

Barristers & Solicitors
Patent & Trade-mark Agents

McCarthy Tétrault

McCarthy Tétrault LLP
Suite 3300, 421-7th Avenue S.W.
Calgary AB T2P 4K9
Canada
Telephone: 403 260-3500
Facsimile: 403 260-3501
mccarthy.ca

D. G. Davies
Direct Line: 403 260-3681
Direct Fax: 403-260-3501
E-Mail: ddavies@mccarthy.ca

Assistant: Penny Goebel
Direct Line: 403-260-3662
E-Mail: pgoebel@mccarthy.ca

April 23, 2007

Alberta Energy and Utilities Board
640 - 5 Avenue S.W.
Calgary Alberta
T2P 3G4

Attention: Mr. Gary D. Perkins

Dear Sir:

Re: EnCana Oil And Gas Partnership (EnCana) Application No. 1394112
Canadian Natural Resources Limited (CNRL) Application No. 1409180
Husky Oil Operations Limited (Husky) Application No. 1481725
Cold Lake Oil Sands Area – Clearwater Deposit

Attached please find the responses of EnCana to the information requests of Husky dated April 17, 2007.

Yours very truly,

McCarthy Tétrault LLP

Original signed by

D. G. DAVIES

cc: Alberta Energy and Utilities Board
Attention: Mr. Ernie Smith

Canadian Natural Resources Limited
Attention: Mr. Jared Paddock

Thackray Burgess
Attention: Mr. Patrick J. McGovern

Husky Oil Operations Ltd.
Attention: Ms. Susan Anderson

Borden Ladner Gervais LLP
Attention: Mr. Randall W. Block

Imperial Oil Resources
Attention: Ms. Cheryl Trudell

EnCana Oil and Gas Partnership (EnCana) Application No. 1394112
Canadian Natural Resources Limited (CNRL) Application No. 1409180
Husky Oil Operations (Husky) Application No. 1481725
Cold Lake Oil Sands Area - Clearwater Deposit
Board's Letter of March 28, 2007

**Response of EnCana Oil and Gas Partnership (EnCana) to the Information Request
of Husky Regarding Simulations in Folder "Runs with HighPressureHWCSS
with GasFlankingBitumen" dated April 17, 2007**

1. Geology:
 - (a) Please provide a precise description of each location in the Clearwater, within the Husky or CNRL leases, where the reservoir geology, properties and geometry is as shown in these models?
 - (b) If EnCana cannot provide the location sought in response to Husky Information request 1a., provide a detailed explanation.
 - (c) If EnCana can provide the confirmation sought in response to Husky Information Request 1a., provide:
 - (i) Copies of all geological data examined and analysis undertaken by or for EnCana that justifies the referenced assumption in respect of reservoir properties and geometry,
 - (ii) A full description of and substantiate all assumptions relied upon in the analysis, and
 - (iii) All core analysis and well logs examined in performing the analysis.

Response: (a), (b) & (c)

Please see EnCana's Response to Board Staff IR-a) and IR-b) (CAL_DOCS-1575127-v1-EnCana Response to Board Questions on Gas Flanking Bitumen Cases from EnCana's April 5 2007 Submission).

2. Permeability Multipliers:
 - (a) Confirm that the permeability multipliers in the I, J, and K directions in gridblocks 29:66, 1:15, and 12:12 are 10 times higher than elsewhere.

- (b) If EnCana cannot provide the confirmation sought in response to Husky Information Request 2a., provide a detailed explanation.
- (c) If EnCana can provide the confirmation sought in response to Husky Information Request 2a., provide:
 - (i) Copies of all geological data examined and analysis undertaken by or for EnCana that justifies the referenced assumption in respect of permeability multipliers,
 - (ii) A full description of and substantiate all assumptions relied upon in the analysis, and
 - (iii) All core analysis and well logs examined in performing the analysis.

Response: (a), (b) & (c)

Please see EnCana's Response to Husky's IR1a., 1b., 1c., 1d., 1e., 1f., 1j., 1k., 1l., 1m., 1n., 1o., 1p., 1q., and 1r. (CAL_DOCS-1574571-v1-EnCana Response to Husky Information Request April 13 2007).

3. Methane Liquid Viscosity

- (a) Please confirm that the methane liquid-equivalent viscosity value at 10 degrees C is 4391 cP.
- (b) If EnCana cannot provide the confirmation sought in response to Husky Information Request 3a., provide a detailed explanation.
- (c) If EnCana can provide the confirmation sought in response to Husky Information Request 3a., provide:
 - (i) Copies of the source of the data examined and analysis undertaken by or for EnCana that justifies the referenced assumption in respect of methane liquid-equivalent viscosity,
 - (ii) A full description of and substantiate all assumptions relied upon in the analysis, and
 - (iii) Justify the use of this high methane liquid-equivalent viscosity and provide a detailed explanation of the impact of its use on increasing or decreasing the live oil viscosity.

Response: (a), (b) & (c)

The source of the fluid characterization that was applied the EnCana's generic models have been previously discussed¹. Please note that the liquid viscosity is for the gas component not methane. We do not believe that changes in the gas component viscosity (liquid phase) will change the overall conclusions of the results of Husky's, EnCana's or CNRL's model runs. This is because the same fluid characterization is applied in both the depletion and no depletion models.

EnCana has rerun Husky's depletion and no depletion model submission of April 5, 2007 replacing the fluid property (PVT) values in the Husky's model with those in the EnCana's generic models including the gas component viscosity (liquid phase) of 4391 cp at 10 degree C. Results of the rerun of Husky's April 5, 2007 model with the high gas component viscosity (liquid phase) show no adverse impact of gas cap depletion on HWCSS. Oil recovery factors of 23.1 and 24.1 % OBIP were achieved for the depletion and no depletion cases respectively. SOR for both cases were the similar at $4.2 \text{ m}^3/\text{m}^3$. The recovery factors are expected be similar for the depletion and no depletion runs of the HSAGD.

EnCana will be pleased to submit the input and output files for the rerun of the Husky's April 5 submission with EnCana's generic model PVT should the Board Staff request them.

4. Relative Permeabilities

- (a) Confirm that for the bitumen zone (rock type 4), the imbibition relative permeability curve for water has an irreducible water saturation of 0.30, in contrast to Husky's value of 0.15, which was based on core data provided to all parties, and in contrast to EnCana's other April 5, 2007 submissions with an irreducible water saturation of 0.45.
- (b) If EnCana cannot provide the confirmation sought in response to Husky Information Request 5a., provide a detailed explanation.
- (c) If EnCana can provide the confirmation sought in response to Husky Information Request 5a., provide:
 - (i) copies of all data examined and analysis undertaken by or for EnCana that supports the referenced assumption in respect of relative permeability curves,
 - (ii) A full description of and substantiate all assumptions relied upon in the analysis, and

¹ Responses of EnCana Oil and Gas Partnership (EnCana) to Board Staff Information Requests (September 19, 2006) -October 3, 2006.

- (iii) Confirm that EnCana's relative permeability curves were based upon core tests, and if so provide the core tests relied upon.
- (iv) Explain and justify EnCana's determination to use a different value for the irreducible water saturation from that used in EnCana's other April 5, 2007 submissions.

Response: (a), (b) & (c)

Please see EnCana's Response to Husky's IR 1s., 1t., 1u. (CAL_DOCS-1574571-v1-EnCana Response to Husky Information Request April 13 2007).

5. Maximum Steam Injection Rate

- (a) Confirm that EnCana limits maximum steam injection rate to 400 m³/day CWE.
- (b) If EnCana cannot provide the confirmation sought in response to Husky Information Request 6a., provide a detailed explanation.
- (c) If EnCana can provide the confirmation sought in response to Husky Information Request 6a., provide:
 - (i) an example where this low maximum rate is used in HWCSS in any Cold Lake area reservoir,
 - (ii) a precise description of when and where dilation was achieved at these low rates in your runs provided in folders "Depletion" and "No Depletion".

Response: (a), (b) & (c)

Please see EnCana's Response to Board Staff IR-a) (CAL_DOCS-1575127-v1-EnCana Response to Board Questions on Gas Flanking Bitumen Cases from EnCana's April 5 2007 Submission).