University of Mississippi

[eGrove](https://egrove.olemiss.edu/)

[Open-File Reports](https://egrove.olemiss.edu/mmri_ofr) **Mississippi Mineral Resources Institute**

1983

A Study of Secondary and Tertiary Oil Recovery Potential in Mississippi

Clifford George

Follow this and additional works at: [https://egrove.olemiss.edu/mmri_ofr](https://egrove.olemiss.edu/mmri_ofr?utm_source=egrove.olemiss.edu%2Fmmri_ofr%2F54&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

Recommended Citation

George, Clifford, "A Study of Secondary and Tertiary Oil Recovery Potential in Mississippi" (1983). Open-File Reports. 54. [https://egrove.olemiss.edu/mmri_ofr/54](https://egrove.olemiss.edu/mmri_ofr/54?utm_source=egrove.olemiss.edu%2Fmmri_ofr%2F54&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Mississippi Mineral Resources Institute at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open-File Reports by an authorized administrator of eGrove. For more information, please contact egrove@olemiss.edu.

A Study of Secondary and Tertiary Oil Recovery Potential in Mississippi

 ϵ

C

 \subset

 ζ

 ℓ

 \mathbb{C}

X.

 \cup

C

 $\begin{array}{c} \square \end{array}$

 \sim

Prepared For The Mississippi Mineral Resources Institute University, Mississippi

> By Clifford E. George Mississippi State University Mississippi State, Mississippi

> > August 1983

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A number of people deserve thanks for helping to bring this study to a conclusion. Among these are the several Mississippi State University students who assisted in searching for data and putting it into computer format. D.O. Hill and J.L. Weeks offered the valuable support of the Mississippi State University Department of Chemical Engineering. Special thanks go to Professor C.H. Kuo for his encouragement and criticism during the course of this project.

A.R. Henderson of the Mississippi State Oil and Gas Board and his able Staff are to be commended for their patience in providing the author with information and relative personal remarks. Thanks also go to the Mississippi Mineral Resources Institute for the neccessary financial support during the course of the last year.

Personal thanks go to the 245 independent and major oil operators in the state who made this project possible. They offered their cooperation and candid comments concerning their respective oil production operations.

i

TABLE OF CONTENTS

 α - α - α - α - α - α - α

 \subset

 \subset

 \mathcal{C} .

 \mathcal{C}

 \mathcal{C}

 \cup

Ò

 \cup

 \cup

 ω

i i

ABSTRACT

C

x

 $\sqrt{2}$

 \leftarrow

 \cup

U

 \cup

A study was made of Mississippi's oil reservoirs to determine to what extent the use of secondary and tertiary oil recovery methods may be expected to play in the future development of Mississippi's oil industry. A survey was made of the current state of the art of chemical flooding, miscible (COp) flooding, and thermal recovery techniques. The primary source of reservoir information was that made available as public record by the Mississippi Oil and Gas Board with some information being furnished by oil operators and their employees throughout the state. The bulk of this information was entered into computer data storage and examined by specified screening criteria. At least 600 of the 1063 reservoirs checked showed at least some technical potential for enhanced oil recovery (EOR). However, since the majority of these fields contain 40 acres or less and are at depths of over 6000 feet, implementation costs will prevent all but a few from ever seeing any EOR efforts. For the reason of excessive depths, the method of steam stimulation, a method which is popular in some other locations, is all but eliminated from consideration in Mississippi. A survey was made of 245 known oil operators in the State. 46% of those responding indicated that they had made EOR studies in the past. Most of these stated that in order for these projects to be viable, it would be necessary for crude prices to rise about 25% to \$40/barrel. The same result may be obtained by granting EOR projects total exemption from windfall profits tax. It was concluded that EOR is a way to increase the ultimate recovery of

iii

the State's oil thus sustaining the economic benifits of a healthy oil industry to this State. This study was supported and sponsored by a grant from the Mississippi Mineral Resources Institute.

 \subset

 \subset

 \mathcal{C}

 ϵ

Ŷ.

 \langle

X.

 \mathbb{C}

 \backslash

U

 \sim

INTRODUCTION

Enhanced Oil Recovery (EOR) is of vital importance to the development of society as we know it today. Each of our citizen's demand the right to consume energy in the form of petroleum products without regard to any restrictions being placed on that use because of finite limited supplies or the fact that the United States controls only a small fraction of the world's known petroleum reserves (1,9). It is incumbent on the oil industry to meet this demand by finding more reserves. One way to increase recovery efficiency is through the application of enhanced oil recovery techniques on existing known oil reservoirs.

 $\left($

O

C

C.

L

U

 \sim

Primary production methods can only hope to produce about 20% of the oil in place from a given reservoir. The percentage usually used when calculating proven reserve is 35%. During the past 35 years, about 2 billion barrels of crude has been produced from Mississippi's oil fields by primary production methods. The challange is to increase the amount of oil which can be recovered from a given oil bearing formation thereby increasing amounts of available crude.

Water flood techniques are used by some in an attempt to drive oil towards producting wells. Water is pumped into a formation by injection wells causing a net flow of water to proceed from the injection wells towards the producers. With this movement, some of the oil in the reservoir is carried along with the water stream to the producing well where it can be

pumped to the surface. However, even with a well designed and operated water flood operation, a majority of oil is left in the ground.(11)

o

C

 \cap

 \cap

 $\left($ $\right)$

C

 \cup

٢

EOR methods have been developed and tested which increase the recovery of oil. The methods used vary considerably and depend on the specific characteristics of the reservoir being considered for treatment. It is desired to use a method which will yield a reasonable amount of oil with minimal incremental cost increase of production. Unfortunately, by nature of the depth of most reservoirs, the cost of undertaking an EOR project is very great and it is often difficult to see sufficient economical justification for these projects. Capitial outlays and the cost of money too often outweigh benifits of an EOR project whose chance of technical success is always a matter of speculation.

There are some sucessful EOR projects being operated in the State of Mississippi at the present time. These projects have been developed in reservoirs that are rather large both in area and formation thickness. Some of these operations are being preformed at depths of up to 11,000 feet which adds greatly the the cost of development.(11,15)

A major portion of Mississippi's oil is produced from small fields with pay sands 10 feet in thickness and less. Application of EOR techniques to these fields at the present time would not be economically justifiable. However, as new drilling technology and EOR technology is developed, EOR may become a viable process even in these small fields.

Reservoir data were collected from information made available from the Mississippi Oil and Gas'Board. This data was used in a computer based screening process to select reservoirs in the State which may have potential for EOR applications.

 \cap

 \subset

C.

G.

 ϵ

X.

O

U

U

C

It was found that on initial examination, 600 out of the 1068 reservoirs may have some potential for EOR although economical limitations would certainly prevent all but a few from further consideration.

A survey of current state of the art techiques for EOR methods is included in this report. Also included are the results of a survey made of oil lease operators during the past year pertaining to present and future EOR operations in the state.

ENHANCED OIL RECOVERY

EOR methods may be divided into groups as follows:

1. Chemical Flooding Techniques

a. Polymer flooding

b. Surfactant flooding

c. Alkaline flooding

2. Miscible Flooding

(Carbon dioxide)

3. Thermal Recovery Methods

a. Hot Water Stimulation

b. Steam

i. Steam soak procedures

ii. Steam flood

c. In-situ Combustion

All of these methods have applications which depend on crude oil, reservoir, and economic considerations. Even with application of these techniques, all of the in place oil in a reservoir can never be captured.

Of the methods discussed, only in-situ combustion can be considered as an ultimate recovery method. Use of combustion requires a minimum consumption of 10% of in place oil with the possibility of recovering the remaining 90%.

Polymer Flooding

 \cup

IJ

Polymer flooding is a term used to describe the enhancement of a water flood operation by adding high molecular weight

polymers to the injected fluid. (13,16) The purpose of the polymer addition is to increase the sweep efficiency of the water drive and thus produce more oil for a given production cost. This is to say, the polymers inhibit driving fluid from flowing through larger pores in the formation and at the same time forcing more fluid through the smaller pores. The net result is that oil that would otherwise be bypassed is forced from the smaller pores.

To use polymer flooding, it is assumed that a water drive must be in operation. Thus, the use of this technique, as well as other chemical flooding, may well be limited to fields with sucessful water drive operations.

Surfactant Flooding

 \subset

€

 \circ

 \bigcirc

 \cup

 \cup

U

U

Surfactant is another term for surface active agent or soap. These a generally organic compounds which have a physical attraction for both water and oil. Hopefully, when a surfactant molecule is brought into contact with a glob of oil, it will cause the oil to become emulsified to some extent in the water phase. When this happens, both the oil and water are dispersed, one in the other, and they both have the same physical characteristics.(13,16)

This mixture will then move towards the producting well as one phase and there will be reduced tendency for separation of the oil and water either by gravity or by surface tension effects. Surfactant is introduced to the formation during water drive operations by mixing it with the injected water.

Alkaline Flooding

 $\sqrt{2}$

 $\sqrt{2}$

k.

 $\mathbb C$

u

U

O

Alkaline or caustic flood is similar to surfactant flooding. Alkaline flood takes advantage of the chemical characteristics of the in place crude oil to create surface active effects by chemical combination of crude oil and caustic.(19) When this chemical combination takes place, it affects the physical characteristics of the water phase much like a soap reducing surface tension effects between the water phase and the oil phase. This surface tension reduction decreases mobility ratios and allows more effective sweeping of oil from the formation.

As with other chemical flood processes, alkaline flooding is used to improve efficiencies of water drive operations. Caustic is introduced at the injection well and is expected to move in the formation towards the producing well. Miscible Flooding (Carbon Dioxide)

Carbon dioxide injection has many effects on crude oil. Favorable characteristics for oil recovery are that it is a means of pressure maintenance, it reduces surface tension and apparent viscosity of the oil, it increases apparent volume of the oil in place, and, under the right conditions, a phenomena called miscible displacement takes place(13,20)

Production of oil from any oil bearing formation depends on the presence of a pressure driving force moving oil to the face of the producing well. One means of providing that force is to pump gas down hole to maintain a minimum pressure in the reservoir. Carbon dioxide has an advantage of being fairly

soluble in reservoir fluids which means that if a localized reduction in pressure occurs, as would happen during the course of flow, CO is available to come out of solution to offset some of that pressure drop thus creating a more uniform flow of fluid and forcing more oil from smaller interstices of the reservoir.

The effect on dissolved CC^ in oil is seen in a reduction of both surface tension and oil viscosity. Both of these effects are favorable factors in the release of oil from the reservoir rock and flow towards the producing well.

An additional positive effect is caused by oil increasing in volume as CC^ is dissolved into the hydrocarbon phase. If a droplet of oil is swollen, then there is a better chance for it to move along with a driving fluid.

Miscible displacement can also take place under the right conditions. This effect occurs at high reservoir pressures and is a result of the in place hydrocarbons vaporizing at reservoir temperature and maintaining a vapor-liquid equilibrium with a miscible CO2-oil phase. Thus, as the oil becomes part of this phase, the liquid oil is displaced by the carbon dioxide. The object of the operation is to maintain a miscible phase and make it move towards the producing well. Due to the sensitive nature of pressure, volume, and temperature relationships, this achievement is often difficult.

Thermal Recovery Methods

C

C

C

C

 \subset

€

U

Ü

U

U

In general, thermal recovery techniques introduce heat to the reservoir in a effort to reduce oil viscosity and surface tension to make the oil more mobile and more likely to move

towards the producing well. This means that thermal recovery would be more likely to be considered for a low gravity crude oil with high viscosity that for a light crude oil. In the case of the high viscosity oil, a small incremental temperature increase can significantly decrease oil viscosity and surface tension.(3,6,7,8,10,21)

The major cost factor for thermal recovery is the cost of heat. Thus, heat loss considerations must be studied carefully. The heat sink which is the limiting characteristic common to all thermal recovery is heat losses to the cap and base rock of the formation. Therefore, as the thickness of a given producing section decreases, the heat efficiency decreases and the cost of energy per barrel of oil generally increases.

To be assured success, a reservoir should have sufficient thickness to offset the cost of energy lost through the cap and base rock. A general statement can be made that one would expect a reservoir with a 50 foot pay zone to have better chances of success with thermal recovery techniques than a reservoir with a thickness of 15 feet. This statement assumes all other factors are equal and considers only heat losses from the reservoir.

Hot Water Flooding

61

C

C

U

Hot water stimulation has been reported in a few cases. Postitive effects are experienced due to heat from the injected water being introduced into the reservoir.

Use of hot water stimulation is limited by the depth of the formation due to heat losses from the water as it is being

pumped down hole. So rapid is this heat loss, that use of hot water in formations over 1,500 to 2,000 feet is impractical. This is to say, most all of the heat energy put into the water at the surface will be dissipated through the walls of the well bore before it ever reaches oil bearing sand. Steam Flooding

 \curvearrowright

 $\sqrt{ }$

€

 \bigcirc

U.

U

U

U

Steam flooding procedures share the same short falls as hot water injection due to heat loss from the steam through the injection string. However, since the energy content of steam is higher than that of hot water at the same temperature, it is able to deliver more heat per unit mass to the oil bearing formation at greater depths. Even so, energy losses become significant at depths of over 5000 feet.

Steam flooding procedures have been successful in several fields in other States and in Canada where formation thicknesses have exceeded 80 feet at depths of $1,000$ to $3,000$ feet. $(16,19)$ There are two different kinds of steam recovery operations, i. Steam Soak

Steam soak, sometimes called the huff and puff method, is effected by injecting steam into a formation for a period of a week to 30 days. At the end of this time, the steam is allowed to condense for a period of 3 to 10 days to allow time for the heat energy to be distributed throughout the formation. At the end of this soak period, oil is pumped from the same well which was used to inject the steam. The result of stimulation in this manner results in desirable oil production rates of several months in duration or until oil production tapers off to a

degree where pumping becomes uneconomicial.

 \cap

 \subset

 $($

 \cup

O.

U

O

U

 \cup

At the end of the production period, steam is injected once again and the cycle is repeated. This process of injection, heat soak, and production is repeated over a period of years. When steam soak procedures start yielding poor results, a given oil field may be converted over to a steam drive operation, ii. Steam Drive

Steam drive operates in a fashion similiar to a water drive project where a single injection well is surrounded by several producing wells in certain patterns. Steam is continiously injected into the formation in a effort to force the heated oil to flow toward the producing wells. The field is operated in this fashion until steam breaks through to the producing wells. Sometimes water injection is alternated with steam injection in an effort to make the oil and water move together in a front. In-Situ Combustion

In-Situ combustion or fireflood is a method of generating energy in a formation by burning a portion of the oil present in the reservoir. This is accomplished by pumping air or oxygen with or without water down an injection string, creating sufficient conditions for ignition, and sustaining sufficient air flow for continued combustion.(3)

Results from an operation such as this can vary but oil recoveries of up to 90% recovery of the oil in place at the time the project was started have been reported.(18) Exact procedures used for the combustion process differ greatly from field to field and even differ among several operators

conducting combustion within the same field. Water is normally injected down hole to 1.) prevent excessive temperatures near the well bore and 2.) generate steam within the formation in an effort to distribute heat ahead of the combustion zone.

In-Situ combustion projects are generally operated in larger multi-well fields.(4,5,12,15,17,21) One injection or combustion well is located so that it is surrounded by several producing wells such as with 5-spot or 7-spot patterns. However, some success has been reported with a 2-spot arrangement as an experiment.(2)

C.

€

X.

 \cup

U

O

U

Several problems arise during the application of combustion techniques. The most important are mechanical problems encounted in keeping high pressure, high volume air compressors operating, corrosion problems at both injection wells and producing wells, and pollution problems caused by escaping combustion gasses at the surface production facilities. All of these problems add hidden operating costs to a given proj ect.(12,15)

Reservoir Screening

 \subset

c

Ċ

C

O.

€

⊖

o

U

U

u

Availiable published oil reservoir data were cataloged into a computer file so that pertinate data could be screened for the purpose of selecting those Mississippi reservoirs which have the greatest potential for EOR applications. Primary source of the information were production reports published by the Mississippi State Oil and Gas Board on a monthly basis. In some cases, inspection of discovery well electrical logs was made to fill in some details. Some of the data were incomplete so that it may be assumed that some reservoirs would not be selected in a screening process due to missing data. A list of the fields and production zones considered are given in the appendix.

Screening was preformed to seperated fields into three groups of EOR potential.(6,13) The groups were chemical flooding processes, CO2 miscible processes, and thermal recovery processes.

The chemical flooding group was further subdivided into the three additional catergories of surfactant flooding, polymer flooding, and alkaline flooding. The thermal recovery systems investigated were steam and in-situ combustion.

A field was said to have potential for surfactant flood if the reservoir met the basic criteria of oil gravity greater than 24 °API, a reservoir temperature less that 250 °F, and a permeablity greater than 20 millidarcies (md) .

The criteria for polymer flooding required that the reservoir temperature be less than 200 °F and the permeablity be

greater than 20 md.

 \cap

 \cap

61

 \bigcirc

U.

U

υ

J

ù.

Alkūne flooding should be most effective with oil gravities less than 35 °API and a temperature of less than 200 $^{\circ}$ F.

Carbon dioxide miscible flooding requires an °API gravity of 27 or greater and a reservoir temperature of less than 250 $^{\circ}$ F.

Thermal recover with steam is most sensitive to depth. Depths of over 5000 feet should not be considered for these processes. In addition, API gravity of the oil should be 25 or less and thickness of the pay zone should be a minimum of 20 feet or greater.

Reservoirs determined to be canidiates for in-situ combustion are those with oil gravities of 25 °API or less and pay thicknesses of 10 feet or greater.

Results of the screening of the reservoirs is given in Table 1.

Table 1 Initial Screening of 1068 Oil Reservoirs in Mississippi

Table one shows a rather large percentage (56%) of oil fields passing an intial inspection as having potential for EOR by surfactant flooding. This is due to the fact that most oil horizons in the State have oil with an API greater than 24. In addition, no restrictions were placed on depth of the reservoir or pay thickness during the screening processes. Both considerations are important factors in calculating cost of implementation and ultimate oil recovery.

 \subset

C.

 \mathcal{C}

 \circ

U

U

U

υ

ω

Polymer flooding also lends itself to a significant percentage of oil fields screened. A limiting reservoir temperature of 200 °F eliminates many prospects from consideration here. Again, this screening procedure does not address depth or pay thickness.

Temperature is also a factor in determining the number of alkaline flood candidates selected (must be below 200 °F). Although there is quite a number of prospects, detailed economic analysis will need to be considered.

Carbon dioxide flooding also seems to fit a good many reservoirs with an initial screening. Predominately higher gravities of over 27 ^OAPI is a major factor in the choice of these reservoirs. $CO₂$ flooding is a method of special interest due to potentially availiablity of naturally occuring $CO₂$ in Rankin County. Again, detailed economic analysis of a project such as this one must be done to insure success.

Table one reflects only a small percentage of know reservoirs in the state as being suitable for EOR by thermal

methods. Steam is all but eliminated as a candidate due to the excessive depths of most of the State's oil formations.

 \subset

 \cap

 \cap

 \circ

 \bigcap

 C

 \cup

 \cup

U

O

U

The thermal method of most interest is recovery by combustion processes. This recovery procedure has been a success in an operation in the State at Heidleberg.(6,15) Even so, the operator had to be very inovatitive to make the operation pay off due in part to the depth of the reservoir (11,000 feet).(15)

Survey of Oil Operators

 \cap

 $\sqrt{2}$

r

 $\sqrt{2}$

 \bigcap

 \cup

 \cup

 \cup

 \cup

U

 \cup

A questionnaire was sent out to all known oil operators in Mississippi in order to determine what interest, if any, the operators have in EOR. A copy of the questionnaire and the cover letter sent is included in the appendix. Of 245 operators surveyed, 32 returned a completed form. A spot followup on those who did not return the form showed that most had little experiece in EOR and therefore felt that no contribution could be made by them sending the form in. Results are given below in Table 2.

Table 2

Summary of Results of

EOR Questionnaire

Therefore percentages may not all up to 100%.

 \cap

O

O

C.

O.

O.

C

U

U.

 \cup

It would seem from the survey that several oil operators (44% of those responding) have made some studies into secondary and tertiary recovery in their existing fields. At the same time, only one of these respondents has carried a project through to a successful conclusion (3%).

Question 8 of the questionnaire inquired as to what price crude oil would need to acheive in order for a EOR operation to be economically justified. The answers ranged from a low of \$11 a barrel to a high of \$50 a barrel with the average response being \$40 a barrel. The question was not clear as to what basis the price had (taxes, ect.) but it is assumed the operators responded with figures that include current severance tax and windfall profit tax structure.

Another question delt with amount of production increase that would be needed in order to justify an EOR operation. Apparently, most operators felt this question was too vague to answer with definite numbers. The respondents felt that incremental increases in pricing structures as being the real key of success to EOR.

Several operators throughout the state were contacted and interviewed either in person or by telephone. For the most part, operators feel general apathy towards EOR under current price and taxiation conditions. Of those interviewed, most felt that EOR technology has not progressed to a point where it will be feasible to conduct wide spread operations of this type in Mississippi. Some operators feel that they are achieving

upwards of 2/3 recovery of original oil in place during primary production operations. This belief, along with the magnitude of capitial required to undertake EOR operations in the deeper horizons around the State support a general feeling among operators that Mississippi is a long way from being involved in large scale EOR operations.

 \cap

 \cap

 \cap

 \cap

 \subset

 \cup

 $\left(\right)$

 \cup

Ü

 \cup

 \cup

CONCLUSIONS

Many of Mississippi's oil reservoirs have at least some possibility of being stimulated by EOR methods from a purely technical stand point. However, when examined from an economics point of view, applicablity of these methods may be limited due to constraints imposed by current technology.

EOR practices will need future development before EOR becomes a common place practice. If future developments are successful, then oil operators will be in a position to increase recoverable amounts of oil from existing reservoirs which will help stablize the general economy of the state. One fact is certain, however, the oil will remain in place until economics makes recovery justified.

 \cap

 \subset

O.

 \cup

U

 \cup

O

u

At the current time excessive taxes imposed on the oil industry in the form of windfall profits tax is impeading the development of EOR operations in the state. The survey made of oil operators indicates an incremental increase in price of crude oil could make several prospective EOR projects viable. The windfall profit taxes have the effect of suppressing increases seen by domestic operators while at the same time keeping prices to the consumer inflated. If EOR operations could be given a complete exemption from windfall profit tax, there is a potential for a flurry of activity in our State to implement and maintain EOR production.

EOR methods are certain to improve and become more competitive as price and demand increase. Ultimately, all current reservoirs will be subjected to some form of EOR in

order to recover amounts of oil remaining from primary \sim $\omega_{\rm f}$ production.

L.

 $\sqrt{2}$

 \cap

 \mathcal{C}^{γ}

 \subset

 ϵ

 \mathcal{L}

 \mathbb{C}

 \mathbb{C}

 \cup

 \cup

REFERENCES

 \cap

 \cap

O

 \mathcal{L}

C.

 \cup

 \cup

 \cup

U

 \cup

- 1. Bois, C., "Reserves, Ressources et Disponibilités Mondiales en Hydrocarbures, " Revue DE L^{.1} Institut Francais Du Petrole (March-April 1982), Vol. 37, No. 2, 135
- 2. Bowman, C.H., "A Two-Spot Combustion Recovery Project, " Journal of Petroleum Technology (Sept 1965), 994
- 3. Buchwald, R.W. , W.C. Hardy, and G.S. Neinast, "Case Histories of Three In-Situ Combustion Projects, " Journal of Petroleum Technology (July 1973), 784
- 4. Burke, Robert G. , "Combustion Project is making a Profit," Oil and Gas Journal (Jan 18, 1975), 44
- 5. Cato, R.W, and W.A. Frnka, "Getty Oil Reports Fireflood Pilot is Successful Project, " Oil and Gas Journal (Feb 12, 1968),93
- 6. Chu, Chieh, "State-of-the-Art Review of Fireflood Field Projects, " Journal of Petroleum Technology (Jan 1982), 19
- 7. Clark, G.A. and others, "The Fry In Situ Combustion Test-Field Operations, " Journal of Petroleum Technology (March 1965) 343
- 8. Fariuq Ali, S.M., "A Current Appraisal of In-Situ Combustion Field Tests, " Journal of Petroleum Technology (April 1972) 477 '
- 9. Enright, Robert J., "World Oil Flow, Refining Capacity Fall; Reserves Rise, " Oil and Gas Journal (Dec 27, 1982), Vol. 80 No 52, 75
- 10. Gates, C.F., "Combustion as a Primary Recovery Process-Midway Sunset Field, " Journal of Petroleum Technology (Aug 1975), 983
- 11. Geffen, Ted Μ., "Oil Production to Expect From Known Technology, " Oil and Gas Journal (May 7, 1973), 66
- 12. "Getty expands Bellevue fire flood, " Oil and Gas Journal (Jan 13, 1975), 45
- 13. Haynex, H.J., Chairman, Committee on EOR, "Enhanced Oil Recovery, "National Petroleum Council, 1976
- 14. lyoho, A.W., "Selecting Enhanced Oil Recovery Processes, " World Oil (Nov 1978), 61

15. Mace, Charles, "Deepest combustion project proceeding successfully, " Oil and Gas Journal (Nov 17, 1975), 75

 Γ

 \cap

 $\sqrt{2}$

n

 ϵ

 \cup

 \leftarrow

C

u

 \cup

U

- 16. Matheny, S.L. Jr., " EOR Methods Help Ultimate Recovery", Oil and Gas Journal (Mar 31, 1980), 79
- 17. Parish, D.R. and others, "Evaluation of COFACAW as a Tertiary Recovery Method, Sloss Field, Nebraska, " Journal of Petroleum Technology (June 1974), 676
- 18. Poettmann, Fred H. , "In situ combustion: a current appraisal, " World Oil (April 1964), 124
- 19. "Secondary and Tertiary Oil Recovery Processes, " Interstate Oil Compact Commission, Oklahoma City, OK 1974
- 20. Spooner, Michal, "Swelling Behavior of Carbon Dioxide-Hydrocarbon Systems, " M.S. Thesis, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA (1978)
- 21. "Texas Fireflood Looks Like a Winner, " Oil and Gas Journal (Feb 17, 1968) 52

APPENDIX A

 $\ddot{}$

 ζ

Survey Questionnaire

- C
- \subset
- \mathbb{C}^+
-
- \cup
- \cup
- \cup

 \subset

 \subset

MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY

MISSISSIPPI STATE, MISSISSIPPI 39762

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERING · PHONE **(601) 325-2480**

P. O. Box CN

October 28, 1982

Re: Secondary and Tertiary Oil Recovery Potential in Mississippi

Dear Sirs:

n.

 \cup

x

U

o

U

A study is being made of the secondary and tertiary oil recovery potential in Mississippi under a grant from the Mississippi Mineral Resources Institute (MMRI). As part of the study, it would be most helpful to have input from you, the oilfield operator. This study is being made to help your awarness of present and future development of trends in Mississippi.

Therefore, a questionnaire is enclosed to determine what information you might be willing to share with us for the purpose of this research project.

This study is strictly for academic purposes. You are under no obligation whatever to answer this questionnaire. Any data you do provide will be kept confidential as to its source. The data may be included in the final report as a part of a statistical sample. It will not refer to your name or operation.

Should you have questions about: any aspect of this project, please feel free to give me a call. Thanks.

Very truly yours,

Clifford E. George, *P.E.* Department of Chemical Engineering Mississippi State University

Mississippi State University Department of Chemical Engineering

MMRI study of Secondary and Tertiary Oil Recovery Potential in Mississippi All questions relate to fields in Mississippi (do not consider water flooding operations)

1. Have you ever attempted any Secondary or Tertiary recovery operation s ?________. Method used (Steam, combustion, C02, ect).

2. If so, were the results satisfactory?(yes/no)

3. Have you conducted any studies concerning secondary or tertiary recovery?(yes/no)

4. If so, what method (steam, combustion, CO2, ect.)

5. As a rule, would you say that the reservoir properties of your producing fields are well known___________, known within certain limits, or, not known at all.

6. Do you think existing secondary and tertiary technology is adequate?(yes/no)

7. In your opinion, what amount of production would be needed from a project to make secondary or tertiary recovery feasible? (BBL/Day)

8. What would the price of oil need to be in order for you to consider secondary and tertiary oil recovery methods? (S/BBL)

9. Would you be willing to share some of your knowledge and experiences for the purpose of helping this research project? . (yes/no)

10. Do you want a copy of the final report when the project is finished?(yes/no)

If your answer is yes to question 9, I will be in contact with you shortly. Thank you very much for your time.

Send completed form to: Clifford E. George, P.E. MMRI Project P.O. Drawer CN Mississippi State, MS 39762

Company Name

 \cap

 \cap

 \subset

 \bigcirc

x.

 \cup

 \cup

 \cup

U

Person to contact Phone ()

- \cup
- U

ID FIELD POOL

C

C

 \subset

 \cap

O

O.

 \cup

 \cup

Ü

O

U

MISSISSIPPIAN CARTER GAS

THIRD SPARTA GAS **ARTMAN OIL** TUSCALOOSA OIL RODESSA OIL **TEW LAKE OIL** 5800 WILCOX OIL **BAKER OIL** LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL FIRST WILCOX OIL BENBROOK OIL ARTMAN OIL MINTER B OIL CHRISTMAS OIL DANTZLER GAS LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL WASHITA-FREDERICKSBURG 2 GAS SLIGO GAS FIRST WILCOX OIL STEWART B. OIL **WILCOX OIL MINTER OIL** WILSON OIL HOSSTON OIL LOWER HELLS SANDSTONE OIL **HOSSTON OIL** MISSISSIPPIAN CARTER GAS 14050 HOSSTON DIL DEVONIAN OIL DEVONIAN LIME OIL MISSISSIPPIAN LEWIS OIL PALUXY OIL CAMPBELL OIL SIXTH HOSSTON GAS RODESSA OIL SLIGO GAS BASAL PALUXY GAS-HOSSTON BOOTH GAS HOSSTON HARPER GAS PALUXY GAS LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL SMACKOVER OIL PALUXY OIL 10380 WASHITA-FREDERICKSBURG GAS-1100 WASHITA-FREDERICKSBURG GAS SMACKOVER C OIL SMACKOVER OIL COFFMAN OIL JAMES LIMESTONE GAS

ID FIELD POOL

C

 $\sqrt{2}$

 \bigcap

Ò

€

O

 \cup

 \cup

 \cup

U

U

COTTON VALLEY OIL WILSON OIL STEWART B.OIL WILSON OIL MISSISSIPPIAN CARTER GAS RODESSA OIL **#ARMSTRONG OIL** MCKITTRICK OIL ARMSTRONG OIL **MISSISSIPPIAN LEWIS GAS** PENNSYLVANIA GAS SPARTA OIL MISSISSIPPIAN CARTER GAS **WILCOX OIL** TEW LAKE WILCOX OIL FIRST WILCOX GAS WILCOX OIL WILCOX OIL BARCKSDALE OIL JENKINS OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL EUTAW OIL MOORINGSPORT-RODESSA OIL RODESSA.OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL SMACKOVER OIL SMACKOVER OIL SMACKOVER OIL MCKITTRICH OIL MINTER DIL WALKER OIL STEWART B.OIL SMACKOVER GAS HOSSTON OIL PALUXY OIL UPPER COTTON VALLEY OIL EVANS GAS LEWIS GAS **BLANEY OIL MCKITTRICK OIL MINTER OIL** WALKER OIL STEWART B OIL SMACKOVER 6AS HOSSTON OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL UPPER TUSCALOOSA OIL WASHITA-FREDERICKSBURG OIL ARMSTRONG OIL

ID FIELD POOL

n

 \cap

 \cap

 $\sqrt{2}$

 \bigcap

 \circ

 $\left($

 \cup

 \cup

U

U

4600 WILCOX OIL PALUXY OIL RODESSA OIL **HOSSTON** PALUXY OIL WEST RODESSA OIL RODESSA OIL LOWER RODESSA OIL SLIGO OIL WASHITA FREDERICKSBURG OIL LOWER RODESSA OIL LOWER TUSCALUOOSA OIL UPPER HOSSTON GAS SMACKOVER OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL COTTON VALLEY OIL HOSSTON OIL RODESSA OIL SLIGO OIL SMACKOVER OIL ARMSTRONG OIL FOSTER OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA WILCOX OIL CAMPBELL OIL MISSISSIPPIAN CARTER GAS $IMISSISSIPPIAN-LEWIS GAS$ COTTON VALLEY GAS CLAYTON OIL PALUXY OIL **EUTAW OIL** LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL HOSSTON GAS WILCOX OIL STEWART B OIL WILCOX OIL **MISSISSIPPIAN CARTER GAS** LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL RODESSA OIL SLIGO OIL COTTON VALLEY OIL **EUTAW OIL** LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL RODESSA OIL SLIGO OIL **BAKER OIL** LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL SLIGO OIL

 $\sqrt{2}$

 \cap

 \cap

Ö

6

O.

D

2

U

BENBROOK OIL PALUXY OIL HOSSTON GAS HOSSTON OIL **FIRST WILCOX OIL** 4600 WILCOX OIL STEWART B.OIL BENBROOK-RATCLIFF OIL WILCOX OIL WILCOX OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL WILCOX OIL BAKER OIL PARKER DIL WILSON OIL MISSISSIPPIAN-BUSKIRK-GAS MISSISSIPPI AN-L'F'PER CARTER GAS HISSISSIPPIAN-LOWER CARTER GAS **MISSISSIPPIAN -LEWIS GAS** MISS I SS I PPI AN-SANDERS GAS PENNSYLVANIAN-1900 SAND-GAS POOL PENNSYLVANIA-NASON GAS ARMSTRONG OIL JENKINS OIL **TEW LAKE OIL** LUCE OIL **IWILCOX-ARTMAN OIL** WILCOX-6ILES OIL STRINGER OIL ARMSTRONG OIL FOSTER OIL MCKITTRICK OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA GAS
BLAKE OIL 3900 WILCOX GAS 4400 WILCOX OIL 5330 WILCOX OIL 5750 WILCOX OIL 5800 WILCOX OIL **HOSSTON OIL** WILCOX DIL WILCOX OIL FREEWOODS OIL JENKINS OIL WALKER OIL **JENKINS OIL** RODESSA DIL SMACKOVER OIL SMACKOVER A OIL

 \cap

 \cap

 \cap

 \cap

 \mathbb{C}

 \odot

 ζ

 \cup

 \cup

 \cup

U

ID FIELD POOL

 \subset

C

 \cap

 \cap

€

C.

 \cup

 \cup

 \cup

Ü

u

BENBROOK OIL MCKITTRICK OIL MCSHANE OIL MINTER OIL WALKER OIL FIRST WILCOX OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA ARMSTRONG OIL WILCOX OIL ARMSTRONG OIL PARKER OIL STEWART °B* OIL WILCOX OIL EUTAW OIL 10300 HOSSTON OIL 10900 LOWER CRETACEOUS OIL PALUXY OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL UPPER TUSCALOOSA OIL EUTAW OIL WILCOX OIL **FOSTER OIL** LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL WILCOX OIL WILCOX OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL STEWART "B" OIL ARTMAN OIL WILCOX OIL WILCOX OIL SELMA GAS ROCK OIL NORPHLET OIL **SMACKOVER GAS** ARMSTRONG OIL WILCOX GIL STEWART 'B" OIL WILCOX OIL MISSISSIPPIAN-CARTER HAI! GAS PALUX Y OIL P-2 PALUXY OIL LT-6 LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL WF-48 WASHUTA FREDERICKSBURG OIL WILCOX OIL NORTH ARMSTRONG OIL SOUTH ARMSTRONG OIL SOUTHWEST ARMSTRONG OIL ASHLEY OIL

ID FIELD POOL

 \cap

 $\mathcal C$

 $\cal C$

 $\cal C$

 \subset

 \circlearrowright

 $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$

U

U

U

w

ID FIELD POOL

 \subset

n

 \cap

 \cap

 \subset

 \circ

 \cup

U

U

 \cup

υ

 \subset

 $\sqrt{ }$

 $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$

 \subset

 ϵ

 \mathcal{C}

X.

U

O

 \cup

U

BAKER OIL BENBROOK OIL 4600 WILCOX OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA **EUTAW OIL** SELNA CHALK OIL RODESSA OIL ARMSTRONG OIL CROSBY OIL JOHNSON OIL WILCOX OIL SPARTA GAS **CKHTRICK OIL BAKER OIL** HARMON OIL PARKER OIL WILCOX OIL WILCOX OIL WILCOX OIL LOWER PALUXY GAS UPPER PALUXY GAS WASHITA-FREDERICKSBURG 6AS WILCOX OIL WILCOX OIL MCSHANE OIL PALUXY GAS SLIGO GAS-SPARTA OIL ARMSTRONG OIL **BAKER OIL** 4300 WILCOX OIL 4600 WILCOX OIL SECOND WILCOX **NORTH WILSON OIL** SOUTH WILSON OIL WILCOX OIL WHITTINGTON OIL SMACKOVER OIL WILCOX ARMSTRONG OIL ALEXANDER OIL **BAKER OIL** BAKER "B" OIL •C" OIL POOL TEW LAKE OIL LOWER SMACKOVER OIL **UPPER SMACKOVER OIL** EUTAW OIL SELMA CHALK OIL RODESSA OIL

ID FIELD FOOL FOOL

 \subset

 \cap

 \subset

 ϵ

 ζ^-

 \circ

 $\left($

 \cup

 \cup

 \cup

 \cup

 \mathcal{A} .

ID FIELD POOL

C

 ϵ

 \subset

 \bigcap

XX.

O

x.

 \cup

U

 \cup

 ω

LOWER TUSCALOOSA GAS UPPER TUSCALOOSA GAS LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL MISSISSIPPIAN CARTER GAS MISSISSIPPIAN LEWIS GAS PENNSYLVANIAN-STRAY SAND-GAS LOWER COTTON VALLEY OIL HOSSTON BOOTH GAS HOSSTON HARPER GAS TUSCALOOSA OIL ARMSTRONG OIL PALUH OIL 11900 PALUXY OIL RODESSA COX GAS SLIGO OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL FIRST WILCOX OIL **FIRST WILCOX OIL** COTTON VALLEY OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA GAS PALUXY OIL WASHITA-FREDERICKSBURG OIL HOSSTON GAS WILCOX OIL MCKITTRICK OIL **MCKITTRICK OIL** MCSHANE OIL WILCOX OIL HAYNESVILLE OIL LUCE OIL SPARTA OIL 4600 WILCOX OIL COTTON VALLEY OIL TEW LAKE OIL HOSSTON GAS SILIGO GAS WILCOX OIL STEWART B OIL SMACKOVER OIL NORPHLET OIL SMACKOVER OIL **BUCKNER OIL** SMACKOVER OIL ARMSTRONG OIL

BENBROOK OIL

 \subset

 $\sqrt{2}$

 \cap

Č

 \bigcap

o

í.

Ċ

U

U

υ

PARKER OIL ARTMAN OIL POOL HOSSTON IVY GAS-RODESSA GAS WILCOX OIL HOSSTON HARPER GAS SPARTA OIL SPARTA OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA GAS WILCOX OIL ARMSTRONG **BARKSDALE OIL** MCKETTRICK OIL PARKER OIL PEARLINE OIL **MCKITTRICK** MILLER OIL ARMSTRONG OIL SECOND WILCOX OIL SPARTA OIL SPARTA OIL EUTAW OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL SMACKOVER EAST OIL WEST SMACKOVER OIL WILCOX OIL SPARTA OIL WILCOX OIL UPPER SMACKOVER OIL SMACKOVER OIL **BAKER OIL EUTAW OIL** ELMA CHALK OIL WILCOX OIL FOSTER OIL FREEWOODS OIL SMACKOVER GAS SMACKOVER GAS HOSSTON OIL RODESSA OIL NORPHLET (CO2> GAS SMACKOVER (CO2)GAS EUTAW-UPPER TUSCALOOSA SELMA CHAULK LOWER TUSCALOOSA LOWER TUSCALOOSA MASSIVE SAND GAS STEVENS OIL SAND A SAND WASHITA-FREDRICKSBURG GAS 10000⁵ WASHITA-FREDRICKSBURG GAS

ID FIELD POOL

 \subset

 \cap

 \subset

 \bigcap

 \subset

 \cup

 ζ .

 \mathbb{C}

 $\zeta_{\rm s}$

a)

×

 $\ddot{}$

ID FIELD POOL

 \subset

 \cap

 \cap

 \subset

 \subset

O

 \bigcirc

 \cup

Ü

U.

 \cup

 \leftarrow

 $\sqrt{2}$

 \cap

 \circ

 \cap

 ϵ

 χ

 \langle

 \cup

 \cup

U

U

ID FIELD

£.

 \cap

 \bigcap

€

 \bigcirc

 $\left(\quad \right)$

ŧ

 \cup

U

755 TALLAHALA CREEK FIELD 756 TALLAHALA CREEK FIELD 757 TALLAHALA CREEK FIELD 758 TALLAHALA CREEK FIELD 759 EAST TALLAHALA CREEK FIELD 760 EAST TALLAHALA CREEK FIELD 761 EAST TALLAHALA CREEK FIELD 762 WEST TAR CREEK FIELD 763 WEST TAR CREEK FIELD 764 TATUMS CAMP FIELD 765 TCHULA LAKE FIELD 766 THOMASVILLE FIELD 767 THOMPSON'S CREEK FIELD 768 THOMPSON'S CREEK FIELD 769 SOUTH THOMPSON'S CREEK FIELD 770 SOUTH THOMPSON'S CREEK FIELD 771 SOUTH THOMPSON'S CREEK POOL 772 SOUTH THOMPSON'S CREEK FIELD 773 TI6ER FIELD 774 TINSLEY FIELD-EAST SEGMENT 775 TINSLEY FIELD-NORTHSEGMENT 776 TINSLEY FIELD-NORTHSEGMENT 777 TINSLEY FIELD-NORTHSEGMENT 778 TINSLEY FIELD-NORTHSEGMENT 779 TINSLEY FIELD-NORTHSEGMENT 780 TINSLEY FIELD-WEST SEG WATERFLOOD 781 TINSLEY FIELD-WEST SEG WATERFLOOD 782 TINSLEY FIELD-WEST SEGMENT 783 TINSLEY FIELD-WEST SEG WATERFLOOD 784 TOM BRANCH FIELD 785 TOM BRANCH FIELD 786 TOM BRANCH FIELD 787 TOM BRANCH FIELD 788 TOM BRANCH FIELD 789 SOUTH TOM BRANCH FIELD 790 TONY CREEK FIELD 791 TREBLOC FIELD 792 TREBLOC FIELD 793 TURKEY CREEK FIELD 794 TYLERTOWN FIELD 795 TYLERTOWN FIELD 796 TYLERTOWN FIELD 797 UNION CHURCH FIELD 798 VERBA FIELD 799 VERBA FIELD 800 VERBA FIELD 801 VOSSBURG FIELD 802 WALDRUP FIELD 803 WALNUT CREEK FIELD 804 WALNUT CREEK FIELD

POOL

COTTON VALLEY HH OIL POOL SLIGO OIL POOL SMACKOVER II OIL POOL MIDDLE SMACKOVER OIL POOL-EAST FLANK RES COTTON VALLEY OIL POOL SMACKOVER ^BA^a OIL POOL SMACKOVER C OIL POOL FREEWOODS OIL POOL PARKER OIL POOL HOSSTON GAS POOL SMACKOVER GAS POOL SMACKOVER GAS POOL TUSCALOOSA OIL POOL WASHITA-FREDERICKSBURB OIL POOL PALUXY OIL POOL LOWER TUSCALOOSA MASSIVE OIL POOL WASHITA-FREDRICKSBURG OIL POOL 9000 WASHITA-FREDRICKSBURG OIL POOL HOSSTON GAS POOL SELMA-EUTAW-TUSCALOOSA OIL POOL MCGRAW SAND WATER FLOOD UNIT PERRY SAND WATERFLOOD UNIT STEVENS SAND WATER INJECTION PROJECT SELMA-EUTAW-TUSCALOOSA OIL POOL WOODRUFF SAND WATERFLOOD UNIT PERRY SAND PERRY-WOODRUFF COMMINGLED POOL SELMA-EUTAW-TUSCALOOSA OIL POOL WOODRUFF SAND BAKER OIL POOL FIRST WILCOX OIL POOL MCKITTRICK OIL POOL PARKER OIL POOL WILSON OIL POOL FIRST WILCOX OIL POOL MCSHANE OIL POOL MISSISSIPPIAN-ABERNATHY OIL POOL MISSISSIPPIAN GAS POOL WILCOX OIL POOL 12700 PALUXY GAS POOL 12810 PALUXY GAS POOL 12530 PALUXY GAS POOL RODESSA GAS POOL MOORINGSPORT OIL POOL PALUXY OIL POOL SLIGO OIL POOL LOWER SMACKOVER OIL POOL COTTON VALLEY OIL POOL FOSTER OIL POOL MINTER OIL POOL

١G

C

 \cap

O

 $\sqrt{2}$

 $\left($

æ.

 \cup

 \cup

U

U

CAMPBELL OIL POOL ARMSTRONG OIL POOL SMACKOVER OIL POOL UPPER PALUXY OIL POOL TUSCALOOSA OIL POOL DANTZLER OIL POOL MOORINGSPORT GAS POOL UPPER WASHITA-FREDERICKSBURG OIL POOL WILCOX OIL POOL JENKINS OIL POOL WILCOX OIL POOL . ARMSTRONG OIL POOL BALL OIL POOL FIRST WILCOX OIL POOL PARKER OIL POOL WALKER OIL POOL HOSSTON GAS POOL UPPER SLIGO GAS POOL HOSSTON GAS POOL HOSSTON-SLIGO GAS POOL 4600 WILCOX OIL POOL ARMSTRONG OIL POOL WILSON OIL POOL SMACKOVER OIL POOL CAMPBELL OIL POOL EUTAW OIL POOL EUTAW OIL POOL EUTAW OIL POOL LOWER COTTON VALLEY OIL POOL UPPER COTTON VALLEY ŪIL FOOL EUTAW OIL POOL LOWER-LOWER CRETACEOUS OIL POOL MIDDLE-LOWER CRETACEOUS OIL POOL UPPER-LOWER CRETACEOUS OIL FOOL ARMSTRONG OIL POOL WILCOX E-2 OIL POOL WILCOX OIL PAULXY OIL EUTAW-UPPER TUSCALOOSA GAS HOSSTON GAS SELMA CHALK GAS-LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA MASSIVE OIL WILCOX GAS LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA MASSIVE OIL 8650 LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL 3700 LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL NORTH 4600 FT WILCOX STEWART "B" OIL

C

7

 \subset

 \subset

X

 \cup

 \cup

L

 \sim

υ

ú

PALUXY GAS WASHITA FREDERICKSBURG GAS UPPER HOSSTON GAS HOSSTON OIL **HOSSTON GAS** MISSISSIPPIAN EVANS GAS MISSISSIPPIAN SANDERS GAS MISSISSIPPIAN WALKER GAS **HOSSTON SINCLAIR GAS** MCKITTRICK OIL PINE ISLAND OIL SECOND WILCOX OIL SECOND WILCOX OIL LOWER WASHITA FREDERICKSBURG GAS-SMACKOVER OIL ARMSTRONG OIL **JENKINS OIL STEWART B OIL** RODESSA GAS-NORPHLET GAS LOWER RODESSA GAS MISSISSIPPIAN CARTER GAS NORPHLET OIL **MCKITTRICK OIL** RODESSA OIL **MCKITTRICK OIL** HOSSTON GAS-FIRST WILCOX OIL **MINTER OIL** SECOND WILCOX 10872 PALUXY OIL **JENKINS OIL MISS-LEWIS-SANDERS Ά' OIL** MISS-WALKER OIL 9150 WASHITA-FREDERICKSBURG OIL 9700 PALUXY GAS-9950 PALUXY GAS 10150 PALUXY GAS 9270 WASHITA FREDERICKSBURG GAS 8800 WASHITA-FREDERICKSBURG OIL STEWART B OIL BENBROOK OIL MORRISON GAS ARMSTRONG OIL WILSON OIL STEWART B OIL

 \subset

-1

 \cap

C

x

 \mathbb{C}

 $\left(\right)$

X.

U

U

STEWART B OIL **BAKER OIL** LOWER TUSCALOOSA BARKSDALE OIL WILSON OIL MINTER OIL WALKER OIL WASHITA-FREDERICKSBURG GAS SLIGO GAS WILCOX-WILSON **MILLER OIL** LOWER TUSCALOOSA GAS LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL 7150 TUSCALOOSA OIL MI SS I SS I PPI AN-ABERNATHY GAS MISSISSIPPIAN EVANS GAS FRIO OIL WILCOX ROBINSON OIL MISSISSIPPIAN-CARTER GAS STEWART B - WILCOX OIL FIRST HOSSTON GAS 5600 WILCOX OIL MINTER OIL **WALKER OIL** SECOND WILCOX OIL **BARKSDALE OIL** FREEWOODS OIL MORRINGSPORT SECOND WILCOX GAS UPPER WASHITA FREDERICKSBURG GAS PARKER OIL WILCOX-PEARLINE OIL ARTMAN OIL PEARLINE OIL UPPER TUSCALOOSA OIL ARMSTRONG OIL MISSISSIPPIAN-EVANS OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL NORPHLET (CO2) GAS NORTHWEST FAULT BLOCK SLIGO GAS LOWER HOSSTON GAS UPPER HOSSTON GAS SELMA CHALK GAS HOSSTON-HATTON GAS NORPHLET GAS (CO2) HOSSTON OIL

×

x

 \cap

 $\sqrt{2}$

Ŷ.

0

x

 \cup

U

 \cup

 \sim

ID FIELD POOL

956 HUTCHINS LANDING SECOND WILCOX OIL WILCOX OIL WILCOX-PARKER A OIL LOWER PALUXY GAS STEWART B OIL **BAKER OIL** LAVON-HOSSTON OIL E-4 PALUXY OIL MANDAMUS T OIL POOL MISSISSIPPIAN MILLERELLA OIL 12374 SLIGO OIL HOSSTON DIFFRIENT GAS COTTON VALLEY GAS COTTON VALLEY FERGUSON OIL FIRST WILCOX OIL FIFTH HOSSTON GAS FIRST HOSSTON GAS HOSSTON BOOTH GAS HOSSTON HARPER GAS HOSSTON GAS HOSSTON OIL RODESSA WALKER GAS JAMES OIL SLIGO-BARNES COTTON VALLEY OIL PALUXY-GAMMILL GAS 10350 WASHITA-FREDERICKSBURG GIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL **HOSSTON GAS** 9466 LOWER TUSCALOOSA GAS 9544 LOWER TUSCALOOSA GAS HOSSTON GAS RODESSA GAS ARMSTRONG OIL 3400 PENNSYLVANIAN GAS WILCOX-CAMPBELL OIL MISSISSIPPIAN-ABERNATHY GIL UPPER RODESSA OIL ARMSTRONG OIL MOORINGSPORT OIL ARMSTRONG OIL SMACKOVER OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL WILCOX OIL SMACKOVER OIL LOWER TUSCALOOSA OIL

 $\sqrt{2}$

 ϵ

 \curvearrowleft

 \bigcap

 $\left($

 \mathcal{C}

O

 \cup

Ü

U

 \sim

HOSSTON OIL HOSSTON DIFFRI ENT GAS ARMSTRONG OIL STEWART B OIL **HOSSTON GAS** LOWER PALUXY GAS RODESSA GAS SILGO GAS ARTMAN OIL MISSISSIPPIAN-LEWIS GAS MISSISSIPPIAN-LOWER SANDERS RODESSA OIL WALKER OIL PALUXY GAS ARTMAN GIL PEARLINE OIL RGDESSA OIL **BAKER OIL** MISSISSIPPIAN SANDERS OIL 1029 CALEDONIA PENNESYLVAN I AN-NASON GAS COTTON VALLEY GAS MCKITTRICK OIL EVANS GAS MISS ISS I PP I AN-CARTER GAS MISSISSIPPIAN LEWIS GAS P-40 PALUXY OIL ARMSTRONG OIL P-2 PALUXY OIL MILLERELLA GAS MISSISSIPPIAN ABERNATHY GAS-MI SS I SS I PPI AN CARTER A GAS MISSISSIPPIAN CARTER B GAS **FIRST HOSSTON GAS** SMACKOVER GAS MCKITTRICK ARMSTRONG OIL SILIGO GAS REA SAND GAS **MISSISSIPPIAN SANDERS GAS** FIRST HOSSTON GAS **HOSSTON HARPER GAS** THIRD WILCOX OIL WILSON OIL MISSISSIPPIAN LEWIS GAS BARKSDALE OIL MIDWAY GAS-PARKER OIL

 $\sqrt{2}$

 $\sqrt{2}$

 $\sqrt{2}$

 \subset

 \langle

 61

 \mathbb{C}^{\times}

 \mathbb{C}

iO.

U.

 \backslash

48

SMACKOVER OIL WALKER B OIL LOWER WASHITA FREDERICKSBURG GAS HOSSTON BOOTH GAS HOSSTON HARPER GAS SLIGO GAS SECOND SLIGO-BOOTH GAS MISSISSIPPIAN LEWIS GAS GRANFI ELD OIL RODESSA 3 OIL MISSISSIPPIAN SANDERS OIL

Open-File Report 83-6S

A Study of Secondary and Tertiary Oil Recovery Potential in Mississippi

Clifford E. George

1983

The Mississippi Mineral Resources Institute University, Mississippi 38677