

1_Suranto_Pet_Sci_Tech_2015.pdf

By A.M. Suranto



9 **An Investigation of Hybrid Steam-Solvent Injection for Increasing Economy and Reducing CO₂ Emission**

A. M. Suranto, W. Bae & A. K. Permadi

11 To cite this article: A. M. Suranto, W. Bae & A. K. Permadi (2015) An Investigation of Hybrid Steam-Solvent Injection for Increasing Economy and Reducing CO₂ Emission, Petroleum Science and Technology, 33:3, 302-310, DOI: [10.1080/10916466.2014.953683](https://doi.org/10.1080/10916466.2014.953683)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10916466.2014.953683>



Published online: 14 Jan 2015.



[Submit your article to this journal](#) ↗



Article views: 261



[View related articles](#) ↗



[View Crossmark data](#) ↗



Citing articles: 1 [View citing articles](#) ↗

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
<http://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=lpet20>

An Investigation of Hybrid Steam-Solvent Injection for Increasing Economy and Reducing CO₂ Emission

A. M. Suranto,¹ W. Bae,¹ and A. K. Permadi²

¹*Department of Energy and Mineral Resources Engineering, Sejong University, Seoul, South Korea*

²*Department of Petroleum Engineering, Bandung Institute of Technology, Bandung, Indonesia*

The hybrid steam-solvent injection scheme has been applied but limited results have been reported in the literature. The optimum solvent concentration to maximize economics and to reduce the CO₂ emission is still in question. A synthetic reservoir model was developed using real field data to study such an injection. Results indicate that the optimal solvent concentration is 5.0% by volume fraction and as the concentration increases the CO₂ emission reduces. The optimum case has 21% gain in the net present value discounted by 12% per annual and 9.1% reduction in the CO₂ emission comparing to the pure steam injection.

Keywords: hybrid steam-solvent injection, solvent concentration, net present value, CO₂ emission, bitumen

1. INTRODUCTION

The Alberta oil sands rank third in proven global crude oil reserves, right after Saudi Arabia and Venezuela. Its total proven reserve was estimated to be 170.2 billion barrels, or about 11% of total global reserves in 2011. About 99% of this comes from oil sand. By 2022, crude bitumen production is expected to be 3.8 million bbl/day (Government of Alberta, 2013). (Government of Alberta, 2013) The bitumen viscosity will reduce to less than 10 cp if the bitumen is heated to more than 200°C. To increase the temperature, heat is used by burning natural gases to produce steam and the greenhouse gas emission will increase (Gates and Chakrabarty, 2008; Deng et al., 2010).

In 2002, Alberta passed Climate Change and Emissions Management Act (CCEMA) (Government of Alberta, 2012) signaling its commitment to manage greenhouse gas emissions in the province. However, in 2010, 19 in situ oil sands facilities still accounted for 18.7 Mt or 15.3% of total greenhouse gas emission in Alberta (Government of Alberta, 2013). To increase the oil production while minimizing energy usage and environmental impact, hybrid steam-solvent injection has been developed. Such the injection has increased the production of about 57% while more than 70% of the solvent retention was recovered from the reservoir (Gupta and Gittins, 2005, 2006).

In the hybrid steam-solvent process, a small amount of solvent is mixed with the steam and is injected into the reservoir. As a result, the solvent vaporizes together with the steam. In the boundary of the steam chamber, the solvent will be distilled and dissolved into the bitumen. Consequently, the bitumen viscosity will be greatly reduced due to two factors (i.e., dissolved solvent and the heat

Address correspondence to W. Bae, 98 Gunja-dong, Gwangjin-gu, Seoul, 143–747 South Korea. E-mail: wsbae@sejong.ac.kr

Color versions of one or more of the figures in the article can be found online at www.tandfonline.com/lpet.




FIGURE 1 Flowchart of the optimization algorithm based on NPV.

from the steam). A good solvent should be condensed at the same condition with water phase. Hexane is a solvent which has the closest vaporization temperature to steam, which is 215°C at pressure of 2200 kPa (Nasr et al., 2003; Nasr and Ayodele, 2006). On the other hand, Shu (1984) investigated that mixture of solvents and bitumen will reduce the viscosity drastically at small concentrations of solvents. In conclusion, if the solvent concentration increases, the bitumen viscosity will decrease exponentially.

There are several considerations in steam-solvent injection process including solvent price, solvent retention, and solvent effectiveness. Adding solvents into steam will be favorable because the cumulative cost per unit volume will decrease of approximately 13% compared to pure steam process (Frauenfeld et al., 2009). In this research, the hybrid steam-solvent injection was applied to the McMurray formation in Canada. Steam efficiency, solvent effectiveness, economic value, and CO₂ emission at different solvent concentrations were observed.

2. OPTIMIZATION OF SOLVENT CONCENTRATION

Figure 1 displays the optimization process used in this work. At first, a basic reservoir model is built. The results of reservoir simulation are compared to field performances reported by EnCana. To make this model comparison possible, the operating condition is varied. In the second step, nine scenarios are built by varying the solvent concentration. In each of those scenarios the net present value (NPV) is observed. Following standard term of CO₂ emission from gas fuel (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2004), the amount of CO₂ emission generated is observed. The NPV and CO₂ emission

1
TABLE 1
Key Reservoir Simulation Parameters Used

Reservoir Property	Value
Initial reservoir temperature, °C	12
Initial reservoir pressure at injection well depth, kPa	2,105
Depth of injection well, m	215
Bitumen viscosity at 100°C, cp	260
Bitumen viscosity at steam injection temperature (220°C), cp	5.7
Bitumen viscosity correlation	$A_{visci} = 2.3693E-5$
$[\mu_i = A_{visci} \cdot \exp(B_{visci}/T_{abs})]$ (CMG, 2012)	$B_{visci} = 6046.7035$
k_v/k_h	0.7
14 dual oil saturation (s_{orw})	0.15
Connate water saturation (s_{wc})	0.15
Residual oil for gas-liquid (s_{org})	0.01
Connate gas saturation (s_{gc})	0.05
k_{rw} 1 reducible oil saturation	0.3
k_{ro} at connate water saturation	1
k_{ro} at connate gas saturation	1
k_{rg} at residual oil saturation	1
Underburden/overburden heat capacity, kJ/m ³ °C	2,600
Underburden/overburden thermal conductivity, kJ/m-day °C	660
Bitumen thermal conductivity, kJ/m day °C	11.5
	1 = 1.01E + 6 kPa
Hexane K-value correlation,	$K_{v4} = -2,697.55^\circ C$
$K_{-value} = \frac{K_{v4}}{p} e^{\frac{K_{v5}}{T+K_{v5}}}$	$K_{v5} = -224.37^\circ C$

Source: Gates and Chakrabarty (2008), Computer Modeling Groups (2012).

equations are the following:

$$NPV = \sum_{t=0}^N \frac{NCF_t}{(1+i)^t} \quad (1)$$

$$CO_2 \text{ emission (kg)} = 50 \times \text{heat employed (GJ)} \quad (2)$$

1 **3. RESERVOIR MODEL**

The thermal reservoir simulator, STARS Version 2012 is used to construct the reservoir model. The reservoir model is described in Table 1. The model did not have gas cap and bottom water drive. The geomechanics were ignored. Figure 2 illustrates the permeability, porosity, and oil saturation distribution in a 3-D form. The left part of the reservoir (Cross Section A) is very permeable while the right part (Cross Section C) is gradually tighter. The distributions of porosity and oil saturation in the reservoir follow the similar pattern. The production well is 2 m above the bottom of the reservoir and the injection well is 5 m above the production well. The thickness of the reservoir is 30 m, the width is 110 m, and the length is 750 m. The total grid number is $30 \times 44 \times 15$ (i, j, k) and the grid size is 2 m in i-direction, 2.5 m in j-direction, and 2 m in k-direction.

The preheating period lasts about six months and the temperature in both of the wells is set to be 220°C. During this process, the heat will be transferred via conduction mechanism to the




FIGURE 2 3D view of reservoir model permeability, porosity, and oil saturation.

1 surrounding wells and both the production and injection wells will be connected hydrodynamically. After preheating, the wells are switched to become injection and production wells. The steam injection is operated at constant pressure at the sand face with a steam quality of 0.9. To prevent steam losses from the chamber, a maximum steam production rate is set to $5 \text{ m}^3/\text{day}$. In all cases, the reservoir simulation project life is set to 15 years. A sensitivity analysis for solvent concentration using hexane is conducted.




FIGURE 3 (A) cSOR and cumulative bitumen production for the pure steam and 10% solvent concentration system; (B) cumulative solvent injection and production for 10% solvent concentration injection scheme.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Reservoir Simulation

Figure 3A displays the cumulative steam oil ratio (cSOR) and cumulative bitumen production versus time of pure steam and 10% solvent concentration scenarios, respectively. The cumulative bitumen production of the solvent injection case is 50% bigger than that of the pure steam injection case. The percentage of solvent retention is approximately 30% at the end of the project (Figure 3B). This phenomenon is comparable to a documented field case performance in Canada (Gupta and Gittins, 2005, 2006). To achieve this performance, the operating conditions of injection pressure and liquid production rate are 2300 kPa and 400 m³/day, respectively.

In the pure steam process, during the first year to the fifth year, the cSOR increases because the steam chamber is still growing up and the effectiveness of the steam has not been maximized yet due to shale barriers in the reservoir (Figure 4). After the steam chamber reaches the top, the bitumen production will be at peak and consequently, cSOR will be decreased. After that, when the steam chamber has been matured, the cSOR will slowly increase due to the decrease of ultimate recovery. Zone A has relatively little shale breaks compared to Zone B and Zone C. Therefore, the performance of steam chamber in Zone A is better than those of Zone B and Zone C. Besides that, the heat will be dispersed if solvent is added. At the end of project life, the steam chamber will be wider in the steam-solvent process compared with that of the process utilizing only pure steam. This indicates that the effectiveness of steam-solvent is better even though the energy used is slightly lower.

The amount of solvent that can penetrate to bitumen depends on the steam chamber volume. The smaller the steam chamber, the less solvent will penetrate into the bitumen. Addition of solvent concentration at this stage is not effective because the solvent has limited movement to the upside of the reservoir and it will condense together with steam. As a result, it goes down to the production well. If the addition of solvent is too much, its effectiveness will greatly reduce because the mixture of solvent, and bitumen viscosity follows an exponential trend (Shu, 1984).

There are two terms in hybrid steam-solvent injection process. The first is energy efficiency, which is defined as the sum of enthalpy from steam injection utilized for getting the bitumen product per unit volume (cumulative energy of ratio [cEOR]). The second is solvent efficiency, the amount of solvent that is needed to be injected to obtain the bitumen production per unit volume (cumulative solvent oil ratio [cSOR]). As can be seen in Figure 5, to obtain 1 m³




FIGURE 4 Cross section of horizontal permeability and temperature distribution in Zones A, B, and C.

of bitumen in pure steam process, it will need 11.7 GJ of energy. While in the hybrid steam-solvent injection ¹6 solvent concentration of 2.5%, the energy required will be reduced to approximately 9 GJ/m³. If the solvent concentration increases, the cEOR will decrease while the csOR will increase.




FIGURE 5 The relationship between energy efficiency and solvent efficiency.




FIGURE 6 The relationship between NPV and CO₂ emission.

4.2 Economic Analysis and CO₂ Emission

The economic analysis used a common set of general assumptions in SAGI projects. Two wells cost and exploration costs are assumed to be \$1.35E6 and \$0.2E6, respectively. Steam generation capital cost is \$2.05E6 for a 430 m³/day-capacity generator. Water treatment capital cost is \$2.45E6 for a 400 m³/day-capacity plant. Solvent capital cost is \$100k. Solvent handling cost is \$20k/year/well, and solvent recompression cost is \$0.17/std m³ (Frauenfeld et al., 2006). The natural gas cost is assumed to be \$4.33/GJ. The other assumptions include water treatment cost is \$1/barrel of water production, the fixed cost is assumed to be 0.9 MM \$/year, the interest rate is 12% per annual, bitumen price is \$70/barrel, and the hexane price is 1.5 times of bitumen price. The net cash flow calculation (NCF) is:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{NCF} = & [\text{Net revenue}] - [\text{Well cost} + \text{exploration cost}] - [\text{steam generation cost}] \\
 & - [\text{water treatment capital cost}] - [\text{solvent capital cost}] \\
 & - [\text{solvent handling cost}] - [\text{solvent recompression cost}] \\
 & - [\text{natural gas cost} + \text{water production treatment cost} + \text{solvent usage cost}] - [\text{fixed cost}]
 \end{aligned}$$

Figure 6 shows that NPV of the pure steam process is lower than that of hybrid steam solvent injection process at concentration range from 2.5% to 12.5% volume. The NPV in which the solvent concentration is 5.0% by volume fraction is the highest and the cEOR and csOR are 7.86 GJ/m³ and 0.16 m³/m³, respectively.

Figure 6 shows that the CO₂ emission can be reduced by adding solvent to the steam. At solvent concentrations of 5.0% to 7.5% CO₂ emission will be decreased to approximately 3.4% but NPV will only be decreased approximately 1 MM\$. At the solvent concentration of 2.5%, there is a dramatic NPV difference compared with pure steam. Additionally, it will also greatly affect on the CO₂

emission. Nevertheless, starting from solvent concentration of 2.5%, the NPV will be influenced. Larger concentration of solvent will generate larger impact on reducing CO₂ emission.

Furthermore, even though the CO₂ emission will start to be influenced even from small solvent concentration (2.5%), it will be slightly affected by continuing added solvent concentration. Economically speaking, the solvent concentration more than 5.0% will reduce the NPV. However, it will be more environmentally favorable. If the NPV is a major priority, the solvent concentration of 5.0% becomes the best case that it can reduce CO₂ emission and increase the NPV approximately 18.05 × 10³ tonnes and 7.76 MM\$, respectively. On the other hand, if the CO₂ emission is a major priority (for example: it must be reduced to 15% CO₂), the solvent concentration should be 10.0% by volume fraction. At that concentration, NPV will be 41.36 MM\$, approximately 7.5% decrease compared to the maximum NPV but it will still be higher than that in the pure steam process (i.e., approximately 12%). Finally, if the solvent concentration is higher than 5.0%, the economic criteria and CO₂ emission will be contradictory.

5. CONCLUSIONS

This study demonstrated that the hybrid solvent injection method will have advantages compared to pure steam injection method. High solvent concentration will result in low CO₂ emission and high recovery factor, but optimum condition will be achieved at solvent concentration of 5.0% by volume fraction. If the solvent concentration is larger than 5.0%, the economical and CO₂ emission will be contradictory. In this investigation, the cEOR and csOR of 7.86 GJ/m³ and 0.16 m³/m³, respectively, had the most profitable NPV. The solvent concentration of 5.0% increased the NPV by 21% (7.76 MM\$) and decreased the CO₂ emission by 9.1% (18.05 × 10³ tonnes), respectively, when compared to those of the scenario of utilizing pure steam.

FUNDING

5 This work was supported by the Energy Resources R&D program of the Korea Institute of Energy Technology Evaluation and Planning (KETEP) grant funded by the Korea Government Ministry of Trade, Industry & Energy (MOTIE).

REFERENCES

- Computer Modeling Groups. (2012). *Stars Users Manual, Version 2012*. Calgary, Alberta, Canada: Computer Modeling Groups.
- Deng, X., Huang, H., Zhao, L., Law, D.H.S., and Nasr, T.N. (2010). Simulating the ES-SAGD process with solvent mixture in Athabasca reservoirs, Alberta Research Council. *J. Can. Pet. Technol.* 49:.
- Frauenfeld, T. W., Deng, X., and Jossy, C. (2006). *Economic analysis of thermal solvent process. SPE 2006-164*.
- Frauenfeld, T. W., Jossy, C., and Bleile, I. (2009). Experimental and economic analysis of the thermal solvent and hybrid processes. *J. Can. Pet. Technol.* 48:55–62.
- Gates, I. D., and Chakrabarty, N. (2008). Design of the steam and solvent injection strategy in expanding solvent steam-assisted gravity drainage. *J. Can. Pet. Technol.* 47:12–20.
- Government of Alberta. (2012). Alberta Environmental and Sustainable Resources Development report: Report on 2010 Greenhouse gas Emission. Available at: <http://esrd.alberta.ca/focus/alberta-and-climate-change/regulating-greenhouse-gas-emissions/documents/8616.pdf>.
- Government of Alberta. (2013). Talk About Oil Sands. Available at: http://www.energy.alberta.ca/OilSands/pdfs/FactSheet_OilSands.pdf.
- Gupta, S. C., and Gittins, S. D. (2005). Field implementation of solvent aided process. *J. Can. Pet. Technol.* 44:8–13.
- Gupta, S. C., and Gittins, S. D. (2006). Christina Lake solvent aided process pilot. *J. Can. Pet. Technol.* 45:15–18.

- Nasr, T. N., and Ayodele, O. R. (2006). *New hybrid steam-solvent process for the recovery of heavy oil and bitumen*. SPE 101717.
- Nasr, T. N., Beaulieu, G., Golbeck, H., and Heck, G. (2003). Novel expanding solvent-SAGD process "ES-SAGD". *J. Can. Pet. Technol.* 42:13–16.
- Shu, W. R. (1984). A viscosity correlation for mixtures of heavy oil, bitumen, and petroleum fractions. *SPE J* 42 June:277–282.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2004). *Unit conversions, emissions factors, and other reference data*. Retrieved from <http://www.epa.gov/cpd/pdf/brochure.pdf>

NOMENCLATURE

NPV	=	net present value	csOR	=	cumulative solvent oil ratio
NCF	=	net cash flow	GJ	=	gigajoule
i	=	discount rate	\$	=	U.S. Dollars
n	=	project's economic life in years		=	SI Metric Conversion Factors
SAGD	=	steam assisted gravity drainage	bbl × 1.5899	=	m ³
cSOR	=	cumulative steam oil ratio	cp × 1.0	=	Pa.sec
cEOR	=	cumulative energy oil ratio	1 tonne	=	1000 kg

51%

SIMILARITY INDEX

PRIMARY SOURCES

- 1** Suranto, A.M., A.K. Permadi, W. Bae, Y. Park, and D.T. Son. "Controlling the hybrid steam-solvent injection for increasing recovery factor and reducing solvent retention in heterogeneous reservoirs", *International Journal of Oil Gas and Coal Technology*, 2016.
Crossref 731 words — 27%
- 2** www.ingentaconnect.com
Internet 141 words — 5%
- 3** A. M. Suranto. "A novel technique combining the cyclic steam stimulation and top gas injection for increasing heat efficiency", *Geosystem Engineering*, 2017
Crossref 67 words — 2%
- 4** researchoutput.csu.edu.au
Internet 60 words — 2%
- 5** Suranto, A.M., A.K. Permadi, and W. Bae. "Smart completion design in cyclic steam stimulation process: an alternative for accelerating heavy oil recovery", *International Journal of Oil Gas and Coal Technology*, 2016.
Crossref 52 words — 2%
- 6** Amir Fayazi, Apostolos Kantzas. "A review on steam-solvent processes for enhanced heavy oil/bitumen recovery", *Reviews in Chemical Engineering*, 2018
Crossref 40 words — 1%
- 7** fac.ksu.edu.sa
Internet 40 words — 1%
- 8** A. M. Suranto, A. K. Permadi, W. Bae. "An investigation on economy and CO2 emission of water alternating steam process (WASP) using response surface correlation", *Journal of Petroleum Exploration and*

-
- 9 linknovate.com 32 words — 1%
Internet
-
- 10 www.onepetro.org 30 words — 1%
Internet
-
- 11 A.M. Suranto, P. Sayoga Heru. "Investigation of Multilevel Injector for Ramp-up Process in Vertical Well Using Steam Assisted Gravity Drainage Method", Energy Procedia, 2017 26 words — 1%
Crossref
-
- 12 repository.um.edu.my 24 words — 1%
Internet
-
- 13 Gates, I.D.. "Oil phase viscosity behaviour in Expanding-Solvent Steam-Assisted Gravity Drainage", Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering, 200710 21 words — 1%
Crossref
-
- 14 El Shazly, Ahmed Salah. "A Comparison of Hybrid Steam-Assisted Gravity Drainage Models in Top Water Reservoirs.", New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, 2018 15 words — 1%
ProQuest
-
- 15 www.nanoscalereslett.com 15 words — 1%
Internet
-
- 16 Arun Venkat Venkatramani, Ryosuke Okuno. "Characterization of water-containing reservoir oil using an EOS for steam injection processes", Journal of Natural Gas Science and Engineering, 2015 10 words — < 1%
Crossref
-
- 17 Yang, Xiaomeng. "Hybrid steam-air heavy oil recovery process design", Proquest, 20111109 8 words — < 1%
ProQuest
-
- 18 ourspace.uregina.ca 8 words — < 1%
Internet

-
- 19 theses.ucalgary.ca 8 words — < 1%
Internet
-
- 20 I. Gates. "Optimization of Steam-Assisted Gravity Drainage in McMurray Reservoir", Proceedings of Canadian International Petroleum Conference CIPC, 06/2005 8 words — < 1%
Crossref
-
- 21 As Muatasim Al Bahlani. "A Critical Review of the Status of SAGD: Where Are We and What Is Next?", Proceedings of SPE Western Regional and Pacific Section AAPG Joint Meeting WRM, 03/2008 8 words — < 1%
Crossref
-
- 22 Yanyong Wang, Shaoran Ren, Liang Zhang, Xiyi Peng, Shufeng Pei, Guodong Cui, Yanmin Liu. "Numerical study of air assisted cyclic steam stimulation process for heavy oil reservoirs: Recovery performance and energy efficiency analysis", Fuel, 2018 8 words — < 1%
Crossref
-
- 23 Rabiei Faradonbeh, M., T.G. Harding, and J. Abedi. "Semi-analytical modeling of steam-solvent gravity drainage of heavy oil and bitumen: Steady state model with linear interface", Fuel, 2016. 7 words — < 1%
Crossref
-

EXCLUDE QUOTES OFF
EXCLUDE BIBLIOGRAPHY ON

EXCLUDE MATCHES OFF