Well Test Interpretation

- The work presented by Drs. Blunt and Gringarten ignores generally accepted well test interpretation practices and techniques. Moreover, Dr. Blunt ignored actual events that took place at Macondo and therefore his analysis is unreliable.

- It is a fundamental tenet of well test analysis that one must account for the specific rate schedule that occurred just prior to the test. Here, Dr. Blunt has completely ignored the rate variation that occurred just prior to shut-in as the choke valve closed, and Dr. Gringarten has not given adequate explanation as to how he handled this rate variation.

- We also show that the amount of hydrocarbons in-place present in the reservoir based on one’s own analysis as well as Drs. Blunt, Gringarten, and BP’s internal experts are consistent with one another, ranging from 295 million to 264 million barrels. These numerical results can be expected to standard conditions using initial Bc. For example, using a Bc of 2.44 and in-place volume estimate of 295 million barrels we derive an amount at in-place of approximately 121 MMSTB.
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