

Flow Visualization and Simulation of Miscible Displacement with Gravity Domination

A thesis Submitted for
**Doctor of Philosophy in
Petroleum Engineering**

By

Zeeshan Mohiuddin

Supervisors:

Dr Manouchehr Haghighi

Dr Yvonne Stokes

Dr Themis Carageorgos

Australian School of Petroleum
Faculty of Engineering, Computer and Mathematical Sciences
The University of Adelaide, Australia

September 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures	v
List of Tables.....	vii
Abstract.....	viii
Statement of Originality.....	x
Acknowledgements.....	xi
List of Publications	xii
Abbreviations, Prefixes and Symbols.....	xiii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Miscibility	1
1.2 The Importance of Miscibility in Petroleum Engineering	2
1.3 Problems Associated with Miscible Gas EOR.....	4
1.3.1 Problem Due to Less Viscosity of Injected Gas	5
1.3.2 Problem Due to Less Density of Injected Gas	5
1.3.3 Gravity-Dominated Miscible Displacement	6
1.4 Research Gap	8
1.5 Research Aims and Objectives	9
1.6 Scope of Work.....	9
1.6.1 Experimental	9
1.6.2 Simulation	10
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	11
2.1 Pore-Scale Visualization	11
Hele-Shaw Cells	11
Capillary Tube.....	11
Powder or Beads Pack.....	12
Glass Micromodel	13
Other Visualization Techniques	14
2.1.1 Pore-Scale Visualization for Miscible Displacement	14
2.1.1.1 Experimental Studies on Miscible Displacement with Gravity Effects	15
2.2 Pore-Scale Simulation	21
2.2.1 Pore Network Modelling.....	22
2.2.2 Pore Scale Simulation Studies on Gravity-Dominated Miscible Flow	24

CHAPTER 3	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	28
3.1	Introduction	28
3.2	Detailed Methodology	28
3.2.1	Literature Review Methodology	29
3.2.2	Pore-Level Experiments' Methodology.....	31
3.2.3	Pore-Level Simulation	33
3.2.3.1	Development of the Simulation Model.....	33
3.2.3.2	Simulation and Experimental Results Comparison	33
3.2.3.3	Sensitivity Studies	34
CHAPTER 4	Visualization Studies	35
4.1	Experimental Facilities Construction.....	35
4.1.1	Glass Micromodel Construction.....	35
4.1.1.1	Pattern Design.....	35
4.1.1.2	Transferring Image from MATLAB to Paintbrush.....	37
4.1.1.3	Transferring Pattern to a Photoresist Film.....	38
4.1.1.4	Application of Photoresist on Glass	39
4.1.1.5	Sandblasting	40
4.1.1.6	Fusing Glass Plates	40
4.1.1.7	Mounting Syringe Connections	42
4.1.2	Construction of Micromodel Holding Rig.....	42
4.1.3	Fluids used in Experimental Studies.....	45
4.1.4	Piping and Instrumentation	47
4.1.5	Experimental Procedure	48
4.1.6	Image Processing.....	49
4.2	Miscible Displacement Experiments	51
4.2.1	Calculations in the Full Domain.....	53
4.2.1.1	Total Pore Volume.....	53
4.2.1.2	2Surface Area (Whole Domain).....	53
4.2.1.3	Depth.....	53
4.2.1.4	Cross-Sectional Area of the Inlet Port	53
4.2.2	Calculations in the Grains Domain	54
4.2.2.1	Total Grains Area.....	55
4.2.2.2	Surface Area (Grains Domain).....	55

4.2.2.3	Porosity	55
4.2.2.4	Effective Width.....	55
4.2.2.5	Grains Domain Velocity and Injection Rate Determination.....	56
4.3	Experimental Results.....	58
4.3.1	Experiments Representing Near Wellbore Flow Rates	58
4.3.1.1	Experiment with First Model.....	58
4.3.1.2	Experiment with Second Model.....	61
4.3.2	Experiments Representing Reservoir Flow Rates	63
4.4	Experiment with Different Orientations	66
4.4.1	0 Degree Cases	66
4.4.2	30 Degree Cases	66
4.4.3	45 Degree Cases	67
4.4.4	60 Degree Cases	67
4.4.5	90 Degree Cases	68
4.5	Error Analysis	74
4.5.1	Sources of Error (Human).....	74
4.5.2	Sources of Error (Instrument)	74
4.5.3	Sources of Error (Calculation and Estimation)	75
CHAPTER 5	FLOW SIMULATION	77
5.1	Model Geometry used in Experiments Results Comparison	77
5.2	Mathematical Model.....	79
5.3	Meshing.....	81
5.4	Model Parameters.....	82
5.4.1	Inlet Velocity	82
5.4.2	Diffusion Coefficient.....	83
5.4.2.1	Using Rackett (1970) correlation	84
5.4.2.2	Using Tyne and Calus (1975) correlation	84
5.4.2.3	Using Basic Definition of Molar Volume	84
5.5	Experimental and Simulation Results Comparison	84
5.5.1	Qualitative Comparison	85
5.5.1.1	Qualitative Comparison of Cases in the First Pattern	85
5.5.1.2	Qualitative Comparison of Cases in the Second Pattern	87
5.5.1.2.1	Injection at the Rate of 0.005 cm ³ /min.....	87

5.5.1.2.2	Injection at the Rate of 0.002 cm ³ /min.....	89
5.5.2	Quantitative Comparison	91
5.5.2.1	Quantitative Comparison of Cases in the First Pattern.....	91
5.5.2.2	Quantitative Comparison of Cases in the Second Pattern.....	93
5.5.2.2.1	Injection at the Rate of 0.005 cm ³ /min.....	93
5.5.2.2.2	Injection at the Rate of 0.002 cm ³ /min.....	94
CHAPTER 6	SIMULATION STUDIES	97
6.1	Comparison with a Previous Work.....	97
6.1.1	The Work of Stevenson et al.	97
6.1.2	Simulation Study using Developed Numerical Model.....	99
6.1.2.1	First Breakthrough Scenario.....	100
6.1.2.2	Second Breakthrough Scenario	102
6.2	Sensitivity Studies	105
6.2.1	Sensitivity Based on Mobility Ratio, Density and Angle of Tilt	105
6.2.1.1	Region 1.....	106
6.2.1.1.1	0 Degree Cases.....	106
6.2.1.1.2	Cases with Dip Angle Higher than 0 Degrees.....	107
6.2.1.1.3	Role of Viscosity Change	108
6.2.1.2	Region 2.....	113
6.2.2	Sensitivity Based on Domain Velocity	119
6.2.3	Sensitivity Based on Heterogeneity	120
6.2.3.1	Heterogeneity Based on Grains Packing	120
6.2.3.2	Heterogeneity Based on Layers of Different Grains Packing	124
CHAPTER 7	CONCLUSION	133
REFERENCES	137
APPENDIX A1:	Source Code for Generating Grains.....	147
APPENDIX A2:	Grain Arrangements	150
APPENDIX B:	Detailed Designed of the Experimental Rig	151
APPENDIX C:	Image Processing Source Code.....	154
APPENDIX D:	Source Code for Creating Multiple Layers of Grains	157

List of Figures

Figure 1-1: Schematic of Immiscible Gas Swelling of Oil in Porous Media (BP-Amoco 1999).....	1
Figure 1-2: Schematic of Miscible Gas Displacement in the Porous Media (BP-Amoco 1999).....	2
Figure 1-3: Underriding of heavier and overriding of lighter fluid during WAG process (Rao 2006).....	6
Figure 1-4: Schematic of Gas Assisted Gravity Drainage Process (Rao 2006).....	7
Figure 2-1: Comparison of the Work by Stevenson et al. (2004) and Tiffin and Kremesec (1988).....	25
Figure 3-1: Methodology Adopted in the Research Work.....	28
Figure 3-2: Methodology to Determine Appropriate Visualization Method for Experimental Study.....	30
Figure 3-3: Methodology for Gap Identification (Experimental Studies).....	30
Figure 3-4: Methodology for Experimental Facilities Development.....	31
Figure 3-5: Angular Tilting of the Model in (a) x-y plane (b) y-z plane.....	32
Figure 4-1: Schematics of the Patterns used in the Experimental Study.....	36
Figure 4-2: Workflow adopted to import actual geometry from MATLAB to MS Paintbrush.....	37
Figure 4-3: Dead Volumes in the Pattern.....	38
Figure 4-4: (A) Schematic of a Photoresist Film, (B) UV Light Exposure Unit.....	39
Figure 4-5: The Rate and Temperature Increment for Fusing Glass Plates.....	41
Figure 4-6: Schematic of the Designed Rig.....	43
Figure 4-7: Tilting of the Micromodel in y-z Plane (A) Axis Representation (B) Fabricated Rig.....	44
Figure 4-8: Tilting of the Micromodel in x-y Plane (A) Axis Representation (B) Fabricated Rig.....	45
Figure 4-9: Phase Diagram of Pure CO ₂ (Vermeulen 2011).....	46
Figure 4-10: Flow Diagram.....	48
Figure 4-11: Image Processing of the Captured Snapshot.....	50
Figure 4-12: Schematic of the Patterns used in the Experimental Study.....	53
Figure 4-13: Schematic of 3-D View of the Micromodel.....	54
Figure 4-14: Grains Domain of the Patterns used in the Experimental Study (A) Pattern 1 (B) Pattern 2.....	55
Figure 4-15: (A) Snapshots of Experiments Conducted in the First Micromodel at Injection Rate of 0.005 cm ³ /min (B) Pre-Breakthrough Profile (C) Pre- and Post-Breakthrough Profile.....	60
Figure 4-16: (A) Snapshots of the Experiments Conducted in the Second Micromodel at Injection Rate of 0.002 cm ³ /min (B) Pre-Breakthrough Profile (C) Pre- and Post-Breakthrough Profile.....	62
Figure 4-17: (A) Snapshots of the Experiments Conducted in the Second Micromodel at Injection Rate of 0.002 cm ³ /min (B) Pre-Breakthrough Profile (C) Pre- and Post-Breakthrough Profile.....	65
Figure 4-18: (A) Comparison of all Cases at 0° (B) Saturation Profile Comparison of all Cases at 0° until Breakthrough.....	69
Figure 4-19: (A) Comparison of all Cases at 0° (B) Saturation Profile Comparison of all Cases at 30°.....	70
Figure 4-20: (A) Comparison of all Cases at 45° (B) Saturation Profile Comparison of all Cases at 45°.....	71
Figure 4-21: (A) Comparison of all Cases at 60° (B) Saturation Profile Comparison of all Cases at 60°.....	72
Figure 4-22: (A) Comparison of all Cases at 90° (B) Saturation Profile Comparison of all Cases at 90°.....	73
Figure 4-23: Volume Ignored due to Air Lock.....	75
Figure 5-1: Porous Geometry used in Experimental and Simulation Studies.....	78
Figure 5-2: The Inlet port (A) without filleted edge and (B) with filleted edge.....	79
Figure 5-3: Meshing of the Porous Domain.....	81
Figure 5-4: Qualitative experimental and simulation comparison for the first pattern.....	86
Figure 5-5: Qualitative experimental and simulation matching for the second pattern at 0.005 cm ³ /min injection rate.....	88
Figure 5-6: Qualitative experimental and simulation matching for the second pattern at 0.002 cm ³ /min injection rate.....	90

Figure 5-7: Quantitative experimental and simulation matching for the first pattern (flow rate 0.005 cm ³ /min)	93
Figure 5-8: Quantitative experimental and simulation matching for the second pattern (flow rate 0.005 cm ³ /min)	94
Figure 5-9: Quantitative experimental and simulation matching for the second pattern (flow rate 0.002 cm ³ /min)	96
Figure 6-1: Graph of Breakthrough Saturation versus Darcy–Rayleigh Number (G)	98
Figure 6-2: Concentration Peak 0.2 mol/m ³ at the Exit Boundary	100
Figure 6-3: Comparison between Breakthrough Saturation, S _b , (%) against the Calculated Darcy–Rayleigh Number, G, for the First Breakthrough Scenario (A) Cartesian Plot and (B) Semi-Log Plot.....	101
Figure 6-4: Pore-Scale Images for the First Breakthrough Scenario (Injection from Bottom).....	102
Figure 6-5: Comparison between Breakthrough Saturation, S _b , (%) against the Calculated Darcy–Rayleigh Number, G, for the Second Breakthrough Scenario (A) Cartesian Plot and (B) Semi-Log Plot.....	103
Figure 6-6: Pore-Scale Images for the Second Breakthrough Scenario (Injection from Bottom)	104
Figure 6-7: Snapshots for Different Mobility Ratios and Density Differences Cases for Region 1.....	109
Figure 6-8: Graphs of S _b vs. Cos θ for Various Density Differences at Particular Mobility Ratios in Region 1	110
Figure 6-9: Graphs of S _b vs. Cos θ for Various Mobility Ratios at Particular Density Differences in Region 1	111
Figure 6-10: Breakthrough Saturation vs. Cos (θ) for Range of Mobility Ratios and Density Differences.....	112
Figure 6-11: Snapshots for Different Mobility Ratios and Density Differences Cases for Region 2.....	115
Figure 6-12: Graphs of S _b vs. Cos θ for Various Density Differences at Particular Mobility Ratios in Region 2	117
Figure 6-13: Graphs of S _b vs. Cos θ for Various Mobility Ratios at Particular Density Differences in Region 2	118
Figure 6-14: Breakthrough Saturation vs Cos (θ) for Range of Mobility Ratios and Density Differences using Domain Velocity of 0.8 ft/day.....	119
Figure 6-15: Breakthrough Saturation vs Cos (θ) for Range of Mobility Ratios and Density Differences using Domain Velocity of 0.4 ft/day.....	120
Figure 6-16: Pattern used to Study Heterogeneity Based on Layers of Different Grains Packing	125
Figure 6-17: Snapshots at the Breakthrough	127
Figure 6-18: Comparison of Breakthrough Occurring at Different Dip Angle in Mix Pattern	128
Figure A2-7-1 Circular Arrangement of the Numerically Controlled Pattern	150
Figure A2-7-2 Distribution of Distances between the Centres of Circles for (a) Pattern 1 and (b) Pattern 2	150

List of Tables

<i>Table 4-1: Geometric Arrangements of the Two Patterns Designed</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Table 4-2: Optimum Parameters to Prepare Glass Micromodel</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>Table 4-3: Density and Viscosities Contrast of Different North Sea Light Oil Reservoirs (Fayers, Hawes et al. 1981)</i>	<i>46</i>
<i>Table 4-4: Experimental Calculations Considering Full Domain</i>	<i>54</i>
<i>Table 4-5: Experimental Calculations Considering Grains Domain</i>	<i>56</i>
<i>Table 4-6: Calculation of the Perkins and Johnson (1963) Dimensionless Number</i>	<i>57</i>
<i>Table 5-1: Inlet Velocities Provided in Simulation during Experimental Results Matching</i>	<i>82</i>
<i>Table 6-1: Variables Range in the Sensitivity Study</i>	<i>106</i>
<i>Table 6-2: Geometric Arrangements of the Designed Patterns</i>	<i>121</i>
<i>Table 6-3: Patterns used to Study Heterogeneity Based on Grains Packing</i>	<i>122</i>
<i>Table 6-4: Snapshots at the Breakthrough</i>	<i>123</i>
<i>Table 6-5: Configuration of Pattern used to Study Heterogeneity Based on Layers of Different Grains Packing</i>	<i>124</i>

Abstract

Gravity assisted miscible gas injection into oil reservoirs is an efficient method of Enhanced Oil Recovery (EOR). Carbon dioxide injection into aquifers for sequestration purposes is another application of miscible displacement under gravity control. This dissertation reports pore-scale experimental and simulation studies to determine the role of different parameters on the frontal stability of the miscible displacement process under gravity domination.

Experimental studies were based on visualization of first contact miscible flooding under gravity domination. Visualization was conducted using the glass micromodel technique. Facilities were designed and fabricated to perform the experiments. Two micromodels with different patterns of loose packing and close packing were prepared through the sandblasting technique. The porous patterns for these micromodels were generated using the MATLAB program. The injection of the lighter and less viscous iso-octane was carried out in comparatively heavier and high viscous butanol. The injections were carried out at different dipping angles ($0 \leq \theta \leq 90$) and injection velocities (representing near wellbore and reservoir flow rates). The images were captured and processed to analyse the frontal movement and to estimate the concentration of injecting fluid in the flow domain. The experimental results presented in this thesis demonstrate the dependencies of various characteristics such as dip angle and porous medium heterogeneity on the process at pore scale.

The simulation studies were performed using the Finite Element Analysis technique. The simulation model was initially validated by matching results with flow visualization experimental studies using glass micromodels. The Navier–Stokes, continuity and convection-diffusion equations were used in the simulation instead of Darcy's law. Wide ranges of parameters applicable for Enhanced Oil Recovery and CO₂ sequestration were used in the sensitivity study. Dip angles (θ) between 0° and 180° (for up-dip and down-dip situations), different domain velocities, density differences of 50 to 900 kg/m³ between the injecting and displaced fluids and viscosity ratios from 1 to 100 (to include light and heavy oils) were investigated. Snapshots were captured in each simulation case for visual comparison of the frontal advancement. In addition, breakthrough saturation was plotted against $\cos(\theta)$ to quantify the competition

between viscous and gravity forces in the gravity-dominated miscible displacement process.

The pore-scale study suggests that the stability of a miscible process can be influenced by several factors. When gravity acts in favour of displacement and there is a moderate to large density difference, angular tilt is the most important parameter influencing displacement. When the density difference is small, then the mobility ratio and flow velocity also play a role. When gravity opposes displacement and buoyancy forces are dominating, results show little sensitivity to the actual tilt angle. Better displacement is seen for lower density difference and for higher flow velocity; yet, again, the mobility ratio only impacts on displacement when the density difference is quite small.

The sensitivity simulation studies were performed based on: (a) mobility ratio, density difference and angle of tilt; (b) domain velocities; and (c) local and global heterogeneity. The sensitivity study for $0 \leq \theta \leq 90$ suggests a region that is sensitive to angular dip. The region $90 < \theta \leq 180$, however, is more sensitive to the density difference between injection and in-place fluids. For $0 \leq \theta \leq 180$ mobility ratio might be significant if the density difference between injection and in-place fluid is small. Sensitivity based on domain velocity suggests that large reduction in domain velocities might lose the inertial effects and might cause overriding, especially for the high-dipping angle cases. Sensitivity based on heterogeneity suggests that decreasing grain spacing promotes the fluid mixing. Therefore, in less permeable zones, the overriding of lighter fluid can be reduced even in high-dipping angle cases.

Statement of Originality

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue, and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Signature : _____

Zeeshan Mohiuddin

Australian School of Petroleum

The University of Adelaide, Australia.

Acknowledgements

I would like to especially thank Dr Manouchehr Haghighi and Dr Yvonne Stokes for their continuous guidance and support. Moreover, I would like to acknowledge Dr Themis Carageorgos and Dr Danny Gibbins for their assistance during the experimental and image processing work. I would also like to thank my family who supported me during the tough times in my PhD studies.

List of Publications

Zeeshan Mohiuddin, Manouchehr Haghighi and Yvonne Stokes (2013). ‘Pore level visualisation and simulation of CO₂ miscible injection with gravity domination’, *Energy Procedia*, **37**: 6885–6900.

Zeeshan Mohiuddin, Manouchehr Haghighi and Yvonne Stokes. ‘Pore level visualisation and simulation of CO₂ miscible injection with gravity domination’, paper presented at the 11th International Conference on Greenhouse Gas Control Technologies, Kyoto International Conference Centre, Japan, 18–22 November 2012.

Zeeshan Mohiuddin, Manouchehr Haghighi, Yvonne Stokes, Themis Carageorgos and Danny Gibbins. ‘Pore scale visualization and simulation of miscible displacement process under gravity domination’, paper IPTC 15310 presented at the International Petroleum Technology Conference Bangkok, Thailand, 15–17 November 2011.

Zeeshan Mohiuddin and Manouchehr Haghighi. ‘Visualization of CO₂ displacement process under gravity domination’, paper SPE 144101 presented at the SPE Enhanced Oil Recovery Conference, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 19–21 July 2011.

Abbreviations, Prefixes and Symbols

Breakthrough Saturation (S_b)

Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS)

Cyclic Gas Injection (CGI)

Density Difference ($\Delta\rho$)

Diffusion Coefficient (D_o)

Enhanced Oil Recovery (EOR)

First Contact Miscibility (FCM)

Gas Assisted Gravity Drainage (GAGD)

Hue Saturation and Value (HSV)

Original Oil in Place (OOIP)

Minimum Miscibility Pressure (MMP)

Mobility Ratio (M)

Multiple Contact Miscibility (MCM)

Red Green Blue (RGB)

Water Alternating Gas (WAG)