

Title: **“Improved Miscible Nitrogen Flood Performance Utilizing
Advanced Reservoir Characterization and Horizontal Laterals
in a Class I Reservoir – East Binger (Marchand) Unit”**

Type of Report: **Topical Report - Budget Period 3**

Reporting Period Start: **July 1, 2004**

Reporting Period End: **June 30, 2006**

Principal Author/Investigator: **Joe Sinner**

Report Date: **September 5, 2006**

Cooperative Agreement No: **DE-FC26-00BC15121**

Contractor Name & Address: **Binger Operations, LLC
P. O. Box 2850
Cody, Wyoming 82414**

DOE Project Manager: **Gary Walker, National Petroleum Technology Office**

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 herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, 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 DOE-sponsored project at the East Binger Unit is an investigation into the benefits of reservoir characterization and horizontal wells in this particular setting of geologic and recovery method. The geologic setting is a tight (average porosity of 7% and average permeability of less than 1 millidarcy) Pennsylvanian-age sandstone at about 10,000 feet, and the recovery method is a miscible nitrogen flood.

The projected oil recovery of the East Binger Unit, prior to the initiation of this project, was about 25%. Gravity segregation of nitrogen and crude oil was believed to be the principal cause of the poor sweep efficiency, and it was envisioned that with horizontal producing wells in the lower portion of the reservoir and horizontal injection wells near the top, the process could be converted from a lateral displacement process to a vertical displacement/gravity assisted process.

Through the characterization and field development work completed in Budget Periods 1 and 2, Binger Operations, LLC (BOL) has developed a different interpretation of the sweep problem as well as a different approach to improving recovery. The sweep problem is now believed to be one of an areal nature, due to a combination of natural and hydraulic fracturing.

Vertical wells have provided a much better economic return than have the horizontal wells. The natural and hydraulic fracturing manifests itself as a direction of higher permeability, and the flood is being converted to a line drive flood aligned with this orientation. Consistent with this concept, horizontal wells have been drilled along the line of the fracture orientation, such that hydraulic fracturing leads to “longitudinal” fractures, in line with the wellbore. As such, the hydraulically fractured horizontal wells are not significantly different than hydraulically fractured vertical wells – save for the potential for a much longer fracture face.

This Topical Report contains data from new wells, plus new and updated production, pressure, and gas analysis data that was not included in the Topical Reports provided at the ends of Budget Periods 1 and 2. The analyses and interpretations of these data are provided in the many technical reports submitted throughout this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 1 |
| CATEGORY/TABLE I – GENERAL INFORMATION | 2 |
| CATEGORY/TABLE II – 3-D DESCRIPTION OF RESERVOIR | 5 |
| CATEGORY/TABLE III – FIELD DEVELOPMENT HISTORY | 6 |
| CATEGORY/TABLE IV – FIELD PRODUCTION CONSTRAINTS AND DESIGN LOGIC | 7 |
| CATEGORY/TABLE V – EVALUATION OF COST-SHARE PROJECT RESULTS | 9 |
| CATEGORY/TABLE VI – SUPPORTING DATA | 10 |
| CATEGORY/TABLE VII – ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION | 10 |

**“Improved Miscible Nitrogen Flood Performance Utilizing Advanced
Reservoir Characterization and Horizontal Laterals in a Class I
Reservoir – East Binger (Marchand) Unit”**

DE-FC26-00BC15121

Executive Summary

The DOE-sponsored project at the East Binger Unit is an investigation into the benefits of reservoir characterization and horizontal wells in this particular setting of geologic and recovery method. The geologic setting is a tight (average porosity of 7% and average permeability of less than 1 millidarcy) Pennsylvanian-age sandstone at about 10,000 feet, and the recovery method is a miscible nitrogen flood.

The projected oil recovery of the East Binger Unit, prior to the initiation of this project, was about 25%, low for a miscible injection project. The poor sweep efficiency of the nitrogen flood was believed to be a vertical sweep problem caused by gravity segregation of the nitrogen and the crude oil. It was envisioned that nitrogen was overriding the oil, leaving the lower portion of the reservoir unswept. Further, it was envisioned that by completing horizontal producing wells in the lower portion of the reservoir and horizontal injection wells near the top, the process could be converted from a lateral displacement process to a vertical displacement/gravity assisted process.

Through the characterization and field development work completed in Budget Periods 1 and 2, Binger Operations, LLC (BOL) has developed a different interpretation of the sweep problem as well as a different approach to improving recovery. The sweep problem is now believed to be one of an areal nature, due to a combination of natural and hydraulic fracturing. Horizontal wells had to be fracture-stimulated to establish commercial production. Following these stimulations, which in all likelihood connected the wellbores with the top of the reservoir through the fracture face, the nitrogen content in the produced gas dropped.

Vertical wells have provided a much better economic return than have the horizontal wells. The natural and hydraulic fracturing manifests itself as a direction of higher permeability, and the flood is being converted to a line drive flood aligned with this orientation (flooding in the “lower perm” direction). In keeping with this concept, horizontal wells have been drilled along the line of the fracture orientation, such that hydraulic fracturing leads to “longitudinal” fractures, in line with the wellbore. As such, the hydraulically fractured horizontal wells are not significantly different than hydraulically fractured vertical wells – save for the potential for a much longer fracture face.

New data provided here that was not included in the Topical Reports provided at the ends of Budget Periods 1 and 2 include updated production, gas analyses, and pressure data for all wells in the field, as well as cost data for all projects implemented during Budget Period 3. Also included are all logs, directional data, and completion reports from all wells drilled in Budget Period 3. Data is provided according to categories and tables of information requested by the Department of Energy.

The analyses and interpretations of these data are provided in the many technical reports submitted throughout this project.

Category/Table I – General Information

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|----------------------------|--------|--------------------------|--------|
| Field Name | East Binger Field | | | | | |
| Reservoir Name | Upper Marchand | | | | | |
| State | Oklahoma | | | | | |
| County | Caddo | | | | | |
| Formation | Hoxbar | | | | | |
| Field Discovery | Denver Production & Refining Company Adah-Noe No. 1 SW/4 Sec. 34-T10N-R10W January 1935 | | | | | |
| Current Operator | Binger Operations, L.L.C. | | | | | |
| Current Working Interest Ownership (companies w/ > 10%): | <table> <tr> <td>Nielson & Associates, Inc.</td> <td>54.54%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Canyon Oil & Gas Company</td> <td>21.70%</td> </tr> </table> | | Nielson & Associates, Inc. | 54.54% | Canyon Oil & Gas Company | 21.70% |
| Nielson & Associates, Inc. | 54.54% | | | | | |
| Canyon Oil & Gas Company | 21.70% | | | | | |

Project Description:

Background: The Pennsylvanian Upper Marchand sand reservoir at East Binger Unit is located at a depth of 9,000 to 10,000 ft in the Anadarko Basin. OOIP for the Marchand sand unit of the Hoxbar group is 100 to 120 MMSTB. The Marchand reservoir covers 13,000 acres at East Binger Unit. 5,300 acres are on Indian lease lands. Phillips Petroleum, as Unit operator, initiated flue gas injection in the 1970s, but had early gas breakthrough. Over time increasing volumes of produced gas became unmarketable due to increased nitrogen content and were shut-in. In 1986 a change was made to nitrogen injection, following the construction of a plant to extract nitrogen from the produced gas and from the air. Nitrogen has the advantages of being widely available, cost-effective, and environmentally superior as an injectant for miscible floods. Binger Operations took over as the field operator in 1998 with 55 producers and 27 injectors. Cumulative production through June 2006 is 22.63 MMBO. Current production (June 2006) is approximately 800 bopd and 13 MMCFD gas, from which is extracted 550 bpd of NGLs and 2.0 MMCFD hydrocarbon gas. Current injection is about 16 MMCFD of nitrogen.

The problems at East Binger are poor sweep, resulting in early injection breakthrough and cycling of injected nitrogen. The original project plan was to demonstrate the effectiveness of horizontal wellbores in improving sweep and reducing gas breakthrough and cycling. Through work performed in Budget Periods 1 and 2, Binger Operations, LLC (“BOL”) is finding that these objectives can be met more economically with vertical well drilling and pattern realignment; i.e., conversions of some existing producing wells to injection.

Work to be Performed: The original objectives of this project were two-fold: first, to demonstrate use of nitrogen as a widely available, cost-effective and environmentally superior injectant for miscible floods, and second, to demonstrate the effectiveness of horizontal wellbores in reducing gas breakthrough and cycling. This second objective would more properly have been stated “to *test* the effectiveness of horizontal wellbores in reducing gas breakthrough and cycling”, as it was determined through the project that vertical wells and pattern realignment are more cost-effective alternatives for achieving the desired result of reducing gas cycling and thereby improving ultimate recovery.

It is hoped that the demonstration will lead to implementation of nitrogen injection projects in areas without readily available carbon dioxide sources. Technology transfer will occur throughout the project.

Project Team Members: Binger Operations, LLC **
International Reservoir Technologies, Inc.

** Binger Operations, LLC is owned by Nielson & Associates, Inc. and Canyon Oil & Gas Company.

Technical Contacts: Joe Sinner, Project Manager
(307) 587-2445
1501 Stampede Avenue, 3rd Floor
Cody, WY 82414

Steve Slawson, Manager, Binger Operations, LLC
(405) 232-0201
204 North Robinson, Suite 2300
Oklahoma City, OK 73102

Primary Drive Mechanism: Solution Gas
Estimated Primary Recovery: 11%
Estimated Incremental Secondary/Tertiary Recovery Factor: 14% (w/o this project)
Estimated Total of Primary and Secondary/Tertiary Recovery Factor: 25%

Date of first production: January 1935
Number of wells drilled in Field: 144 (through June 2006)

| | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| Well Patterns: | mixed 5-spot / line drive |
| Number of wells penetrating reservoir: | 144 |
| Total completions to date in field: | 144 |
| | |
| Total current completions: | 89 (as of 6/30/2006) |
| Total current producers: | 58 (as of 6/30/2006) |
| | 44 Flowing and/or Plunger Lift |
| | 3 Gas Lift |
| | 5 Rod Pump |
| | 6 Shut-In |
| Total current injectors: | 31 (as of 6/30/2006) |
| | 3 Shut-In |

Summary field history:

The field was discovered in 1935, but after an offset dry hole was drilled, no other drilling took place until the 1970s. Three wells were drilled between 1972 and 1974, after which drilling activity accelerated and proceeded rapidly through 1975 and 1976. The field was developed on 160 acre drilling spacing units and prior to unitization in 1977, 95 wells had been drilled. Fourteen dry holes subsequently defined the productive area. The field produced approximately 3 million barrels of oil by primary production methods.

Initial potentials ranged up to 1400 BOPD. The majority of wells exhibited an early decline rate of approximately 30% per year. Total field oil production rate peaked at 6,400 BOPD in April 1976, with 61 wells were producing. Field-wide production may have continued to increase, but, in order to conserve reservoir energy, some operators voluntarily began restricting production from the initial allowable of 666 to 133 BOPD per well in April of 1975. After a September 1975 hearing, the Oklahoma Corporation Commission (OCC) reduced the allowable to 133 BOPD. Through 1976, while unitization efforts were in progress, the OCC further restricted the allowable, first from 133 to 100 BOPD per well and later to 10 BOPD per well for most wells.

In January 1977, the operators reached agreement on unitization parameters and the future method of enhanced recovery – flue gas injection. On February 1, 1977, the OCC raised the legal allowable to 50 BOPD per well, where it remained until the effective date of unitization, August 1, 1977.

After unitization, thirteen production wells were initially converted to inert gas injection. Initial injection rates were 6 MMCFD, increasing to 20 MMCFD by 1979. By early 1978, however, the expected production response from inert gas injection had not yet materialized, and the field experienced areas of early gas breakthrough. Twenty-three infill development locations were drilled between 1980 and 1983. Ten of those wells completed 80-acre development in a portion of the field.

Early gas breakthrough, injectivity decline problems, and corrosion-related casing leaks were encountered during the early years of inert gas injection. The injectivity problems were alleviated by installing high efficiency coalescing filters at critical injection wells and at the plant, and implementing a variety of well clean-up treatments, including xylene soaks and refracture treatments. Casing leaks were repaired with cement and/or liners. However, a number of wells were plugged over time due to casing problems.

By the early to mid 1980s, increasing inert gas breakthrough volumes caused some of the produced gas to become unmarketable. Some wells, if they were appropriately located, were converted to gas injection. A secondary gas gathering system was also built to re-inject unmarketable gas as a blend with the inert gas. The limits of this system were reached by 1985.

As the quantity of shut-in oil production increased, the re-injection of the high nitrogen gas became economically justifiable. In 1985, the Unit contracted Niject Services Company to provide nitrogen management services. Niject designed, built, and operated facilities on-site to process the produced gas from the Unit into saleable liquid and gaseous hydrocarbons and nitrogen for reinjection, extract nitrogen from air, and provide the Unit with high pressure nitrogen. The plant came on line in December 1986. Niject owned and operated the plant through 1997. The Unit purchased the plant in January 1998, and took over operation of it in 2001.

Category/Table II – 3-D Description of Reservoir

Areal and Vertical Description

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Areal Extent | 13,000 acres (approx.) |
| Average Porosity | 7% |
| Average Initial Oil Saturation | 75% |
| Average Initial Water Saturation | 25% |
| Average Initial Gas Saturation | 0% |
| Average Permeability | 0.15 md |
| Directional Permeability | 0.08 md NW-SE, 0.22 md NE-SW |
| Pay Continuity | Very High |
| Reservoir Dip | 1° to the SW |
| Faults | None known |
| Salt Domes | None |
| Average Net Pay Thickness | 33' (main "C Sand", map included – Item 1) |
| Average Gross Pay Thickness | 48' |
| No Gas Cap or Aquifer | |

Geologic Characteristics

Lithology Sandstone
 Geologic Age Pennsylvanian / Missourian
 Additional information submitted in previous Topical Report.

Fluid Characteristics

Initial Reservoir Pressure 5415 psia
 Reservoir Temperature 190°F
 Oil Gravity 45°API
 Oil Viscosity at standard conditions 1.1 cp
 Oil Viscosity at in-situ conditions 0.36 cp
 Initial Oil Formation Volume Factor 1.52 RB/STB
 Bubble Point Pressure 2786 psia
 Initial Gas in Solution 1000 SCF/STB
 Fluid Composition See Topical Report from Budget Period 1
 Gas Gravity 0.85
 Initial Gas Formation Volume Factor N/A (no free gas)
 Log of Bo, Rs, Bg vs. Pressure See PVT reports submitted with Topical Report from Budget Period 1
 Water Density Unknown
 Water Viscosity Unknown
 Water Salinity 58,000 ppm assumed from nearby field

Category/Table III – Field Development History

Recovery Technique - Primary

Start Date January 1935 (1st well)
 January 1972 (2nd well)
 1975 (numerous wells)
 Project Life Ongoing
 Estimated Incremental Recovery 11%
 Timing of Drilling of New Wells See “EBU Well Cmpl & Stim Data.xls”
 Monthly Production by well See “Well Prod by Month.txt”
 Number and Timing of new wells See “Well Cmpl & Stim Data.xls”

Recovery Technique – Tertiary

Start Date September 1, 1977
 Type of Injectant Flue Gas; then Nitrogen (December 1986)
 Project Life Ongoing
 Estimated Incremental Recovery 14%
 Monthly Production by well Provided on Diskette

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Monthly Production by well | See “Well Prod by Month.txt” |
| Monthly Injection by well | See “Well Inj by Month.txt” |
| Number and Timing of new wells | See “EBU Well Cmpl & Stim Data.xls” |
| Number and Timing of conversions | See “EBU Well Cmpl & Stim Data.xls” |

Well Data

See “EBU Well Cmpl & Stim Data.xls”, “API-numbers.xls”, “EBU Well Location & Status Info.xls”, and “EBU Log Data by Zone.xls”.

Category/Table IV – Field Production Constraints and Design Logic

Problem Statement – constraints on further producibility

(Excerpt from original grant proposal):

The EBU is currently undergoing enhanced recovery operations through the use of a miscible nitrogen flood. The main producibility problem within the miscible nitrogen flood at the EBU appears to be the early breakthrough and cycling of the injected gas, primarily through the higher permeability layers in the top section of the Marchand ‘C’ sand. These permeability variations are common reservoir heterogeneities found in Class I reservoirs. The reservoir heterogeneities are further complicated by the viscous fingering of the injected gas due to the unfavorable mobility ratio between the oil and the injected gas, and leads to the dissipation of the slug and poor sweep efficiency. Natural gravity segregation of the injected gas also plays a role in the producibility problem, when not properly managed, because the gas does not readily maintain a vertical moving miscible bank through the reservoir. Ultimately, this results in difficulties in achieving and maintaining miscible pressure throughout the reservoir and reduces expected ultimate recovery. It also results in unnecessary incremental operating expenses due to the additional processing and injection of the cycled breakthrough gas.

The producibility problems at the EBU have been apparent since early in the life of the EOR project, and have been partially responsible for a change in the injectant from flue gas to nitrogen. The miscible recovery process at the EBU was initiated at the time of unitization in August 1977 with the injection of flue gas. Within one year, gas breakthrough was noted in various locations. As the channeling and breakthrough problems continued, they were initially handled by shutting in the offending wells, or by converting them to injection if properly located. Until 1986, the produced gas was sold directly to one of three pipelines, and the increasing nitrogen content reduced the BTU value of the gas, rendering it unmarketable.

In 1986, a Nitrogen Management Facility (NMF) was built in the Unit boundaries by Niject for the EBU. Its construction and use was intended to reduce the cost of inert gas production, address tubular corrosion and injector plugging problems attributable to products formed by the flue gas, and to improve the field economics by enabling oil

production and recovery of NGLs from wells that had been shut-in due to gas breakthrough. The NMF is an integrated plant which combines cryogenic air separation, natural gas treating (sweetening), Natural Gas Liquid (NGL) processing, and cryogenic hydrocarbon gas separation and compression. Upon plant completion, the miscible process was converted over to the use of nitrogen as the inert injected gas.

The plant was originally designed to handle inlet gas with a nitrogen content of up to 70%. The NMF plant inlet gas composition is currently [late 1998, at report submittal] about 71% nitrogen, with over a third of the active producers producing gas that is 70% or greater nitrogen. Several producing wells have been shut-in due to excessively high nitrogen content in the produced gas. The NMF plant efficiency is currently limiting field production in that several wells with high gas-oil ratios (GORs) have been restricted to allow the plant to operate with less downtime and within the original design envelope.

Reservoir characterization and simulation work suggests that high (relative to the majority of the reservoir) permeability channels exist within the reservoir, particularly along the top of the Marchand sand, that are enabling the channeling and cycling of injected gas through the reservoir. A review of the gas saturations across the reservoir suggests that gravity segregation effects are in-place and are exacerbating the gas-channeling problem. In addition, there are areas within the reservoir which are not receiving pressure support due to the cycling effects, and have fallen below miscibility pressure. All of these situations are working negatively against the ultimate recovery from this EOR process.

Proposed Solution for Reduction of Constraints
(Excerpt from original grant proposal):

Binger Operations intends, through this project, to demonstrate the potential to improve recovery by turning the natural fluid flow and reservoir properties to our advantage in improving sweep, maintenance of miscible pressure and ultimate recovery.

The project will incorporate the use of several advanced reservoir characterization and recovery technologies, and advanced reservoir management techniques. To further define the reservoir heterogeneities and extent of the producibility problems discussed above, this project will utilize a 3-D simulation in the form of a fine grid compositional window-area model encompassing the selected pilot area. The data for the window-area model will originate from the full-field model developed by IRT, and enhanced by additional pressure and reservoir property data, as well as flow profile information. The window-area model will also be used to aid in the planning of pattern development, the designing of the optimum configuration for the horizontal lateral sections, and injection facility needs.

The producibility problems will be addressed through the use of horizontal laterals placed in the lower portion of the sand section in producers, and along the upper portion of the reservoir in injectors. Completion and stimulation technology will be investigated to

attempt to determine the most efficient manner in which to treat the horizontal sections without inducing fractures through which the gas could channel down into the wellbore. Fracture stimulation technology will also be investigated and incorporated into the stimulation of the injectors in the pilot area to optimize the volume of gas that is injected into this low permeability reservoir.

Category/Table V – Evaluation of Cost-Share Project Results

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Type of Project | Advanced Tertiary (Miscible Gas w/ Horizontal Drilling) |
| <u>Injection Program</u> | |
| Type of Injectant | Nitrogen (preceded by flue gas, 1977 – 1986) |
| Injection Schedule | See “Well Inj by Month.txt” (Category/Table III) |
| Injection Pattern | mixed 5-spot / line drive |

Number and Schedule of New Producers Drilled:

| | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|
| EBU 37-3H | drilled 2Q 2001 (converted 4Q 2003) |
| EBU 64-3H | drilled 2Q 2002 |
| EBU 74-2 | drilled 4Q 2002 |
| EBU 63-2H | drilled 3Q 2003 |
| EBU 44-3 | drilled 1Q 2004 |
| EBU 46-3 | drilled 1Q 2004 |
| EBU 67-2 | drilled 2Q 2004 |
| EBU 65-2 | drilled 3Q 2004 (converted 1Q 2005) |
| EBU 47-2 | drilled 2Q 2005 |
| EBU 16-2 | drilled 3Q 2005 |
| EBU 43-2 | drilled 3Q 2005 (converted 2Q 2006) |
| EBU 60-2 | drilled 3Q 2005 |

Number and Schedule of New Injectors Drilled:

EBU 74-2 (above) originally planned as an injector but kept as a producer following the drilling and sidetracking of EBU 65-2, which was originally planned as a producer but subsequently converted to injection.

Number and Schedule of Conversions:

| | |
|-----------|------------------------|
| EBU 57-1 | converted June 2002 |
| EBU 65-1 | converted January 2003 |
| EBU 59-1 | converted May 2003 |
| EBU 37-3H | converted October 2003 |
| EBU 65-2 | converted March 2005 |
| EBU 43-2 | converted April 2006 |

Simulation Study

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Type of Simulator Utilized | 3-D full field compositional (VIP) |
| Simulator Input Data | Provided on CD w/ previous Topical Report |
| Simulation of Performance | Provided on CD w/ previous Topical Report |

Project Economics

Incremental non-drilling capital costs

| | |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| Plant Additions/Modifications | \$ 418,000 |
| Producer-to-Injector Conversions | \$ 252,000 |

Drilling and Completion Costs by well

| | |
|-----------|----------------------------|
| EBU 37-3H | \$ 3,900,000 (approximate) |
| EBU 64-3H | \$ 2,519,000 |
| EBU 63-2H | \$ 1,867,000 |
| EBU 74-2 | \$ 708,000 |
| EBU 44-3 | \$ 915,000 (approximate) |
| EBU 46-3 | \$ 932,000 |
| EBU 65-2 | \$ 1,273,000 |
| EBU 67-2 | \$ 888,000 |
| EBU 16-2 | \$ 1,194,000 |
| EBU 47-2 | \$ 1,343,000 |
| EBU 43-2 | \$ 1,131,000 |
| EBU 60-2 | \$ 1,038,000 |

Reservoir Description Costs

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 – Data gathering and processing | \$ 250,000 (estimate) |
| 2 – Reservoir simulation study | \$ 220,000 (approximate) |

Category/Table VI – Supporting Data

A list of materials is provided in Attachment 1.

Category/Table VII – Environmental Information

| | |
|--|---|
| Surface Elevation | 1300' – 1500' above SL |
| Surface Conditions | mixed plains, hills, creeks with canyons |
| Distance from navigable surface water | Greater than 5 miles to navigable waters, but less than ¼ mile from many wells to waters which flow into those navigable waters |
| Depth of groundwater | ~ 200' |
| Volume of produced water | ~ 10 b/d for entire field |
| Produced water disposal method | Haul to commercial disposal |
| Volume of drilling wastes from new wells | ~ 15,000 bbls/well |

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Drilling mud content for new wells | LSND and oil base |
| Drilling mud handling practice | closed system on BIA land; lined pit on fee land |
| Surface impoundments | ~ 20' x 80' lined cuttings pits (fee land only) |

ATTACHMENT 1

Improved Miscible Nitrogen Flood Performance Utilizing Advanced Reservoir Characterization and Horizontal Laterals in a Class I Reservoir – East Binger (Marchand) Unit Cooperative Agreement No: DE-FC26-00BC15121

Materials List for Topical Report for Budget Period 3

Category/Table I - General Information

None

Category/Table II - 3-D Description of Reservoir

- 1 Net Pay Map (updated)

Category/Table III - Field Development History

None

Category/Table IV - Field Production Constraints and Design Logic

None

Category/Table V - Evaluation of Cost-Share Project Results

None

Category/Table VI - Supporting Data

- 2 EBU 65-2 Spectral Density - Dual Spaced Neutron Log (Halliburton) - Paper Copy
- 3 EBU 65-2 High Resolution Induction Log (Halliburton) - Paper Copy
- 4 EBU 65-2ST Directional Survey Log (Halliburton) - Paper Copy
- 5 EBU 65-2ST Spectral Density - Dual Spaced Neutron Log (Halliburton) - Paper Copy
- 6 EBU 65-2ST High Resolution Induction Log (Halliburton) - Paper Copy
- 7 EBU 67-2 Spectral Density - Dual Spaced Neutron Log (Halliburton) - Paper Copy
- 8 EBU 67-2 Dual Induction Log (Halliburton) - Paper Copy
- 9 EBU 67-2 Cement Bond Log (Wellserv) - Paper Copy
- 10 EBU 16-2 Compact Phot Density - Compensated Neutron Log (Precision Energy Services) - Paper Copy
- 11 EBU 16-2 Array Induction Shallow Focused Electric Log (Precision Energy Services) - Paper Copy
- 12 EBU 47-2 Lithodensity / Compensated Neutron Log (Schlumberger) - Paper Copy
- 13 EBU 47-2 Array Induction Imager Log (Schlumberger) - Paper Copy
- 14 EBU 60-2 Lithodensity / Compensated Neutron Log (Schlumberger) - Paper Copy
- 15 EBU 60-2 Array Induction Imager/SP Log (Schlumberger) - Paper Copy
- 16 EBU 43-2 PND-S Well Evaluation Log (Precision Energy Services) - Paper Copy
- 17 EBU 65-2 (& 65-2ST) Drilling and Completion History
- 18 EBU 67-2 Drilling and Completion History
- 19 EBU 16-2 Drilling and Completion History
- 20 EBU 43-2 Drilling and Completion History
- 21 EBU 47-2 Drilling and Completion History
- 22 EBU 60-2 Drilling and Completion History
- 23 8-1/2" x 11" copies of well schematics from all new wells

ATTACHMENT 1 (continued)

Category/Table VII - Environmental Information

None

Multiple Categories/Tables

- 24 Electronic Files on CD:
- API-Numbers.xls -- listing of wells and their API numbers
 - EBU Well Cmpl & Stim Data.xls -- completion and stimulation data by well (incl. tubulars, perms, IPs, etc.)
 - Well Prod by Month.txt -- historical production volumes by month for all wells
 - Well Inj by Month.txt -- historical injection volumes by month for all wells
 - EBU Well Location & Status Info.xls
 - EBU Log Data by Zone.xls
 - EBU Pressure Table.xls
 - EBU Wellwork History.xls -- brief summaries of well work for all wells
- Electronic Well Log Data (folder containing the following):
- EBU 16-2.las (log data in Log Ascii Standard format)
 - EBU 44-3_las.zip (log data in Log Ascii Standard format)
 - EBU 44-3_sonic_rock_las.zip (log data in Log Ascii Standard format)
 - EBU 46-3.las (log data in Log Ascii Standard format)
 - EBU 47-2_las.zip (log data in Log Ascii Standard format)
 - EBU 60-2 LAS MainPass.las (log data in Log Ascii Standard format)
 - EBU 60-2 LAS Repeat.las (log data in Log Ascii Standard format)
 - EBU 65-2.las (log data in Log Ascii Standard format)
 - EBU 65-2ST.las (log data in Log Ascii Standard format)
 - EBU 67-2.las (log data in Log Ascii Standard format)

Note:

Copies of porosity, surveys, completion reports from wells completed before this Project were provided with previous Topical Reports.

- All logs, surveys, completion reports from EBU 37-3H provided with Topical Report for Budget Period 1.
- All logs, surveys, completion reports from EBU 64-3H provided with Topical Report for Budget Period 2.
- All logs, surveys, completion reports from EBU 74-2 provided with Topical Report for Budget Period 2.
- All logs, surveys, completion reports from EBU 63-2H provided with Topical Report for Budget Period 2.
- All logs, surveys, completion reports from EBU 44-3 provided with Topical Report for Budget Period 2.
- All logs, surveys, completion reports from EBU 46-3 provided with Topical Report for Budget Period 2.
- PVT and Core reports sent with Topical Report for Budget Period 1 (nothing new since then).
- Reports from lab studies sent with Topical Report for Budget Period 1 (nothing new since then).