BOENRE Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Well Containment Screening Tool

Lance Labiche



Well Containment Screening Tool

- A joint industry task force was established to develop an evaluation tool to demonstrate if a well design and equipment is adequate for Well Containment.
- The WCST analyzes the well's mechanical and geologic integrity to determine which of the 3 following categories the well falls into:
 - Full mechanical and geologic integrity
 - Mechanical or geologic integrity not intact, but consequence of failure is acceptable
 - Wellbore integrity does not exist and well cannot be shut-in without hydrocarbons escaping/broaching to sea



Level 1 Screening Tool

- Level 1 is designed to expedite approval for wells that can be fully shut-in without causing underground flow using very conservative assumptions and simple calculations
- The WCST analyzes 2 load cases:
 - Collapse during uncontrolled flow to seafloor.
 - Burst after shut-in with a full hydrocarbon gradient.





Level 1 Acceptance Criteria

Screening tool results

5. Shut in Pressure below formation integrity when well shut-in	PASS
6.1 Burst Integrity	PASS
6.2 Trapped annuli check	PASS
6.3 Collapse Integrity	PASS

• If a well does not pass all 4 of the above level 1 criteria than a level 2 is required for that hole interval



Level 2 Screening Tool

Level 2 WCST:

- Uses field/offset data and more advanced calculations to mitigate the probability of the failures identified in level 1.
 - Fluid gradient analysis
- If the failure cannot be mitigated/eliminated than a consequence analysis is performed to see if failure is acceptable
 - Broaching analysis

Level 2 is based on the Level 1 WCST, with the following modified/additional calculations:

- Annulus pressure buildup for trapped annuli
- Secondary string collapse and burst verification
- Formation strength verification for failed strings



Fluid Gradient Analysis

- BOEMRE's internal process for handling well specific fluid gradient requests in a level 2 WCST:
 - Company supporting documentation is sent to RE
 - RE determines the most appropriate analog well
 - RE runs nodal analysis to determine flowing and static gradients
 - RE gradient package and Operator's gradient package are reviewed by upper management
 - A decision is made based on the more conservative set of gradient numbers



Broaching analysis

- BOEMRE internal procedures for conducting broaching studies:
 - Operator submits there broaching analysis
 - RE reviews location for known natural seeps
 - RE reviews latest seismic data looking for path for hydrocarbons to take to broach to seafloor (faults, along salt face)
 - RE determines the probability of broaching



1. Collapse/burst ratings in WCST not matching the ratings in the ewell permit

0	Interval Number:			Interval Number: 4 Type: Casing Name					Intermediate			
Section Number	Casing Size (in) Casing Weight (lb/ft)		Casing Burst Rating Grade (psi)		Collapse Rating (psi)	Dept MD	h (ft) TVD	Pore Pressure (ppg)				
1	14.000	113.0	TN-110	11000	8132	6292	6292	14.2				
2	13.625	88.2	HCQ - 125	10030	6400	21515	21475	14.2				

Collapse Ananlysis Component description	Collapse rating (psi)	Depth of interest (ft TVD)	Hydraulic Isolation Depth (ft- TVD)	Annulus Pressure Buildup (psi)	Setting MW, or PP (ppg)
14" 113.00 P110 TH-523 - X-Over	6400	6304	20,483	440	14.1
13-5/8" 88.20 Q125HC SLX @ Mid String	6400	13540	20,483	440	14.1
13-5/8" 88.20 Q125HC SLX @ HID	6400	20483	20,483	0	12.8
13-5/8" 88.20 Q125HC SLX @ 13-5/8"shoe	6400	21475	20,483	0	13.1



2. Incorrect casing setting depths (mistaking MD for TVD, using old wellbore schematic)

0	Interval N	umber:	4 Тур	e: Casing	Name:	Int	erme	diate
Section Number	Casing Size (in) Casing Weight (lb/ft)		Casing Burst Rating Grade (psi)		Collapse Rating (psi)	Dept MD	h (ft) TVD	Pore Pressure (ppg)
1	14.000	113.0	TN-110	11000	8132	6292	6292	14.2
2	13.625	88.2	HCQ - 125	10030	6400	21515	21475	14.2

Enter string type	String or liner lap fully cemented?	Liner lap	Setting Depth (ft-	Setting Depth (ft-	Planned TOC	Planned TOC (ft-	Shoe Depth (ft-	Shoe Max Angle epth (ft- above ve	Idle < 1	Hydr Isolatio	aulic n Depth
		S- 000 IL?	MD)	TVD)	(11-1110)	TVD)	MD)	previous shoe	yourr	ft-MD	ft-TVD
Casing	N	N	21,475	21,575	19,450	19,450	18,800	0	Y	20,463	20,483



3. Changing formulas in the screening tool

Commente	
Comments	
0.052+(C73-F73)"H73"0.052,C73" <mark>E73</mark> "0.052),I),0)
	Comments).052+(C73-F73)'H73'0.052,C73'E73'0.052



4. Changing fluid gradients and assumptions on level 1

HOLE SECTION:	10-5/8"	<u>S</u>	IOE DEPTH(FT-TYD);		27,200							
	Depth (ft-	Reservoir	Reservoir Pressure or Bottom hole Flowing Pressure (ppg) (psi)		Assumed fluid gradient for calc	Mud Line Shut in Pressure	Shut in ppg @					
	TYD)	Fluid			(psiłft)	(psi)	shoe	Com	ments			
	29,284	Oil	14.086 21,450		0.369	13,169	14.62	2 Justification for gradient is provided as attachment.				
								Used average of shut-in (0.369) and flowing (0.364) grad			dients	
								obtained with	Prosper sim	ulation.		

Enter string	String or liner lap fully cemented?	String or liner	String or liner lap fully cemented?	String or liner lap fully cemented?	String or liner lap fully cemented?	Liner lap	Setting Depth (ft-	Setting Depth (ft-	Planned TOC (ft-MD)	Planned TOC (ft-	Previous Shoe Depth (ft-	Max Angle above	Idle < 1 year?	Hydraulic Isolation Depth		Trapped Annulus?	
type			MD)	TVD)		TVD)	MD)	shoe	Joan	ft-MD	ft-TVD						
Tieback	N	N	22,862	22,862	19,500	19,500	18,020	0	Y	21,181	19,000	LEVEL 2 REQUIRED					
Liner	N	Y	23,993	23,993	23,200	23,200	22,862	0	Y	23,597	23,597	LEVEL 2 REQUIRED					
Liner	N	Y	26,617	26,350	25,617	25,531	23,993	35	Y	26,117	25,941	NO					
										-		N/A					



5. Not running APB models for tiebacks/trapped annuli

APB calculator for Untrapped Annulus	OH Woak pt	Soffing MW	EC at woak			Level 2						
String	(ft TVD)	(ppg)	pt (ppg)	Calculated APB (psi)		Alternative APB (psi)	Comments	Comments / justification of alternative APB used				Standard A
16" Liner	9,000	12.1	13.3	56	32							Annulus ass
14"/13-5/8" Casing	12,000	12.9	14.0	68	36	7,250	APB Pressure	e modeled in We	ellcat			FG at the pr
< <insert additional="" and="" as="" copy="" down="" for="" form<="" interest="" necessary="" of="" other="" rows="" td="" zones=""><td>y down form</td><td>ulas - <mark>do NO</mark></td><td>T delete this</td><td>line</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></insert>		y down form	ulas - <mark>do NO</mark>	T delete this	line							
		Depth of	Hydraulic Isolation	Annulus Pressure	Setting MW,	Internal	External					
Collapse Analysis	Collapse	interest (ft	Depth (ft-	Buildup	or PP	Pressure	Pressure	Collapse	Design			
Component description	rating (psi)	TVD)	TVD)	(psi)	(ppg)	(psi)	(psi)	Load (psi)	Factor	Com	ment	
14" Casing	8,650	6,280	13,255	686	12.7	2,613	4,833	2,220	3.89	APB Pressure	e modeled in We	licat
13-5/8" Casing (13,255')	5,930	13,255	13,255	686	12.7	3,659	9,440	5,780	1.02	13-5/8" Casin	g fails at single	point (13,255')
13-5/8" Casing (6,300')	5,930	6,280	13,255	686	12.7	2,613	4,833	2,220	2.67	Entire 13-5/8"	ntire 13-5/8" string collapses	



6. Not submitting data to justify well specific gradient

10-5/8"	Sł	ioe Depth(FT-TYD):		27,200						
Depth (ft-	Reservoir	Reservoir Pressure or Bottom hole Flowing Pressure		Assumed fluid gradient for calc	Mud Line Shut in Pressure	Shut in ppq @				
TYD)	Fluid	(ppg)	(psi)	(psi/ft)	(psi)	shoe	Comments			
29,284	Oil	14.086	21,450	0.369	13,169	14.62				
			-		-	-	Used average of shut-in (0.369) and flowing (0.364) grad		dients	
			-		-	-	obtained with Prosper simulation.			



7. Incorrect mud weights used above/below the HID

• Incorrect version (MW is used below HID)

Collapse rating (psi)	Depth of interest (ft TVD)	Hydraulic Isolation Depth (ft- TVD)	Annulus Pressure Buildup (psi)	Setting MW, or PP (ppg)	Internal Pressure (psi)	External Pressure (psi)	Collapse Load (psi)	Design Factor
8,650	6,280	13,255	686	12.7	2,613	4,833	2,220	3.89
5,930	14,000	13,255	686	12.7	3,771	9,932	6,161	0.96
5,930	6,280	13,255	686	12.7	2,613	4,833	2,220	2.67

• Correct version (PP is used below HID)

Collapse rating (psi)	Depth of interest (ft TVD)	Hydraulic Isolation Depth (ft- TVD)	Annulus Pressure Buildup (psi)	Setting MW, or PP (ppg)	Internal Pressure (psi)	External Pressure (psi)	Collapse Load (psi)	Design Factor
8,650	6,280	13,255	686	12.7	2,613	4,833	2,220	3.89
5,930	14,000	13,255	0	12.4	3,771	9,027	5,256	1.12
5,930	6,280	13,255	686	12.7	2,613	4,833	2,220	2.67



 Pore Pressure and Fracture gradients not matching up with the Pore Pressure Plot in permit or in casing summary in eWell

Depth (ft- TYD)	Reservoir Fluid	Reservoir or Botte Flowing I	Pressure om hole Pressure	Assumed fluid gradient for calc (psi/ft)	Mud Line Shut in Pressure	Shut in ppg @ shoe	
		(ppg)	(psi)		(psi)		
3,500	Oil	10,1	1,838	0.23	2,607	5.15	







9. Burst/Collapse analysis – not analyzing at correct point of interest (HID, shoe, at casing cross-over, TOL, all points of interest, etc.)





10. Wrong version of wellbore schematic sent with the excel file (needs to match schematic in eWell)

0	Interval Number:		4 Type: Casing		Name: Intermediate			
Section Number	Casing Size (in)	Casing Weight (lb/ft)	Casing Grade	Burst Rating (psi)	Collapse Rating (psi)	Dept MD	th (ft) TVD	Pore Pressure (ppg)
1	14.000	113.0	TN-110	11000	8132	6292	6292	14.2
2	13.625	88.2	HCQ - 125	10030	6400	21515	21475	14.2





Revised Screening Tool

- The following revisions will require a revised screening tool be submitted via eWell permit
 - Changing casing setting depths by +/- 100'
 - Decrease in cement volume
 - Increase in cement volume because of need to isolate a hydrocarbon zone not previously identified
 - Increase in casing setting mud weight





Thank you

