

EnCana's Information Requests for Husky January 12, 2007

A) With respect to the Husky's Model Study Report dated January 8, 2007 please:

1. Provide the full results and reports of the Hycal Laboratory work referred to on pages 3 and 11-12. Please also provide any other laboratory data or tests for the Clearwater zone, whether used in the model or not, that Husky has not previously submitted.
2. Provide the source and details of the geostatistical model referred to on page 5. If any data was incorporated from wells other than the four wells mentioned in the report please identify the wells and provide any data not previously submitted. Please provide the petrophysical evaluations and facies descriptions referred to on page 5 and any depositional environment work that was used as model input. Please indicate how many geostatistical realizations were developed and briefly discuss the criteria that were used in selecting the one that was used in the model.
3. Provide core analysis data (if possible similar to that submitted for confidential wells in Excel spreadsheet format) for AA/8-7-69-4W4, AA/13-8-69-4W4, and other non-confidential Husky wells in the area with overburden plug data. It appears that the porosities for overburden plugs on Husky's wells are not available on the public record.
4. Confirm that, although a structural cross section is shown in Figure 2 on page 6, the 2D and 3 D models do not incorporate any structural data and employ a flat top and a tilted gas bitumen contact. If this is correct, why did Husky not incorporate its Top Clearwater Sand Structure Map (Figure IR6b-1) of the area or its Top Water Isopach (IR 06.11.10 2-2)?
5. Provide all laboratory data referred to in discussing the shale layer on page 7. Please indicate whether Husky believes the permeability of 50 md and porosity of 10% assigned to the shale layer apply only to Husky's one section generic model or if they are appropriate values for the shale layers Husky has mapped in its Clearwater West Shale Isopach (IR 06.11.10 2-3 Nov 16 2006) and its Clearwater Shale Isopach (Figure IR3-1 October 24, 2006)
6. Expand on the comment on page 6 that "several adjusted volume grid blocks were placed in the top gas zone". EnCana's preliminary review of the model input and output data indicates that the initial gas cap volume in the model was $2.4 \times 10^6 \text{m}^3$ and the adjusted volume was $660.3 \times 10^6 \text{m}^3$. Does this not effectively create an unconfined gas cap considering the relatively small bitumen volume in the model?
7. Explain why Husky forced the model gas cap to deplete to 200 kPaa (page 8) before the start of SAGD or CSS production, as this appears to result in pressures throughout the model that are far below the current piezometer pressures. Please indicate the approximate time that would be required in the real world to achieve this level of

pressure depletion throughout Husky's area of commercial bitumen reserves using Husky's estimated production declines in the Fisher Clearwater B and D pools. Please explain why Husky chose to contrast what appears to be an unrealistically low reservoir pressure case with a case assuming no depletion. Is Husky planning on repressuring EnCana's gas pools before it commences its pilot?

8. Provide details on the comments on page 8 that "the depletion rates lead to pressure production over periods of time reasonably consistent with measured piezometer data" and on page 18 in item 3a "The pressure depletion observed in the field can also be duplicated in the simulation model". Please include the point in time at which pressure matches were observed, the piezometer pressures used, and how the model gas cap pressures at the time of the match relate to current estimated pressures in the Fisher Clearwater B pool. Why, after going to all the expense and effort to gather piezometer data, did Husky choose to model an area that includes only one piezometer well?
9. Explain in more detail why the "The observed negative effect of gas cap depletion is expected to be more pronounced with larger well spacing" (page 8 item 3 e) and clarify what "observed negative effect" Husky is referring to.
10. Indicate the source of the critical gas saturation of 0.1% used in the models.
11. Quantify the effect on bitumen recovery in the model of each of the negative factors referred to in Husky's conclusions on page 3 and 4. Since Husky's HSAGD 2-D model runs show a higher cumulative oil production and presumably higher recovery level for its depleted reservoir case than for its not depleted case what specific negative impacts does the model (as opposed to technical papers dealing with other reservoirs and areas) indicate due to viscosity reduction, reduction of solution gas, mobile water migration to the gas cap, steam chamber communication with the gas cap, heat losses to the cap rock and the "other possible mechanisms".
12. Provide the input and output data for all economic evaluations, performed before January 8, 2007, that support Husky's eight references in the report to "downgraded" "adversely affected" or "poorer" economics.
13. Husky indicated on October 4, 2006 in response to EnCana IR 1 that "Husky is currently conducting simulation studies with the intent of submitting a formal pilot application to the Board by the end of 2006. Since Husky has been working on these studies for over three months it would appear that they have had time to model more cases than the simple one section generic model they have presented. If additional models or areas have been evaluated please briefly describe these models and the results.

B) With respect to previous information submitted by Husky please provide:

1. The full lab reports for the clay analysis and XRD data summarized in Table 1 to Husky's Nov. 28 2006 IR responses.
2. The lab analysis reports for the oil analyses summarized in the Nov. 28 2006 IR response to EnCana's IR 5.