
From: Daniel_G_Rey@nalcoexxon.com
Sent: Wednesday, June 09, 1999 6:53 AM
To: "David Horsup at SUG_HUB.CCNEEC"@nalcoexxon.com; "Daniel G Rey at SUG_HUB.CCNEEC"@nalcoexxon.com; Crawford, Gary R
Cc: PBU, CIC Prod Chem Todd/Spano; Brown, Richard A (NEEC)
Subject: Re[2]: Urgent - Please Review and Comment

Additional Header Information:

Received: from amgw3.bp.com ([208.221.178.129]) by mail.nalcoexxon.com (Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.1 (569.2 2-6-1998)) with SMTP id 86256789.007B350E; Mon, 7 Jun 1999 17:25:45 -0500
Received: by amgw3.bp.com; id SAA19350; Mon, 7 Jun 1999 18:22:21 -0400

Received: from amclvx8.clv.am.bp.com(161.99.146.100) by amgw3 via smap (V2.1)

id xma019311; Mon, 7 Jun 99 18:21:55 -0400

Received: by AMCLVX8 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)

id <M36MQY5G>; Mon, 7 Jun 1999 18:21:55 -0400

Message-ID: <05481C2F274CD011882A0000F8024BCD02E70A91@AMANCX2>

From: "Crawford, Gary R" <CrawfoGR@BP.com>

To: "'David_Horsup@nalcoexxon.com'" <David_Horsup@nalcoexxon.com>,
"D. Rey" <Daniel_G_Rey@nalcoexxon.com>

Cc: "PBU, CIC Prod Chem Todd/Spano" <PBUCICProdChem@BP.com>,
"Brown, Richard A (NEEC)" <BrownR1@BP.com>

Subject: RE: Urgent - Please Review and Comment

Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 18:20:41 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="-----_=_NextPart_000_01BEB134.25EDA1BE"

David and Danny,

We will be pursuing field conversion of 99VD049 on an accelerated schedule to help meet the budget pressure for this year (Discontinuing EC1081A is the other key part to meeting the budget). We feel that this is less risky than an across-the-board cut of 10% which we are most confident would allow significant measurable corrosion damage to occur. The good news is that we have enough 98VD019 and 99VD054 in Alaska or on its way, that conversion cannot logistically happen before September 1 which is just in time to meet the budget! Also, very importantly, this gives us time to gather more B, X, and R LDF data as well as complete the well line test at A-13.

Attached, are some slides summarizing our intentions at this time.

The

timeline is critical and we have been instructed to work back from September 1 to nail down the dates for ordering and shipping 99VD049. Please review these slides and provide input regarding the drop-dead order and ship dates.

We will not be ordering any more 98VD019 or 99VD054 unless something goes wrong with the 99VD049.

Preliminary ER probe data from X pad indicates no change in performance.

However, R pad data may show a shift toward slightly higher corrosivity (2.8 to 4.3 mpy) but we feel it is still too early to judge that small of change.

Also, significant production changes from R pad have been occurring, creating more complexity. The EOA still has no corrosion data from their well line test sites.

Are there any other concerns that need to be addressed before we finalize the plan for Richard?

John/Andy - I assume we still have EB at the WPM's and GC's to inject if OIW/BS&W become a problem?

Thanks,

Gary

<<99VD049ExpPlan.ppt>>

> -----
> From:
> David_Horsup@nalcoexxon.com[SMTP:David_Horsup@nalcoexxon.com]
> Sent: Monday, June 07, 1999 9:48 AM
> To: Paisley, Dominic M.; Crawford, Gary R; Woollam, Richard C.
> Cc: "Richard A Brown at SUG_HUB.CCNEEC"@nalcoexxon.com; PBU, CIC
NS TL
> Felix/Phillips; Felix, Rick D; PBU, CIC Prod Chem Todd/Spano;
"Daniel G
> Rey at SUG_HUB.CCNEEC"@nalcoexxon.com
> Subject: Re: Urgent - Please Review and Comment
>
>
> Richard,
>
> The team discussed this, this morning and the general consensus
was
> that migration over to the 049 chemistry would offer the
minimum risk
> scenario. Obviously there are risks associated with it but
these
> would be less than a total field-wide reduction in dosage of
10%.
> Since this product contains a new demulsifier at a lower
dosage, it
> might be wise to have some of this on hand in case of an upset
at the
> Gathering Centres. In terms of logistics I do not foresee any
> problems at this end. Danny will be able to give you a clearer
> indication of timings for subsequent rail car quantities. How
soon
> would you look to implement this?
>
> Best wishes,
> David
>
>
> _____ Reply Separator
>
> Subject: Urgent - Please Review and Comment
> Author: "Woollam, Richard C." <WoollaRC@BP.com> at NEEC
> Date: 06/06/99 21:29
>
>
> Additional Header Information:
> Received: from amgw3.bp.com ([208.221.178.129]) by
mail.nalcoexxon.com
> (Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.1 (569.2 2-6-1998)) with SMTP id
> 86256788.00766E10; Sun, 6 Jun 1999 16:33:34 -0500

>
> From a risk perspective, if we need to reduce cost by 10% then with
> the current corrosion inhibitor technology we would simply be taking
> 10% out of the system with the resultant increase in corrosion rate.
> If we move to 049, we will get the 10% reduction in corrosion
> inhibitor costs and we
may
> not
> get the increase in corrosion rate.
>
> I fully accept that this is a risky call and we will have to review
> the risks associated with it.
>
> In order to maximize the benefit from such a move we will have to
make
> some
> decisions very quickly. John, Rick and I are meeting Monday to
discuss
> this
> and a number of other budget options. Could you please have your
> thoughts together, cost implications, timing, logistics etc., by noon
> Monday, June 7th, so we can make a decision in the afternoon.
>
> The above, and the cessation of the PW injection (with the exception
> of S
> pad) should put us on track for the budget through the remainder of
> the year.
>
> If you have any questions, concerns then please let me know (break
> into the TL's meeting as required).
>
> Thanks and sorry for the short notice - it only occurred to me
> yesterday that this was an option!
>
> Richard.
>
> <<Chemical Budget Buster.xls>>
>
> PS Danny/David - Can you please start working some of the issues
first
> thing
> in Houston - the logistics are going to be a big part of this one! I
> would also like some thoughts from Sugarland on the potential risks -
likely
> performance of 049 in essence!
>
>

Gary:

Thanks for the heads up. You indicate in the PPT slides that you will order RC quantities of 99VD049 on July 7 for a July 15 ship date. What is the anticipated quantity? Are staggered ship dates ok?

We need to make sure we're ready on this end with production scheduling, raw materials, etc.

Thanks, Danny