

#### Sampling a Stimulated Rock Volume: An Eagle Ford Example

Kevin T. Raterman, Principal Engineer ConocoPhillips

#### **<u>Stimulated Rock Volume...</u>** Where to begin?



# **Our Questions**

#### • What is <u>Stimulated versus</u> <u>Drained</u> <u>Rock</u> <u>Volume</u>?

- Are SRV and DRV identical?
  - What data are sufficient to describe either?

#### – What is the spatial extent and variability of SRV/DRV?

- Well spacing and stacking
- Cluster spacing

#### Are outcomes repeatable?

#### Can predictions be improved?

• Fracture and proppant propagation modeling

# **Pilot Design**

- Spatial sampling ... define what is there
  - 2 Pre-completion sample wells
  - 4 Post-completion sample wells
- Remote completion monitoring ... extend beyond the known
  - Distributed Acoustic/Temperature Sensing (DAS/DTS)
  - Dual well microseismic
- Production monitoring ... establish link to performance
  - Production logs
  - Tracers (oil, water, and proppant)
  - Pressure monitoring within the SRV

## **Location and Geologic Setting**





### **Pilot Layout / Data Acquisition**



Well	Producer	Cuttings - proppant	Core	Image Logs	RA Tracer	RA Tracer Log	DTS/DAS	Geophones	Pressure Gauges
P1	Х								
P2	Х				Х	х			
P3	Х				Х	Х	Х		Х
P4	Х					х			
P5	Х								
S1				Х		Х	х	Х	х
S2			Х	Х				Х	
S3		Х	Х	Х		х			
S3 ST01		х		x		x			
S3 ST02		х		х		x			
S3 ST 03		x	х	х		x			х

# **Completion Design**

Design Type	Limited entry			
Clusters /Stage	5			
Cluster Spacing	47 ft.			
Pre flush	Acid/linear gel			
Slurry Carrier Fluid	30# borate gel			
Flush	Linear gel/slickwater			
Fluid Volume	21 bbl./ft.			
Proppant Load	1500 lb./ft.			
Proppant type	White sand			
Proppant Size	40/70, 30/50			

# **Hydraulic Fracture Characteristics**

- Frequency
- Spatial distribution
- Length and height
- Simple or complex
- Vertical or dipping
- Orientation vs principal stresses

### **Base State : Natural Fractures**

- Pilot located in seismically quiet area
  - No mappable faults
  - Few subseismic features (FEV)
- S1 image log 1 fracture in 216 ft. of section
- S2 baseline core 5 fractures in 200 ft.
- S2 image log 7 fractures in 1,120 ft.
- Natural and hydraulic fractures are ~ parallel

## **Hydraulic Fracture Facts**

- Abundant
- Not mineralized
- Extensional
- Planar and dipping
- Strike perpendicular to S<sub>Hmin</sub>
- Smooth, ridged, and stepped surfaces
- No matrix damage



# **Hydraulic Fracture Complexity**

- Branching evident in core and FMI
- Complex 3D fracture pattern
  - More prevalent upwards vs outwards





Upward

## **Hydraulic Fracture Swarms**

- Swarms of closely spaced hydraulic fractures
- Less intensely fractured between swarms
- 15 25 fractures per swarm
- Weak correlation between swarm frequency and cluster spacing



# **Hydraulic Fracture Spacing**



- Fracture count exceeds cluster count
- 20 60% of wellbore has fractures at < 5ft. spacing (swarm)
- Larger gaps with distance from producer

# **Hydraulic Fracture Density**



- Fracture density and count greatest near producer
- Fracture density declines upward and outward

# **Dip and Orientation**

- Perpendicular to S<sub>Hmin</sub>
- Strike: N 60° E
- Dip: 75-80°SE
- Predominantly parallel fractures at all locations
- More dip variation above the producer



## **Hydraulic Fracture Composite**



#### **Proppant Abundance**

- 3 proppant filled fractures in 480 ft. of core (7 perf clusters)
- Little evidence for abundant proppant transport at distances greater than 75 ft.





#### **Hydraulic Fracture Character**

- Hydraulic Fractures are complex not simple
  - multiple, discrete and parallel
  - dip, but align with in-situ stress
  - spatially distributed unevenly
  - often occur in swarms

- Proppant is rarely sampled, especially far from producer
  - RA tracers indicate limited wellto-well proppant transport
- No matrix permeability enhancement
  - core perm measurements

## **Remote Monitoring**

- What do microseismic & DAS tell us about the SRV?
  - What is the relationship between DAS & MS events and hydraulic fractures?
  - How should microseismic / DAS data be used?
    - SRV dimensions?
    - Indicator of permeability enhancement?
    - Related to drainage?

## **Microseismic**

- Co-located events
- 90% of events within Eagle Ford
- Linear to dispersed stage event patterns
- Few events in toe of P3
- Events reach adjacent wells (>1000 ft.)



## **HF Density to MS Density Correlation**

• Poor correlation between MS events and all Hydraulic Fractures



# **Cross-Well DAS (vertical well S1)**

- DAS, MS and pressure response concurrent
- Pressure exceeds S<sub>Hmin</sub> indicating fracture event



DAS measures a strain rate change Red = extension Blue = compression

# **Cross-Well DAS (horizontal well P3)**



# **DAS Completion Monitoring**

- DAS response recorded from all monitored stages at P3
- Multiple hydraulic fractures per stage extend >1,500 ft.
- Pre-existing hydraulic fractures at P3 prior to stimulation



## **A Few Key Points**

- Hydraulic stimulation creates fracture complexity
  - Simple concepts of one fracture per cluster are unrealistic
  - Fracture area likely exceeds that predicted by models
- Multiple fractures per stage extend long distances
- Sparse evidence for abundant proppant transport beyond 75 ft.
- Microseismic events do not adequately represent hydraulic fracture abundance and density

#### **Acknowledgements**

- ConocoPhillips
- Extended technical team, contractors and vendors who met the unique operational and analysis challenges