Density Porosity (DPHI)
(V/V)

WELL
#1018

Well #1018
p. 2 of 2

1000

1100

sp

STIA
STIT

TKPH

SPHI

DEFAULT

AITH .005

:4

FIELD

11-JUN-1998 02:34

Well #1018

p. 1 of 2

Output DLIS Files

DEFAULT

AITH .005

FN:4

FIELD

11-JUN-1998 02:34

1284.0 FT

124.5 FT

Integrated Hole/Cement Volume Summary

Hole Volume = 245.34 F3

Cement Volume = 122.48 F3 (assuming 4.50 IN casing O.D.)

Computed from 1275.0 FT to 183.0 FT using data channel(s) CALI

OP System Version: 7C0-712

DBM

PIP SUMMARY

- └ Integrated Hole Volume Minor Pip Every 10 F3
- └ Integrated Hole Volume Major Pip Every 100 F3
 - └ Integrated Cement Volume Minor Pip Every 10 F3
 - └ Integrated Cement Volume Major Pip Every 100 F3

Time Mark Every 60 S

W-CL
#1018

Well #1018
p. 2 of 2

1000

1100

Input DLIS Files

DEFAULT

AITH .007

FN:4

FIELD

9-JUN-1998 04:02

1254.0 FT

107.0 FT

Output DLIS Files

DEFAULT

AITH .010

FN:7

FIELD

9-JUN-1998 05:20

1254.0 FT

107.2 FT

OP System Version: 7C0-712

DBM

Well #1019

p. 1 of 2

PIP SUMMARY

Time Mark Every 60 S

Well
#1019

900

1000

Well #1019
p. 2 of 2

0.2	AIT-H 90 I	Investigation (AHT90)	200
		(OHMM)	
0.2	AIT-H 60 Inch	Investigation (AHT60)	200
		(OHMM)	

Tool/Tot
Drag
From D3T
to STIA

0.2	AIT-H 30 Inch	Investigation (AHT30)	200
		(OHMM)	

Well #1019
p. 1 of 2

Gamma Ray (GR)
(GAPI)

Cable
Drag
From STIA
to STIT

0.2	AIT-H 20 Inch	Investigation (AHT20)	200
		(OHMM)	

SP (SP)
(MV)

Stuck
Stretch
(STIT)
0 (F) 50

0.2	AIT-H 10 Inch	Investigation (AHT10)	200
		(OHMM)

800

STIA
STIT

SP

GR

WELL
#1019

900

1000

Well #1019

p. 2 of 2

TENS

AHT90

AHT60

AHT30

AHT20

AHT10

Integrated Hole/Cement Volume Summary

Well #1020

p. 1 of 2

Hole Volume = 261.83 F3

Cement Volume = 134.93 F3 (assuming 4.50 IN casing O.D.)

Computed from 1225.0 FT to 76.5 FT using data channel(s) CALI

OP System Version: 7C0-712

DBM

PIP SUMMARY

- └ Integrated Hole Volume Minor Pip Every 10 F3
- └ Integrated Hole Volume Major Pip Every 100 F3
 - └ Integrated Cement Volume Minor Pip Every 10 F3
 - └ Integrated Cement Volume Major Pip Every 100 F3

Time Mark Every 60 S

Well
#1020

1000

1100

STIA
STIT

INPH

SPHI

Integrated Hole/Cement Volume Summary

Hole Volume = 261.83 F3

Cement Volume = 134.93 F3 (assuming 4.50 IN casing O.D.)

Computed from 1225.0 FT to 76.5 FT using data channel(s) CALI

Well #1020

p. 1 of 2

OP System Version: 7C0-712

DBM

PIP SUMMARY

- Integrated Hole Volume Minor Pip Every 10 F3
- Integrated Hole Volume Major Pip Every 100 F3
 - Integrated Cement Volume Minor Pip Every 10 F3
 - Integrated Cement Volume Major Pip Every 100 F3

Time Mark Every 60 S

Well
#1020

900

1000

1100

Well #1020
p. 2 of 2

P System Version: 8C1-205

MCM

AIT-H
-H
-L

APCW-98Q1
APCW-98Q1
APCW-98Q1

LDT-D
SDT-C
TCC-B

APCW-98Q1
rpcwx-1048
APCW-98Q1

Well #1021
p. 1 of 2

PIP SUMMARY

Time Mark Every 60 S

Well #1021

SP (SP)
(MV)

80 20

Gamma Ray (GR)
(GAPI)

200

Productivity
From DPHI to SPHI

Gas
From DT to TNPH

Env. Corr. Thermal Neutron Porosity (TNPH)
(V/V)

0.6

0

Density Porosity (DPHI)
(V/V)

0.6

0

Caliper (CALI)
(IN)

14

Stuck
Stretch
(STIT)
(F)

0 50

Delta-T (DT)
(US/F)

200

100 0.6

Sonic Porosity (SPHI)
(V/V)

0

100

200

Well
#1021

Well #1021
p. 2 of 2

1000

1100

PIP SUMMARY

Time Mark Every 60 S

Well #1021

Well #1021
p. 2 of 2

1000

TENS

1100

STIA
STIT

PIP SUMMARY

Time Mark Every 60 S

Well #1022
p. 1 of 2

MAIN PASS

Well #1022

SP (SP)
(MV)

-80 20

Gamma Ray (GR)
(GAPI)

50 200

Productivity
From DPHI to SPH

Gas
From DT to TNPH

Env. Corr. Thermal Neutron Porosity (TNPH)
(V/V)

0.6 0

Density Porosity (DPHI)
(V/V)

0.6 0

Caliper (CALI)
(IN)

4 14

Stuck
Stretch
(STIT)
(F) 50

Delta-T (DT)
(US/F)

200 100 0.6

Sonic Porosity (SPH)
(V/V)

0.6 0

100

--CSG--

200

900

WELL
#1022

1000

STIA

INP-1

(LDF)

From DST 0.2

(OHMM)

2000

SP (SP)
(MV)

20

Cable
Drag
From STIA
to STIT

0.2

AIT-H 20 Inch Investigation (AHT20)
(OHMM)

2000

Well #1022
p. 1 of 2

Gamma Ray (GR)
(GAPI)

200

Stuck
Stretch
(STIT)

0.2

AIT-H 10 Inch Investigation (AHT10)
(OHMM)

2000

0 (F) 50

100

TENS

STIA
--CSG--

SP

200

GR

AHT90

AHT50

AHT30

900
Well
#1022

1000

JENS

STIA

From T to TNPH

WELL #1023

SP (SP)
(MV)

Env. Corr. Thermal Neutron Porosity (TNPH)
(V/V)

Gamma Ray (GR)
(GAPI)

Density Porosity (DPHI)
(V/V)

Caliper (CALI)
(IN)

Stuck
Stretch
(STIT)
(F)

Delta-T (DT)
(US/F)

Sonic Porosity (SPHI)
(V/V)

Well #1023
p. 1 of 2

Well
1023
900

Well #1023
p. 2 of 2

1000

FNPH

STIA
STIT

4100

PIP SUMMARY

- Integrated Hole Volume Minor Pip Every 1'
- Integrated Hole Volume Major Pip Every 100 F3
 - Integrated Cement Volume Minor Pip Every 10 F3
 - Integrated Cement Volume Major Pip Every 100 F3

Well #1023
p. 1 of 2

Time Mark Every 60 S

MAIN PASS

Well # 1023

		AIT-H 90 Inch Investigation (AHT90)	
		(OHMM)	2000
		AIT-H 60 Inch Investigation (AHT60)	
		(OHMM)	2000
Tension (TENS) (LBF)	0	AIT-H 30 Inch Investigation (AHT30)	2000
10000		(OHMM)	
Tool/Tot Drag From D3T to STIA		AIT-H 20 Inch Investigation (AHT20)	
		(OHMM)	2000
SP (SP) (MV)	20	AIT-H 10 Inch Investigation (AHT10)	
		(OHMM)	2000
Gamma Ray (GR) (GAPI)	200	AIT-H 10 Inch Investigation (AHT10)	
50		(OHMM)	2000
	0 (F) 50

900

WELL
1023

1000

TRNG

STIA
STIT

SP

1100

FIELD TESTING & OPTIMIZATION OF CO₂/SAND FRACTURING TECHNOLOGY

**Group #7B – Blaine Co, Montana – Four Wells – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy –
September 2002**

Final Report

**By
RAYMOND L. MAZZA**

**Period of Performance
October 1, 1994 – November 30, 2004**

**Work Performed Under Contract No.: Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199
"Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"**

**For:
U. S. Department of Energy
National Energy Technology Laboratory
Morgantown, West Virginia**

**By
Petroleum Consulting Services
Canton, Ohio**

Table of Contents

DISCLAIMER.....	1
I. ABSTRACT.....	2
II. INTRODUCTION	2
III. BACKGROUND.....	4
IV. METHODOLOGY.....	5
A. Mathematical Analog of Production Data.....	6
B. Missing Data.....	6
C. Examples	7
V. PRODUCING HORIZON.....	9
VI. GEOLOGY	12
A. Stratigraphy.....	12
B. Structure.....	14
VII. FIELD	15
VIII. RESERVOIR.....	16
A. Porosity, Permeability, Thickness, and EUR.....	16
B. Reservoir Pressure and Temperature	16
C. Gas Properties	17
D. Sensitivity to Stimulation Liquids.....	17
IX. CO ₂ CHARACTERISTICS	17
X. CONVENTIONAL STIMULATION TREATMENTS.....	19
XI. IS THE PROPOSED RESERVOIR LIKELY TO BENEFIT FROM THE CO ₂ /SAND TECHNOLOGY?.....	20
A. OPERATOR.....	20
1. Interest in CO ₂ /sand technology?.....	20
2. Adequate test opportunity?.....	20
3. Presently active drilling program?.....	21
4. Is there a future for successful results? Is the operator likely to continue implementing this technology without DOE cost support?	21
5. Interest in DOE cost-supported participation?	21
6. Share production data for five years?.....	21

Table of Contents

XII.	LETTER OF INTENT	21
XIII.	TEST AREA.....	30
A.	Control Wells.....	31
B.	Candidate Wells – 6 > 4 Wells.....	31
1.	Electric Logs.....	34
2.	Completion.....	36
3.	Perforation Strategy	36
4.	Production Review and Projections	36
XIV.	CO ₂ /SAND STIMULATION TREATMENTS.....	38
A.	Design	38
B.	Proppant Size	46
C.	Treatment Volume	46
D.	Treatment Volume Comparison – Conventional vs. CO ₂ /Sand.....	46
XV.	STIMULATION CHECKLIST	47
XVI.	CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS.....	49
A.	Establishing success criteria	49
B.	Conclusions	51
XVII.	PRE-TEST CONCLUSIONS.....	51
XVIII.	DOE APPROVALS	54
XIX.	FIELD ACTIVITIES	58
A.	Preparations.....	58
B.	Stimulations.....	58
1.	Candidate Well #1 – S-B Ranch 02-05 (25-041-22955).....	58
2.	Candidate Well #2 – Kane 05-08 (25-041-22279).....	63
3.	Candidate Well #3 – Kane 05-05 (25-041-22557).....	68
4.	Candidate Well #4 – Blackwood 06-09 (25-041-22161)	73
5.	Stimulation Summary	78
C.	Post Stimulation.....	78
1.	Flow Back Procedures.....	78
2.	Cleaning Frac Sand from the Well Bore.....	78

Table of Contents

XII.	LETTER OF INTENT	21
XIII.	TEST AREA.....	30
A.	Control Wells.....	31
B.	Candidate Wells – 6 > 4 Wells.....	31
1.	Electric Logs.....	34
2.	Completion.....	36
3.	Perforation Strategy	36
4.	Production Review and Projections	36
XIV.	CO ₂ /SAND STIMULATION TREATMENTS.....	38
A.	Design	38
B.	Proppant Size	46
C.	Treatment Volume	46
D.	Treatment Volume Comparison – Conventional vs. CO ₂ /Sand.....	46
XV.	STIMULATION CHECKLIST	47
XVI.	CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS.....	49
A.	Establishing success criteria	49
B.	Conclusions	51
XVII.	PRE-TEST CONCLUSIONS.....	51
XVIII.	DOE APPROVALS	54
XIX.	FIELD ACTIVITIES	58
A.	Preparations.....	58
B.	Stimulations.....	58
1.	Candidate Well #1 – S-B Ranch 02-05 (25-041-22955).....	58
2.	Candidate Well #2 – Kane 05-08 (25-041-22279).....	63
3.	Candidate Well #3 – Kane 05-05 (25-041-22557).....	68
4.	Candidate Well #4 – Blackwood 06-09 (25-041-22161)	73
5.	Stimulation Summary	78
C.	Post Stimulation.....	78
1.	Flow Back Procedures.....	78
2.	Cleaning Frac Sand from the Well Bore.....	78

Table of Contents

XX.	RESULTS.....	79
A.	Production Comparisons.....	79
1.	Candidate Well # 1 – S-B Ranch (25-005-22955).....	79
2.	Candidate Well # 2 – Kane 05-08 (25-005-22279).....	80
3.	Candidate Well # 3 – Kane 05-05 (25-005-22557).....	82
4.	Candidate Well # 4 - Blackwood 06-09 (25-005-22161).....	84
B.	Production Summary – Candidate Wells.....	86
1.	Production Comparisons – Pre and Post Stimulation.....	86
a.	Pre-Stimulation.....	86
b.	Post-Stimulation.....	87
c.	Incremental Production Improvement	88
XXI.	COSTS	89
A.	Projected	89
B.	Actual.....	98
C.	Projected vs. Actual.....	98
XXII.	CONCLUSIONS.....	98
XXIII.	RECOMMENDATIONS	100
XXIV.	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	100

DISCLAIMER

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

ABSTRACT

The demonstration of a 100% liquid free CO₂/sand stimulation process was executed on four producing, but unstimulated Candidate Wells (four stages) in the Upper and Middle Eagle Sands in Blaine Co, Montana in September, 2002. The process is unique in that because CO₂ is the only fluid which enters the formation and requires a specialized closed system, pressurized blender to mix up to 45,000 pounds of proppant with the CO₂. The CO₂ vaporizes at reservoir conditions and leaves a liquid-free proppant pack. The reservoir pressure in the Eagle Sands in the Test Area had diminished to 225 psi and was insufficient to expel the spent stimulation liquids used in conventional water-based treatments, and consequently there are a large number of unstimulated wells.

In-zone placed sand volumes ranged from 8,500 to 21,800 lbs and was proportional to the CO₂ volume, which ranged up to 835 Bbls and was limited by the maximum storage capability. All four wells had production improvements which after 22 months ranged from 3.1 to 54.1 MMcf and averaged 19.5 MMcf. The total incremental improvement is 77.8 MMcf.

I. ABSTRACT

The demonstration of a 100% liquid free CO₂/sand stimulation process was executed on four producing, but unstimulated Candidate Wells (four stages) in the Upper and Middle Eagle Sands in Blaine Co, Montana in September, 2002. The process is unique in that because CO₂ is the only fluid which enters the formation and requires a specialized closed system, pressurized blender to mix up to 45,000 pounds of proppant with the CO₂. The CO₂ vaporizes at reservoir conditions and leaves a liquid-free proppant pack. The reservoir pressure in the Eagle Sands in the Test Area had diminished to 225 psi and was insufficient to expel the spent stimulation liquids used in conventional water-based treatments, and consequently there are a large number of unstimulated wells.

In-zone placed sand volumes ranged from 8,500 to 21,800 lbs and was proportional to the CO₂ volume, which ranged up to 835 Bbls and was limited by the maximum storage capability. All four wells had production improvements which after 22 months ranged from 3.1 to 54.1 MMcf and averaged 19.5 MMcf. The total incremental improvement is 77.8 MMcf.

II. INTRODUCTION

Ocean Energy, Inc. (Ocean) was the largest gas producing company in Montana and was the operator of record for approximately 650 producing gas wells in the north-central area of the state, southeast of Havre (Figure 1). These wells produce from a shallow, 1,500 to 2,000 feet Upper Cretaceous formation (Eagle Sandstone) which in certain pressure depleted segments of the Tiger Ridge field is irreversibly damaged by the liquids used in conventional nitrogen foam stimulations.

Figure 1

Because the reservoir pressure in the Tiger Ridge field had declined to approximately 225 psi, liquid-based stimulation techniques would not clean up following the treatment. The spent stimulation liquids remain trapped in the formation and significantly impede gas production. Additionally, there was also evidence of formation damage resulting from the invasion of drilling mud filtrate. These wells contain large gas volumes which could be produced more rapidly if a non-damaging stimulation process were available.

Ocean was therefore interested in the CO₂/Sand stimulation process, primarily because of the non-damaging, liquid-free aspects. And, was interested in the DOE cost-shared demonstration program to offset the expense and evaluate the non-damaging aspects of this treatment.

The accompanying information addresses the specifics of the Tiger Ridge field in Blaine County, Montana which identified six potential Candidate Wells for CO₂/Sand stimulation (Four were selected). The wells were producing, and following approval, were made ready and stimulated. Three required setting a plug to eliminate the lowermost perforations during the stimulation treatments and were removed following a post stimulation period.

III. BACKGROUND

Since the discovery of Eagle gas at Tiger Ridge by High Crest Oil in November, 1968, the industry has focused its attention on the development of this huge gas reserve and has conducted an extensive search for new fields. Gas reserves found on the north flank of the Bear Paw uplift were estimated to be in the magnitude of 500 billion cubic feet. "It is believed that additional exploration and development drilling will prove new reserves on the north side of the uplift and a major new producing area on the south flank. It is not unrealistic to estimate the probable reserves on the flanks of the Bear Paw uplift in excess of 1 trillion cubic feet of gas."

The Tricentrol United States, Inc. initially operated the Tiger Ridge and Bull Hook Gas Units in Blaine and Hill Counties of north-central Montana. The area of interest lies south of Havre, Montana, and encompasses approximately 112,000 surface acres of unitized Eagle Sandstone Formation in the two units as shown in Figure 1. The Eagle sandstones are approximately 1300 feet deep and range in thickness from 5 feet to over 150 feet of net gas pay, with the average approximately 30 to 40 feet.

The discovery well was the O'Neil 1-8 in the SE/NE of Section 1, 31N-17E Blaine County, drilled during September, 1966. The well was drilled through the Eagle Sandstone at 1340 feet and found to be productive. This indicated the possibilities of commercial gas production in the area.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The methodology employed in this demonstration differs from that used in previous evaluations. In the previous demonstrations the Candidate Wells were new wells with no production history, and in those evaluations the post stimulation production from the Candidate Wells was compared with that from nearby producing Control Wells.

Because the Candidate Wells in this demonstration were unstimulated and had a previous production history, the production which occurred subsequent to the CO₂/sand stimulation was compared with that prior to the treatment. This evaluation enabled the response to the stimulation to be compared on a "before and after" per-well basis and eliminated reservoir differences.

The evaluation of the produced gas was made through the use of pre stimulation production rates which is the basis for back-extrapolation to the earlier times in the producing life. This technique results in an uninterrupted production sequence, and thereby eliminates the unknowns associated with shut-ins, missing data, higher production rates resulting from the pressure build-up associated with shut-ins, etc. It also, and perhaps more significantly enables an unencumbered assessment to be made in that it removes the bias created by the higher rate "flush" production rates frequently recorded early in the producing life. The flush production is a result draining the more permeable portions of the formation which can be increased by the presence of natural fractures.

**Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"**

A. Mathematical Analog of Production Data

The procedure to remove flush or missing production volumes utilized a fit of a mathematic equation of the later time, but pre stimulation production.

B. Missing Data

This process can also provide a significant benefit where there is missing production data. Also, in instances where there is only a very limited knowledge of the early production histories or where there is co-metered gas production can benefit as well.

C. Examples

The following examples demonstrate the procedure utilized to remove the gas produced during the flush production period which in this case lasted approximately 13 months.

The actual produced gas volume was 41 MMcf while the projected volume was 23 MMcf or a difference of 18 MMcf. The projected five year cumulative production is 92 MMcf whereas the actual production volume measured was 110 MMcf.

In the second example there was no production data available for the first 29 months, additionally the available data included two shut in periods which are followed by flush production. By utilizing a mathematic fit of the steady state production data a realistic projection of the early time production resulted. The limited data set was then utilized, and the bias resulting from the flush production periods following the shut in periods was removed.

In removing the effects of the flush production volume a more realistic assessment of the response to the different stimulation types resulted. The production plots for each well including the actual and projected values are included.

V. PRODUCING HORIZON

The Eagle Formation can be divided into three units: the upper, middle and lower sandstones. The upper sandstone (Figure 2) attains a thickness of over 75 feet and is the primary gas producing reservoir on the flanks of the Bear Paw uplift. The middle sandstone, which develops a thickness in excess of 75 feet, (Figure 3) is separated from the upper unit by a 10 to 40 foot thick shale bed. It is an excellent reservoir that only produces in those fault blocks where the upper sandstone is completely filled with gas or where the upper sandstone is not developed. The lower sandstone is thinner and less widespread than the other units. It is normally separated from the middle sandstone by a thin shale, but locally the two combine. The lower sandstone only produces in two wells on the south edge of the Tiger Ridge field, and in both of these wells, the upper and lower sands are completely full of gas.

note: This information has been excerpted from literature prepared some years prior and there could be, and likely are more than two wells now producing from the lower Eagle member.

Figure 2

STRATIGRAPHIC NOMENCLATURE CHART

Figure 3

Isopach map of net porous sandstone in upper unit of Eagle Sandstone Formation.

VI. GEOLOGY

The Eagle Sandstones are within the Montana group of the Santonian stage (82-86 my) of the Upper Cretaceous series and could be considered as a traditional sand reservoir. It is overlain by the Martin Sandstone, which is a newly rediscovered zone contained within the Niobrara sequence (Figure 4).

A. Stratigraphy

The Eagle Formation is composed of a series of thick, porous littoral sandstones which were deposited during the first major eastward regression of the Upper Cretaceous sea. The individual sandstone members are very extensive and for all practical purposes form blanket reservoirs which extend from Canada southeast to the outcrop on the north flank of Cat Creek anticline. The white, salt and pepper, fine grained sandstones are sub-angular to sub-rounded and contain glauconite with some pyrite and lignite. They have excellent porosity and permeability.

In the eastern part of this region, the Eagle is underlain by the silty shale's of the upper Colorado Group. In the western part, it is underlain by the Virgelle Sandstone, which is a sandy facies of the upper Colorado.

After deposition of the Eagle Formation the seas transgressed the entire region and deposited the gray shale's of the Claggett Formation. The Claggett is believed to be the primary source of the gas produced from the Eagle Formation. The overall stratigraphy of the area is ideal for the generation and accumulation of hydrocarbons.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
 September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 4

B. Structure

The Bear Paw uplift plays a major role in the entrapment of gas in the Eagle Formation. For this reason it is important to understand the structural development of the area. As can be seen from Figure 5, the northwest-southeast trending Eagle sandstones cross the present-day uplift. This uplift probably formed in early Laramide time, however there is some evidence that it may have begun to form as early as Eagle time. From its inception, the Bear Paw uplift was a major focal point of gas entrapment. Evidence which is preserved indicates that a gas field of enormous proportions accumulated before later deformation destroyed it.

Figure 5

Isopach map of net porous sandstone in middle unit of Eagle Sandstone Formation.

As the Bear Paw uplift continued to grow, intensive igneous activity occurred in the central part. This igneous activity, in combination with a very weak shear plane located just above the Greenhorn Formation, caused extensive land sliding on both the north and south flanks. Subsurface data show a large area on the south flank where volcanic flows rest on the lower Colorado Shale. This is the area where the landslide broke away from the uplift when it slid to the southeast. Similar conditions seem to exist on the north flank, but are not as well defined. Deeper well penetrations indicate that faulting does not extend to depth, and that a normal (unfaulted) structural configuration exists below the Greenhorn.

The landslide on the south side of the uplift is the easiest to define, since much of the deformation can be mapped on the surface. The landslides carried with them the down dip edges of the paleo-gas field. This gas was then re-entrapped in normal fault blocks which occurred at the head of the slides. The Bear Paw uplift continued to rise, and erosion, which stripped the Eagle Formation from the crestal part, destroyed a major portion of the old gas field. It is believed that additional gas reserves will be found high on the flanks of the Bear Paw uplift, within the normal fault block areas at the head of the old landslides. Numerous traps are also present in the thrust fault segments which occur at the toe of the slide areas, but to date these traps have contained only small gas pools.

VII. FIELD

Because the wells in the Tiger Ridge Field are shallow, 1,500-2,000 feet, and are relatively inexpensive to drill and complete, they provide good investment returns even at a 50% success rate. The reservoir is naturally fractured as a result of the Bear Paw uplift and further it is compartmentalized by igneous intrusives, and as a consequence the EUR's vary significantly.

VIII. RESERVOIR

A. Porosity, Permeability, Thickness, and EUR

The porosity ranges from 15 to 25 percent with permeability's ranging from 10 to 60 md and the completed thickness for both the Upper and Middle Eagle Sands approaches 100 feet, depending on the gas/water contact. The newer wells produce approximately 150 Mcf daily and have EUR's on the order of 400 MMcf. Older wells which were drilled at virgin pressure had EUR's ranging generally up to 2BCF.

B. Reservoir Pressure and Temperature

The lower pressure reservoir portions where the Candidate Wells are located are in the Tiger Ridge field which is north of the Bear Paw mountains. This lower pressure section has been extensively drilled, are is now pressure depleted (225 psi). It generally will not clean up following the liquid-based stimulation treatments. Whereas the areas south of the Bear Paw mountains have significantly greater pressure, 500 psi and can be successfully stimulated with nitrogen foam.

The reservoir pressure as measured by shut-in wellhead pressures in the Candidate Wells ranges from 175 to 297 psi in the test area:

Well	S - #	Pi (Psi)
T30N-R18E		
S-B Ranch	02-05	
Blackwood	06-09	222
Kane	05-08	175
Kane	05-05	297
Kane	04-12	204
S-B Ranch	02-11	225

And, the reservoir temperature is approximately 70 degrees F.

C. Gas Properties

The gas composition is made up of methane, ethane, and nitrogen. There are no sulfur gases nor carbon dioxide present:

Component	Mol pct
C ₂ H ₄	96.5
C ₃ H ₈	0.5
CO ₂	0.0
N ₂	3.0
Sulfur Compounds	0.0
Total	100.0

which results in a biogenic gas with a calorific value of 983 BTU per cubic foot (wet basis).

D. Sensitivity to Stimulation Liquids

This reduced pressure, relatively* dry gas reservoir has a long history of being successfully stimulated with conventional water-based stimulations. Unfortunately, because of the reduced reservoir pressure, the spent stimulation liquids remain in the formation for an extended period and thereby reduce the permeability to gas. The sensitivity of this reservoir to liquids is a consequence of the inability of the reduced pressure to displace the stimulation liquids as opposed to the more conventional conditions of formations reactivity such as swelling shale.

* The completion practices are to perforate the Upper Eagle and the Middle Eagle Sand above any liquid as indicated by the electric logs. The wells do produce very slight volumes of water which are lifted with velocity strings, and any entrained liquid is carried in the gas and does not collect in the separators nor is there any liquid in the tanks.

IX. CO₂ CHARACTERISTICS

The reservoir temperature is 70° F and the pipeline pressure is 15 to 18 psi. The CO₂ will vaporize under these conditions, requiring approximately 29 MM BTUs per 100 tons of liquid CO₂ (Figure 6).

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
 September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Pt # Location	Press (psig)	Temp (°F)	State	Density (lb/cuft)	Enthalpy BTU/lbm
PUMPING*					
1 Well head	3000	0	SL	66.7	-3900
2 Perfs (@1,400 ft)	3636	20**	SL	64.9	-3892
NOT PUMPING					
3 Perfs***	786	20	SL	61.9	-3894
4 Formtn***	225	-18	SL	65.4	-3906
SI/ Flow back			SL>SV SV>SHV		
5 Formtn	225	70	SHV	1.90	-3761
6 Perfs	23	70	SHV	0.32	-3755
7 Well head	17	60	SHV	0.25	-3753
* Pumping through 4.50 in casing at 32 bbls per min					
** Heat gain through casing at 32 bbls per min = $278(10)^3$ BTUs (68 BTU/sqft @ LMDT = 2.6°F)					
*** At the instant that the pumping is terminated $-3906 - (-3761) = -145$ BTU/lb = $-290(10)^3$ BTU/ton					

Heat required to vaporize = $-290(10)^3 \times 91 = -26.39(10)^6$ BTU

Temp diff = $70 - 20 = 50$ deg F

Thermal Conductivity of CO₂ @ 510 deg R @ 100 psi = 0.01 (Btu/hr-sq ft)/(Deg F/ft)

Figure 6

Based on the prediction that the liquid CO₂ will, immediately following the pumping activity, quickly diminish to approximately 786 psi, and then will further drop to the reservoir pressure of 225 psi. This pressure reduction will cause the CO₂ temperature to diminish from +20 F to -18 degrees F. The state of the CO₂ will remain in a liquid phase and it will continue to gain heat at constant temperature through the mixture range. The temperature will begins to increase only after all of the liquid has vaporized.

The CO₂ will at that point be completely vaporized and will continue to increase in temperature until it reaches the formation temperature of 70 degrees F. The majority of the heat will be consumed in changing the phase from a liquid to a gas.

An inquiry was made into the freezing point of the formation water. Ocean's field operations personnel indicated that the water is very fresh, and that it will freeze at 30 degrees F. There was concern that the formation water would freeze. This concern was discussed with Ocean, and calculations on the porosity, water saturation, and heat requirement resulted in Ocean relating that the risk of formation damage from the freezing was reviewed and considered to be minimal.

X. CONVENTIONAL STIMULATION TREATMENTS

Where the reservoir pressure is sufficient to displace the spent stimulation liquids from the reservoir as it still is south of the Bear Paw Uplift, a conventional stimulation generally utilizes a 70 to 75 quality nitrogen foam treatment with approximately 50 barrels of water and 20,000 pounds of 20/40 sand proppant.

Those treatments are pumped down 4-1/2 inch (10.50, K-55) casing at a pressure of 1,200 psi and a clean rate of 16 to 20 barrels per minute through 30 to 50 perforations. The sand concentration averages 4 pounds per gallon of foam. The breakdown pressure can reach 2,200 psi. No breakdown acid is used.

There are also a few wells in the vicinity of the Candidate Wells which have sufficient energy to displace the spent stimulation liquids, but the majority had not been stimulated. One recently drilled well has a reservoir pressure of only 125 psi, but a very strong flow rate. A decision was made to stimulate it with an 80 quality N₂ foam stimulation. The strong flow rate is believed to be adequate to reject the stimulation liquids.

XI. IS THE PROPOSED RESERVOIR LIKELY TO BENEFIT FROM THE CO₂/SAND TECHNOLOGY?

Because the CO₂/Sand stimulation utilizes CO₂ as the working fluid which is pumped as a liquid and will then vaporize at formation temperature and flow from the reservoir as a gas, no liquid remains behind and the gas can flow from the reservoir unimpeded through the artificially created and propped fractures.

A. OPERATOR

Ocean's working interest position in these wells ranged up to 100% and averaged approximately 62%. Additionally, they transport gas for other producing companies, Klabzaba Oil & Gas and John Brown resulting in a total throughput of 78 MMcf per day from 740 wells. The gas is delivered to Great Lakes Transmission via various pipelines operated by Montana Power, Trans Gas, and Trans Canada.

1. Interest in CO₂/sand technology?

Ocean was interested in identifying a stimulation technique which could be used in this liquid sensitive, low pressure reservoir.

2. Adequate test opportunity?

The proposed Candidates would enable an evaluation of the benefits of the liquid-free CO₂/sand stimulation process to be evaluated in an environment where conventional treatments, because the low reservoir pressure (225 psi) was insufficient to expel the spent stimulation liquids could not.

3. Presently active drilling program?

Ocean had an active program and beyond that there were many existing wells which were unstimulated.

4. Is there a future for successful results? Is the operator likely to continue implementing this technology without DOE cost support?

It was strongly indicated that Ocean would continue with the process if the production results were economically favorable.

5. Interest in DOE cost-supported participation?

Ocean indicated an interest in participating in the cost-shared program.

6. Share production data for five years?

They did not comply with the written agreement to provide the post stimulation production data for the agreed upon five year time period.

XII. LETTER OF INTENT

A Letter of Intent which:

- A. Identified the proposed Candidate Wells, their location, the gas producing formations (Eagle Sandstones), and their sensitivity to damage from liquid-based stimulations
- B. Recognized Ocean as the operator
- C. Addressed the potential benefit of the liquid-free CO₂/Sand stimulations
- D. Related that the DOE has a cost-shared demonstration project to introduce this unique technology to U.S. operators, and

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

- E. That the DOE may, subject to their concurrence agree to bear one-half (1/2) of the costs of the stimulations, including the service company charges for product (CO₂, proppant), services, and mobilization.
- F. Confirmed that Ocean was interested in participating in a cost-shared demonstration of the CO₂/Sand stimulation technology and was offering the Candidate Wells for consideration for cost-shared funding under this demonstration effort.
- G. Confirms that Ocean agrees with and supports the Criteria for Success
- H. Ocean agreed to make every effort to avoid "killing" these wells with water and that they would only kill a well in the event of an environmental or safety emergency. In the event of the need to introduce water into the well, Ocean agreed to immediately notify Petroleum Consulting Services (PCS) prior to the treatment.
- I. Ocean agreed that to enable a meaningful comparison of the technologies to be made that these Candidate Wells will be turned in line shortly after stimulation and will be operated at wellhead pressures of 20 psi or less.
- J. Ocean agreed to provide monthly production (gas, oil, and water) and pressure data for both the candidate and the control wells for a period of five years following the CO₂/Sand stimulations. (They failed to comply with this requirement) The monthly production information, including any recordings, shall be forwarded to PCS.
- K. Ocean indicated an intention to enter into a 50/50 cost-shared participation of the stimulation expenses for these Candidate Wells, subject to DOE approvals.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

- L. Ocean agreed to bear the remaining expenses of these treatments and any remaining activities, i.e., those expenses normally associated with these treatments: cement bond log, perforating, bridge plug installation and removal (without introducing liquids if performed following the CO₂/Sand stimulations) dozers, service rigs, etc.

The Letter of Intent was executed by Ocean's Corporate Officer and is attached (Figure 7).

Figure 7 – p. 1 of 7

Letter of Intent – Demonstration CO₂/Sand Stimulation Project – May, 2002
p. 1 of 5

Operator: Ocean Energy, Inc (Ocean)
Candidate Well Location: Blaine County, Montana
Field: Bear Paw - Tiger Ridge Unit
Target Formation: Eagle Sandstone (Middle and Upper)
Candidate Wells: Old Wells (three will be selected from the following list of presently producing wells):

Well	S - #
T30N-R18E	
S-B Ranch	02-05
Blackwood	06-09
Kane	05-08
Kane	05-05
Kane	04-12
S-B Ranch	02-11

Background:

The wells within the Bear Paw field in Blaine County, Montana produce from the pressure-depleted Eagle Sandstones, and are damaged by conventional liquid-based hydraulic fracturing stimulations. The damage results from the inability of the reduced reservoir pressure to expel the spent stimulation liquids following the treatment.

The invasion of the drilling mud into the Eagle Sands during the drilling of these wells and the inability to effectively stimulate them with liquid-based treatments provides an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of a liquid-free stimulation process. This technique utilizes CO₂ as the working fluid which, through the use of specialized equipment, can be pumped as a liquid and will then vaporize at the reservoir pressure and temperature and subsequently flow from the reservoir as a gas leaving a liquid-free proppant pack in the hydraulically created fracture.

This unique process has the potential to significantly improve the gas production rates both through the removal of the near well bore formation damage resulting from the invasion of drilling mud, and also by hydraulically fracturing the formations and placing a liquid-free sand pack within it.

A demonstration project to evaluate the benefits of the liquid CO₂ Sand process in three (3) of the six (6) proposed Candidate Wells is herein described.

Objective:

To evaluate the potential benefit of a liquid-free CO₂/Sand hydraulic stimulation technology in reservoirs from which the natural gas production is impaired by the liquids employed in conventional stimulation treatments.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 7 – p. 2 of 7

Letter of Intent – Demonstration CO₂/Sand Stimulation Project – May, 2002
p. 2 of 5

Methodology:

The evaluation will be conducted within a controlled setting to enable an objective assessment of the production responses resulting from these stimulations to be made. The Candidate Wells have been completed in the target formation and have been selected on the basis of their upside potential for production rate improvement, a commercial volume of remaining reserves, and mechanical suitability for this demonstration (number of perforations & tubing diameter). The proposed Candidates have sufficient background production history to provide the basis for comparing the post-stimulation production rates following the CO₂/Sand stimulations.

Statement:

Whereas, Ocean Energy (Ocean) is the operator of certain wells situated in Blaine Co, Montana within the Tiger Ridge Unit of the Bear Paw Field.

Whereas, Certain formations within this area including the Eagle Sands typically contain natural gas which is drilled and exploited by Ocean.

Whereas, The exploitation of the natural gas from the Eagle Sands is known to benefit from hydraulic stimulation practices to increase the gas production rate and thereby enhance the economic benefit.

Whereas, Conventional hydraulic stimulation practices utilize water-based treatments, and because the reservoir pressure within certain areas of this field has diminished to the point where it is insufficient to eject the spent stimulation liquids from the reservoir.

Whereas, There is a unique "liquid-free" hydraulic stimulation technology which utilizes liquid Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) as the working fluid, and which because of its characteristics enables a stimulation treatment to be pumped as a liquid to both create hydraulic fractures and also to transport proppant. The CO₂ then subsequently changes phase from a liquid to a gas at reservoir conditions and the formation is then void of any liquids or other chemicals which were used in the stimulation.

Note: This CO₂/Sand stimulation process requires a unique, specialized blender to mix the CO₂ and proppant under pressure.

Whereas, The cost of these treatments is more expensive than conventional treatments primarily because of the specialized equipment required and also the cost of the CO₂.

Whereas, The U.S. Department Of Energy (DOE) has a cost-shared demonstration project to introduce this unique technology to U.S. operators. The intention of this program is to enable the operator to evaluate the benefits of this technology on its wells, providing that certain reservoir conditions are present, and that the reporting requirements are satisfactory to both parties. If these conditions exist then, the DOE may, subject to their concurrence agree to bear one-half (1/2) of the costs of the stimulations, including the service company charges for product (CO₂, proppant), services, and mobilization.

Whereas, The DOE requires that in order to provide a representative demonstration that a minimum of three (3) of the Candidate Wells be stimulated.

Whereas, The demonstration of the CO₂/Sand technology is provided through DOE's prime contractor, Petroleum Consulting Services, LLC (PCS).

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
 September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 7 – p. 3 of 7

Letter of Intent – Demonstration CO₂/Sand Stimulation Project – May, 2002
 p. 3 of 5

Whereas, Ocean is interested in participating in the cost-shared demonstration of the CO₂/Sand stimulation technology, and is offering the Candidate Wells as described above for consideration in the cost-shared funding under this demonstration effort.

Therefore, because Ocean Energy (Ocean) is the operator of the Candidate Wells, and is interested in stimulating these wells with the CO₂/Sand stimulation process does hereby agree to the terms of this agreement, and is hereby requesting DOE support in demonstrating the liquid-free CO₂/Sand stimulation process in these Candidate Wells.

The completion, remaining production, and some reservoir properties of the Candidate Wells have been obtained and are summarized as:

Well	S - #	Perf Upr Eagle	Perf Mid Eagle	H ₂ O Lvl	Rem (MMcf)	Skin	Prod (Mc/d)	TTL	Pi (Psi)	P* (Psi)
T30N-R18E										
S-B Ranch	02-05	1134-1197w/10	1220-1261w/ 8	TBD	484,345	TBD	35	??/01	TBD	TBD
Blackwood	06-09	1144-1162w/35	1156-1230w/45	TBD	986.5	+2 R3	220	10/80	222	114
Kane	05-08	1362-1408w/48	1436-1474w/32	TBD	1,306.5	+2.00	100	11/82	175	95
Kane	05-05	1110-1136w/42	1170-1220w/74	TBD	249.3	-12.9	60	10/91	257	83.5
Kane	04-12	1238-1284w/71	1316-1375w/112	TBD	1,131	TBD	100	07/85	204	TBD
S-B Ranch	02-11	1068-1102w/16	1164-1204w/ 8	TBD	4,636.40	-1.82	130	12/72	225	TBD

Criteria for Success

The Criteria for success has been developed for each Candidate Well and is based on the following assumptions:

1. Capital cost for the CO₂/Sand stimulation treatment: \$86M
2. Market price: \$2.50/dth - fixed
3. Calorific value: 1000 BTU/CF
4. Discount rate: 25%
5. Production decline rate: Variable and driven by the production projections supplied by Ocean.

And, which have been used to determine the following total uninterrupted and unencumbered minimum annual production volumes as indicated below, necessary for an economic success.

T30N-R18E		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5
Well	# - S	(MMcf)	(MMcf)	(MMcf)	(MMcf)	(MMcf)
From		06/01/02	06/01/03	06/01/04	06/01/05	06/01/06
Through		05/31/03	05/31/04	05/31/05	05/31/06	05/31/07
S-B Ranch	02-05	25,199	21,421	18,208	15,474	13,153
Blackwood	06-09	90,383	85,593	81,057	76,761	72,692
Kane	05-08	47,626	42,501	37,927	33,845	30,203
Kane	05-05	33,063	24,485	18,134	13,428	9,944
Kane	04-12	51,348	46,873	42,789	39,061	35,658
S-B Ranch	02-11	78,306	71,865	65,954	60,530	55,551

Figure 7 – p. 4 of 7

Letter of Intent – Demonstration CO₂/Sand Stimulation Project – May, 2002
p. 4 of 5

Ocean hereby agrees that these production projections will serve as the basis for establishing the success criteria, and if the actual production volumes from these Candidate Wells exceed these tabulated annual production volumes, subject to adjustments for any non-producing intervals, then Ocean agrees that the CO₂/Sand stimulation process will have resulted in an economic benefit.

Stimulation Treatment:

The design of the stimulation treatments is to consist of approximately 120 tons of liquid carbon dioxide (CO₂) and up to 47,500 pounds of TBD size sand proppant pumped at injection rates of approximately 50 to 60 barrels per minute, and is to consist of a single-stage treatment in each of the three Candidate Wells.

Requirements

Ocean further agrees to comply with the following requirements

1. Because the liquid-free CO₂/proppant process provides a completely dry stimulation it is imperative that liquids not be introduced into the well bore following these treatments.

Ocean agrees to make every effort to avoid "killing" these wells with water or other liquid substance, and agrees that any effort to kill a Candidate Well will only take place in the event of an environmental or safety emergency. In the event of the need to introduce water or other liquids into any well in which DOE participates, then Ocean will immediately notify PCS prior to the introduction of liquids into a Candidate Well.

2. Ocean agrees that to enable a meaningful comparison of the technologies to be made that these candidate wells will be turned in line shortly after stimulation and will be operated at wellhead pressures of 20 psi or less.
3. Ocean agrees to provide monthly production (gas, oil, and water) and pressure data for both the candidate and the control wells for a period of five (5) years following the CO₂/Sand stimulations. The monthly production information, including any recordings, shall be forwarded directly to PCS.
4. If following the treatments any proppant is found in the casing above the lowermost perforation, it will be removed from the well bore at Ocean's expense. No liquids will be circulated for the clean-out unless written approval is obtained from the DOE.
5. The production will be adjusted for any non-producing periods, should they occur
6. The CO₂/Sand stimulation will be considered an economic success if the above tabulated annual production volumes are attained.
7. If there should be any additional discounts associated with these activities, then Ocean agrees to promptly forward one-half to PCS for return to the DOE.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 7 – p. 5 of 7

Letter of Intent – Demonstration CO₂/Sand Stimulation Project – May, 2002
p. 5 of 5

The DOE, subject to their approval of the submitted information, which includes:

1.	Letter of Intent	This document
2.	A map of the candidate wells and nearby offsetting wells	Candidate wells
3.	Electric logs	Candidate wells
4.	Cumulative production data	Candidate wells
5.	Monthly pipeline pressure data	Candidate wells
6.	Stimulation records tabular and strip charts	Candidate wells
7.	Well completion reports	Candidate wells
8.	Description of the field activity	Candidate Wells
9.	Schedule for treating the candidate wells TBD, 2002	TBD
10.	Liability Release (PCS, LLC)	Separate Document

Ocean hereby indicates an intention to enter into a 50/50 cost-shared participation of the stimulation expenses for these candidate wells, subject to DOE approvals.

Ocean agrees to bear the remaining expenses of these treatments and any remaining activities, i.e., those expenses normally associated with these treatments: cement bond log, perforating, bridge plug installation and removal (without introducing liquids if performed following the CO₂/Sand stimulations) dozers, service rigs, etc.

If these conditions are satisfactory, please acknowledge by signing below, and returning this document to:

Petroleum Consulting Services, LLC
P. O. Box 35833
Canton, Ohio 44735
(330) 499-3823 (330) 499-2280 (fax)

Date:

Signed:

5/25/02

Company Officer - Ocean Energy, Inc.

Title: V.P. Exploration NAO

Witness: _____

Final Report -- Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
September 2002 -- Single Stage Treatments -- Ocean Energy
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 7 -- p. 6 of 7

AMMENDMENT TO LETTER OF INTENT (LOI) DATED MAY 23, 2002

DATE: July 15, 2002

p. 1 of 2

As an outcome of discussions held on July 9, 2002 between the;

Operator: Ocean Energy, Inc (Ocean),
Contractor: PCS, and
The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE);

regarding the identification of Candidate Wells located in Blaine County, Montana (T30N-R18E), and their stimulation with the liquid-free CO₂/Sand stimulation process under the terms of the original LOI. - which addresses the provisions for a cost-shared demonstration of this technology, the following modifications were made:

1. The number of Candidate Wells to be stimulated with and has been increased from three to four.
2. The Candidate Wells have been specifically identified as:

Well	S - #
<u>T30N-R18E</u>	
S-B Ranch	02-05
Blackwood	06-09
Kane	05-08
Kane	05-05

3. The S-B Ranch 02-05 has a limited number of perforations, 18 and is completed in both the Upper and Middle Eagle Sand members. Based on the electric log response it is not expected to produce water.

It was agreed that both the Upper and Middle Eagle Sand intervals would be stimulated with a single-stage CO₂/Sand stimulation

4. The other three Candidate Wells, Blackwood 06-09, Kane 05-08, and Kane 05-05 will be stimulated in the Upper Eagle Sand member only.

The Upper Eagle will be isolated through the installation of a solid, impermeable plug inside the production casing, between the Upper and Middle Eagle formations which will prevent the stimulation treatment from passing it.

5. The steady-state production rates need to be established prior to the stimulation. The plan is to set temporary plugs in these three Candidate Wells within a few days and to begin the production monitoring.
6. The plugs will remain in place for a period of time sufficient to obtain a post-stimulation steady state production rate.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 7 – p. 7 of 7

AMMENDMENT TO LETTER OF INTENT (LOI) DATED MAY 23, 2002

DATE: July 15, 2002

p. 2 of 2

7. The treatments will utilize radioactive tracers to enable the location of the hydraulically created fracture(s) to be specifically identified providing:
 - a. That the service company can demonstrate their ability to inject the radioactive isotopes into liquid CO₂ at a pressure of 300 psi and at a temperature of 0 degrees Fahrenheit prior to the treatments.
 - b. The hazards associated with immediate flow back of sand in the well bore following a screen out can be assured as a safe procedure
8. The hurdle production rates were calculated previously, and are addressed in the original LOI.

If these modifications to the original LOI are satisfactory, please acknowledge by signing below, and returning this document to:

Petroleum Consulting Services, LLC
P. O. Box 35833
Canton, Ohio 44735
(330) 499-3823 (330) 499-2280 (fax)

Date:

Signed:

July 19, 2002

Gregory E Evans
Company Officer - Ocean Energy, Inc.

Title: VP EXPLORATION NORTH AMERICA

Witness: Ken Seif 7/17/2002

XIII. TEST AREA

Discussions with Ocean were directed towards the identification of an area in which the reservoir pressure of the Eagle Sandstone was depleted, where there was a sufficient data base of background production information, and which would hold an appreciable basis for future activity. The result being that a test area was identified in T30N, R18E. The accompanying map (Figure 8) indicates the test area and the Candidate Wells.

Figure 8

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
 September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

A. Control Wells

There were no Control Wells included in this effort because the Candidate Wells were actively producing wells which enabled both the pre- and post-stimulation production rates to be measured and compared.

This approach is unique to this effort because in the past the producing wells had been previously stimulated with liquid-based treatments and the reservoir was considered to be damaged by these stimulation liquids. Consequently, the CO₂/Sand stimulations had to be performed in new, unstimulated wells and, the existing previously stimulated wells served as the Control Wells to which the production responses were compared.

This approach in measuring the pre- and post-stimulation response from wells which have never been stimulated is superior to that which utilized the Control Wells because the well specific variables of porosity, thickness, etc. are eliminated.

B. Candidate Wells – 6 > 4 Wells

There were six originally proposed Candidate Wells from which four were selected. They are located within Township 30N-Range 18E (Figures 9 and 10). The wells are listed in the order considered by Ocean to provide the greatest opportunity to demonstrate and evaluate the effectiveness of the CO₂/Sand stimulation technology, that is, the S-B Ranch 02-05 is considered to be the most desirable for stimulation. (Ultimately Blackwood 06-09 had the largest incremental improvement of 54.1 MMcf following 22 producing months following the stimulation).

Well	S - #	Upr Eagle Perfs	Mid Eagle Perfs	Lwr Eagle Perfs	PB Req'd	Stim Type (Sxs, Bbls)	Rem (MMcf)	Skin	Prod (Mcf/d)	Pi (Psi)
T30N-R18E	S - #	Upr Eagle Perfs	Mid Eagle Perfs	Lwr Eagle Perfs	PB Req'd	(Sxs, Bbls)	(MMcf)			
S-B Ranch	02-05	1120-1202 1134-1197w/12	1222-1260 1220- 1261w/ 8	1283-1290 None	No	None	484.345	TBD	35	170
Kane	05-08	1359-1334 1362-1380w/22	1436-1502 1388-1408w/ 26	1515-1538 None	Yes@1420	None	359.000	+2.00	100	175
Kane	05-05	1094-1142 1110-1136w/42	1168-1233 1170-1220w/ 74	1283-1290 None	Yes@1150	None	96.700	+12.9	60	297
Blackwood	06-09	1142-1188 1144-1147w/20	1241-1288 1156-1162w/ 18	1302-1328 None	No	None	986.500	+2.83	220	222
Kane	04-12	1238-1301 1238-1284w/71	1316-1383 1316-1375w/112	1395-1422 None	Yes@1294	None	460.568	+6.74	100	204
S-B Ranch	02-11	1052-1128 1068-1102w/16	1157-1238 1164-1204w/ 8	1250-1252 None	No	None	853.946	-1.82	180	225

Figure 9

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
 September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 10

1. Electric Logs

- a. The electric logs on two of the Candidate Wells are attached (Figures 11 and 12).

Figure 11 S-B Ranch 02-05

Figure 12 Kane 05-08

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
 September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

2. Completion

The completion technique was to set and cement casing, generally 4-1/2 in, through the Eagle Sands, run electric logs to determine the gas/water contact, and perforate above it. Generally, the Upper Eagle and upper section of the Middle Eagle were perforated. No stimulations were generally performed because the reservoir pressure (225 psi) was insufficient to expel the spent stimulation liquids

3. Perforation Strategy

The design criteria was to limit the number of perforations to a maximum of 40. Because of the large number of perforations in three of the Candidates, and the associated concern regarding an insufficient transport velocity, the design included temporarily plugging-off the lower perforations during the stimulation.

Well	S - #	Upr Eagle Perfs	Mid Eagle Perfs	Lwr Eagle Perfs	PB Req'd	Add'l Perfs	Total Perfs During Stim
T30N-R18E							
S-B Ranch	02-05	1120-1202 1134-1197w/12	1222-1260 1220-1261w/ 8	1283-1290 None	No	20	40
Kane	05-08	1359-1334 1362-1380w/48	1436-1502 1388-1408w/ 34	1515-1538 None	Yes@1420	-34	48
Kane	05-05	1094-1142 1110-1136w/42	1168-1233 1170-1220w/ 74	1283-1290 None	Yes@1150	-74	42
Blackwood	06-09	1142-1188 1144-1147w/20	1241-1288 1156-1162w/ 18	1302-1328 None	No	0	38
Kane	04-12	1238-1301 1238-1284w/71	1316-1383 1316-1375w/112	1395-1422 None	Yes@1294	-112	71
S-B Ranch	02-11	1052-1128 1068-1102w/16	1157-1238 1164-1204w/ 8	1250-1252 None	No	16	40

4. Production Review and Projections

All six of the proposed Candidate Wells produce from both the Upper and Middle Eagle Sand members. None were perforated in the Lower Eagle. Three of the Candidate Wells contained a large number of perforations which were considered to be too many and for the CO₂/Sand process.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
 September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

This was because the proppant transport rate into the individual perforations will be insufficient to transport the proppant and will increase the likelihood of a screen out.

The wells were rank ordered by Ocean in their recommended sequence which was believed to provide the most benefit. This rank ordering results in the plugging of the Lower Eagle Sand in the wells which are ranked 3, 4, and 5, which almost dictates that at least one of the three Candidates will require plugging of the Middle Eagle and treating the Upper sand member only.

Well						Prod
T30N-R18E	S - #	Upr Eagle Perfs	Mid Eagle Perfs	Lwr Eagle Perfs	PB Req'd	(Mcf/d)
S-B Ranch	02-05	1120-1202 1134-1197w/12	1222-1260 1220-1261w/ 8	1283-1290 None	No	35
Blackwood	06-09	1142-1188 1144-1147w/20	1241-1288 1156-1162w/ 18	1302-1328 None	Yes	220
Kane	05-08	1359-1334 1362-1380w/22	1436-1502 1388-1408w/ 26	1515-1538 None	Yes@1420	100
Kane	05-05	1094-1142 1110-1136w/42	1168-1233 1170-1220w/ 74	1283-1290 None	Yes@1150	60
Kane	04-12	1238-1301 1238-1284w/71	1316-1383 1316-1375w/112	1395-1422 None	Yes@1294	100
S-B Ranch	02-11	1052-1128 1068-1102w/16	1157-1238 1164-1204w/ 8	1250-1252 None	No	180

In order to properly measure the production response associated with the CO₂/Sand treatment, a producing period sufficient to eliminate the production from the unstimulated interval (Middle Eagle) was agreed to.

Ocean installed the temporary plugs immediately before the stimulation and then removed it after 22 months following the CO₂/Sand stimulation. This procedure allowed for the stimulation of only the Upper Eagle while comparing the post-stimulation production from both the Upper and Middle Sands.

The production histories for the six Candidate Wells were plotted and accompanied the submittal package to the DOE. The production rates for each well was identified, and used as an input to determine the minimum annual post-stimulation production necessary to achieve an economic success. The economic success calculations are attached and addressed in the CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS section.

XIV. CO₂/SAND STIMULATION TREATMENTS

A. Design

In the initial proposal various stimulation designs were prepared by Canadian Fracmaster and presented to Ocean. The result being that the design which included the largest proppant volume was selected.

During the two year intervening period, Canadian Fracmaster had been acquired by another service company, and bids for the CO₂/Sand stimulations were obtained from another Canadian based service company, TriCan Well Service, Ltd.

The proposed design included 44,100 pounds of 20/40 sand proppant and 685 barrels of liquid CO₂ (132 tons) pumped at 47 barrels per minute – The pumped volume is 513 barrels (99 tons) . The maximum sand concentration is 5 pounds per gallon, and the projected wellhead pressure is 1,531 psi (10,560 kPa). A copy of the proposal including the sand schedule is attached (Figure 13).

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
 September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 13 – p. 1 of 7

CO ₂ /SAND STIMULATION - OCEAN ENERGY - BLAINE CO, MT					06/01/02			
INPUTS		DELIVERY DISTANCES(Km)			COST(\$CAN)		COST(\$US)	
PRODUCT	SAND	441 SX	300	PER WELL	\$95,811		\$62,422	
	CO ₂	160 TONS	300					
	N ₂ /CO ₂	1.03 MCF/TON						
HORSEPOWER		1770 HHP			OPERATOR		\$31,211	
PUMP RATE		47 BPM			DOE		\$31,211	
DISCOUNT		40 %					\$62,422	
	N ₂	164.8 MCF	300					
CONVERSION FACTORS:	KW/HP	1.3410 sm ³ /TON	1.2120					
	m ³ /BBL	6.2905 tonne/TON	1.1025					
	Kg/LB	2.2050 Km/MI	1.6090					
	sm ³ /SCF	35.3100 \$US/\$CAN	0.6515					
DESCRIPTION	METRIC UNIT	METRIC QUANT	UNIT COST(\$CAN)	UNIT COST(\$CAN)	UNIT COST(\$US)	US UNIT	US QUANT	UNIT COST(\$US)
STAGE #1								
PUMPING	KW	1319.91	12.30	16,235	10,577	HHP	1770	5.98 \$US/HHP
BLENDER(SET UP)	UNIT	1	2190.00	2,190	1,427	UNIT	1	1426.80 \$US/UNIT
BLENDER(PUMPING)	m ³ /min	7.5	210.00	1,569	1,022	BPM	47	21.75 \$US/BPM
20/40 API SPEC SAND	tonne	20	380.00	7,600	4,951	SK	441	11.23 \$US/SK
SAND DELIVERY	tonne/Km	6000	0.95	5,700	3,714	TON/MI	4,111	0.90 \$US/TON/MI
DENSIMETER								
CONNECTION TRUCK	UNIT	1	1510.00	1,510	984	UNIT	1	983.78 \$US/UNIT
VAN	UNIT	1	3860.00	3,860	2,515	UNIT	1	2514.82 \$US/UNIT
N ₂ PUMPING UNITS	UNITS	2	2250.00	4,500	2,932	UNITS	2	1465.89
N ₂	sm ³	4667	1.35	6,301	4,105	MCF	165	24.91
N ₂ DELIVERY								
CO ₂	sm ³	132	635.00	83,825	54,613	TONS	160	341.33 \$US/TON
PORTABLES	UNITS	2	2440.00	4,880	3,179	UNITS	2	1589.68 \$US/UNIT
TRANSPORT (SET UP)	UNITS	2	620.00	1,240	808	UNITS	2	403.94 \$US/UNIT
CO ₂ DELIVERY	m ³ -Km	39602.6	0.39	15,445	10,063	TON/MI	77,232	0.13 \$US/TON/MI
			TOTAL	154,855	100,889			
WELLS	3		TOTAL	464,565	302,668			
MILEAGE-FRAC UNIT (8)	UNIT/Km	2400	4.83	11,592	7,552	UNIT/MI	1.96	
MILEAGE-FRAC UNIT (2)	UNIT/Km	600	4.83	2,898	1,888	UNIT/MI	1.96	
			TOTAL	14,490	9,440			
			TOTAL- 3 WELLS	\$479,055	\$312,109			
			DISCOUNT	\$191,622	\$124,843			
			TOTAL- 3 WELLS	\$287,433	\$187,265			
			PER WELL	\$95,811	\$62,422			
			OPERATOR		\$31,211			
			DOE		\$31,211			
					\$62,422			

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 13 – p. 2 of 7

— Original Message —

From: Browne, Dave
To: Raymond L. Mazza
Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2002 6:03 PM
Subject: RE: Quote for Liquid CO₂ Fracs Near Havre, MT

Ray,

1. We can frac at Havre for US\$ 56,000 per frac. This is based on the the information you supplied Mike Tulissi regarding horsepower, splitting the mileage between 3 fracs, assuming there is only one day between each frac and we frac in April. I'll send you a program soon.
2. We are interested bidding on the Kentucky fracs for April or May. It would be best if we could do Havre and Kentucky in the same border crossing.
3. We will also like to bid on your other projects.

Dave Browne

— Original Message —

From: Raymond L. Mazza [mailto:o.g@worldnet.att.net]
Sent: February 20, 2002 9:50 AM
To: David J Browne
Cc: Gary Covatch; Al Yost
Subject: Quote for Liquid CO₂ Fracs Near Havre, MT

Dave,

During your absence last week, I spoke with Michael Tulissi regarding

1. An updated cost estimate for your previous proposal (10/17) for stimulating three wells near Havre, Mt with single-stage treatments during your slack time, perhaps in April. The design would be for 20 Tonnes of 30/50 proppant, 120 short tons of CO₂, and 2000 hydraulic horsepower.
2. Interest in performing liquid CO₂ fracs in eastern Kentucky, near Pikeville in April. The design would be for 20 Tonnes of 30/50 proppant, 120 short tons of CO₂, and 4000 hydraulic horsepower.
3. Exploring your interests in providing liquid CO₂ stimulation treatments in the western U.S. in south west Wyoming and northern New Mexico.

Please let me know as soon as you can about the quote for Havre as the operator is awaiting my call back.

Welcome back,

Regards,

Ray Mazza (330) 499-3823

2/22/2002

Figure 13 – p. 3 of 7

WELL SERVICE LTD.

STIMULATION PROPOSAL

Liquid CO₂ Frac

20.0 tonne Sand (20/40)

Belly River - Eagle (Gas)

Ocean Energy - Hill County

Havre Montana

Version 3 Option 1

Inject Down Casing

Approved: February 20 2002

PETROLEUM CONSULTING SERVICES

Box 35833

Canton, Ohio

44735

Prepared For: Raymond Mazza

For Service Call: Red Deer (403) 346-4667

Sales Rep: Chuck Vozniak (403) 215 1982

Designed By: David Browne (403) 215 5890

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) - September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 13 – p. 4 of 7

Ocean Energy - Hill County Havre Montana
Liquid CO2 Frac
Option 1 Version 3

Completions

Wellhead: Wellhead Saver (Casing)

Pumping Configuration: Casing

Casing: 114.3mm, 14.14kg/m, J-55
0.0 - 480.0 m (TMD)

Burst: 30 MPa
Collapse: 23 MPa

Hole Volume: 3.87 m³

Perforations: 457.0 - 480.0 m (TMD)

Formation: Belly River - Eagle (Gas)
Frac Gradient: 20.0 kPa/m

BHST: 14 °C

Calculations

$$P_{fracture} = \text{Gradient}_{fracture} (20.0 \text{ kPa/m}) \times \text{Depth}_{vertical} (480.0 \text{ m}) = 9600 \text{ kPa}$$

$$P_{friction} = \text{Gradient}_{friction} (12.0 \text{ kPa/m}) \times \text{Depth}_{measured} (480.0 \text{ m}) = 5760 \text{ kPa}$$

$$P_{\text{hydrostatic}} = \text{Gradient}_{\text{hydrostatic}} (10.0 \text{ kPa/m}) \times \text{Depth}_{\text{vertical}} (480.0 \text{ m}) = 4800 \text{ kPa}$$

$$P_{injection} = P_{fracture} (9600 \text{ kPa}) + P_{friction} (5760 \text{ kPa}) - P_{hydrostatic} (4800 \text{ kPa}) = 10560 \text{ kPa}$$

$$\text{Power}_{\text{CO}_2} = P_{\text{injection}} (10560 \text{ kPa}) \times \text{Rate}_{\text{CO}_2} (7.5 \text{ m}^3/\text{min}) / 60 = 1320 \text{ kW}$$

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
 September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 13 – p. 5 of 7

Ocean Energy - Hill County Havre Montana
 Liquid CO₂ Frac
 Option 1 Version 3

Procedures

Equipment: 2 CO₂ Storage Tanks
 1 CO₂ Transport
 1320 kW Frac CO₂ Pumping
 1 Frac Van
 1 Iron Truck
 1 Liquid CO₂ Blender
 2 N₂ Pumping Units

Objective: To perform a CO₂ Frac treatment on the Eagle (Belly River) formation.

Key Notes: Be prepared to flow well back immediately following treatment.

Safety: Spot tanks and equipment as per recommended equipment spacing. Conduct pre-treatment safety meeting with all personnel on location. Review all fire, chemical, and high pressure hazards.

Rig Up: Rig up to fracture well down Casing, through a Wellhead Saver (Casing).

Pressure: Pressure Test: 30 MPa

Maximum Pressure: 24 MPa

Rate: Anticipated downhole rate is 7.50 m³/min, at 10,560 kPa.

Spearhead: 1.00 m³ of Spearhead Acid.

Pad: 20.00 m³ of CO₂.

Proppant: 20.00 tonne of Sand (20/40), placed with 58.53 m³ of CO₂.

Flush: 3.07 m³ of CO₂. This corresponds to an underflush volume of 0.80 m³, and must be recalculated on location.

Shut In: Shut in well, and rig out Trican equipment. Customer will supply all flowback equipment. When flowing well back, follow Alberta Recommended Practices, OHS, & AEUB recommendations.

Ocean Energy - Hill County Havre Montana
 Liquid CO₂ Frac
 Option 1 Version 3

Treatment Schedules

Liquid CO₂ Blender Treatment Schedule 1

Stage	Blender Slurry			Blender Clean			Blender Proppant				Fluid And Proppant	
	Rate (m ³ / min)	Volume (m ³)		Rate (m ³ / min)	Volume (m ³)		Concentration (kg / m ³)		Amount (tonne)			
	Start of Stage	Per Stage	Cum. At End Of Stage	Start of Stage	End of Stage	Per Stage	Cum. At End Of Stage	Start of Stage	End of Stage	Per Stage		Cum. At End Of Stage
1 Spearhead	1.00	1.0	0.0	1.00	1.00	1.0	0.0					Spearhead Acid
2 Pad	7.50	20.0	20.0	7.50	7.50	20.0	20.0					CO2
3 Proppant	7.50	5.1	25.1	7.36	7.23	5.0	25.0	50	100	0.4	0.4	CO2 Sand (20/40)
4 Proppant	7.50	10.6	35.7	7.23	6.97	10.0	35.0	100	200	1.5	1.9	CO2 Sand (20/40)
5 Proppant	7.50	10.9	46.7	6.97	6.74	10.0	45.0	200	300	2.5	4.4	CO2 Sand (20/40)
6 Proppant	7.50	11.3	58.0	6.74	6.52	10.0	55.0	300	400	3.5	7.9	CO2 Sand (20/40)
7 Proppant	7.50	11.7	69.7	6.52	6.31	10.0	65.0	400	500	4.5	12.4	CO2 Sand (20/40)
8 Proppant	7.50	12.1	81.8	6.31	6.12	10.0	75.0	500	600	5.5	17.9	CO2 Sand (20/40)
9 Proppant	7.50	4.3	86.1	6.12	6.12	3.5	78.5	600	600	2.1	20.0	CO2 Sand (20/40)
10 Flush	7.50	3.1	89.2	7.50	7.50	3.1	81.6					CO2

**Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"**

Figure 13 – p. 6 of 7

Ocean Energy - Hill County Havre Montana
Liquid CO₂ Frac
Option 1 Version 3

Fluid And Mixing Requirements

HCl (15%) Volume From Program: 1.0 m³
Total HCl (15%) Volume: 1.0 m³

CO₂ (Liquid) Volume From Program: 81.6 m³
Cool-down and Losses: 27.4 m³
Total CO₂ (Liquid) Volume: 109.0 m³ Requires: 1 CO₂ Transport
2 CO₂ Storage Tanks

N₂ Volume From Program: 4000 sm³
Cool-down and Losses: 600 sm³
Total N₂ Volume: 4600 sm³ Requires: 2 N₂ Pumping Units

1 m³ Spearhead Acid (15% HCl) Spearhead
5 kg/m³ IC-3 (Iron Control) - pre-mixed
2 L/m³ AI-1 (Corrosion Inhibitor) - pre-mixed
2 L/m³ S-1 (Surfactant) - pre-mixed

Total Products Required

2L AI-1 (Corrosion Inhibitor)
1 m³ HCl (15%)
4600 sm³ N₂ (Gas)
20 tonne Sand (20/40)

109 m³ CO₂ (Liquid)
5 kg IC-3 (Iron Control)
2L S-1 (Surfactant)

Ocean Energy - Hill County Havre Montana
Liquid CO₂ Frac
Option 1 Version 3

Discounted Price

Amount	Description	Discount	Unit Price (Discounted, Area A)	Price (Discounted)
Services And Equipment				
7.5 m ³ /min	Blender (Pumping)	40.0%	\$135.00 / m ³ /min	\$1,012.50
2 unit	CO ₂ Storage Tank	40.0%	\$1,580.00 / unit	\$3,120.00
1 unit	CO ₂ Transport (Setup)	40.0%	\$399.00 / unit	\$399.00
1320 kW	Frac CO ₂ Pumping (kW, 0-35.0 MPa)	40.0%	\$7.95 / kW	\$10,494.00
1 unit	Frac Van (Setup)	40.0%	\$2,478.00 / unit	\$2,478.00
1 unit	Iron Truck (Setup)	40.0%	\$972.00 / unit	\$972.00
1 unit	Liquid CO ₂ Blender (Setup)	40.0%	\$1,470.00 / unit	\$1,470.00
2 unit	N ₂ Pumping Unit (Setup)	40.0%	\$1,425.00 / unit	\$2,850.00
				Sub-total: \$22,795.50
Products				
2L	AI-1 (Corrosion Inhibitor)	40.0%	\$16.59 / L	\$33.18
109 m ³	CO ₂ (Liquid)	40.0%	\$381.00 / m ³	\$41,529.00
1 m ³	HCl (15%)	40.0%	\$372.00 / m ³	\$372.00
5 kg	IC-3 (Iron Control)	40.0%	\$7.92 / kg	\$39.60
4600 sm ³	N ₂ (Gas)	40.0%	\$0.84 / sm ³	\$3,864.00
2L	S-1 (Surfactant)	40.0%	\$12.84 / L	\$25.68
20 tonne	Sand (20/40)	40.0%	\$246.00 / tonne	\$4,918.77
				Sub-total: \$50,782.23
Travel And Cartage				
109 m ³ x 300 km	Cartage (Liquid CO ₂)	40.0%	\$0.25 / m ³ km	\$8,240.40
20 tonne x 300 km	Cartage (Proppant)	40.0%	\$0.61 / tonne km	\$3,671.08
8 unit x 100 km	Frac Unit (Travel)	40.0%	\$3.09 / unit km	\$2,472.00
2 unit x 100 km	N ₂ Unit (Travel)	40.0%	\$3.09 / unit km	\$618.00
				Sub-total: \$15,001.48
				Total Discounted Price: \$88,579.21

All quantities (including mileage) are estimated, and are subject to change depending upon actual amounts used. Any service or materials required, but not mentioned will be at book price less discount. Any applicable taxes (eg: GST) will be added to the invoice. Book prices less discount are in effect for 30 days after the date shown. Due to the uncertainty of energy costs, prices may change without notice.

Third Party

Cartage (Additional Chemicals)
Fluid Cartage & Heating
Wellhead Saver (Casing)

Figure 13 – p. 7 of 7

B. Proppant Size

20/40 (USS) sand proppant was currently being utilized in the conventional treatments and successful in the CO₂/sand stimulations, and on that basis was proposed in the design

C. Treatment Volume

The conventional treatments were relatively small, 200 sacks. The ability to transport proppant with liquid CO₂ is limited especially as the kh increases.

Efforts were to place the maximum proppant load of 44,100 pounds (for TriCan's blender). This plan would enable a maximum proppant volume to be realized and because the normal design trade off between the proppant volume and the damage resulting from the spent frac liquids becomes moot when compared to CO₂. The maximum benefit would be realized and there is no sustained penalty for increasing the volume of liquid CO₂ - because it will vaporize and flow from the reservoir as a gas.

A geologically similar but lower permeability formation was stimulated in Phillips County approximately 80 miles east of the test area and no problems were experienced placing the full 47,500 pound proppant load (FracMaster blender) in May 1998 (Group #5).

In actuality the sand proppant placed in-zone, following the removal of sand from the wellbore ranged from 8,500 to 24,900 lbs and averaged 16,400 lbs.

D. Treatment Volume Comparison – Conventional vs. CO₂/Sand

Generally, the wells in the vicinity of the Candidate Wells were not stimulated because of the low reservoir pressure. Should they have been, it would likely have been with a high quality N₂ foam containing approximately 20,000 pounds of 20/40 proppant.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
 September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

XV. STIMULATION CHECKLIST

A stimulation checklist is attached (Figure 14). It summarizes the pertinent information regarding the reservoir, stimulation treatment, production, and marketing.

Figure 14 – p. 1 of 2

PETROLEUM CONSULTING SERVICES
 (330) 499-3823
 (330) 499-2280 (fax)

CO₂/SAND STIMULATION CHECKLIST
 p. 1 of 2

Date: 05/18/00

Formation:	<u>Eagle Sand</u>	Operator:	<u>Ocean Energy - Amoco Bldg</u>
Geologic Era:	<u>Upper Cretaceous</u>		<u>1670 Broadway Ste 2700</u>
County:	<u>Blaine</u>		<u>Denver, CO 80202</u>
State:	<u>Montana</u>	POC:	<u>Mr. Richard Myal (303) 308-8868</u>
Field:	<u>Tiger Ridge</u>		<u>Mr. Ken Sigl (713) 265-6637</u>
Basin:	<u>Sweet Grass Arch/Bear Paw Uplift</u>		<u>Mr. David Thomas (713) 265-6631</u>

1. Reservoir
 - a. Depth (ft): 1100-1600
 - b. Thickness (ft): 0-100
 - c. Porosity (%): 16-26
 - d. Permeability (md): (Unconfined core = 350) 10-60
 - e. Pressure (psig): 150-350(N of Mtn)
 - f. Temp (deg F): 70
 - g. Well Spacing (A): 80-160
2. Production
 - a. Natural
 - i. Gas (MMcf/d):
 - ii. Oil (BO/d): 0
 - b. Post-Stimulation - Current Technology
 - i. Gas (Mcf/d):
 - ii. Oil (BO/d):
3. Completion: Set Through & Perforate
4. Frac Length Required (ft):
5. Frac Gradient (psi/ft): 0.7-0.8
6. Frac Type (Gel Wtr, Foam, etc) - Present Technology: N2 Foam
 - a. Breakdown Acid: None
 - b. Foam Quality: 70-75
 - c. Breakdown Pressure (psi): 2200
 - d. Liquid Volume (bbl): 175
 - e. Sand Placed (sxs): 215
 - f. Rate (bpm): 27
 - g. Sand Conc (ppg): 4.0
 - h. Avg Treating Pressure (psi): 1200
 - i. Max Treating Pressure (psi): 1250
 - j. ISIP (psi): 800
 - k. Costs (\$M)
 - i. Service Company: 20
 - ii. CO₂ (\$/ton): 200
 - iii. Tanks w/ Trucking: 2.4
 - iv. Service Rig: 0
 - v. Load Water Disposal: \$1.00/BBL
 - vi. Pit - Earthwork, Liner: 2.0

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 14 – p. 2 of 2

PETROLEUM CONSULTING SERVICES
(330) 499-3823
(330) 499-2280 (fax)

CO₂/SAND STIMULATION CHECKLIST

p. 2 of 2

Date: 05/03/00

Formation: Eagle Sand Operator: Ocean Energy

7. Load Water
 - a. Vol Returned (bbls) (%): (Low Pressure Area Tiger Ridge) 10
 - b. Time Required (days): Lengthy
 - c. Vol Retained (bbls): 90
8. Casing - Candidate Wells
 - a. Dia (in): 4.5
 - b. Weight (lb/ft): 10.50
 - c. Grade: K-55
 - d. MWP (psi): (4790 psi interval yield @ 80%) 3,830
9. Perforations - Candidate Wells
 - a. Depth (ft):
 - b. Number: 5
10. Calorific Value (BTU/cuft): 970
11. Pipeline Pressure (psi): 15-18
12. Allowable CO₂ concentration in sales line (%) 2 (Many Islands)
13. Gas Transporter: Many Islands
14. Gas Purchaser: Montana Pwr/Great Lakes
 - a. Purchase Price (\$/dth): (Net bank @ wellhead) 1.50/Mcf
15. EUR with Current Tech
 - a. Gas (MMcf):
 - b. Oil (MBO): 0
16. NPV with Current Tech (\$M):
17. Predict Required EUR for Candidate Wells (\$M):
18. Predict Required NPV for Candidate Wells (\$M):
19. Comments:

XVI. CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS

The evaluation was conducted within a controlled setting to enable an objective assessment of the production responses resulting from these stimulations to be made. The Candidate Wells had been completed in the target formation and were selected on the basis of their upside potential for production rate improvement, a commercial volume of remaining reserves, and mechanical suitability for this demonstration (number of perforations & tubing diameter). The proposed Candidates had a sufficient background production history to provide the basis for comparing the post-stimulation production rates following the CO₂/Sand stimulations.

A. Establishing success criteria

The completion, remaining production, and some reservoir properties of the Candidate Wells were obtained and are summarized as:

Well	S - #	T	Upr Eagle	Mid Eagle	Lwr Eagle	PB Req'd	H ₂ O	Stim Type	Rem	Skin	Prod	Pi	P*
		°F	Perfs	Perfs	Perfs		Lvl	Sxs, Bbls	MMcf		Mcf/d	Psi	Psi
T30N-R18E													
B Ranch	02-05	72	1120-1202 1134-1197w/12	1222-1260 1220-1261w/ 8	1283-1290 None	No	TBD	None	484.345	TBD	35	170	TBD
Kane	05-08	72	1359-1334 1362-1380w/22	1436-1502 1388-1408w/ 26	1515-1538 None	Yes@1420	TBD	None	359.000	+2.00	100	175	95
ane	05-05	72	1094-1142 1110-1136w/42	1168-1233 1170-1220w/ 74	1283-1290 None	Yes@1150	TBD	None	96.700	+12.9	60	297	83.5
Blackwood	06-09	72	1142-1188 1144-1147w/20	1241-1288 1156-1162w/ 18	1302-1328 None	No	TBD	None	986.500	+2.83	220	222	114
ane	04-12	72	1238-1301 1238-1284w/71	1316-1383 1316-1375w/112	1395-1422 None	Yes@1294	TBD	None	460.568	+6.74	100	204	107
S-B Ranch	02-11	72	1052-1128 1068-1102w/16	1157-1238 1164-1204w/ 8	1250-1252 None	No	TBD	None	853.946	-1.82	180	225	TBD

The Criteria for success has been developed for each Candidate Well (the calculations for each well are included in their individual well sections) and is based on the following assumptions:

1. An economic success required that the cost benefit associated with the production rates resulting from the CO₂/Sand stimulations will have to exceed the pre-stimulation

production revenues by a discounted cash flow which equals or exceeds the cost of the treatment

2. Capital cost for the CO₂/Sand stimulation treatment: \$86,000. This was a previous estimate which was at the time considered to likely be greater than the actual cost. In that event the production hurdle rates will be recalculated using the actual treatment cost.

a.	Market price:	\$2.50/dth – fixed
b.	Calorific value:	1000 BTU/CF
c.	Discount rate:	25%
d.	Production decline rate:	Variable and driven by the production projections supplied by Ocean.

The evaluation was not further burdened by the operating expenses because they are presently being incurred and would be the same irrespective of the treatment.

These inputs were used to determine the following total uninterrupted and unencumbered minimum annual production volumes as indicated below, necessary for an economic success.

The methodology was to project the production from the historical production rates for each well, and then to add an incremental production rate to compensate for the cost of the treatment. The total of these two components, the projected production rate and the incremental value to offset the stimulation cost, equals the minimum total production rate required for an economic success.

The individual production projections and the incremental rates necessary to provide the discounted cash flow have been calculated on an annual basis, for five years and are included in the individual well sections, and are summarized:

T30N-R18E		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	Total
Well	# - S	(MMcf)	(MMcf)	(MMcf)	(MMcf)	(MMcf)	(MMcf)
From:		06/01/02	06/01/03	06/01/04	06/01/05	06/01/06	06/01/02
Through:		05/31/03	05/31/04	05/31/05	05/31/06	05/31/07	05/31/07
S-B Ranch	02-05	25,199	21,421	18,208	15,474	13,153	93,455
Blackwood	06-09	90,383	85,593	81,057	76,761	72,692	406,486
Kane	05-08	47,626	42,501	37,927	33,845	30,203	192,102
Kane	05-05	33,063	24,485	18,134	13,428	9,944	99,054
Kane	04-12	51,348	46,873	42,789	39,061	35,658	215,729
S-B Ranch	02-11	78,306	71,865	65,954	60,530	55,551	332,206

Ocean concurred that these production projections will serve as the basis for establishing the success criteria, and if the actual production volumes from these Candidate Wells exceed these tabulated annual production volumes, subject to adjustments for any non-producing intervals, then Ocean agreed that the CO₂/Sand stimulation process will have resulted in an economic benefit.

B. Conclusions

Summarizing, the CO₂/Sand stimulation process were to be considered to be economically successful if the total annual production from the proposed Candidate Wells, subject to any corrections as mentioned above, exceeded these volumes.

XVII. PRE-TEST CONCLUSIONS

- A. The Upper and Middle Eagle Sands in the Test Area were considered likely to benefit from the CO₂/Sand stimulation process because of the absence of liquids in an area known to incur reservoir damage from stimulation liquids, and the additional benefits of the proppant could result in increased production rates.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

- B. The Operator, Ocean Energy, Inc. (Ocean) was the largest gas producing company in Montana and is the operator of record for approximately 650 producing gas wells in the north-central area of the state, southeast of Havre.
- C. A Canadian-based pumping service company with the ability to perform these liquid CO₂/Sand treatments, exceptional technical ability, outstanding equipment, was in reasonably close proximity, and provided a cost-competitive bid.
- D. Ocean could derive a significant benefit from the non-damaging CO₂/Sand stimulation treatments, and had offered six Candidate Wells and requested participation in demonstrating this technology under the DOE's cost-shared demonstration project.
- E. The Candidate Wells which all produce from the Upper and Middle Eagle Sand members.
- F. These wells are presently producing wells and the pre-stimulation production for each well has been utilized to project required production rates to establish an economic success based on:
 - 1. A capital cost for the CO₂/Sand stimulation treatment: \$86M (which was a previous estimate)
 - 2. Market price: \$2.50/dth – fixed
 - 3. Calorific value: 1000 BTU/CF
 - 4. Discount rate: 25%
 - 5. Production decline rate: Variable and driven by the production projections supplied by Ocean.

- G. The economically justifiable break-even production improvement ratios to substantiate the increase in stimulation costs based on net gas market prices excluding royalties, taxes, etc. are:

Well	# - S	Rem MMcf)	Skin	Prod Mcf/d)	Req'd Prod Improvement Ratio
S-B Ranch	02-05	484.345	TBD	35	2.77
Blackwood	06-09	986.500	+2.83	220	1.18
Kane	05-08	359.000	+2.00	100	1.46
Kane	05-05	96.700	+12.9	60	2.34
Kane	04-12	460.568	+6.74	100	1.40
S-B Ranch	02-11	853.946	-1.82	180	1.23

- H. Three of the Candidate Wells contained a large number of perforations which were considered to be too many and for the CO₂/Sand process. If any of these three wells were selected, then the plan was to temporarily plug the lowermost perforations, which would eliminate the Middle Eagle sand from the stimulation treatment.
- I. The wells were rank ordered by Ocean in their recommended sequence which is believed to provide the most benefit. This rank ordering results in the plugging of the Lower Eagle Sand in the wells which were ranked 3, 4, and 5, which almost dictates that at least one of the three Candidates will require plugging of the Middle Eagle and treating the Upper sand member only.

In order to properly measure the production response associated with the CO₂/Sand treatment, a producing period sufficient to eliminate the production from the unstimulated interval (Middle Eagle) was required.

Ocean's present plan was to install the temporary plug immediately before and to remove it shortly after the CO₂/Sand stimulation. This procedure will allow for the stimulation of only

the Upper Eagle while comparing the post-stimulation production from both the Upper and Middle Sands.

- J. The costs of the stimulations were recognized to be potentially greater than bid because it was based on performing the stimulations in April when the oilfield activity is at minimum level because of road weight limit restrictions during the spring "break up". The bid was extended at a discount of 40%, an earlier bid prepared last September included a discount of 31%.

If the higher discount rate was rescinded because of a post-April treatment execution, then the three-well total cost would increase from \$187,265 to \$215,735 (US).

- K. The treatments could be performed in July. (They were executed in late September, 2002, and the service company honored the higher discount rate).

XVIII. DOE APPROVALS

A request for stimulating six Candidate Wells was submitted to the DOE (June, 2002). Following some interrogatories (Figure 15) and a conference call to Ocean from a meeting being held at DOE's Morgantown, WV offices which resulted in four of the Candidates being selected.

Well	# - S	Rem (MMcf)	Skin	Prod (Mcf/d)	Req'd Prod Improvement Ratio
S-B Ranch	02-05	484.345	TBD	35	2.77
Kane	05-08	359.000	+2.00	100	1.46
Kane	05-05	96.700	+12.9	60	2.34
Blackwood	06-09	986.500	+2.83	220	1.18

Subsequent approvals for the treatments were extended by the DOE and the four wells were stimulated in September 2002.

Figure 15 – p. 1 of 4

**Review of Candidate Well Package No. 7B
Ocean Energy
Eagle Sand, Blaine County, Montana**

**By: Bill Schuller
E²S/EG&G
July 2, 2002**

Background:

Ocean Energy is producing gas from the partially depleted Eagle Sandstone unit in Township 30N, Range 18E, Blaine County, Montana. The partially depleted reservoir does not have sufficient energy to recover any fluid used in well stimulation and, therefore, wells drilled and completed within the partially depleted reservoir are left unstimulated. Wells in the area are drilled over-pressure with drilling mud that infiltrates and further hampers production from the untreated reservoir.

Ocean Energy has requested the use of CO₂/sand stimulation technology being tested by the U.S. Department of Energy's National Energy Technology Laboratory through a contract with Petroleum Consulting Services, LLC of Canton, Ohio. CO₂/Sand stimulation uses liquid carbon dioxide as the proppant carrier fluid. Because the CO₂ converts to a gas under normal reservoir temperatures, CO₂ requires no additional reservoir energy and is expelled from the reservoir during post-stimulation blowback. Sand proppant is left within the newly created fractures, thus reducing near wellbore mud damage.

Three wells are proposed for stimulation from six candidate wells offered by Ocean Energy. All six wells have been online producing gas with no reportable water production. Production dates range from a little over a year to more than 30 years. This CO₂/Sand stimulation demonstration project is unique since the wells have previous production histories. Previous CO₂/Sand stimulation projects have been conducted on new wells and production compared to older producing wells. The Ocean Energy project allows for any increased post-stimulation gas production to be determined immediately.

Review of Candidate Wells:

The six candidate wells, listed in importance for testing CO₂/Sand stimulation by Ocean Energy are: S-B Ranch 02-05, Blackwood 06-09, Kane 05-08, Kane 05-05, Kane 04-12, and S-B Ranch 02-11. Advantages/disadvantages of each well are reported in the following discussion.

S-B Ranch 02-05:

Both wells S-B Ranch 02-05 and 02-11 are separated from the other four candidate wells by several miles. Selection of either or both of these wells as part of the three test wells

Figure 15 – p. 2 of 4

would make a single isolated well in either the S-B Ranch area or the other area. This would make it difficult to determine any abnormalities that might occur in the single well area.

The location of S-B Ranch 02-05 would suggest it is both pressure and production depleted. Well S-B Ranch 02-05 currently produces 35 Mcf/d, the lowest production of any of the proposed wells. Initial open flow was 160 Mcf/d, one-third of the second lowest candidate well, Blackwood 06-09, which had a reported open flow of 510 Mcf/d. Reservoir pressure is 170 psi, again the lowest of the proposed wells. Addition of 20 perforations before CO₂/Sand stimulation may improve production, but adds another element to the equation as to what contributed to any enhanced production, the additional perforations, the stimulation, or both. It is doubtful based on all these criteria that the well would be able to meet the required 2.77 production improvement necessary to deem the stimulation a success.

Blackwood 06-09:

The Blackwood 06-09 well has no significant problems and is a viable candidate well. The well has the highest current production (220 Mcf/d) and also has one of the higher reservoir pressures (222 psi). CO₂/Sand stimulation should reduce the current +2.83 skin, thus allowing the well to achieve the required 1.18 production improvement ratio. Since the Kane 05-05 well in the same area is only to be stimulated in the Upper Eagle formation, the Blackwood 06-09 well should also only be stimulated in the Upper Eagle. Stimulation of both the Upper and Middle Eagle adds to the complexity of the problem of determining the actual stimulation benefits, especially if compared with wells not stimulated in the Middle Eagle. If both zones are stimulated, they should be isolated and metered separately.

Kane 05-08:

The Kane 05-08 well is another viable candidate well. Current design is to set a temporary bridge plug and stimulate both the Upper and Middle Eagle formations. Since only 8 feet separates the bottom perforations in the Upper Eagle and top perforations in the Middle Eagle, stimulation of only the Upper Eagle may be impossible. If the final decision is made to only stimulate the Upper Eagle to keep it consistent with the Kane 05-05 well, a tracer should be used to determine if the stimulated fracture grew down into the Middle Eagle formation. If both zones are stimulated, production should be isolated and metered separately.

Kane 05-05:

The Kane 05-05 well had the highest initial production potential (1075 Mcf/d) of all the candidate wells and would suggest the well should be performing better than its current production of 60 Mcf/d. This is especially true since the well also has the highest reservoir pressure (297 psi) of all the candidate wells. A high calculated skin of +12.9 would indicate drilling fluid damage could be restricting production, making this an

Figure 15 – p. 3 of 4

excellent candidate for CO₂/Sand stimulation to reduce skin effects. The well has 42 perforations in the Upper Eagle and an additional 74 perforations in the Middle Eagle formation. Due to the large number of perforations, a temporary bridge plug is to be set between the formations and only the Upper Eagle formation is to be stimulated. A total of 34 feet separate the bottom Upper Eagle perforations and top Middle Eagle perforations. Any downward growth outside the stimulated formation will probably connect both formations. Thus this well becomes an obvious candidate for tracer testing to determine fracture vertical extent and migration outside the stimulated formation.

Kane 04-12:

The Kane 04-12 well is to be stimulated only in the Upper Eagle formation. Previous CO₂/Sand stimulation experience has indicated the total number of perforations should be limited to approximately 40 to reduce screen-out of the sand during stimulation. The Upper Eagle formation within the Kane 04-12 well has 71 perforations; nearly double the maximum number of perforations. The large number of perforations places the well in a high risk for sand screen-out and should be withdrawn as a candidate well.

S-B Ranch 02-11:

As with the S-B Ranch 02-05 well, the S-B Ranch 02-11 well is separated from the other four candidate wells. Since a three well stimulation program is planned, selection of either or both S-B Ranch wells would create a one well test area, either at the S-B Ranch area or the Blackwood/Kane area. A calculated skin of -1.82 indicates drilling mud is not damaging this well and in fact, the well may have encountered a natural fracture. Additional stimulation could further reduce the skin effect, but may not show a significant increase in production to offset the stimulation costs.

Recommendations:

The following recommendations are made based on the previous discussions of each candidate well:

- Preferred wells for testing CO₂/Sand stimulation are:
 - Blackwood 06-09
 - Kane 05-08
 - Kane 05-05
- The Blackwood 06-09 and Kane 05-08 wells should only be stimulated in the Upper Eagle formation to be consistent with the Kane 05-05 well. If both formations are stimulated, the zones should be isolated and metered separately. Zonal isolation and metering should also be conducted in the Kane 05-05 well for consistent interpretation of results.

Figure 15 – p. 4 of 4

- Tracer testing should be conducted in the Kane 05-05 well to determine if the stimulation broke into the underlying, unstimulated Middle Eagle formation. Tracer testing should not be undertaken until at least the second well to determine if the CO₂/Sand stimulation can actually be conducted on the Eagle formation.

XIX. FIELD ACTIVITIES

A. Preparations

The wells were perforated where needed (where there were too few) during the week prior to the treatments, CO₂ was procured, and the service company mobilization from Red Deer, Alberta initiated. Four portable CO₂ storage trailers (80 tons each) which provided the storage capacity for two stimulation treatments were mobilized.

B. Stimulations

1. Candidate Well # 1 – S-B Ranch 02-05 (25-041-22955)

The well was perforated with 30 holes over a 136 foot interval from 1,125 to 1,261 feet.

The pressurized blender was transported to the well site on the day of the treatment, September 15, 2002 and filled with 20/40 sand. The treatment was then executed at a breakdown pressure of 1,820 psi at the perforations, 10,300 lbs of proppant and 432 bbls (83 Tons) of CO₂ were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 37.8 barrels per minute and 2,318 psi respectively. The maximum sand concentration was 2.4 lbs per gal, and averaged 1.2, the maximum rates and pressures were 39.6 Bpm and 3,115 psi respectively (Figure 16).

The treatment screened out at a sand concentration of 2.4 ppg with 1,800 lbs of proppant in the wellbore leaving 8,500 lbs of proppant in-zone.

Figure 16 – p. 1 of 4

Post Frac Summary

OCEAN ENERGY

S-B Ranch 2-5-30-18

Eagle (Gas) 345.7 m - 384.4 m

LIQUID CO₂ FRAC Pumped On Sep 15, 2002

Pumping Configuration: Casing

Average Treatment Rate: 6.20 m³/min

Average Treatment Pressure: 16,000 kPa

ISIP: 2,000 kPa

15 min SIP: N/A

Max DH Proppant Concentration: 290 kg/m³

Figure 16 – p. 2 of 4

Page 60

Figure 16 – p. 3 of 4

WELL SERVICE LTD.

Treatment Data Charts

OCEAN ENERGY

Eagle (Gas) 2-5-30-18 345.7 m - 384.4 m

LIQUID CO₂ FRAC, Down Casing September 15, 2002

Figure 16 – p. 4 of 4

WELL SERVICE LTD.

Net Pressure Chart

(Based On 3,000 kPa Closure)

OCEAN ENERGY

Eagle (Gas) 2-5-30-18 345.7 m - 384.4 m

LIQUID CO₂ FRAC, Down Casing September 15, 2002

2. Candidate Well #2 -- Kane 05-08 (25-041-22279)

The Kane 05-08 was perforated with 48 holes over a 46 foot interval from 1,362 to 1,408 feet.

The pressurized blender was transported to the well site on the day of the treatment, September 17, 2002 and filled with 20/40 sand. The treatment was then executed at a breakdown pressure of 2,900 psi at the perforations, 27,300 lbs of proppant and 835 bbls (161 Tons) of CO₂ were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 31.0 barrels per minute and 3,032 psi respectively. The maximum sand concentration was 2.3 lbs per gal, and averaged 1.0, the maximum rates and pressures were 32.5 Bpm and 3,147 psi respectively (Figure 17).

The instantaneous shut in pressure was 686 psi which results in a gradient of 0.5 psi/ft. The stimulation pressure-rate history plot is included. The in zone proppant volume was estimated 24,900 pounds.

Figure 17 – p. 1 of 4

Post Frac Summary

OCEAN ENERGY

Kane 5-8-30-18

Eagle (Gas) 415.24 m - 429.26 m

LIQUID CO₂ FRAC Pumped On Sep 17, 2002

Pumping Configuration: Casing

Average Treatment Rate: 4.83 m³/min

Average Treatment Pressure: 21,200 kPa

ISIP: 4,800 kPa

15 min SIP: 3,100 kPa

Max DH Proppant Concentration: 370 kg/m³

Figure 17 – p. 2 of 4

Page 65

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
 September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 17 – p. 3 of 4

Treatment Data Charts

OCEAN ENERGY

Eagle (Gas) 5-8-30-18 415.24 m - 429.26 m

LIQUID CO₂ FRAC, Down Casing September 17, 2002

Figure 17 – p. 4 of 4

WELL SERVICE LTD.

Net Pressure Chart

(Based On 3,000 kPa Closure)

OCEAN ENERGY

Eagle (Gas) 5-8-30-18 415.24 m - 429.26 m

LIQUID CO₂ FRAC, Down Casing September 17, 2002

3. Candidate Well #3 - Kane 05-05 (25-041-22557)

The Kane 05-05 was perforated with 42 holes over a 26 foot interval from 1,110 to 1,136 feet.

The pressurized blender was transported to the well site on the day of the treatment, September 18, 2002 and filled with 20/40 sand. The treatment was then executed at a breakdown pressure of 2,385 psi at the perforations, 23,800 lbs of proppant and 815 bbls (157 Tons) of CO₂ were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 46.0 barrels per minute and 2,581 psi respectively. The maximum sand concentration was 2.4 lbs per gal, and averaged 0.9, the maximum rates and pressures were 50.3 Bpm and 3,495 psi respectively (Figure 18).

The stimulation pressure-rate history plot is included. The in zone proppant volume was estimated 21,800 pounds.

Figure 18 – p. 1 of 4

Post Frac Summary

OCEAN ENERGY

Kane 5-530-18

Eagle (Gas) 338.4 m - 346.3 m

Liquid CO₂ Frac Pumped On Sep 18, 2002

Pumping Configuration: Casing

Average Treatment Rate: 7.29 m³/min

Average Treatment Pressure: 17,900 kPa

ISIP: N/A Screened Out

15 min SIP: 2000 kPa

Max DH Proppant Concentration: 290 kg/m³

Figure 18 – p. 3 of 4

TRICAN

WELL SERVICE LTD.

Treatment Data Charts

OCEAN ENERGY

Eagle (Gas) 5-530-18 338.4 m - 346.3 m

Liquid CO₂ Frac, Down Casing September 18, 2002

Figure 18 -- p. 4 of 4

WELL SERVICE LTD.

Net Pressure Chart

(Based On 3,000 kPa Closure)

OCEAN ENERGY

Eagle (Gas) 5-530-18 338.4 m - 346.3 m

Liquid CO₂ Frac, Down Casing September 18, 2002

4. Candidate Well #4 – Blackwood 06-09 (25-041-22161)

The Blackwood 06-09 was perforated with 30 holes over a 18 foot interval from 1,144 to 1,162 feet.

The pressurized blender was transported to the well site on the day of the treatment, September 19, 2002 and filled with 20/40 sand. The treatment was then executed at a breakdown pressure of 3,570 psi at the perforations, 10,600 lbs of proppant and 633 bbls (122 Tons) of CO₂ were pumped at an average rate and pressure of 20.0 barrels per minute and 3,321 psi respectively. The maximum sand concentration was 1.3 lbs per gal, and averaged 0.6, the maximum rates and pressures were 28.0 Bpm and 3,408 psi respectively (Figure 19).

The instantaneous shut in pressure was 1,290 psi which results in a gradient of 1.1 psi/ft. The stimulation pressure-rate history plot is included. The in zone proppant volume was estimated 10,400 pounds.

Figure 19 – p. 1 of 4

Post Frac Summary

OCEAN ENERGY

Blackwoods 6-9-30-18

Eagle (Gas) 348.8 m - 355.2 m

Liquid CO₂ Frac Pumped On Sep 19, 2002

Pumping Configuration: Casing

Average Treatment Rate: 3.00 m³/min

Average Treatment Pressure: 22,900 kPa

ISIP: 8,900 kPa

5 min SIP: 2,700 kPa

Max DH Proppant Concentration: 150 kg/m³

Figure 19 – p. 2 of 4

Page 75

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
 September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 19 – p. 3 of 4

Figure 19 – p. 4 of 4

Net Pressure Chart

(Based On 3,000 kPa Closure)

OCEAN ENERGY
Eagle (Gas) 6-9-30-18 348.8 m - 355.2 m
Liquid CO₂ Frac, Down Casing September 19, 2002

5. Stimulation Summary

The stimulation specifics of the four Candidate Wells are summarized:

Well	# - S	CO ₂	Sand (lbs)		Max Tr	Avg Rate	Sand Conc	
		Bbls	Pumped	In-Zone	Psi	BPM	Max	Avg
S-B Ranch	02-05	432	10,300	8,500	3,115	37.8	2.4	1.2
Kane	05-08	835	27,300	24,900	3,147	31.0	2.3	1.0
Kane	05-05	815	23,800	21,800	3,495	46.0	2.4	0.9
Blackwood	06-09	633	10,600	10,400	3,408	20.0	1.3	0.6

C. Post Stimulation

1. Flow Back Procedures

The flow back procedure was initiated immediately following the removal of the stimulation hardware. The flow was restricted with a choke to enable the CO₂ vapor to flow safely. The choke size was increased as the pressure diminished and the CO₂ concentration was monitored. Some sand was produced as was expected because of the intentional under flush.

2. Cleaning Frac Sand from the Well Bore

Air was circulated through coiled tubing which was run to the temporary bridge plugs, or in the case of the S-B Ranch 02-05 to the total depth to circulate any sand from the well. In actuality very little was found.

XX. RESULTS

A. Production Comparisons

1. Candidate Well # 1 – S-B Ranch (25-005-22955)

The post-stimulation production through July, 2004 was 28.5 MMcf, and the projected volume based on the pre-stimulation production was 14.7 MMcf, therefore an increase in production volume of 13.8 MMcf has resulted from the liquid-free CO₂ /Sand stimulation.

2. Candidate Well # 2 – Kane 05-08 (25-005-22279)

The Kane 05-08 had a bridge plug installed between the Middle and Upper Eagle Sand members during the week of August 26, 2002, was stimulated with the liquid-free CO₂/Sand process on September 17th. The well produced for approximately six months prior to removing the bridge plug on March 24, 2003. When the plug was removed, the production increased from approximately 55 to 150 MCFD confirming that the Upper and Middle Eagle sands were isolated from each other during the stimulation and tests.

The production rates were measured both before (94 MCFD) and after (28 MCFD) the plug was set and the incremental production attributable to the stimulation was recorded for both scenarios.

The post-stimulation production through July, 2004 was 46.4 MMcf. The projected volume based on the pre-stimulation production and adjusted for the non-productive periods was 39.6 MMcf, therefore an increase in production volume of 6.8 MMcf has resulted from the liquid-free CO₂ /Sand stimulation.

There was an additional volume produced from the Upper Eagle following the stimulation and prior to the removal of the Bridge Plug, but it has been excluded to facilitate an objective comparison with the production from both zones prior to the installation of the Bridge Plug.

3. Candidate Well # 3 – Kane 05-05 (25-005-22557)

The Kane 05-05 had a bridge plug installed between the Middle and Upper Eagle Sand members during the week of August 26, 2002, was stimulated with the liquid-free CO₂/Sand process on September 18th. The well produced for approximately six months prior to removing the bridge plug on March 24, 2003, and when the plug was removed, the production increased from approximately 25 to 75 MCFD establishing that the Upper and Middle Eagle sands were isolated from each other during the stimulation and tests.

The post-stimulation production through July, 2004 was 21.5 MMcf, and the projected volume based on the pre-stimulation production was 18.4 MMcf, therefore an increase in production volume of 3.1 MMcf has resulted from the liquid-free CO₂/Sand stimulation.

There was an additional volume produced from the Upper Eagle following the stimulation and prior to the removal of the Bridge Plug, but it has been excluded to facilitate an objective comparison with the production from both zones prior to the installation of the Bridge Plug.

Kane - #05-05 (T30N-R18E)

Blaine Co, MT

Stimulated: 09/18/02 (Month #132)

4. Candidate Well # 4 - Blackwood 06-09 (25-005-22161)

The Blackwood 06-09 had a bridge plug installed between the Middle and Upper Eagle Sand members during the week of August 26, 2002, was stimulated with the liquid-free CO₂/Sand process on September 19th. The well produced for approximately six months prior to removing the bridge plug on March 24, 2003. When the plug was removed, the production increased from approximately 190 to 370 MCFD establishing that the Upper and Middle Eagle sands were isolated from each other during the stimulation and tests.

The post-stimulation production following the removal of the Bridge plug through July, 2004 was 146.8 MMcf, and the projected volume based on the pre-stimulation production was 92.7 MMcf, therefore an increase in production volume of 54.1 MMcf has resulted from the liquid-free CO₂ /Sand stimulation.

There was an additional volume produced from the Upper Eagle following the stimulation and prior to the removal of the Bridge Plug, but it has been excluded to facilitate an objective comparison with the production from both zones prior to the installation of the Bridge Plug.

B. Production Summary – Candidate Wells

1. Production Comparisons – Pre and Post Stimulation

a. Pre-Stimulation

The pre-stimulation production from the four Candidate Wells was extrapolated to project the future production, and these projections served as the basis to which the production following the stimulations was compared. The projected post-stimulation volumes ranged from 14.7 to 92.7 MMcf and averaged 41.4 MMcf through July, 2004.

Projected Post-Stim Production - Based on Pre-Stim Prod

Blaine Co, MT (T30N-R18E)

Stimulation: CO₂/Sand

b. Post-Stimulation

Because Ocean failed to provide the production data as per contract, the production data was obtained from public data sources (through July, 2004). The public data is reported on a monthly basis and does not include the number of producing days and therefore the production comparisons do not take into account any non-production times which results in the incremental improvements being reduced. There were known instances of non-producing periods exceeding two weeks in one of the wells and also other non-producing time intervals for all four Candidates as well.

The post-stimulation volumes for an unknown of producing days ranged from 21.5 to 146.8 MMcf and averaged 60.8 MMcf through July, 2004.

c. Incremental Production Improvement

The incremental production improvements irrespective of the unknown number of producing days mentioned above ranged from 3.1 to 54.1 MMcf and averaged 19.5 MMcf through July, 2004.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Through July 2004

Twp/Rge	T30N/R18E	T30N/R18E	T30N/R18E	T30N/R18E	Totals
Co/St	Blaine/Mt	Blaine/Mt	Blaine/Mt	Blaine/Mt	
Field	Tiger Ridge	Tiger Ridge	Tiger Ridge	Tiger Ridge	
API Number (25-005-xxxxx)	22955	22279	22557	22161	
Surface	S-B Ranch	Kane	Kane	Blackwood	
Sec-#	02-05	05-08	05-05	06-09	
Subsequent to Bridge Plug Removal*					
Actual Post-stim Cum (MMcf)	28.5	46.4	21.5	146.8	243.2
Proj Cum (based on pre-stim prod) MMcf)	<u>14.7</u>	<u>39.6</u>	<u>18.4</u>	<u>92.7</u>	<u>165.4</u>
Incremental Prod Increase (MMcf)	13.8	6.8	3.1	54.1	77.8

XXI. COSTS

A. Projected

The stimulation costs were bid in February, 2002 and included a significant discount – providing that the treatments were executed in April, during the reduced activity period during the spring "break up" – a copy is attached (Figure 20).

Blender, 1770 HHP (1 Quint), manifold and iron truck:	
44,100 pounds frac sand (20/40), 685 bbls CO ₂ (132 tons),	
delivery (186 miles), and computer control center and report:	(US) \$60,533
3 Wells:	\$181,599
Mobilization:	<u>5,665</u>
Presuming that no standby charges are incurred, then the charge	
for stimulating the three Candidate Wells would be:	<u>\$187,264</u>
Or per well:	(US) <u>\$62,421</u>

The cost-sharing would result in the following per-well allocations:

Ocean	\$31,211
DOE	<u>\$31,210</u>
Total	\$62,421

Figure 20 – p. 1 of 8

STIMULATION PROPOSAL

Liquid CO₂ Frac

20.0 tonne Sand (20/40)

Belly River - Eagle (Gas)

Ocean Energy - Hill County Havre Montana

Version 1 Option 1

Inject Down Casing

Approved: September 27 2001

PETROLEUM CONSULTING SERVICES

Box 35833

Canton, Ohio

44735

Prepared For: Raymond Mazza

For Service Call: Red Deer (403) 346-4667

Sales Rep: Chuck Vozniak (403) 215 1982

Designed By: Michael Tulissi (403) 215 2995

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
 September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 20 – p. 2 of 8

Ocean Energy - Hill County Havre Montana
 Liquid CO₂ Frac
 Option 1 Version 1

Completions

Wellhead: Casing Saver
 Pumping Configuration: Casing

Casing: 114.3mm, 14.14kg/m, J-55
 0.0 - 480.0 m (TMD)
 1575 ft

Burst: 30 MPa 4351 psi
 Collapse: 23 MPa 3336 psi

Hole Volume: 3.87 m³ 136.7 Cu ft = 263.20 cu

Perforations: 457.0 - 480.0 m (TMD)
 1500 1574

Formation: Belly River - Eagle (Gas)
 Frac Gradient: 22.0 kPa/m 1.574 = 0.97 psi/ft
 BHST: 14 °C 22.6 °F

Calculations

$$\begin{aligned}
 P_{\text{fracture}} &= \text{Gradient}_{\text{fracture}} (22.0 \text{ kPa/m}) \times \text{Depth}_{\text{vertical}} (480.0 \text{ m}) = 10560 \text{ kPa} \times \frac{1}{6.895} = 1532 \text{ psi} \\
 P_{\text{friction}} &= \text{Gradient}_{\text{friction}} (12.0 \text{ kPa/m}) \times \text{Depth}_{\text{measured}} (480.0 \text{ m}) = 5760 \text{ kPa} \times \frac{1}{6.895} = 835 \text{ psi} \\
 P_{\text{hydrostatic}} &= \text{Gradient}_{\text{hydrostatic}} (10.0 \text{ kPa/m}) \times \text{Depth}_{\text{vertical}} (480.0 \text{ m}) = 4800 \text{ kPa} \times \frac{1}{6.895} = 696 \text{ psi} \\
 P_{\text{injection}} &= P_{\text{fracture}} (10560 \text{ kPa}) + P_{\text{friction}} (5760 \text{ kPa}) - P_{\text{hydrostatic}} (4800 \text{ kPa}) = 11520 \text{ kPa} \times \frac{1}{6.895} = 1672 \text{ psi} \\
 \text{Power}_{\text{CO}_2} &= P_{\text{injection}} (11520 \text{ kPa}) \times \text{Rate}_{\text{CO}_2} (7.5 \text{ m}^3/\text{min}) / 60 = 1440 \text{ kW} = 1931 \text{ HP}
 \end{aligned}$$

Final Report -- Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
 September 2002 -- Single Stage Treatments -- Ocean Energy
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 20 -- p. 3 of 8

Ocean Energy - Hill County - Havre Montana
 Liquid CO₂ Frac
 Option 1 Version 1

Procedures

Equipment: 2 CO₂ Storage Tanks
 2 CO₂ Transports
 1440 kW Frac CO₂ Pumping
 1 Frac Van
 1 Iron Truck
 1 Liquid CO₂ Blender
 2 N₂ Pumping Units

Objective: To perform a CO₂ Frac treatment on the Eagle (Belly River) formation.

Key Notes: Be prepared to flow well back immediately following treatment.

Safety: Spot tanks and equipment as per recommended equipment spacing. Conduct pre-treatment safety meeting with all personnel on location. Review all fire, chemical, and high pressure hazards.

Rig Up: Rig up to fracture well down Casing, through a Casing Saver.

Pressure: Pressure Test: 30 MPa $\times 0.145 = 435 \text{ PSI}$
 Maximum Pressure: 24 MPa $= 348 \text{ PSI}$

Rate: Anticipated downhole rate is 7.50 m³/min, at 11,520 kPa. $\times 1.47 = 10.935 \text{ m}^3/\text{min}$

Spearhead: 1.00 m³ of Spearhead Acid. $\times 6.295 = 6.295 \text{ m}^3/\text{min} \times 40 = 251.8 \text{ m}^3$

Pad: 50.00 m³ of CO₂. $\times 1.21 = 60.5 \text{ m}^3 = 1766 \text{ ft}^3 = 314.88 \text{ L}$

Proppant: 20.00 tonne of Sand (20/40), placed with 51.70 m³ of CO₂. $\times 1.21 = 62.557 \text{ m}^3$

Flush: 3.07 m³ of CO₂. This corresponds to an underflush volume of 0.80 m³, and must be recalculated on location.

Shut In: Shut in well, and rig out Trican equipment. Customer will supply all flowback equipment. When flowing well back, follow Alberta Recommended Practices, OHS, & AEUB recommendations.

Ocean Energy - Hill County - Havre Montana
 Liquid CO₂ Frac
 Option 1 Version 1

Fluid And Mixing Requirements

HCl (15%) Volume From Program: 1.0 m³

Additional Fluid Volume: 0.0 m³

Total HCl (15%) Volume: 1.0 m³ 22.4 ft^3

CO₂ (Liquid) Volume From Program: 104.77 m³ $\times 6.295 = 659.832 \text{ m}^3 \times \frac{1}{5.9} = 111.836 \text{ m}^3$

Cool-down and Losses: 27.23 m³ $\frac{171}{830} = 0.206$

Total CO₂ (Liquid) Volume: 132.0 m³ Requires: 2 CO₂ Transports
 2 CO₂ Storage Tanks

N₂ Volume From Program: 4000 sm³ $\times 35.31 = 141,260 \text{ scf}$

Cool-down and Losses: 600 sm³ $\frac{21,146}{76,586} = 0.276$

Total N₂ Volume: 4600 sm³ Requires: 2 N₂ Pumping Units

1 m³ Spearhead Acid (15% HCl) Spearhead

5 kg/m³ IC-3 (Iron Control) - pre-mixed

2 L/m³ AI-1 (Corrosion Inhibitor) - pre-mixed

2 L/m³ S-1 (Surfactant) - pre-mixed

Total Products Required

2 L AI-1 (Corrosion Inhibitor)
 1 m³ HCl (15%)
 4600 sm³ N₂ (Gas)
 20 tonne Sand (20/40)

132 m³ CO₂ (Liquid) 111.836 m^3
 5 kg IC-3 (Iron Control)
 2 L S-1 (Surfactant)

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
 September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 20 – p. 4 of 8

Ocean Energy - Hill County Havre Montana
 Liquid CO₂ Frac
 Option 1 Version 1

Treatment Schedules

Liquid CO₂ Blender Treatment Schedule1

Stage	Blender Slurry			Blender Clean				Blender Proppant				Fluid And Proppant	
	Rate (m ³ /min)	Volume (m ³)		Rate (m ³ /min)		Volume (m ³)		Concentration (kg / m ³)		Amount (tonne)			
	Start of Stage	Per Stage	Cum. At End Of Stage	Start of Stage	End of Stage	Per Stage	Cum. At End Of Stage	Start of Stage	End of Stage	Per Stage	Cum. At End Of Stage		
1 Spearhead	1.00	0.3	0.0	1.00	1.00	1.0	0.0					Spearhead Acid	
2 Pad	7.50	30.0	50.0	7.50	7.50	50.0	50.0					CO2	
3 Proppant	7.50	14.5 3.1	53.1	7.36	7.23	3.0	53.0	50 50	100	0.2 4.4	0.2 4.4	CO2 Sand (20/40)	1
4 Proppant	7.50	25.6 6.3	59.4	7.23	6.97	6.0	59.0	100 100	200	0.9 1.1	1.1 2.4	CO2 Sand (20/40)	5
5 Proppant	7.50	41.5 6.6	66.0	6.97	6.74	6.0	65.0	200 200	300	1.5 2.6	2.6 5.9	CO2 Sand (20/40)	13
6 Proppant	7.50	66.7 10.2	76.2	6.74	6.52	9.0	74.0	300 300	400	3.2 5.8	5.8 12.6	CO2 Sand (20/40)	29
7 Proppant	7.50	88.1 14.0	90.2	6.52	6.31	12.0	86.0	400 400	500	5.4 11.2	11.2 24.9	CO2 Sand (20/40)	56
8 Proppant	7.50	88.1 14.5	104.7	6.31	6.12	12.0	98.0	500 500	600	6.6 17.8	17.8 34.7	CO2 Sand (20/40)	89
9 Proppant	7.50	28.3 4.5	109.3	6.12	6.12	3.7	101.7	500 500	600	2.2 44.1	20.0 44.1	CO2 Sand (20/40)	100
10 Flush	7.50	3.1	112.3	7.50	7.50	3.1	104.8					CO2	

706.42m

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
 September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 20 – p. 5 of 8

TRICAN

Ocean Energy - Hill County Havre Montana
 Liquid CO₂ Frac
 Option 1 Version 1

Discounted Price

Amount	Description	Discount	Unit Price (Discounted, Area A)	Price (Discounted)
Services And Equipment				
2 unit	CO ₂ Storage Tank	25.0%	\$1,830.00/unit	\$3,660.00
2 unit	CO ₂ Transport (Setup)	25.0%	\$465.00/unit	\$930.00
1074 hp 1440 kW	Frac CO ₂ Pumping (kW, 0-35.0 MPa)	25.0%	\$9.23/kW	\$13,284.00
1 unit	Frac Van (Setup)	25.0%	\$2,895.00/unit	\$2,895.00
1 unit	Iron Truck (Setup)	25.0%	\$1,132.50/unit	\$1,132.50
1 unit	Liquid CO ₂ Blender (Setup)	25.0%	\$1,642.50/unit	\$1,642.50
2 unit	N ₂ Pumping Unit (Setup)	25.0%	\$1,687.50/unit	\$3,375.00
47.2 hp 7.5 m ³ /min	Blender (Pumping)	25.0%	\$157.50/m ³ /min	\$1,181.25
Sub-total:				\$28,100.25
Products				
2 L	Al-1 (Corrosion Inhibitor)	25.0%	\$19.39/L	\$38.78
160T 830 8.5L 132 m ³	CO ₂ (Liquid)	25.0%	\$565.50/m ³	\$74,646.00
1 m ³	HCl (15%)	25.0%	\$435.00/m ³	\$435.00
5 kg	IC-3 (Iron Control)	25.0%	\$9.28/kg	\$46.31
162.4 m ³ 4600 sm ³	N ₂ (Gas)	25.0%	\$1.01/sm ³	\$4,657.50
2 L	S-1 (Surfactant)	25.0%	\$15.00/L	\$30.00
44,100 #	20 tonne Sand (20/40)	25.0%	\$285.00/tonne	\$5,698.58
Sub-total:				\$85,552.16
Travel And Cartage				
20 tonne x 300 km	Cartage (Proppant)	25.0%	\$0.71/tonne km	\$4,275.00
132 m ³ x 300 km	Cartage (Liquid CO ₂)	25.0%	\$0.29/m ³ km	\$11,583.00
8 unit x 300 km	Frac Unit (Travel)	25.0%	\$3.62/unit km	\$8,694.00
2 unit x 300 km	N ₂ Unit (Travel)	25.0%	\$3.62/unit km	\$2,173.50
1 unit x 300 km	Acid Unit (Travel)	25.0%	\$3.62/unit km	\$1,086.75
Sub-total:				\$27,812.25
Total Discounted Price:				\$141,464.66

All quantities (including mileage) are estimated, and are subject to change depending upon actual amounts used. Any service or materials required, but not mentioned will be at book price less discount. Any applicable taxes (eg: GST) will be added to the invoice. Book prices less discount are in effect for 30 days after the date shown. Due to the uncertainty of energy costs, prices may change without notice.

Third Party

Wellhead Saver (Casing)
Fluid Cartage & Heating

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
 September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

Figure 20 – p. 6 of 8

TRICAN
 Ocean Energy - Hill County Havre Montana
 Liquid CO₂ Frac
 Option 1 Version 1

Discounted Price

Amount	Description	Discount	Unit Price (Discounted, Area A)	Price (Discounted)
Services And Equipment				
2 unit	CO ₂ Storage Tank	25.0%	\$1,830.00 / unit	\$3,660.00
2 unit	CO ₂ Transport (Setup)	25.0%	\$465.00 / unit	\$930.00
1440 kW	Frac CO ₂ Pumping (kW, 0-35.0 MPa)	25.0%	\$9.23 / kW	\$13,284.00
1 unit	Frac Van (Setup)	25.0%	\$2,895.00 / unit	\$2,895.00
1 unit	Iron Truck (Setup)	25.0%	\$1,132.50 / unit	\$1,132.50
1 unit	Liquid CO ₂ Blender (Setup)	25.0%	\$1,642.50 / unit	\$1,642.50
2 unit	N ₂ Pumping Unit (Setup)	25.0%	\$1,687.50 / unit	\$3,375.00
7.5 m ³ /min	Blender (Pumping)	25.0%	\$157.50 / m ³ /min	\$1,181.25
				Sub-total: \$28,100.25
Products				
2 L	AI-1 (Corrosion Inhibitor)	25.0%	\$19.39 / L	\$38.78
132 m ³	CO ₂ (Liquid)	25.0%	\$565.50 / m ³	\$74,646.00
1 m ³	HCl (15%)	25.0%	\$435.00 / m ³	\$435.00
5 kg	IC-3 (Iron Control)	25.0%	\$9.26 / kg	\$46.31
4600 sm ³	N ₂ (Gas)	25.0%	\$1.01 / sm ³	\$4,657.50
2 L	S-1 (Surfactant)	25.0%	\$15.00 / L	\$30.00
20 tonne	Sand (20/40)	25.0%	\$285.00 / tonne	\$5,698.58
				Sub-total: \$85,552.16
Travel And Cartage				
20 tonne x 300 km	Cartage (Proppant)	25.0%	\$0.71 / tonne km	\$4,275.00
132 m ³ x 300 km	Cartage (Liquid CO ₂)	25.0%	\$0.29 / m ³ km	\$11,583.00
8 unit x 300 km	Frac Unit (Travel)	25.0%	\$3.62 / unit km	\$8,894.00
2 unit x 300 km	N ₂ Unit (Travel)	25.0%	\$3.62 / unit km	\$2,173.50
1 unit x 300 km	Acid Unit (Travel)	25.0%	\$3.62 / unit km	\$1,086.75
				Sub-total: \$27,812.25
				Total Discounted Price: \$141,464.66

All quantities (including mileage) are estimated, and are subject to change depending upon actual amounts used. Any service or materials required, but not mentioned will be at book prices less discount. Any applicable taxes (eg: GST) will be added to the invoice. Book prices less discount are in effect for 30 days after the date shown. Due to the uncertainty of energy costs, prices may change without notice.

Third Party

Wellhead Saver (Casing)
Fluid Cartage & Heating

TRICAN

Ocean Energy - Hill County Havre Montana
 Liquid CO₂ Frac
 Option 1 Version 1

Treatment Schedules

Liquid CO₂ Blender Treatment Schedule1

Stage	Blender Slurry			Blender Clean			Blender Proppant				Fluid And Proppant	
	Rate (m ³ /min)	Volume (m ³)	Cum. At End Of Stage	Rate (m ³ /min)	Volume (m ³)	Cum. At End Of Stage	Concentration (kg / m ³)		Amount (tonne)			
	Start of Stage	Per Stage		Start of Stage	End of Stage		Per Stage	Start of Stage	End of Stage	Per Stage		Cum. At End Of Stage
1 Spearhead	1.00	1.0	0.0	1.00	1.00	1.0	0.0					Spearhead Acid
2 Pad	7.50	50.0	50.0	7.50	7.50	50.0	50.0					CO2
3 Proppant	7.50	3.1	53.1	7.36	7.23	3.0	53.0	50	100	0.2	0.2	CO2 Sand (20/40)
4 Proppant	7.50	6.3	59.4	7.23	6.97	6.0	59.0	100	200	0.9	1.1	CO2 Sand (20/40)
5 Proppant	7.50	6.6	66.0	6.97	6.74	6.0	65.0	200	300	1.5	2.6	CO2 Sand (20/40)
6 Proppant	7.50	10.2	76.2	6.74	6.52	9.0	74.0	300	400	3.2	5.8	CO2 Sand (20/40)
7 Proppant	7.50	14.0	90.2	6.52	6.31	12.0	86.0	400	500	5.4	11.2	CO2 Sand (20/40)
8 Proppant	7.50	14.5	104.7	6.31	6.12	12.0	98.0	500	600	6.6	17.8	CO2 Sand (20/40)
9 Proppant	7.50	4.5	109.3	6.12	6.12	3.7	101.7	600	600	2.2	20.0	CO2 Sand (20/40)
10 Flush	7.50	3.1	112.3	7.50	7.50	3.1	104.8					CO2

Figure 20 – p. 7 of 8

Ocean Energy - Hill County Havre Montana
 Liquid CO₂ Frac
 Option 1 Version 1

Fluid And Mixing Requirements

HCl (15%) Volume From Program: 1.0 m³

Additional Fluid Volume: 0.0 m³

Total HCl (15%) Volume: 1.0 m³

CO₂ (Liquid) Volume From Program: 104.77 m³

Cool-down and Losses: 27.23 m³

Total CO₂ (Liquid) Volume: 132.0 m³

Requires: 2 CO₂ Transports
 2 CO₂ Storage Tanks

N₂ Volume From Program: 4600 sm³

Cool-down and Losses: 600 sm³

Total N₂ Volume: 4600 sm³

Requires: 2 N₂ Pumping Units

1 m³ Spearhead Acid (15% HCl) Spearhead

5 kg/m³ IC-3 (Iron Control) - pre-mixed

2 L/m³ AI-1 (Corrosion Inhibitor) - pre-mixed

2 L/m³ S-1 (Surfactant) - pre-mixed

Total Products Required

2 L AI-1 (Corrosion Inhibitor)

1 m³ HCl (15%)

4600 sm³ N₂ (Gas)

20 tonne Sand (20/40)

132 m³ CO₂ (Liquid)

5 kg IC-3 (Iron Control)

2 L S-1 (Surfactant)

Figure 20 – p. 8 of 8

Ocean Energy - Hill County Havre Montana
 Liquid CO₂ Frac
 Option 1 Version 1

Completions

Wellhead: Casing Saver
 Pumping Configuration: Casing

Casing: 114.3mm, 14.14kg/m, J-55
 0.0 - 480.0 m (TMD)

Burst: 30 MPa
 Collapse: 23 MPa

Hole Volume: 3.87 m³

Perforations: 457.0 - 480.0 m (TMD)

Formation: Belly River - Eagle (Gas)
 Frac Gradient: 22.0 kPa/m
 BHST: 14 °C

Calculations

$$\begin{aligned}
 P_{fracture} &= \text{Gradient}_{fracture} (22.0 \text{ kPa/m}) \times \text{Depth}_{vertical} (480.0 \text{ m}) = 10560 \text{ kPa} \\
 P_{friction} &= \text{Gradient}_{friction} (12.0 \text{ kPa/m}) \times \text{Depth}_{measured} (480.0 \text{ m}) = 5760 \text{ kPa} \\
 P_{hydrostatic} &= \text{Gradient}_{hydrostatic} (10.0 \text{ kPa/m}) \times \text{Depth}_{vertical} (480.0 \text{ m}) = 4800 \text{ kPa} \\
 P_{injection} &= P_{fracture} (10560 \text{ kPa}) + P_{friction} (5760 \text{ kPa}) - P_{hydrostatic} (4800 \text{ kPa}) = 11520 \text{ kPa} \\
 \text{Power}_{CO_2} &= P_{injection} (11520 \text{ kPa}) \times \text{Rate}_{CO_2} (7.5 \text{ m}^3/\text{min}) / 60 = 1440 \text{ kW}
 \end{aligned}$$

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
 September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

B. Actual

The actual costs for stimulating the four Candidate Wells ranged from \$US 51,065 to 70,113 and averaged \$63,189

Invoice	Well	\$ Can	Exchange Rate	\$ US
C38873	S-B Ranch 02-05-30-18	\$ 80,595.69	0.6336	\$ 51,065.43
C38874	Kane 05-08-30-18	\$104,486.34	0.6336	\$ 66,202.55
C38876	Kane 05-05-30-18	\$110,657.64	0.6336	\$ 70,112.68
C38877	Blackwood 06-09-30-18	\$103,183.50	0.6336	\$ 65,377.07
Total		\$398,923.17		\$252,757.73
			Per Well	63,189

C. Projected vs. Actual

The actual and projected costs for stimulating the four Candidate Wells were similar:

Actual Cost (\$US)	63,189
Projected Cost (\$US)	62,421
Difference (\$US)	768
Percent (%)	1.2

XXII. CONCLUSIONS

The production through July 2004 (22 months) results in the following observations:

A. CO₂/Sand stimulations can be successfully pumped in the Eagle Sands.

One well, S-B 02-05 screened out with 8,500 lbs of 20/40 sand proppant in zone. The total pumped CO₂ volume was 432 Bbls. Subsequently the pad volume was increased and the wells were treated with available CO₂ volumes.

Final Report – Demonstration of CO₂/Sand Stimulations in Four Candidate Wells (Blaine Co, Montana) -
 September 2002 – Single Stage Treatments – Ocean Energy
 Contract #DE-AC21-94MC31199 "Field Testing & Optimization of CO₂/Sand Fracturing Technology"

- B. The in-zone placement of proppant was proportional to the pumped CO₂ volume:

Well	# - S	CO ₂	Sand (lbs)		Sand Conc	
		Bbls	Pumped	In-Zone	Max	Avg
S-B Ranch	02-05	432	10,300	8,500	2.4	1.2
Kane	05-08	835	27,300	24,900	2.3	1.0
Kane	05-05	815	23,800	21,800	2.4	0.9
Blackwood	06-09	633	10,600	10,400	1.3	0.6

- C. All four Candidate Wells had production improvements which through July, 2004 (22 months following the stimulation) ranged from 3.1 to 54.1 MMcf and averaged 19.5 MMcf. The total incremental improvement is 77.8 MMcf.

Twp/Rge	T30N/R18E	T30N/R18E	T30N/R18E	T30N/R18E	Totals
Co/St	Blaine/Mt	Blaine/Mt	Blaine/Mt	Blaine/Mt	
Field	Tiger Ridge	Tiger Ridge	Tiger Ridge	Tiger Ridge	
Surface	S-B Ranch	Kane	Kane	Blackwood	Total
Sec-#	02-05	05-08	05-05	06-09	
Subsequent to Bridge Plug Removal*					
Actual Post-stim Cum (MMcf)	28.5	46.4	21.5	146.8	243.2
Proj Cum (based on pre-stim prod) (MMcf)	<u>14.7</u>	<u>39.6</u>	<u>18.4</u>	<u>92.7</u>	<u>165.4</u>
Incremental Prod Increase (MMcf)	13.8	6.8	3.1	54.1	77.8

- D. One well, Blackwood 06-09, accounts for the majority – 70% (54.1/77.8) of the incremental production increase.

- E. When compared with the criteria for success only one of the four Candidate Wells, Blackwood 06-09 exceeded the production criteria.

Surface	S-B Ranch	Kane	Kane	Blackwood	Total
Sec-#	02-05	05-08	05-05	06-09	
Yr 1					
Production (MMcf)	17.7	35.4	16.3	103.4	172.8
Success Criteria (MMcf)	<u>25.2</u>	<u>47.6</u>	<u>33.1</u>	<u>90.4</u>	<u>196.3</u>
Difference (MMcf)	-7.5	-12.2	-16.8	13.0	-23.5
Yr 1 + 10 Months (Through July 2004)					
Production (MMcf)	28.5	61.0	28.8	194.2	312.5
Success Criteria (MMcf)	<u>43.1</u>	<u>83.0</u>	<u>53.5</u>	<u>161.7</u>	<u>341.3</u>
Difference (MMcf)	-14.6	-22.0	-24.7	32.5	-28.8