Rate Transient Analysis

1-4: TRADITIONAL DECLINE ANALYSIS

1. Traditional (Arps) Decline Curves



2. Decline Rate Definitions



Exponential Decline:

- Decline rate is constant.
- Log flow rate vs. time is a straight line.
- Flow rate vs. cumulative production is a straight line.
- Provides minimum EUR (Expected Ultimate Recovery).

Hyperbolic Decline:

- Decline rate is not constant ($D=Kq^b$).
- Straight line plots are NOT practical and b is determined by nonlinear curve fit.

b value	Reservoir Drive Mechanism
0	Single phase liquid (oil above bubble point) Single phase gas at high pressure
0.1-0.4	Solution gas drive
0.4-0.5	Single phase gas
0.5	Effective edge water drive
0.5-1.0	Commingled layered reservoirs

Harmonic Decline:

- Decline rate is directly proportional to flow rate (b=1).
- Log flow rate vs. cumulative production is a straight line.

Summary:

- Boundary-dominated flow only.
- Constant operating conditions.
- Developed using empirical relationships.
- Quick and simple to determine EUR.
- EUR depends on operating conditions.
- Does NOT use pressure data.
- b depends on drive mechanism.

3. Exponential Decline



4. Harmonic Decline



5-10: FETKOVICH ANALYSIS

5. Analytical: Constant Flowing Pressure



- q_D and t_D definitions are similar to well test.
- Convenient for transient flow.
- Results in single transient stem but multiple boundary-dominated stems.

$$q_D = \frac{141.2 q B\mu}{kh(p_i - p_{wf})}, \quad t_D = \frac{0.00633kt}{\phi\mu c_t r_{wa}^2}$$

- q_{Dd} and t_{Dd} definitions are convenient for production data analysis.
- Convenient for boundary-dominated flow.
- Results in single boundary-dominated stem but multiple transient stems.

$$q_{Dd} = q_D \ln(r_{eD} - 0.5), \quad t_{Dd} = \frac{2t_D}{(\ln r_{eD} - 0.5)(r_{eD}^2 - 1)}$$

6. Analytical: Constant Flowing Pressure



7. Empirical: Arps Depletion Stems



Replot on Log-Log Scale

8. Empirical: Arps-Fetkovich Depletion Stems



10. Fetkovich/Cumulative Type Curves



Summary:

- Combines transient with boundary-dominated flow.
- Transient: Analytical, constant pressure solution.
- Boundary-Dominated: Empirical, identical to traditional (Arps).
- Constant operating conditions.
- Used to estimate EUR, skin and permeability.
- EUR depends on operating conditions.
- Does NOT use pressure data.
- Cumulative curves are smoother than rate curves.
- Combined cumulative and rate type curves give more unique match (Figure 10).

9. Fetkovich Type Curves



11-14: MODERN DECLINE ANALYSIS: BASIC CONCEPTS

11-12: Material Balance Time

11. Comparison of q_D and $1/p_D$



- Material Balance Time (t_c) effectively converts constant pressure solution to the corresponding constant rate solution.
- Exponential curve plotted using Material Balance Time becomes harmonic.
- Material Balance Time is rigorous during boundary-dominated flow.



12. Equivalence of q_D and $1/p_D$



13-14: Type Curve Interpretation Aids

13. Concept of Rate Integral



- Rate Integral is cumulative average rate.
- Rate Integral is an effective way to remove noise.

Rate (Normalized)

- Combines rate with flowing pressure. $\frac{q}{\Delta p}$

Integral (Normalized Rate)

- Smoothes noisy data but attenuates the reservoir signal. $\frac{1}{t_c}\int_0^{t_c} \frac{q}{\Delta p}dt$

Derivative (Normalized Rate)

- Amplifies reservoir signal but amplifies noise as well. $-\frac{d(\frac{q}{\Delta p})}{d(\ln t_c)}$

Integral-Derivative (Normalized Rate)

- Smoothes the scatter of the derivative. $-\frac{d}{d(\ln t_c)}(\frac{1}{t_c}\int_0^{t_c}\frac{q}{\Delta p}dt)$

14. Derivative and Integral-Derivative



15-18: GAS FLOW CONSIDERATIONS

15-16: Pseudo-Pressure

15. Darcy's Law

- Liquid (Constant Viscosity): $\Delta p \propto q$
- Gas: Viscosity and Z-factor are not constant. Define Pseudo-Pressure (p_p):

$$p_p = 2\int_{p_0}^{p} \frac{p\,dp}{\mu_g Z}$$

Pseudo-Pressure (p_p) corrects for changing viscosity (μ_g) and Z-factor with pressure.

Darcy's Law for Gas: $\Delta p_p \propto q$

Gas properties vary with pressure:

- Z-factor (Pseudo-Pressure, Figures 15 & 16)
- Viscosity (Pseudo-Pressure & Pseudo-Time, Figures 15, 16 & 18)
- Compressibility (Pseudo-Time, Figures 17 & 18)

- Pseudo-pressure corrects for changing viscosity and Z-factor with pressure.
- In all equations for liquid, replace pressure (p) with pseudo-pressure (p_p).

Note: For gas, $q_D = \frac{1}{p_D} = \frac{1.417\times10^6 qT}{kh(p_p - p_{pwf})}$

16. Pseudo-Pressure (p_p)



17-18: Pseudo-Time

17. Gas Compressibility Variation



- Compressibility represents energy in reservoir.
- Gas compressibility is strong function of pressure (especially at LOW PRESSURES).
- Ignoring compressibility variation can result in significant error in original gas-in-place (G) calculation.
- Pseudo-time (t_a) corrects for changing viscosity and compressibility with pressure.
- Pseudo-time calculation is ITERATIVE because it depends on μ_g and c_t at average reservoir pressure, and average reservoir pressure depends on G (usually unknown).

Note: Pseudo-time in build-up testing is evaluated at well flowing pressure NOT at average reservoir pressure.

18. Pseudo-Time (t_a)

- In all equations for liquid, replace Time (t) with Pseudo-Time (t_a).

$$t_a = (\mu_g c_t)_i \int_0^t \frac{dt}{\overline{\mu}_g \overline{c}_t}$$

- Convert material balance time (t_c) to Material Balance Pseudo-Time (t_{ca}).

$$t_{ca} = \frac{1}{q}\int_0^{t_c} q\,dt_a = \frac{(\mu_g c_t)_i}{q}\int_0^t \frac{q\,dt}{\overline{\mu}_g \overline{c}_t}$$

Note: $\overline{\mu}_g$ and $\overline{c}_t$ are evaluated at average reservoir pressure (unlike build-up testing).

19-22: FLOWING MATERIAL BALANCE

19. Oil: Flowing Material Balance



Oil

$$p_i - p_{wf} = \frac{N_p}{c_t N} + qb_{pss}$$

$$\frac{q}{p_i - p_{wf}} = -\frac{N_p}{c_t N b_{pss}(p_i - p_{wf})} + \frac{1}{b_{pss}}$$

Note: b_{pss} is the inverse of productivity index and is constant during boundary-dominated flow.

Gas

$$p_{pi} - p_{pwf} = \frac{\alpha G_{pa}}{G_i} + qb_{pss}$$

$$\frac{p_{pi} - p_{pwf}}{q} = \frac{\alpha G_{pa}}{qG} + b_{pss}$$

$$\overline{p}_p = p_{pwf} + qb_{pss}$$

20. Gas: Determination of b_{pss}



21. Gas: Flowing Material Balance



22. Procedure to Calculate Gas-In-Place

Calculating G is ITERATIVE:

1. Estimate G; plot $\overline{p}/\overline{Z}$ vs. G_p from p_i/Z_i to G.
2. At any time, G_p is known. Determine $\overline{p}$ at G_p from $\overline{p}/\overline{Z}$ plot.
3. Obtain $\overline{\mu}_g$ and $\overline{c}_t$ at $\overline{p}$.
4. Convert t to t_a and p_{pi} to p_{pwi} (Figures 18 & 16).
5. Determine b_{pss} from Figure 20.
6. Determine $\overline{p}$ from $\overline{p}_p = p_{pwf} + qb_{pss}$.
7. Plot $\overline{p}/\overline{Z}$ vs. G_p and determine new G.
8. Repeat steps 2-7 until G converges.

Summary:

- Uses flowing data. No shut-in required.
- Applicable to oil and gas.
- Determines hydrocarbon-in-place, N or G.
- Oil (N): Direct calculation.
- Gas (G): Iterative calculation because of pseudo-time.
- Simple yet powerful.
- Data readily available (wellhead pressure can be converted to bottomhole pressure).
- Supplements static material balance.
- Ideal for low permeability reservoirs.

23-32: RADIAL TYPE CURVES

23-24: Radial Flow Model: Type Curve Analysis

23. Calculations for Oil (Agarwal-Gardner Type Curves)

$$k = \frac{141.2 B_o \mu_o}{h}\left(\frac{q/\Delta p}{q_D}\right)_{match}$$

$$r_{wa} = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{0.00633k}{\pi\phi\mu_o c_t}\left(\frac{t_c}{t_{DA}}\right)_{match}}}{(r_{eD})_{match}}, \quad s = \ln\left(\frac{r_w}{r_{wa}}\right)$$

$$r_e = \sqrt{\frac{0.00633k}{\pi\phi\mu_o c_t}\left(\frac{t_c}{t_{DA}}\right)_{match}}, \quad N = \frac{\pi r_e^2 \phi h S_{oi}}{B_{oi}}$$

All radial flow type curves are based on the same reservoir model:

- Well in centre of cylindrical homogeneous reservoir.
- No flow outer boundary.
- Skin factor represented by r_{wa}.

- Information content of all type curves (Figures 25-32) is the same.
- The shapes are different because of different plotting formats.
- Each format represents a different "look" at the data and emphasizes different aspects.

24. Calculations for Gas (Agarwal-Gardner Type Curves)

$$k = \frac{1.417\times10^6 T}{h}\left(\frac{q/\Delta p_p}{q_D}\right)_{match}$$

$$r_{wa} = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{0.00633k}{\pi(\phi\mu_g c_t)_i}\left(\frac{t_{ca}}{t_{DA}}\right)_{match}}}{(r_{eD})_{match}}, \quad s = \ln\left(\frac{r_w}{r_{wa}}\right)$$

$$r_e = \sqrt{\frac{0.00633k}{\pi(\phi\mu_g c_t)_i}\left(\frac{t_{ca}}{t_{DA}}\right)_{match}}, \quad G = \frac{\pi r_e^2 \phi h S_{gi}}{B_{gi}}$$

Note: Gas calculations are ITERATIVE because of pseudo-time.

25-26: Blasingame

25. Blasingame: Rate (Normalized)



$$q_{Dd} = q_D \ln(r_{eD} - 0.5), \quad r_{eD} = \frac{r_e}{r_{wa}}$$

$$t_{Dd} = \frac{2t_D}{(\ln r_{eD} - 0.5)(r_{eD}^2 - 1)}$$

- q_{Dd} and t_{Dd} definitions are similar to Fetkovich.
- Normalized rate ($q/\Delta p$ or $q/\Delta p_p$) is plotted.
- Three sets of type curves:
  1. q_{Dd} vs. t_{Dd} (Figure 25).
  2. Rate integral (q_{Ddi}) vs. t_{Dd} (has the same shape as q_{Dd}).
  3. Rate integral-derivative (q_{Ddid}) vs. t_{Dd} (Figure 26).
- In general: $q_{Dd} = q_D\, b_{Dpss}$, $t_{Dd} = \frac{2\pi}{b_{Dpss}} t_{DA}$
- b_{Dpss} is a constant for a particular well/reservoir configuration.

26. Blasingame: Integral-Derivative



27-28: Agarwal-Gardner

27. Agarwal-Gardner: Rate (Normalized)



$$q_{Dd} = \frac{1}{p_D} = \frac{141.2 q B\mu}{kh(p_i - p_{wf})}$$

$$t_{DA} = \frac{0.00633kt}{\phi\mu c_t A}$$

- q_{Dd} and t_{DA} definitions are similar to well testing.
- Normalized rate ($q/\Delta p$ or $q/\Delta p_p$) is plotted.
- Three sets of type curves:
  1. q_{Dd} vs. t_{DA} (Figure 27).
  2. Inverse of pressure derivative ($1/p_{Dd}$) vs. t_{DA} (not shown).
  3. Inverse of pressure integral-derivative ($1/p_{Ddi}$) vs. t_{DA} (Figure 28).

Notes:

1. Pressure derivative is defined as $p_{Dd} = \frac{d(p_D)}{d(\ln t_{DA})}$
2. Inverse of pressure derivative is usually too noisy and inverse of pressure integral-derivative is used instead.

28. Agarwal-Gardner: Integral-Derivative



$$p_{Ddi} = \frac{1}{t_{DA}}\int_0^{t_{DA}} p_D\, dt_{DA}$$

$$p_{Dd} = \frac{d(p_{Ddi})}{d(\ln t_{DA})}$$

29-30: Normalized Pressure Integral (NPI)

29. NPI: Pressure (Normalized)



$$p_D = \frac{1}{q_D} = \frac{kh(p_i - p_{wf})}{141.2 q B\mu}$$

- p_D and t_{DA} definitions are similar to well testing.
- Normalized Pressure ($\Delta p/q$ or $\Delta p_p/q$) is plotted rather than normalized rate ($q/\Delta p$ or $q/\Delta p_p$).
- Three sets of type curves:
  1. p_D vs. t_{DA} (Figure 29).
  2. Pressure integral (p_{Di}) vs. t_{DA} (has the same shape as p_D).
  3. Pressure integral-derivative (p_{Dd}) vs. t_{DA} (Figure 30).

30. NPI: Integral-Derivative



31-32: Transient-Dominated Data

31. Rate (Normalized)



- Similar to Figures 27 & 28 but uses t_D instead of t_{DA}. This format is useful when most of the data are in TRANSIENT flow.
- q_D and t_D definitions are similar to well testing.
- Normalized rate ($q/\Delta p$ or $q/\Delta p_p$) is plotted.
- Three sets of type curves:
  1. q_D vs. t_D (Figure 31).
  2. Inverse of pressure integral ($1/p_{Di}$) vs. t_D (not shown).
  3. Inverse of pressure integral-derivative ($1/p_{Ddi}$) vs. t_D (Figure 32).

32. Integral-Derivative



33-40: FRACTURE TYPE CURVES

33-37: Finite Conductivity Fracture

33. Rate



$$t_{Dxf} = \frac{0.00633kt}{\phi\mu c_t x_f^2}$$

- Fracture with finite conductivity results in bilinear flow (quarter slope).



- Dimensionless Fracture Conductivity is defined as: $F_{CD} = \frac{k_f w}{k x_f}$
- Fracture with infinite conductivity results in linear flow (half slope).



- For F_{CD}>50, the fracture is assumed to have infinite conductivity.

34. Integral-Derivative



35. Elliptical Flow: Integral-Derivative



36. Elliptical Flow: Integral-Derivative



37. Elliptical Flow: Integral-Derivative



38-40: Infinite Conductivity Fracture

38. Blasingame: Rate and Integral-Derivative



39. NPI: Pressure and Integral-Derivative



40. Wattenbarger: Rate



41-43: HORIZONTAL WELL TYPE CURVES

41. Blasingame: Integral-Derivative



42. Blasingame: Integral-Derivative

43. Blasingame: Integral-Derivative

44-45: WATER-DRIVE TYPE CURVES

44. Blasingame: Rate

- Mobility ratio (M) represents the strength of the aquifer.

$$M = \frac{k_{aq}}{k_{res}}\frac{\mu_{res}}{\mu_{aq}}$$

- M = 0 is equivalent to Radial Type Curves (Figures 25-32).

45. Agarwal-Gardner: Rate

NOMENCLATURE

a	semi-major axis of ellipse	G_p	gas cumulative production	p_{Di}	dimensionless pressure integral	r_e	exterior radius of reservoir	x_e	reservoir length
A	area	G_{pa}	pseudo-cumulative production	p_{Dd}	dimensionless pressure integral-derivative	r_{eD}	dimensionless exterior radius of reservoir	x_f	fracture half length
b	hyperbolic decline exponent or semi - minor axis of ellipse	h	net pay	p_i	initial reservoir pressure	r_w	wellbore radius	y_e	reservoir width
b_{Dpss}	dimensionless parameter	k	permeability	p_p	pseudo-pressure	r_{wa}	apparent wellbore radius	y_w	well location in y-direction
b_{pss}	inverse of productivity index	k_{aq}	aquifer permeability	$\overline{p}_p$	pseudo-pressure at average reservoir pressure	s	skin	Z	gas deviation factor
B	formation volume factor	k_f	fracture permeability	S_{gi}	initial gas saturation	$\overline{Z}$	gas deviation factor at average reservoir pressure
B_{gi}	initial gas formation volume factor	k_h	horizontal permeability	S_{oi}	initial oil saturation	Z_i	initial gas deviation factor
B_o	oil formation volume factor	k_{res}	reservoir permeability	p_{pi}	initial pseudo-pressure	t	flow time	α	constant
B_{oi}	initial oil formation volume factor	k_v	vertical permeability	p_{pwf}	pseudo-pressure at well flowing pressure	t_a	pseudo-time	ϕ	porosity
c_g	gas compressibility	K	constant	p_{wf}	well flowing pressure	t_c	material balance time	μ	viscosity
c_o	total compressibility	L	horizontal well length	q	flow rate	t_{ca}	material balance pseudo-time	μ_{aq}	aquifer fluid viscosity
$\overline{c}_t$	total compressibility at average reservoir pressure	M	mobility ratio	q_D	dimensionless rate	t_D	dimensionless time	μ_g	gas viscosity
D	nominal decline rate	N	original oil-in-place	q_{Dd}	dimensionless rate	t_{DA}	dimensionless time	$\overline{\mu}_g$	gas viscosity at average reservoir pressure
D_e	effective decline rate	N_p	oil cumulative production	q_{Ddi}	dimensionless rate integral	t_{Dd}	dimensionless time	μ_o	oil viscosity
D_i	initial nominal decline rate	p	pressure	q_{Ddid}	dimensionless rate integral-derivative	t_{Dxf}	dimensionless time	μ_{res}	reservoir fluid viscosity
F_{CD}	dimensionless fracture conductivity	p_D	dimensionless pressure	q_i	initial flow rate	t_{Dye}	dimensionless time		
G	original gas-in-place	p_{Dd}	dimensionless pressure derivative	Q	cumulative production	T	reservoir temperature		
				Q_{Dd}	dimensionless cumulative production	w	fracture width		

Oil field units; q_o (MMSCFD); t (days)

Fekete
fekete.com

All analyses described can be performed using Fekete's Rate Transient Analysis software F.A.S.T. RTA™