

EFFICIENT SIMULATION OF THERMAL ENHANCED OIL
RECOVERY PROCESSES

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
RESOURCES ENGINEERING
AND THE COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES
OF STANFORD UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Zhouyuan Zhu
August 2011

© 2011 by Zhouyuan Zhu. All Rights Reserved.

Re-distributed by Stanford University under license with the author.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 United States License.

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/us/>

This dissertation is online at: <http://purl.stanford.edu/fn674bf7126>

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that, in my opinion, it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Margot Gerritsen, Primary Adviser

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that, in my opinion, it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Anthony Kovsky, Co-Adviser

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that, in my opinion, it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Marco Thiele

Approved for the Stanford University Committee on Graduate Studies.

Patricia J. Gumpert, Vice Provost Graduate Education

This signature page was generated electronically upon submission of this dissertation in electronic format. An original signed hard copy of the signature page is on file in University Archives.

Abstract

Simulating thermal processes is usually computationally expensive because of the complexity of the problem and strong nonlinearities encountered. In this work, we explore novel and efficient simulation techniques to solve thermal enhanced oil recovery problems. We focus on two major topics: the extension of streamline simulation for thermal enhanced oil recovery and the efficient simulation of chemical reaction kinetics as applied to the in-situ combustion process.

For thermal streamline simulation, we first study the extension to hot water flood processes, in which we have temperature induced viscosity changes and thermal volume changes. We first compute the pressure field on an Eulerian grid. We then solve for the advective parts of the mass balance and energy equations along the individual streamlines, accounting for the compressibility effects. At the end of each global time step, we account for the nonadvective terms on the Eulerian grid along with gravity using operator splitting. We test our streamline simulator and compare the results with a commercial thermal simulator. Sensitivity studies for compressibility, gravity and thermal conduction effects are presented.

We further extended our thermal streamline simulation to steam flooding. Steam flooding exhibits large volume changes and compressibility associated with the phase behavior of steam, strong gravity segregation and override, and highly coupled energy and mass transport. To overcome these challenges we implement a novel pressure update along the streamlines, a Glowinski θ -scheme operator splitting and a preliminary streamline/finite volume hybrid approach. We tested our streamline simulator on a series of test cases. We compared our thermal streamline results with those computed by a commercial thermal simulator for both accuracy and efficiency. For the cases

investigated, we are able to retain solution accuracy, while reducing computational cost and gaining connectivity information from the streamlines. These aspects are useful for reservoir engineering purposes.

In traditional thermal reactive reservoir simulation, mass and energy balance equations are solved numerically on discretized reservoir grid blocks. The reaction terms are calculated through Arrhenius kinetics using cell-averaged properties, such as averaged temperature and reactant concentrations. For the in-situ combustion process, the chemical reaction front is physically very narrow, typically a few inches thick. To capture accurately this front, centimeter-sized grids are required that are orders of magnitude smaller than the affordable grid block sizes for full field reservoir models.

To solve this grid size effect problem, we propose a new method based on a non-Arrhenius reaction upscaling approach. We do not resolve the combustion front on the grid, but instead use a subgrid-scale model that captures the overall effects of the combustion reactions on flow and transport, i.e. the amount of heat released, the amount of oil burned and the reaction products generated. The subgrid-scale model is calibrated using fine-scale highly accurate numerical simulation and laboratory experiments. This approach significantly improves the computational speed of in-situ combustion simulation as compared to traditional methods. We propose the detailed procedures to implement this methodology in a field-scale simulator. Test cases illustrate the solution consistency when scaling up the grid sizes in multidimensional heterogeneous problems. The methodology is also applicable to other subsurface reactive flow modeling problems with fast chemical reactions and sharp fronts.

Displacement front stability is a major concern in the design of all the EOR processes. Historically, premature combustion front break through has been an issue for field operations of in-situ combustion. In this work, we perform detailed analysis based on both analytical methods and numerical simulation. We identify the different flow regimes and several driving fronts in a typical 1D ISC process. For the ISC process in a conventional mobile heavy oil reservoir, we identify the most critical front as the front of steam plateau driving the cold oil bank. We discuss the five main contributors for this front stability/instability: viscous force, condensation, heat conduction, coke plugging and gravity. Detailed numerical tests are performed to test

and rank the relative importance of all these different effects.

PREVIEW

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to express my appreciation to my advisors: Margot Gerritsen, Anthony Kovscek, Marco Thiele and Louis Castanier. They provided me with great experience, guidance and continuous support during my doctoral study. I want to thank Professor Louis Durlofsky for serving on my committee. I would also like to thank Professor Biondo Biondi for kindly chairing my defense.

I owe many thanks to my research group members in the SUPRI-C and SUPRI-A group, including Alexandre Lapene, Wenjuan Lin, Murat Cinar, and Golnaz Alipour. I would like to thank Mohammad Bazargan for providing the three reaction model. I want to thank former and fellow students, including Morten Kristensen, Qing Chen, Tianhong Chen, Jeremy Kozdon, Hui Zhou and many others. I would also like to thank other alumnus Yuguang Chen, Tom Tang, Yuanlin Jiang, Yaqing Fan.

I would also like to thank all the other faculties, staff, and fellow students of the Department of Energy Resources Engineering for making my doctoral study so fruitful and enjoyable. Special thanks to Robert Lindblom, who is the coolest geologist teacher I ever met.

I would like to thank my mentors and friends at BP, Steven Vittoratos and Chris West, with special thanks to Steven who brought me into the Canadian heavy oil community. I also would like to thank industry affiliates and mentors who provided great help and advices during the course of my doctoral research work: Paul Naccache, David Law, Paul Hammond, Franck Monmont, and many others.

This work was prepared with the support of the Stanford Graduate Fellowship and financial aid from Schlumberger Ltd. The support of the Stanford University Petroleum Research Institute (SUPRI-A and SUPRI-C) Industrial Affiliates is also

acknowledged.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for their support during these years. I want to especially thank my mother, Hui Jiang, who has devoted tremendous support and encouragement for my education in the last twenty years. I would also like to thank my cousin Mingyu Zhu and my uncle Hang Jiang who gave much support during my PhD studies.

PREVIEW

Contents

Abstract	iv
Acknowledgements	vii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Heavy Oil and Thermal Enhanced Recovery	1
1.2 Motivations and Objectives	2
1.3 Thesis Outline	3
2 Literature Review	5
2.1 Streamline Simulation	5
2.1.1 Streamline Simulation Concept and Basics	5
2.1.2 Advantages and Disadvantages of Streamline Simulation	6
2.1.3 Streamline Simulation for Complex Physics Processes	9
2.2 In-situ Combustion	11
2.2.1 In-situ Combustion Process	11
2.2.2 Field Applications of ISC	12
2.2.3 Numerical Simulation of In-situ Combustion	15
2.2.4 Challenges in Combustion Reaction Modeling	16
2.2.5 Alternative Approaches	16
2.2.6 Thermal Front Stability for ISC	18
3 Governing Equations	21
3.1 General Conservation Equations	21

3.2	Phase Equilibrium	22
3.3	Fluid Property Calculations	24
3.4	Chemical Reactions	25
3.5	Primary Equations and Variables	26
4	Thermal Streamline Simulation for Hot Water Flood	28
4.1	Streamline Simulation Framework	28
4.2	Streamline Formulation for Hot Water Flood	29
4.3	Specific Techniques	31
4.3.1	Mappings	31
4.3.2	Operator Splitting for Non-advective Processes	32
4.3.3	Treatment of Compressibility	33
4.4	Hot Water Flood Results	33
4.4.1	Incompressible Hot Water Flood	34
4.4.2	Compressible Hot Water Flood	39
4.4.3	Gravity Effects	42
4.4.4	Heat Conduction Effects	43
4.5	Concluding Remarks	44
5	Thermal Streamline for Steam Flood	45
5.1	Streamline Simulation Framework	45
5.2	Streamline Formulation for Steam Flood	46
5.3	Specific Techniques	49
5.3.1	1D Pressure and Volumetric Flux Update Approach for Large Compressibility	49
5.3.2	Glowinski θ -Scheme Operator Splitting Approach for Non-advective Processes	55
5.3.3	Preliminary Hybrid Simulation	56
5.4	Steam Flood Results	58
5.4.1	Heterogeneous Quarter-Five Spot Steam Flood	58
5.4.2	Cyclic Steam Stimulation	62
5.4.3	Heterogeneous Multi-well Pattern Steam Flood	64

5.4.4	Vertical Cross Section Steam Flood	69
5.5	Discussion and Applications	72
5.5.1	Streamline Simulation as Fast Proxy: Cost Comparison	72
5.5.2	Optimization and Flux Patterns	73
5.6	Concluding Remarks	74
6	In-situ Combustion Simulation	76
6.1	Kinetic Reaction Models	76
6.2	1D Combustion Tube Simulation	79
6.3	Sensitivity Studies on 1D ISC Problem	85
6.4	Grid Size Effects and their Cause	89
6.4.1	Grid Size Effects	89
6.4.2	The Cause of Grid Size Effects	91
6.4.3	Why not Adaptive Mesh Refinement?	92
6.4.4	The Need for Upscaling	93
6.5	Concluding Remarks	94
7	Upscaling for In-situ Combustion Reactions	95
7.1	Non-Arrhenius Reaction Modeling	96
7.2	Implementation	99
7.2.1	Pseudo Code	99
7.2.2	Implementation in Commercial Software	100
7.3	Upscaling Test Cases	102
7.3.1	1D Tests	102
7.3.2	2D Tests	104
7.3.3	3D Tests	107
7.4	Discussion and Applications	108
7.4.1	Valid Range	108
7.4.2	Sub-grid Scale Heterogeneity and its Effects on Reaction Up- scaling	111
7.5	Concluding Remarks	119

8	Front Stability Study for In-situ Combustion	121
8.1	1D Flow Regimes	121
8.2	Contributors for Front Stability/Instability	123
8.3	Numerical Tests	126
8.3.1	Minimizing Numerical Errors	126
8.3.2	Small Sub-grid Scale Front Stability	131
8.3.3	Large Field-scale Front Stability	136
8.4	Concluding Remarks	136
9	Future Directions	139
9.1	Thermal Streamline Simulation	139
9.1.1	Non-advective Forces	139
9.1.2	Guidelines for Commercial Code Development	139
9.1.3	Thermal Streamline Simulation for SAGD?	140
9.2	In-situ Combustion	142
9.2.1	History Matching of Field-scale ISC process	142
9.2.2	Calibrating the Operational Range for Sustaining ISC Combustion	143
9.2.3	Grid Size Effects for Other Thermal or Non-Thermal EOR Processes	144
9.2.4	How to Use In-situ Combustion as a Gravity Drainage Process in Fractured Carbonate Reservoir?	145
10	Conclusions	150
A	Simulation Inputs	154
B	STARS Input File for Three Reaction Model	158
C	Eclipse Input File for Three Reaction Model	166
D	STARS Input File for Upscaled Three Reaction Model	179
E	SAGD Input File	187

F SAGD Input File for Grid Size Effects Study	193
Bibliography	203

PREVIEW

List of Tables

4.1	Errors of different viscosity properties compared with reference result (400 × 400 STARS result) using L2 norm	37
4.2	Effects of thermal compressibility on the production (surface condition)	41
4.3	Heat Pe number and its influence on the simulation result.	44
5.1	Errors of thermal streamline and STARS compared to reference (360 × 180 STARS result) using the relative L2 norm.	61
5.2	Sensitivity study on choice of θ . The simulation results close to each other by using different θ	62
5.3	Errors of thermal streamline and STARS compared to reference (200 × 200 STARS result) using L2 norm.	69
7.1	Explanation of major variables in the upscaling pseudo code.	101
7.2	Explanation of major functions in the upscaling pseudo code.	102
7.3	Summary of Sub-grid Scale Heterogeneity ISC Tests	118
A.1	Reservoir properties for hot water flood	154
A.2	Viscosity relationships for hot water flood	155
A.3	Fluid parameters for incompressible hot water flooding	155
A.4	Coefficients of density calculations in compressible hot water flood . .	155
A.5	Reservoir properties for steam flood	155
A.6	Well control for steam flood	156
A.7	Fluid parameters for steam flood	156
A.8	Reservoir properties for cyclic steam stimulation	156

A.9 Fluid properties in three reaction ISC model.	157
A.10 Rock properties in ISC simulation.	157
A.11 Kinetics parameters for three reaction ISC model.	157
A.12 Reaction stoichiometry for three reaction ISC model.	157

PREVIEW

List of Figures

2.1	Streamline simulation framework, with the four major steps in a global time step.	7
2.2	Different zones in the field in-situ combustion process, courtesy of US Department of Energy, Bartlesville, Oklahoma.	13
2.3	Different zones in 1D in-situ combustion process.	13
4.1	The permeability field in quarter five-spot hot water flood test case. .	34
4.2	The water saturation results in quarter five-spot hot water flood test case.	34
4.3	The temperature results in quarter five-spot hot water flood test case.	35
4.4	The pressure results in quarter five-spot hot water flood test case. . .	35
4.5	The comparison between 1D fully implicit (FIM) transport solver and 1D single point upwind explicit (SPU) transport solver for thermal SL simulation (50X50).	36
4.6	The surface cumulative production results for M=10 quarter five-spot hot water flood test case.	38
4.7	The surface cumulative production results for M=100 quarter five-spot hot water flood test case.	38
4.8	The surface cumulative production results for M=1000 quarter five-spot hot water flood test case.	39
4.9	The saturation results in compressible quarter five-spot hot water flood test case.	40
4.10	The temperature results in compressible quarter five-spot hot water flood test case.	40

4.11	The surface cumulative production comparison results in compressible quarter five-spot hot water flood test case.	41
4.12	Saturation results in gravity test case 1 (quarter five-spot hot water flood with dipping).	42
4.13	Saturation results in gravity test case 2 (quarter five-spot hot water flood with dipping).	42
5.1	Steam condensation causes volume change and flux reduction right at the steam front.	49
5.2	Streamline segments constructed from the injector to the producer. .	50
5.3	1D streamline pressure and volumetric flux update approach. Transmissibility and block volume of each segment is calculated for the 1D transport.	50
5.4	Streamline (s, n, m) coordinates and cross sectional area along the streamline.	51
5.5	1D pressure update improvements in capturing transient pressure change within a global time step, (M=1000 quarter five spot hot water flood test case). With two BHP controlled wells, classical SL underestimates the breakthrough. Both SL predict-correct [71] and SL with pressure update improves the hot water breakthrough results, compared to fine-scale reference.	54
5.6	Pressure transient behavior inside a global time step (M=1000 quarter five spot hot water flood test case). The pressure stitched together from all the 1D pressure solves (B) is similar to the pressure we get at the beginning of the next global time step (C).	54
5.7	Schematic of coupled energy-mass transport. Changing the total energy of a grid block changes the fluid volume inside, thus causing fluid transport to adjacent cells.	55
5.8	Glowinski θ -scheme operator splitting. Most of the transport is solved along 1D streamlines $[0 \sim (1 - \theta)\Delta t]$. Small amount of advective flux is used to correct the volume changes in heat conduction/gravity step.	56

5.9	An equivalent representation of Glowinski θ -scheme operator splitting. Most of the transport is solved along 1D streamlines. Small amount of advective flux is used to correct the volume changes in heat conduction/gravity step.	57
5.10	Quarter five spot steam flood permeability field and initial streamline shape.	58
5.11	Viscosity curve for water and oil.	59
5.12	Quarter five spot temperature and gas saturation at 3000 days (pre breakthrough).	60
5.13	Quarter five spot water and oil saturation at 3000 days (pre breakthrough).	60
5.14	Sensitivity study on the choice of θ . The simulation results are close to each other by using different θ	62
5.15	Hybrid procedures in cyclic steam stimulation ($SL \rightarrow FV \rightarrow SL$) and the initial streamline shape.	63
5.16	Cyclic steam stimulation temperature result.	64
5.17	Cyclic steam stimulation oil saturation result.	65
5.18	Cyclic steam stimulation production profile (SL and FV).	65
5.19	2D multiple well test case permeability field.	66
5.20	2D multiple well test case initial streamline shape.	66
5.21	Multiple well test case temperature and oil saturation at 1500 days (pre breakthrough).	67
5.22	Multiple well test case field production history (pre breakthrough). .	68
5.23	Multiple well test case temperature and oil saturation at 2100 days (post breakthrough).	68
5.24	Multiple well test case field production history (post breakthrough). .	69
5.25	2D vertical cross section steam flood test case 1 (homogeneous permeability field).	70
5.26	2D vertical cross section steam flood case 2 (heterogeneous permeability field).	71
5.27	Flux pattern map, by Thiele and Batycky [106].	74

6.1	Gas composition from ramped temperature oxidation experiments. . .	77
6.2	Relative permeability (water-oil and liquid-gas, respectively) and oil viscosity curve used in the simulation of Hamaca oil 1D combustion tube experiment.	80
6.3	Temperature, oil saturation and pressure profiles in 1D combustion tube simulation after 498 min of air injection.	81
6.4	Typical temperature profile history from a 1D combustion tube experiment, from Lapene et al., [66]	81
6.5	Water, oil and gas production rates in 1D combustion tube simulation.	83
6.6	Produced gas composition analysis in 1D combustion tube simulation.	84
6.7	Oil bank and combustion front distance-time diagram from 1D combustion tube simulation.	84
6.8	1D ISC simulation: peak temperature and combustion front velocity as a function of the injection air flux.	85
6.9	1D ISC simulation: oil saturation profile as a function of the initial oil saturation S_{oi}	86
6.10	Temperature profiles as a function of the initial water saturation S_{wi} of 0.10, 0.24 and 0.50 from left to right.	88
6.11	Combustion tube simulation of a mobile heavy oil with high initial oil saturation S_{oi} at 378min.	89
6.12	Characteristics of different fronts in 1D ISC problem: scenario 1 (bitumen like oil viscosity and oil bank stays inside the steam plateau). .	90
6.13	Characteristics of different fronts in 1D ISC problem: scenario 2 (mobile heavy oil viscosity and leading edge of steam plateau follows behind the oil bank).	90
6.14	Basic assumption for thermal reservoir simulation: instantaneous mixing in each cell.	91
6.15	Grid-size effects in 1D combustion tube simulation. We require at least 200 grid blocks to achieve convergent solution in this 0.8m long combustion tube simulation.	92

7.1	The critical physics for 1D ISC. When the reaction front sweeps through the reservoir, a certain amount of oil becomes fuel and burns (usually $x = 5 \sim 10\% S_o$). The rest of the mobile oil is displaced further downstream.	95
7.2	ISC upscaling work flow.	98
7.3	1D ISC upscaling tests: kinetic and upscaled model using different grid resolutions. The coarse scale upscaled model matches the fine-scale kinetics based reference, while the coarse scale kinetic model fails. . .	103
7.4	1D ISC upscaled model with different equivalent fuel amount S_{ofuel} . The front location has a direct relationship with the fuel amount S_{ofuel} . . .	103
7.5	ISC upscaling in horizontal 2D 1/4 five spot case: O_2 fraction in gas phase with different grid resolution and both kinetic and upscaled model. . .	105
7.6	ISC upscaling in horizontal 2D multi well case: coarse grid upscaled model and fine grid kinetic model.	105
7.7	ISC upscaling in horizontal 2D heterogeneous case: coarse grid upscaled model and fine grid kinetic model.	106
7.8	ISC upscaling in 2D vertical case: coarse grid upscaled model and fine-grid kinetic model.	107
7.9	3D field-scale case using the upscaled reaction model. Consistency is achieved between different grid resolutions.	109
7.10	Permeability and oil saturation results for 2D case with uncorrelated white noise permeability field. The combustion front propagates stably. . .	112
7.11	2D case with correlated heterogeneity (low perm in the middle). We observe some oxygen bypass and change in equivalent fuel amount. . .	113
7.12	2D case with correlated low permeability squares. We calculate oxygen efficiency $E_u = 0.90$ and fuel amount $S_{ofuel} = 9.7\%$	114
7.13	2D case with horizontal layered permeability. We observe oxygen bypass and change in equivalent fuel amount.	115
7.14	2D case with heterogeneity (layer 1 of SPE 10 [23]). The oxygen efficiency is $E_u = 0.91$ and fuel amount $S_{ofuel} = 8.6\%$	116

7.15	2D case with channelized heterogeneity (layer 51 of SPE 10 [23]). The oxygen efficiency is $E_u = 0.85$ and fuel amount $S_{ofuel} = 13\%$	117
7.16	Different scales in measurements, geomodeling and reservoir simulation, lecture notes of ERE 241 Seismic Reservoir Characterization. . .	120
8.1	Different fronts and flow regimes in 1D ISC process.	123
8.2	Perturbation length λ at leading edge of steam plateau, from [50]. . .	125
8.3	Trigger instability by changing the initial oil saturation at the boundary.	127
8.4	Test of numerical errors with triggered instability. The effect of grid size and 5-point versus 9-point scheme is illustrated.	129
8.5	Test of temporal numerical errors with automatic time-step selection and restricted time step sizes.	130
8.6	Sensitivity to thermal conductivity. Heat conduction stabilizes the displacement front in small lab-scale tests. Reduced thermal conductivity cases show greater instability.	132
8.7	Nusselt number characterizes the heat conduction stabilizing effect, compared to Fig. 8.6.	133
8.8	Pore blocking with the Kozeny-Carman correlation. Very small changes are observed compared to base case.	134
8.9	Pore blocking with an exaggerated permeability reduction. The combustion front slows down only when implementing pore blocking of more than one order of magnitude reduction in permeability.	135
8.10	Unstable displacement in 2D larger scale ISC process. Heat conduction is incapable of dissipating the energy of large wavelength perturbations.	137
9.1	Total phase velocity vectors in 2D SAGD process. Convection cell/loop current occur when tracing streamlines.	141
9.2	Grid size effects in 2D SAGD simulation (early time 360 days). The simulation achieves convergent solution when using grid size $0.5m \times 0.5m$ in this case.	145

9.3	Grid size effects in 2D SAGD simulation (late time 1100 days). The simulation achieves convergent solution when using grid size $0.5m \times 0.5m$ in this case.	146
9.4	Concept of ISC assisted gas oil gravity drainage in fractured media. Vent well is added to achieve hydrostatic gravity drainage condition in the reservoir.	148
9.5	Gravity stable ISC process for a single block of fractured media. Because of the gas diffusion, we are able to combust into the matrix. Most of the flue gas is produced from upper right corner.	149

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Heavy Oil and Thermal Enhanced Recovery

A large part of the world oil resource exists in the form of heavy oil, which is usually defined as oil with API gravity less than 22 and viscosity typically larger than 100cp. Estimated original oil in place of more than 1.8 trillion barrels is present in Venezuela, 1.7 trillion barrels in Alberta, Canada, and 20- 25 billion barrels on the North Slope of Alaska. The development of such resources by traditional methods (primary depletion, waterflood) is often inefficient due to the high viscosity of the heavy oil. At such high viscosities, the oil flows extremely slowly or not at all. For example, the bitumen resources in Athabasca oil sands typically have an extremely large viscosity of about $10^6 cp$.

Thermal recovery processes rely on viscosity reduction of the oil through heat that is injected (steam or hot water injection) or generated in-situ (in-situ combustion), and are well suited for efficiently unlocking these heavy oil resources. Accordingly to current U.S. Department of Energy data, thermal enhanced recovery techniques account for about 50% of the domestic Enhanced Oil Recovery (EOR) production. Steam flooding, cyclic steam stimulation and hot water flooding are widely used, but other processes, such as in-situ combustion (ISC) and increasingly steam-assisted gravity drainage (SAGD) are applied and are attractive to recover heavy oil resources.

1.2 Motivations and Objectives

Planning and management of thermal EOR processes generally make extensive use of reservoir simulation. Nearly all the commercial and academic thermal simulators are traditional finite volume (FV) based codes that use either a fully implicit (FIM) time stepping method or an adaptive implicit (AIM) method [6, 37, 101]. The computational costs for simulating thermal processes are usually high because of the complexity of the problem and strong nonlinearity encountered. As a result, it is time consuming to run optimization and/or sensitivity studies on grids with desirable numerical resolution. For problems such as ISC and SAGD, the simulations show extremely large computational costs with very strict requirements on the sizes of grid blocks, due to the need to capture/resolve accurately the narrow thermal fronts existing in these processes. Field-scale ISC simulation is still impractical, due to large computational costs associated with accurately resolving the inch-sized reactive combustion fronts. There is, therefore, an urgent need to develop fast and efficient numerical simulation methodologies for thermal EOR problems. Predictive mathematical models and efficient simulators are needed to improve our understanding of these thermal EOR processes and enable cost-effective design of these projects.

In this work, we focus on three major problems: the extension of streamline simulation (SL) to thermal problems (hot water flood and steam flood), the efficient simulation of field-scale ISC process through reaction upscaling, and the analysis of thermal front stability in ISC. The detailed objectives are as follows:

1. For the thermal streamline simulation, we are seeking a fast and effective reservoir simulator that gives sufficient accuracy for use in reservoir simulation studies, such as ranking, optimization and history matching. This is a first time that streamline simulation is extended to complex thermal problems such as steam flood. Problems such as fluid compressibility, strong coupling and gravity effects need to be addressed.
2. For the ISC simulation, our main objective is to find an efficient simulation technique to upscale the reaction kinetics for full field-scale ISC simulation. To