

Development and Testing of Novel Additives for Improved Wellbore Stability and Reduced Losses

Mark W. Sanders, Steven Young and James Friedheim, M-I SWACO

Copyright 2008, AADE

This paper was prepared for presentation at the 2008 AADE Fluids Conference and Exhibition held at the Wyndam Greenspoint Hotel, Houston, Texas, April 8-9, 2008. This conference was sponsored by the Houston Chapter of the American Association of Drilling Engineers. The information presented in this paper does not reflect any position, claim or endorsement made or implied by the American Association of Drilling Engineers, their officers or members. Questions concerning the content of this paper should be directed to the individuals listed as authors of this work.

Abstract

Lost circulation material (LCM) in a variety of forms has been utilized for decades throughout the oil industry, with mixed success, as a means of curtailing fluid losses. Today with higher extraction costs and increasing wellbore complexity, there is a heightened awareness of the need to improve upon lost circulation operational practices and on the economics of drilling a well.

One area the industry is focusing on more closely is wellbore stability, and with it, on bettering our understanding of lost circulation, induced fracture sealing and wellbore strengthening. These are all especially relevant in situations involving narrow drilling windows, particularly when drilling into highly depleted zones where induced fracturing and heavy losses can present a major risk.

This paper will describe the application of a unique laboratory-scale fracture testing tool designed and engineered as a means of bolstering our understanding of lost circulation materials and how they seal. In turn, this led to the development of novel drilling fluid additives specifically designed to improve wellbore stability and minimize fluid losses into drilling-induced fractures and thus leading a new class of products of lost prevention materials (LPM).

Introduction

Invert-emulsion drilling fluids (IEDF) have been the systems of choice when drilling demanding wells requiring a highly inhibitive fluid that is capable of ensuring high rates of penetration (ROP), good lubricity and the lowest risk for stuck pipe. One potential drawback to the use of these fluids (and to a lesser extent, high-performance water-based fluids) is the high cost associated with lost circulation. In today's technically demanding wells, such losses commonly occur into fractures, either drilling-induced or naturally occurring. In dealing with these losses, adding drilling fluid to maintain circulation of the well, remediation of the loss zone and/or lowering the mud weight to decrease the equivalent circulating density (ECD) compounds the costs of the well.

Bridging and sealing these fractures, particularly induced fractures, using lost circulation material (LCM), cement or chemical plugs requires sealing the fracture mouth with solids. Once an initial bridge is formed, additional particles accumulate to form a seal, which in turn, helps reduce mud

flow through the fracture, thus isolating the tip and preventing further fracture extension. The tangential stress, or hoop stress, exerted by the bridge at or near the wellbore can prevent further fracturing by increasing the stability of the near-wellbore region via compression.^{1,2} One of many prevailing theories on wellbore stabilization within the industry suggests that by combining these tangential stresses among sealed radial fractures, wellbore stability can be improved by building a so-called "stress cage".³ Increasing the fracture closure stress (FCS) is another theory practiced within the industry, whereby formation stability can be enhanced by engineering an increase in FCS that is greater than the ECD while drilling. This is achieved by deliberately plugging, as opposed to bridging, a fracture at the near-wellbore.²

The characteristics of fractured impermeable rock contrast with those of permeable zones. Typically, induced fractures in permeable rock formations are found within a depleted sand or carbonate. Such fractures normally are more easily "sealed" or "closed" than fractures induced in tight sands, siltstones, and shale. This is due, in large part, to permeable formations having a higher potential for filtrate loss and matrix plugging. Field data compiled from lost-circulation events within permeable formations suggest that leakoff to the formation matrix plays a vital role in healing these loss zones. Reducing fluid loss (pressure transmission) through a sealing bridge, while promoting leakoff into the permeable formation behind the bridge, promotes closure of the fracture behind the blockage. The fracture tip also will then become isolated from hydraulic pressure, thus preventing any further extension of the fracture.^{4,5} Not surprisingly, induced fractures in relatively impermeable formations are commonly more difficult to heal than fractures in permeable zones. Consequently, additional criteria need to be considered when planning wellbore strengthening applications in shale.⁶

To combat losses in induced fractures, two distinct methods have evolved:

Preventative treatment involves adding LCM in low concentrations to the drilling fluid to control fractures as they develop in a potential loss zone. The formation can be pressured regularly to build hoop stress and seal small induced fractures as they develop. The benefit of this method is that large fractures theoretically will not occur and losses will be

reduced. The difficulty in engineering such preventative treatment lies in the removal of the correctly sized lost prevention material (LPM) – a term reflecting a more engineered approach to LCM selection – from the treated drilling fluid using appropriate solids-control equipment, although tried and tested techniques do exist.⁷

Remedial treatment involves drilling until a loss is encountered. At this point, a high concentration LPM pill is squeezed into the loss zone. The remedial treatment approach can result in high losses before circulation is regained and/or an inability to effectively seal fractures and control the loss, resulting in expensive wellbore loss remediation operations.

Regardless of the technique used, wellbore lost circulation and stability issues from drilling-induced or natural fractures can result in sizeable economic losses. To help alleviate the problem, an extensive laboratory study was undertaken to identify the optimum characteristics of lost circulation material needed with regard to fracture sealing and wellbore strengthening.⁸

The result was the development of test apparatus that could mimic a fracture in impermeable rock, and the subsequent evaluation of literally dozens of materials and LPM blends. This, in turn, led to the identification of the key properties needed for the development of unique additives for improved wellbore stability.

Development of an Impermeable Fracture Tester

Given the prohibitive cost and difficulty of testing large-size cores, the initial step called for the development of laboratory-scale equipment that could easily and cost effectively mimic a fracture in impermeable rock. An opposed piston design was ultimately developed and found to yield relatively consistent measurements of pressure, conduction loss, and fracture opening. In turn, this provided the ability to screen a number of materials that could potentially seal and prop fractures of variable width, and with a high degree of test repeatability.

The fracture test device developed as a key component of this study used two matched 2½-in. (6.35-cm) diameter corrugated aluminum platens to simulate formation fracture faces with the fracture gap being set using three set-screws (Figure 1). Furthermore, the fracture faces were sandblasted to increase the level of surface irregularities, and hence frictional effects, allowing for better particle adhesion and to encourage bridging. Natural materials were used in the early days of development. However, it was deemed necessary to change to machined metal surfaces given issues experienced with reproducibility when using natural rock as fracture faces.

Three high-precision syringe pumps, used in conjunction with two accumulator/reservoir vessels, were employed to control the drilling fluid and fracture-tip pressures within the fracture cell, while keeping the fracture closure pressure constant. Given that these pumps could accurately measure fluid volumes, both delivered and received, with micro-litre precision, they also were used for monitoring both the volume of filtrate collected from the fracture tip and also the fracture-closure volume. The latter was used for estimating any

propping within the fracture cell. The fracture test apparatus could operate to a maximum pressure of 1,250 psi. A schematic for this device is shown in Figure 2.

Operation of the impermeable fracture test apparatus involved pumping a test fluid from the mud reservoir (labeled MR1 in Figure 3) through the open fracture of the fracture cell (FC) and into the fracture-tip accumulator cell (MR2). The test fluid was pumped at a constant flow rate of 0.5 mL/min while maintaining constant fracture tip (to simulate pore pressure) and fracture closure pressures of 25 and 125 psi, respectively. These values were selected based upon experience with the instrument. The fluid pressure at the beginning of a test (or starting pressure) was 25 psig and this pressure was maintained at or above this value by the constant flow of fluid into the fracture cell. The effects of the fluid and/or bridging material on a fracture of pre-determined width could then be determined by monitoring the mud pressure, which is variable and dependent upon the quality of fracture seal.

The fracture test apparatus was designed to be capable of the following functions:

- Establish fracture closure (or sealing) pressure
- Apply constant pressure at fracture tip
- Inject particulate-containing drilling fluid into the fracture at a controlled rate
- Measure pressure of injected fluid
- Measure fracture opening (from Δ volume of closure pressure pump)
- Measure volume of fluid lost to fracture tip

To achieve these functions, three main data values were used: (1) mud pressure (i.e., fluid pressure applied to the fracture), (2) conduction loss (i.e., fluid lost into the fracture through the fracture tip), and (3) change in fracture width. An example of how this data is presented graphically is given in Figure 4 which illustrates a test run on an IEDF containing a proprietary ground cellulose product at a concentration of 20 lb/bbl (57 kg/m³).

The line showing mud (or fluid) pressure can be interpreted, once a seal forms, as the sealed pressure on the wellbore side of the fracture. Initial mud pressure is 25 psig and a fixed 0.5 mL/min flow rate pumps the test fluid through the open fracture towards a fracture tip which is held at a constant backpressure of 25 psig. (The initial fracture width in this case has been set at 530 microns (μ m)). As the bridge is formed, mud pressure increases.

The middle line graphically represents the conductivity loss (or tip loss) of the test fluid as it flows into and through the fracture. Initially, the value increases steadily with time as whole mud is lost to the fracture. Once the initial bridge forms, the conductivity loss is reduced and the slope of the line approaches zero. This reduction in slope corresponds to the building and integrity of a fracture seal, allowing an increase in fluid pressure to occur.

The bottom line on the plot represents the change in fracture width from the initial width of 530 μ m. As the

pressure builds and the seal remains, the fracture width increases until the strength of the seal is exceeded, as shown by the drop in fluid pressure and a reduction in fracture width. Fluid is lost to the fracture tip when the seal partially fails as shown by the rise in conductivity.

In this example, the fracture seal moves and is pushed further into the fracture, by forming, failing and re-forming again with time. Fluid pressure continues to increase (with seal slippage) until a maximum of approximately 900-psig sealing pressure and a 125 μm fracture width increase is achieved. At this point, the seal has exceeded its ability to deform and fails catastrophically. Upon failure at 655 μm , fracture width returns to the initial point and the mud pressure begins to rise again as a new seal forms. In some tests, the change in fracture width does not return to zero upon seal failure. This could mean that the fracture has been held open beyond its initial width by residual sealing material built up within the fracture. The amount of fracture width change that remains after a seal failure is designated as propped width. Propping applies permanent FCS. In other words, additional “hoop stress” is gained without the need for applied mud pressure. An example of this is given in Figure 5, which shows the results of an IEDF containing a blend of custom ground nut and proprietary graphite materials developed as part of this study.

In contrast, a poorly performing material will not form a steady seal (pressures are low) and fluid is lost at a constant rate to the tip. An example of this, for mica, is given in Figure 6.

Laboratory Testing and Results

Hundreds of fracture tests were carried out using this apparatus with a view to evaluating the relative performance and key characteristics of various types of LPM. The results have enabled a basic characterization of the important elements of LPM to be achieved, in addition to providing a means of differentiating between materials likely to be and those not likely to be successful in sealing fractures in impermeable zones. Many of these results, and their key findings, have also been verified by using other, larger scale, test apparatus such as the high-pressure fracture test rig shown in Figure 7. This particular device uses a 15-cm core of rock and operates at a pressure of up to 11,000 psi, measuring the pressure taken to both initiate a fracture, and subsequently, to reopen the fracture with the test fluid containing the LPM.⁸ Although the findings from this device will not be discussed in detail in this paper, a graphical representation of selected results is given in Figure 8.

A 13-lb/gal (1,558 kg/m^3), API barite-weighted IEDF with an oil-to-water ratio (OWR) of 80:20 was selected as the drilling fluid of choice for the majority of tests performed using the impermeable fracture tester. A small number of unweighted fluids were also tested.

Dozens of materials and blends of LPM were evaluated. Materials tested included cellulose, synthetic elastomers, rubber, polyethylene, polypropylene, mica, glass, graphite and petroleum coke-based materials, iron-based compounds, and

calcium carbonate. Shapes tested included particulates, short fibers, long fibers, platelets, gels, flakes, films, and irregular/regular spheres. Other test criteria included surface texture, material hardness, resilience, bulk density and size.

Tests were performed over a range of fracture sizes ranging from 280 to 1,100 μm , although the majority of the tests were carried out at between 500 and 530 μm , a size deemed “typical” by many within the industry through a combination of anecdotal evidence and numerical modeling. This size also appeared to minimize sealing contributions from the weighting agent itself.

A summary of the major conclusions of this project is discussed below in terms of successful and unsuccessful traits of LPM.

Characteristics of Successful LPM

In many respects, lost-circulation issues in permeable formations can be approached in a more liberal way given the ability of these zones to allow leakoff of carrier fluid into the formation. Leakoff of drilling fluid readily immobilizes material en masse into the loss zone without the need for fracture extension and the inter-particle adhesion needed to build a seal. Hence, a more diverse collection of materials to seal fractures and pores can be used. However, there are a number of key characteristics that have been found to be important to the overall performance of an LPM.

- Size
- Range of sizes
- Shape (sphericity)
- Aspect ratio
- Surface texture
- Concentration
- Compressive strength
- Bulk density
- Resiliency (compression/expansion)

1. **Particle Size and Size Distribution.** Larger particle sizes allow for increased FCS through an increased ability to bridge wide fractures. However, too many large particles, without a range of smaller particles present to seal the gaps will increase conductivity to the fracture tip. Fine particle sizes decrease conductivity, but do not increase fracture closure stress directly. Therefore, size and the distribution of sizes (particle-size range or PSD) are the most critical factors for the performance of an LPM. The maximum size required will be determined by the anticipated fracture width to be bridged, with a good linear spread of particles below this upper size to ensure optimal bridging of smaller fractures and the building of an efficient seal or bridge in the largest fractures.
2. **Particle Shape and Texture.** Spheroidal-shaped particles have been shown to provide optimum close packing, flexible bridging, and constrict the size of

flow paths through a seal. Particles exhibiting a “roughness” in texture have been shown to be more efficient in sealing, possibly due to the surface roughness, providing a good anchor point for additional sealing materials. High aspect materials, such as mica, where there are extreme differences between geometric dimensions, do not function well.

3. **Particle Concentration and Bulk Density.** Typically, if the above characteristics are optimized, a more rapid and improved seal can be formed with an increased particle concentration in the fluid. For API barite-weighted fluids, a typical minimum concentration to form an effective seal has been found to be 20 lb/bbl. Materials with a low bulk density have an advantage in that a greater number of particles are present for the weight of material added.
4. **Particle Compressive Strength.** Materials exhibiting a high compressive strength will provide a more efficient seal. The relative strength of a material also reflects its ability to prop a fracture. This is also particularly relevant to wellbore strengthening.
5. **Resiliency.** The ability of a material to compress and expand does appear to play a role in the overall performance of an LPM with regard to fracture propping and sealing. However, a high level of resilience does not preclude the need for other characteristics such as particle shape, texture, concentration, and distribution.

The best materials shown by testing for consistently sealing fractures were sized synthetic graphite, specifically sized ground nut hulls, specifically sized proprietary ground cellulose particles, and calcium carbonate. Blends of these materials can be used to optimize particle-size distribution, resulting in a more successful seal.

Characteristics of Unsuccessful LPM

Particle morphology and aspect ratio have a major influence on how well, or how poorly, a material will perform as an LPM. Round materials such as sized proppant, fibrous materials such as chopped glass fiber, or materials with high aspect ratios such as mica or flakes generally do not perform well. Some of these materials can build a seal, but the conductivity loss to the fracture typically is continuous and sealed pressure is low, with limited increases in fracture width. Fibrous and filament-type materials in particular are to be avoided, as when added to typically successful blends they will reduce the sealing ability of the fluid significantly.

Other ineffective products include elastomers, rubbers, and ground plastics. Elastomers and rubbers will extrude progressively under pressure to form flow paths in the sealing bed. This type of deformation was also observed in ground polypropylene, but at higher pressure than the rubbers.

Based on this test apparatus, it was determined that very

coarse particles (over 1.5 mm) can stunt sealing performance in a fracture. Too many large particles will increase the fracture conductivity by disrupting sealing beds. Very coarse particles can be used in a formulation, but their effectiveness decreases rapidly beyond 5 to 10 lb/bbl.

Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM) images of acceptable and unacceptable materials are shown in Figure 9.

API-Grade and Fine-Grade Barite

The most commonly used solid added to most drilling fluids in the oilfield is barite and this is added primarily for weight-up. However, the results from this study suggest that that drilling fluids weighted with barite may also benefit in terms of fracture sealing performance. API-grade barite was found to be particularly effective.

API-barite specifications dictate that no more than 30 wt% is less than 6 μm and no more than 3.0 wt% is greater than 75 μm .⁹ Initial tests with the fracture device using a 13-lb/gal IEDF suggested that API barite, in lab-formulated fluids, will help bridge and seal narrow fracture widths (<280 μm as in this case) with no other solids present given its relatively high concentration within the fluid. Fracture sealing benefits were also noted with finer 325-mesh graded barite (<45 μm), although its sealing benefits were much less pronounced. With regard to larger fracture sizes, although barite alone cannot seal them, when used in combination with larger particles, barite contributes as filler for efficient sealing.

Barite sealing is shown in Figure 10. In this example, the fracture seal develops rapidly with only minor slippage of the seal being observed, and with little or no fluid conductivity. Furthermore, the fracture width builds to an additional $\pm 70 \mu\text{m}$ above the initial fracture setting, at which point the seal fails at ± 430 psig; the fracture width does not return to the initial 280- μm setting, indicating that residual barite has adhered to the fracture surface and propped the floating piston off of its standoff pins. With regard to fluid loss, reduced conductivity in a fracture relies on the rapidity at which a seal is formed as well as the tightness of the seal once the fracture is bridged. API-grade barite has been found to perform well on both counts using this test apparatus.

Graphitic-Based Material

Certain types of graphitic-based materials have long been recognized as effective sealants for induced fractures. It was assumed this was due to the hard and resilient characteristics of these products. Testing of various LPM materials has confirmed that specifically designed graphitic materials are indeed highly efficient at sealing fractures. However, although not detailed in this paper, the role of resiliency was shown to have a more minor role.⁸

Figure 11 shows the sealing effect of 20 lb/bbl of a unique synthetic graphite blend added to a similar 13-lb/gal barite-weighted fluid. In this case, two tests were run and plotted side-by-side to demonstrate reproducibility.

Utilizing a 530- μm fracture width setting, a combination of barite and graphite allows formation of a seal that is both flexible enough to allow the fracture to open to 740- μm and be

able to withstand an applied pressure of 950 psig. On analysis of the seal formed, the relatively high concentration of barite allowed the seal to form quickly and pack the seal tightly. This ultimately resulted in smaller spaces between particles and in turn a much reduced fluid-loss rate to the tip.

After testing, seal components consisting of barite and synthetic graphite were removed from the fracture cell and examined under magnification. The seal had a remarkable capacity for deformation while still retaining a structural integrity that allowed it to stop or slow conductivity loss in an increasing-width fracture environment.

LPM Blends

Particle-size distribution has proven to be a key factor in the performance of LPM in sealing induced fractures within impermeable zones. However, due to the limited particle-size control achievable with standard grinding, most materials do not have a PSD that will perform well in a large fracture. Acquiring better sealing performance can be done using blends of materials that have the necessary particle properties of shape, surface texture, and resistance to deformation. When combined, blends can demonstrate improved performance over the individual blend components by enhancing particle-size distributions in key size ranges. Blending compatible materials can optimize performance and improve results.

Blending can have significant advantages over the use of a single LPM product. Effective blending allows an operator to use a certain percentage of conventional, rigsite-available, materials to achieve desired results. This is particularly relevant when using preventative treatment methods to drill through largely impermeable formations where the likelihood of induced fractures occurring is high. Since a relatively large percentage of added material may be removed every circulation by the solids-control equipment, using high concentrations of a key LPM product as an extended preventative measure can become costly unless specialized recovery systems are used.⁷ Blending gives an Operator another method of controlling costs by using more inexpensive LPM while potentially providing better sealing and increased stability.

Fracture testing revealed that blending accentuates the positive performance aspects of each component and can address the limitations of the respective components. For example, the strength of ground nut hulls and calcium carbonate is in sealing pressure and increasing fracture width, but the most glaring weakness of these materials, especially carbonates, is conductivity to tip. An important strength of coke and graphite LPM is the substantial reduction in conductivity relative to carbonates and nut when properly sized. Therefore, combinations of nut or calcium carbonate with graphite continually produced very good results on the fracture test device. The end result is that blends of materials can achieve enhanced results relative to treatments using only one LPM additive.

A disadvantage of blending entails one of the key advantages mentioned previously. The use of blends coupled with the wide array of materials available in the industry can

lead to the inclusion of blend components that do not effectively increase performance, such as waste cardboard, cellophane, bagasse (sugarcane fiber), and glass fiber. These LPM's will increase the stability marginally at best, and in many cases can detract from the absolute efficiency of the treatment. Materials such as mica are readily available and very inexpensive, but given the physical aspects of the material, it provides little additional stability in the wellbore due to continuous conductivity and limited sealing pressure. In essence, the shape of the particles disturbs the sealing bed. Despite the relative lack of performance, mica continues to be used in the field because of its associated costs. Blends should only contain components which will enhance the implementation of the treatment and not negatively affect the sealing of fractures.

Conclusions

The fracture-test apparatus developed for this study has given great insight into the effectiveness of LPM in impermeable zones. Apart from the ability to rapidly and inexpensively test the sealing effectiveness of various materials, the most significant benefit from this equipment is the control and measurement of changes in fracture width. Stress-cage theory relies on the development of increased fracture closure stress imparted by a seal on the fractured formation. Thus, results from this device can be used to help optimize LPM types and concentrations for wellbore stabilization and strengthening. The tester also gives an indication of propped width within sealed fractures caused by LPM that has been pressed into the fracture. Propped fracture widths can be used to determine a measure of residual prop which will remain even when well circulation has stopped and hydraulic pressure is reduced.

This work revealed the critical importance of particle sizing in the sealing of fractures. Appropriate size distribution is the key aspect of a successful LPM because it will allow for the sealing of fractures in a wide range of initial widths. Applying a material or blend of LPM with a broad distribution of particle sizes that can seal a range of widths will be more effective in sealing induced fractures than a narrow distribution. Optimization of sizing for particular widths should be achieved through laboratory testing combined with well data and the use of bridging software.

Preventative treatment methods involving continuous addition of LPM to the mud to maintain particle concentration and size distribution provide the best chance for success in controlling losses in impermeable zones prone to fracturing. Testing concluded that high concentrations of high-performing material will increase sealing capabilities over a broad range of fracture widths by sealing faster and producing increased fracture width, while total concentrations reduced below 15 – 20 lb/bbl will decrease this performance markedly. Applying LPM preventatively has the potential to reduce major loss incidents by rapidly sealing fractures initiated in the near-wellbore while also potentially improving overall wellbore stability.

Remedial treatment will require more material to provide

sufficient control of the fracture width and the material must be suited to the fracture encountered. Large-volume losses treated by remedial treatment methods will require a high-concentration pill (50–100 lb/bbl) of broad-distribution LPM with an emphasis on the percentage of larger particle sizes (0.8–1.5 mm) present in the treatment.

Barite has been shown to contribute to fracture sealing, and in laboratory testing, provided a seal without any other LPM material present. Thus, barite, in particular API-grade, could be used on its own for sealing small fractures if present in sufficient concentrations, and at the very least, may be regarded as a contributory sealing material for reducing fluid conductivity. However, for most field situations, treatments should contain at least 10 lb/bbl of a complimentary LPM, although 15 – 20 lb/bbl would be preferred. More material should be added per circulation in case of heavier losses to a total of 20 – 40 lb/bbl.

The best LPM treatments involved blends of various grades of the most effective additives, namely, calcium carbonate, ground nut, graphite and graphite/coke blends. Unique additives were also developed as part of this project and these were based primarily on graphitic blends. Broad-range particle-size distributions combined with material properties such as resilience, compressive strength and particle morphology all contributed to the successful performance of these unique additives over a large range of fracture sizes. These products were also found to have an enhanced performance when combined with complimentary LPM materials.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the management of M-I SWACO, together with the members of the Fracture Studies JIP for permission to publish this paper. Special recognition for this work should also be given to Paul Way of Schlumberger Cambridge Research, Cambridge, England and to both Robert

Schlemmer and William LaFon, previously with M-I SWACO.

References

1. Aston, M.S., Alberty, M.W., McLean, M.R., de Jong, H.J. and Armagost, K. "Drilling Fluids for Wellbore Strengthening." SPE 87130, SPE/IADC Drilling Conference, Dallas, 2-4 March 2004.
2. Dupriest, F.E. "Fracture Closure Stress (FCS) and Lost Returns Practices." SPE 92192, SPE/IADC Drilling Conference, Amsterdam, 23-25 February 2005.
3. Alberty, M.W. and McLean, M.R. "A Physical Model for Stress Cages." SPE 90493, SPE Annual Technical Conference, Houston, 26-29 September 2004.
4. Tehrani, A., Friedheim, J., Cameron J. and Reid, W. "Designing Fluids for Wellbore Strengthening – Is it an Art?" AADE-07-NTCE-75, AADE National Technical Conference, Houston, 10-12 April 2007.
5. Fuh, G-F., Beardmore, D. and Morita, N. "Further Development, Field Testing, and Application of the Wellbore Strengthening Technique for Drilling Operations." SPE/IADC 105809, SPE/IADC Drilling Conference, Amsterdam, 20-22 February 2007.
6. Aston, M.S., Alberty, M.W., Duncum, S., Bruton, J.R., Friedheim, J.E. and Sanders, M.W. "A New Treatment for Wellbore Strengthening in Shale." SPE 110713, SPE Annual Technical Conference, Anaheim, California, 11-14 November 2007.
7. van Oort, E., Browning, T., Butler, F., Lee, J. and Friedheim, J. "Enhanced Lost Circulation Control through Continuous Graphite Recovery." AADE-07-NTCE-24, AADE National Technical Conference, Houston, 10-12 April 2007.
8. Fracture Studies Joint Industry Project (JIP), M-I SWACO, 2004–2006.
9. *API Spec 13A: Specification for Drilling-Fluid Materials*, 17th Edition, American Petroleum Institute, 2006.



Figure 1 – Corrugated Aluminium Platens of the Fracture Tester. The positions of the three set-screws can be seen near the centre.




Figure 2 – Schematic of the Impermeable Fracture Test Device. The test apparatus consists of a mud reservoir (left cylinder, MR1), fracture cell (center cylinder, FC), and fracture-tip accumulator (right cylinder, MR2).




Figure 3 – Fracture Cell Apparatus with Schematic of the Fracture Cell.




Figure 4 – Fracture Sealing Evaluation of a Proprietary Cellulosic LPM against a Fracture Size of 530 μ m.




Figure 5 – Fracture Sealing Evaluation of a Proprietary Graphitic-Nut Blend against a Fracture Size of 530 μ m.




Figure 6 – Fracture Sealing Evaluation of Mica against a Fracture Size of 530 μ m.



Figure 7 – High-Pressure Fracture Testing Equipment and Pre-Test Core






Figure 8 – High-Pressure Fracture Tester Results Indicating Fracture Re-Opening Pressures.


Acceptable Materials for Induced Fractures




Proprietary Graphitic Blend




Marble



Nut Husks



Ground Petroleum Coke



Graphite




Proprietary Cellulosic Blend

Unacceptable Materials for Induced Fractures




Bagasse (Sugar Cane Fiber)




Flake Graphite



Cellulosic Blend



Flake Calcium Carbonate

Spherical Coke, Graphite &
Proppant

Mica

Figure 9 – Examples of Acceptable and Unacceptable Materials for Sealing-Induced Fractures




Figure 10 – Fracture Sealing Evaluation of API-Grade Barite against a Fracture Size of 280 μ m.




Figure 11 – Fracture Sealing Evaluation of a Proprietary Graphite-Based LPM against a Fracture Size of 530 μ m.