

# WATER SHUTOFF AND CONFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT: AN INTRODUCTION

Bergit Brattekas<sup>1</sup> and Randy Seright<sup>\*2</sup>:

<sup>1</sup>Dept. of Physics and Technology, University of Bergen, Norway

<sup>2</sup>New Mexico Institute of Mining & Technology, Socorro, New Mexico, USA.

## ABSTRACT

This report provides an introduction to the topic of water shutoff and conformance improvement. After indicating the volumes of water produced during oilfield operations, a strategy is provided for attacking excess water production problems. Problem types are categorized, typical methods of problem diagnosis are mentioned, and the range of solutions are introduced for each problem type. In the third section of the report, the concept of disproportionate permeability reduction is introduced—where polymers and gels may reduce permeability to water more than to oil or gas. When and where this property is of value is discussed. The fourth section describes the properties of formed gels as they extrude through fractures and how those properties can be of value when treating conformance problems caused by fractures. Section 5 covers the efficiency with which gels block fractures after gel placement—especially, the impact of fluids injected subsequent to the gel treatment.

## KEYWORDS

Water shutoff, conformance improvement, reservoir sweep improvement

## ABBREVIATIONS

$c$	= final concentration, ppm [ $\mu\text{g/g}$ ]
$c_o$	= original concentration, ppm [ $\mu\text{g/g}$ ]
$F_r$	= resistance factor (water mobility/gelant or gel mobility)
$F_{rr}$	= residual resistance factor (water mobility before gel/water mobility after)
HPAM	= partially hydrolyzed polyacrylamide
$h_f$	= fracture height, ft [m]
$h_2$	= height of Layer 2, ft [m]
$k$	= permeability, darcys [ $\mu\text{m}^2$ ]
$k_1$	= permeability of Layer 1, mD [ $\mu\text{m}^2$ ]
$k_2$	= permeability of Layer 2, mD [ $\mu\text{m}^2$ ]
$k_f$	= fracture permeability, D [ $\mu\text{m}^2$ ]
$k_{ro}$	= relative permeability to oil
$k_{rw}$	= relative permeability to water
$L$	= length, ft [m]
$L_f$	= fracture length, ft [m]
$dL/dt$	= rate of gel propagation in a fracture, ft/d [m/d]
Mw	= polymer molecular weight, g/mol
OOIP	= original oil in place
PV	= pore volumes of fluid injected
$dp/dl$	= pressure gradient, psi/ft [Pa/m]
$q_{tot}$	= total injection rate, bbl/d [ $\text{m}^3/\text{d}$ ]
$R$	= correlation coefficient
$r_{gel}$	= radius of gelant penetration, ft [m]
$S_{or}$	= residual oil saturation

$S_{wr}$  = residual-water saturation  
TDS = total dissolved solids  
 $t$  = time, d  
 $u_l$  = leakoff rate,  $\text{ft}^3/\text{ft}^2/\text{d}$  [ $\text{m}^3/\text{m}^2/\text{d}$ ]  
WOR = producing water/oil ratio  
 $w_f$  = fracture width, ft [m]  
 $\mu$  = viscosity, cp [mPa-s]

## 1. VOLUMES OF WATER PRODUCED

Large volumes of saline water are produced during oil and gas production. In 2000, Bailey *et al.* [1] reported that 3 barrels of water were produced for each barrel of oil—amounting to about 75 billion barrels of water at that time and costing an estimated \$40 billion for disposal. Clark and Veil [2] reported that 21 billion barrels of water were produced in the United States during 2007. Veil [3] updated this number to 24.4 billion barrels for the year, 2017. Roughly half of this water is re-injected for waterflooding or enhanced oil recovery, and roughly half is injected into disposal wells. Although the salinity of this water can vary over a wide range (0.1 to 40% total dissolved solids, TDS), the median salinity is 3.23% TDS and not usable for drinking or agricultural purposes [4].

From the operator's viewpoint, produced water is generally a nuisance that adds cost to hydrocarbon production. There are lifting costs (associated with lifting the water from the formation to the surface), processing costs (associated with oil/water separation), and disposal costs (associated with injecting water into a disposal well, if the water is not recycled for waterflood use). Further, produced water can accentuate costs associated with corrosion, scale formation, sand production, formation damage, and environmental spills. One might consider half of the produced water as useful, in that it is re-injected for waterflooding operations (to displace oil). For the other half, it seems only a detriment.

Despite the costs and nuisance associated with water production, most operators choose to live with it. For example, with the recent boom in shale oil production in Southeast New Mexico (USA), typically four barrels of highly saline water were produced with each barrel of oil—with roughly 1 million BOPD produced here in early 2020 [5]. Because of infrastructure limitations, much of this water must be trucked to disposal wells, followed by injection at a cost of \$0.65 per bbl. In spite of these costs, there was little interest in reducing the volume of water production. The zeal toward producing oil at \$50-70/bbl greatly outweighed the cost of water treatment and disposal. Interestingly, for this area, less than 10% of the original oil in place will be recovered, given current projections.

Beyond living with the produced water, the next most common practice is either to sell the well or property or to simply shut-in high water-cut wells. This approach is reasonable if the oil saturation is low in the area around the well. If not, what should be done? This chapter is directed toward what can be done, other than just accepting the water production. Improving sweep efficiency and reducing channeling is also very relevant to enhanced oil recovery—since the operator would much prefer that expensive injected fluids (surfactant, polymer, CO<sub>2</sub>, steam, etc.) stay in the reservoir and displace oil rather than be produced too quickly. Thus, the concepts in this chapter should be of value for any enhanced oil recovery project.

## 2. A STRATEGY TO ATTACK EXCESS WATER PRODUCTION PROBLEMS

There are many different reasons why water might be produced during oil and gas production. Table 1.1 provides a list of many of those reasons [6].

Table 1.1. Excess Water Production Problems  
(Categories are listed in increasing order of treatment difficulty)

1	Casing leaks
2	Flow behind pipe
3	Unfractured wells (injectors or producers) with effective barriers to crossflow.
4	Two-dimensional coning through a hydraulic fracture from an aquifer.
5	Natural fracture system leading to an aquifer.
6	Faults or fractures crossing a deviated or horizontal well.
7	Single fracture causing channeling between wells.
8	Natural fracture system allowing channeling between wells.
9	Three-dimensional coning.
10	Cusping.
11	Channeling through strata (no fractures), with crossflow.
12	Single zone (no fractures) with a high mobile water saturation.

Because each type of problem in Table 1.1 has a different character, each type of problem requires a different approach for solution. With unrestricted resources, the problem would be thoroughly characterized before attempting a solution. Unfortunately, for various reasons (most commonly, financial or manpower-related), adequate characterization of the water-production problem often does not occur. To help this situation, many people have offered strategies to attack water production problems [6-16] and suggested various categorizations of problems, in an attempt to simplify the analysis. The strategy that we advocate involves looking for and solving the easiest water-production problems first. The problems in Table 1.1 are listed roughly in increasing order of difficulty to solve. Our strategy also advocates beginning the diagnostic process using information that is already available. Thus, our approach advocates first examining existing information to determine whether any of the first listings in Table 1.1 are the problem, before assuming that any of the last listings are the problem. If uncertainty exists about the nature of the problem, the first new money spent on additional diagnosis would be better directed at the earlier problems on the list, rather than the later problems.

The strategy involves asking four questions in the following order:

1. Is there a problem?
2. Does the problem occur right at the wellbore?
3. Is the problem due to a fracture or fracture-like feature?
4. Is the problem accentuated by crossflow?

## 2.1. Is there a problem?

For the first question (Is there a problem?), one must ask whether the existing hydrocarbon recovery is unreasonably low for the pattern or collection of wells under consideration. The expected recovery depends on time, drive mechanism, pore volumes of fluid injected (usually water), water/oil mobility ratio, vertical heterogeneity, and pattern configuration. In a homogeneous, permeable reservoir with low oil viscosity that is efficiently produced by an edge-water drive, the expected recovery can be quite high. For example, the East Texas field [17] has produced over 5.42 billion barrels of ~7 billion barrels original oil in place (OOIP). For a linear waterflood in a thin homogeneous reservoir, fractional flow calculations generated Figure 1.1—which plots expected oil recoveries as a function of pore volumes injected and oil/water viscosity ratio (using the conditions specified in the figure). When water displaces light (low-viscosity) oil, most of the mobile oil saturation can be displaced very efficiently by injected water. However, as the oil viscosity increases, the efficiency of displacement decreases. In Figure 1.1, note that at 1 PV of water injection, the mobile oil recovered decreases by about 10 percentage points for each factor of 10 increase in oil viscosity.





Figure 1.1. Expected oil recovery vs PV water injected.

If the injection-production pattern changes from a perfect linear displacement (as in Figure 1.1, or perhaps, between parallel horizontal injection/production wells) to a homogeneous five-spot pattern, the efficiency of waterflooding decreases by about 20% for a unit mobility ratio [18,19]. Vertical heterogeneity (i.e., layering, fractures) can dramatically decrease reservoir sweep efficiency, especially for unfavorable mobility ratios with free crossflow [18]. Craig [18] and Willhite [19] discussed estimation of recovery efficiency as a function of well pattern, reservoir layering, permeability contrast, and oil viscosity. These references (along with standard reservoir engineering calculations/simulations) should be consulted to assess whether the observed producing water/oil ratio is unexpectedly high for your particular reservoir and wells.

## 2.2. Does the problem occur right at the wellbore?


The easiest excess-water-production problems to fix occur right at the wellbore—including flow behind pipe, casing leaks, and isolated water zones. Cement is the most common water-control material [20], especially since it is used for all completions—to seal between the formation and the casing so that hydrocarbon-productive zones are isolated from non-productive zones.

**2.2.1. Flow Behind Pipe.** Problems with flow behind pipe (Figure 1.2) exist if the primary cement placement was inadequate or if the primary cement fails (separates from the pipe or formation) after completion of the well. Common ways to detect flow behind pipe [21,22] include cement bond logs, temperature surveys, and noise logs (if gas flows behind pipe). Problems with flow behind pipe are most commonly addressed using cement squeezes [20]. These methods usually require a workover rig, and consequently, are expensive to perform. If the channel behind pipe is quite narrow (often associated with gas or separation of the cement from the formation or pipe), cement may not be able to penetrate effectively into the channel. For these cases, gel treatments have often worked [23-25]. Gels are able to penetrate into very narrow channels, whereas cement often cannot. Once set, gels can have sufficient strength to resist significant pressure gradients within narrow channels or within porous media. However, they usually rupture very easily in wider channels. In contrast, cements have much greater compressive and tensile strengths (many 1000s of psi) [20].




**Figure 1.2.** Flow behind pipe.

**2.2.2. Casing Leaks.** Casing leaks (Figure 1.3) are most commonly treated with either cement or mechanical devices (casing patches, packers, etc.) [20,26-28]. For very small leaks (pinhole leaks), cement often is ineffective—again because of limitations in penetrating small openings. Gels have been used at times to treat these small leaks [29-32]. Leaks are commonly diagnosed with pressure tests, flow surveys (e.g., spin flowmeter), or wellbore televIEWERS [20,33,34].



**Figure 1.3.** Casing leak.

**2.2.3. Isolated Water Zones.** In many cases, the natural stratification provides flow barriers (e.g., shale, anhydrite layers) between oil zones and water zones (Figure 1.4). For those instances, isolation within the wellbore is typically pursued. Especially, for cases where water from an underlying aquifer gradually rises to flood oil zones, plug backs can effectively shut-off encroaching water [20]—where cement is placed in the bottom of the well. For cases where isolated water zones exist above isolated oil zones, mechanical devices are commonly used to stop water inflow. Gels have been used in some cases [35,36]. The reader must recognize that these methods cannot be effective if fluids can crossflow beyond the wellbore. Effective barriers that isolate the water zone are detected most effectively by observing a significant pressure difference between the water zone and other zones (after accounting for gravity) [6]. Flow profiles and well logs are also helpful [21,22].



**Figure 1.4.** Isolated open water zone.

**2.2.4. Deviated or Horizontal Wells.** Deviated or horizontal wells present a special challenge for water control. On the one hand, the well can be drilled exclusively in the hydrocarbon zone of interest—thereby, theoretically avoiding water zones. Unfortunately, hydrocarbon zones still possess heterogeneity in the areal and vertical directions. Water inflow from an underlying

formation can be uneven because of variations in formation thickness, vertical permeability, and placement of the well. Especially, vertical fractures or non-sealing faults can cross these wells—and allow water inflow from other formations. Diagnosis of when water enters the horizontal well is crucial information and can be accomplished using flow profiles [37-39]. However, because of the cost and technical challenges associated with obtaining flow profiles, they are not commonly performed. Thus, making flow profiles more cost-effective or easier to perform is an important need.

Various completion types have been used for horizontal wells, including open hole, cased hole with cemented screens, pre-drilled or slotted liners, and various inflow control devices [40-42]. Most of these allow little or no control over fluid inflow after they are installed. Common inflow flow devices are basically pipe with a certain number of openings/holes per unit of length [43-46]. More advanced inflow flow devices have mechanically activated sliding sleeves to open or cover the openings [47-50].

Autonomous inflow control devices have been offered which claim to selectively allow hydrocarbon entry while reducing or eliminating water entry into the pipe [51]. These claims appear misleading or dubious. If the formation provides a certain fractional flow of water and oil to a particular opening in the pipe, a mass balance dictates that fractional flow must be maintained. Thus, even if these static pieces of metal could distinguish between oil and water, they cannot change the fractional flow. One could argue that a device might allow some degree of selectivity by changing the flow from laminar to turbulent at the point of entry into the pipe. In laminar flow, flow capacity is directly proportional to fluid viscosity, while in turbulent flow, flow capacity is directly proportional to density and much less sensitive to viscosity. If the oil is viscous, one might argue that forcing the flow to become turbulent favors oil entry over water (because the water is denser than oil). There are multiple flaws with this argument. First, changing the flow regime from laminar to turbulent necessarily means that the pressure drop across the device is increased dramatically, so all fluids will experience more resistance to entering the pipe. Second, if you knew enough about the local pressure conditions and fluids present at the device's location to predict whether flow could transition from laminar to turbulent, it would be far more cost effective to either complete or not complete the interval without using the expensive autonomous inflow control device.

Another type of passive inflow control device uses buoyant balls to open or close an opening, depending on whether oil or water is present [50]. Although these devices have a reasonable underlying concept, their acceptance is not yet widespread.

Some of the mechanical methods used for vertical wells are also used to control water in horizontal and deviated wells, including through-tubing bridge plugs [52,53], through-tubing bridge plugs with cement [54], and coiled tubing with inflatable packers [55,56].

Intelligent completions (smart wells) are another method for control in multilateral wells [57]. Valves are located downhole where a lateral segment joins the main lateral. By adjusting these valves, the contributions from the high water-cut laterals can be reduced or shutoff, while allowing open flow from the more productive laterals.

### 2.3. Is the problem caused by a fracture or fracture-like feature?


If fractures are the source of the excess water production, cement and mechanical methods are generally ineffective—unless the fracture crosses perpendicular to the axial direction of the well (i.e., a horizontal fracture cutting through a vertical well or a transverse vertical fracture cutting through a horizontal well).

Fractured wells are very common. A large fraction of newly drilled wells is intentionally (hydraulically) fractured for stimulation of injectivity or productivity [58]. Many (perhaps most) injection well are fractured unintentionally because of poor injection water quality or because of needs to meet injectivity requirements [59]. Further, natural fractures are very common, especially in tighter reservoirs [60].

With the proper length and orientation, fractures can enhance injectivity, productivity, and sweep efficiency [61]. Unfortunately, with the wrong length and orientation, they can accentuate channeling between injector-producer pairs or from an aquifer into a production well [61].


**2.3.1. Diagnosis.** A number of methods can be used to diagnose whether a well intersects fractures. The well history can be valuable in learning whether a well has been intentionally fractured previously. Examination of well injectivity or productivity is often an easy way to judge if the well has fractures [6]. In particular, if the observed injectivity or productivity is five or more times greater than the flow capacity calculated by Darcy's law for radial flow (i.e., inputting the matrix rock permeability and thickness), a fracture must be present. Very rapid transit of a tracer between an injector-producer pair is also a definitive indicator of a fracture channel [62]. Borehole televiewers, formation imaging logs, examination of cores, and other methods can also be of value.

There are a number of different scenarios where fractures cause excess water production. Each scenario has a somewhat different goal for solution. One of the simplest scenarios involves a single fracture that leads all the way from an injection well to a production well (Figure 1.5). One might think that plugging the entire fracture might be desirable. However, this course would substantially reduce injectivity for the injection well and productivity for the production well. So, in this case the ideal solution is to plug the middle third of the fracture. That would allow high injectivity and productivity and actually increase sweep efficiency over the case where no fracture was present [63].




**Figure 1.5.** Water channeling from an injector to a producer through a single fracture.

A second scenario involves a system of natural fractures that connect an injection well and a production well (Figure 1.6). For this case, the goal would be to block the most direct fracture while leaving the secondary fractures open to allow high injectivity (for the injection well) and productivity (for the production well). One might think that blocking the most direct channel would be of limited value because injected water would simply channel through the next most direct fracture. However, one must realize that natural fractures tend to follow a log-normal distribution of widths [64]. Also, the conductivity of a given fracture is proportional to the third power of fracture width [58,65]. Thus, only one or two fractures are likely responsible for the vast majority of the channeling problem. If the second-most conductive fracture has half the width of the most conductive fracture, the second-most conductive fracture will have only one-eighth the conductivity of the most conductive fracture. If the most conductive fracture is plugged, water channeling could be reduced by over 80% (so water is diverted into other parts of the reservoir to displace oil).




**Figure 1.6.** Water channeling from an injector to a producer through natural fractures.

In a vertical production well, a single hydraulic fracture might lead from the well down into an aquifer (Figure 1.7). In this case, one would like to plug the lower part of the fracture (in the aquifer), while leaving the upper of the fracture open so that oil can flow freely to the well [66,67].




**Figure 1.7.** Fracture leading from a vertical production well down to an aquifer.

For a vertical production well in a naturally fractured reservoir, a system of fractures may lead down to an aquifer (Figure 1.8). Here, the goal would be to plug the fractures leading down into the aquifer while leaving the fractures open in the oil zone [68].



**Figure 1.8.** Natural fractures leading from a vertical production well down to an aquifer.

In a horizontal production well, a fracture or fault may cross the well and lead to an aquifer (Figure 1.9). In this case, the goal would be to plug the fracture without damaging those parts of the horizontal well in the remainder of the oil zone [69,70].




**Figure 1.9.** Fracture leading from a horizontal production well down to an aquifer.

Gels are the most effective means that we currently have to treat excess water production through fractures [69-74]. Cement cannot penetrate into narrow fractures, and in wide fractures, gravity segregation makes the cement drop to the lower part of the fracture—leaving the upper part open [6,75]. Foams may reduce fracture conductivity during injection, but wash out of fractures too easily [76,77] during chase floods. Continuous injection of foam reduces fracture

channeling [78], but may be considered an EOR method rather than fracture remediation approach, and requires a high ratio of injected gas compared to surfactant enriched water.


#### 2.4. If the problem is associated with matrix flow, is the problem accentuated by crossflow?

Beyond the possibilities listed above, one can envision several scenarios where fractures are not responsible for excess water production. Figure 1.10 illustrates the case where water cones up through matrix (no fractures) from an underlying aquifer to a production well.




**Figure 1.10.** 3D coning from an underlying aquifer (no fractures and no barriers to flow).

Figure 1.11 illustrates the case where water cusps through matrix (no fractures) from a nearby aquifer to a production well.



**Figure 1.11.** Cusping from a nearby aquifer (no fractures and no barriers to flow).

Figure 1.12 illustrates the cases where water channels through matrix (no fractures) from a nearby injection well to a production well.



**Figure 1.12.** Channeling from a nearby injection well (no fractures and no barriers to flow).

The above problems are generally very difficult and/or expensive to correct. In concept, the coning and cusping problems in Figures 1.10 and 1.11 could be solved by reducing the production rate enough so that gravity prevents the water from rising into the well. However, in most cases, the necessary rate reductions would not allow economic oil production rates [67,79]. A more common approach has been to use horizontal production wells instead of vertical producers [80]. Under some circumstances, horizontal wells can reduce pressure gradients sufficiently that water does not rise into the producer. The chance of this approach working increases by (1) placing the horizontal well near the top of the oil column, (2) having a thick oil column, and (3) having a relatively light (low density and low viscosity) oil.

Several tools have helped to diagnose whether crossflow through matrix occurs in a reservoir. Well logs can identify low-permeability (e.g., shale or anhydrite) barriers that can inhibit crossflow [21,22]. Perhaps, the most effective means to assess crossflow is to place a packer between the zones of interest and examine whether a pressure difference can be maintained [6,81].

**2.4.1. *WOR diagnostic plots.*** A valuable indication of the origin of an excess water problem can come from plots of water/oil ratio (WOR) versus time [82-84]. When viewed along with other information, these plots can also help identify the cause of the problem. In spite of aggressive claims to the contrary, these diagnostic plots (of WOR or WOR derivative versus time) should not be used alone to diagnose excessive water production mechanisms and problems [83-84]. WOR diagnostic plots were touted as capable of distinguishing whether premature water breakthrough is caused by water coning or channeling through high permeability layers [82]. Supposedly, gradually increasing WOR curves with negative derivative slopes are unique for coning problems, and rapidly increasing WOR curves with positive derivative slopes are indicative of a channeling problem. This method is not used to distinguish between linear flow (fracture or flow behind pipe) and radial flow for either channeling or coning. Previous work [75] has proven that the distinction between linear flow (associated with fractures) or radial flow (associated with unfractured matrix) is extremely important to water shutoff and conformance improvement—much more so than whether the problem is due to generic channeling or coning.

Reservoir models were built for water coning and channeling, and sensitivity analyses were conducted using numerical simulation [83,84]. Reservoir and fluid parameters were varied to examine WOR and WOR derivative behavior for both coning and channeling production problems. The study demonstrated that multi-layer channeling problems could easily be mistaken as bottom-water coning, and vice versa, if WOR diagnostic plots are used alone to identify an excessive water production mechanism. Consequently, WOR diagnostic plots can easily be misinterpreted and should not be used alone to diagnose the specific cause of a water production problem [83,84].

**2.4.2. Polymer flooding.** Especially for reservoirs with viscous oils, polymer flooding can be an effective solution for the problem in Figure 1.12 [61,85-87]. With the proper design and conditions, a polymer front can displace oil out of low-permeability zones as efficiently as in an adjacent high-permeability zone [61,85,86]. Polymer flooding is a proven technology.

Nevertheless, despite claims to the contrary, we would not characterize polymer flooding as a mature technology. Many improvements remain to be made in cost-effectiveness, polymer stability, polymer propagation (i.e., retention), process design, and understanding of mechanism of action (especially regarding the feasibility of displacement of capillary-trapped residual oil). Polymer floods involve significant expense and commitment since typically polymer banks injected must be in the range of 50-100% pore volume [61].

**2.4.3. In-depth profile modification.** An alternative method was proposed and commercialized [85,88] to treat problems like those in Figure 1.12. A detailed examination of this method (illustrated in Figure 1.13) is presented in Seright et al. 2012 [89].




Figure 1.13. Illustration of in-depth profile modification.

In this method, a block is placed in the high-permeability zone. This idea requires (1) the blocking agent must have a low viscosity (ideally a unit-mobility displacement) during placement, (2) the rear of the blocking-agent bank in the high-permeability zone must outrun the front of the blocking-agent bank in adjacent less-permeable zones, and (3) an effective block to flow must form at the appropriate location in the high-permeability zone [85,89].

This in-depth profile modification is most appropriate for high permeability contrasts (e.g. 10:1), high thickness ratios (e.g., less-permeable zones being 10 times thicker than high-permeability zones), and relatively low oil viscosities [89]. Because the blocking agent is relatively expensive relative to HPAM (typically 5-6 times more expensive), economics favor small blocking-agent bank sizes (e.g. 5% of the pore volume in the high-permeability layer). Although short-term economics may favor in-depth profile modification, ultimate recovery will normally be considerably lower than from a traditional polymer flood [89].

The commercial process [90] usually involves reservoirs with a thermal front. Cold water is sometimes injected into hot reservoirs, creating a thermal front that moves through the reservoir more slowly and evenly than the displacement front [88]. If a gelant is injected that is heat-activated, a plug could form in the high-permeability strata after the formulation passes the thermal front. With correct planning, no plug forms in the less-permeable strata because the gelant never reaches the thermal front (so the gelant never becomes hot enough to react and form a gel).

The commercialized concept uses polymer particles that pop or swell when activated, [91,92]. The material contains crosslinked sulfonate-containing micro-particles (0.1-3  $\mu\text{m}$  in diameter) with both labile and stable internal crosslinks [92]. The kernel particles are produced as a 30% dispersion in light mineral oil. This dispersion is diluted using a surfactant (surfactant/polymer ratio of 1:2 to 1:3) to prepare polymer concentrations from 3,000 ppm to 4,500 ppm [90,93]. The polymer cost \$5.71/lb in 2003 [90]. Activation commonly occurs upon heating. The polymer particles are intended to swell when they pass the thermal front in high-permeability watered-out strata, thus diverting subsequently injected water/fluids into the less-permeable oil strata. Estimated resistance factors for the popped polymer ranged from 11 to 350 [92,94,95]. Field applications of the process have occurred in Indonesia [90], Argentina [96], Alaska [94,95], and Tunisia [93]. Ohms et al. [95] reported injecting ~40,000 lbs of polymer (38,000 bbl with 3,300-ppm polymer), and recovering ~60,000 bbl of oil. Husband et al. [94] reported injecting ~200,000 lbs of polymer (190,000 bbl with 3,000 ppm polymer) into three wells, and recovering ~500,000 bbl of oil. Interestingly, successful polymer floods commonly recover two or more times more oil per pound of polymer than observed with this in-depth profile modification method [97]. In general, polymer flooding is a much less complicated, less risky, and more cost-effective method than in-depth profile modification [89]. Seright et al. [89] provide a much more detailed comparison.

**2.4.4. Foams.** In theory, there are circumstances where foams could provide improved sweep compared to polymer solutions [98]. These circumstances require the following: (1) foam forms in high permeability pathways but not in low permeability strata, (2) no crossflow occurs between high- and low- permeability strata, AND (3) the foam resistance factor in the high- permeability strata is high enough to overcome the permeability contrast and the unfavorable mobility ratio between the gas bank and the oil/water bank in the less-permeable strata. Foams will generally not be superior to polymers under other circumstances unless gravity effects provide a fortuitous benefit. Other limitations for foams must be recognized, including (1) difficulties formulating foams to meet the above requirements, (2) challenges with foam propagation, especially due to surfactant retention, (3) compression costs associated with foam injection, and (4) limitations on foam stability under reservoir conditions. Another major challenge is control of the effective

viscosity or mobility reduction provided in situ. In a given mobility control application, there is an optimum level of mobility desired for the injected fluid. Too little viscosity (or mobility reduction) leads to inefficient displacement, while too much viscosity leads to injectivity problems. For polymer solutions, any desired viscosity level can be achieved very accurately simply by adjusting the polymer concentration. In contrast, most foams allow little or no control over the level of mobility reduction provided. Although several applications of foams have been reported in an attempt to improve conformance [99-101], they cannot yet be considered a proven technology for water shutoff. Foams could, however, be more useful for gas shutoff purposes, and beneficial in CO<sub>2</sub>-EOR applications [102]. Using CO<sub>2</sub> as a foam processing solvent may replace organic solvents such as chlorofluorocarbons that are being phased out for environmental reasons, and promote improved CO<sub>2</sub> storage in mature oil reservoirs [103]. Combinations of polymer and foam injection, like polymer enhanced foams and foamed gels could overcome some inherent drawbacks of both methods but have not been widely investigated [76,77].

**2.4.5. Colloidal dispersion gels.** Colloidal dispersion gels [104-106] are formulations that typically contain low concentrations of polymer (e.g., 300-ppm HPAM) and a crosslinker (e.g., 15-ppm Al<sup>3+</sup> or Cr<sup>3+</sup>). Typically, a 10% (or less) pore-volume bank of the formulation is injected [105]. These formulations have been claimed to plug high-permeability strata without entering or damaging less-permeable strata and/or acting as a lower-cost, more-effective polymer-flooding agent. These claims are false. A detailed analysis and review of colloidal dispersion gels is available [107]. This review reveals that that colloidal dispersion gels cannot propagate deep into the porous rock of a reservoir, and at the same time, provide resistance factors (effective viscosity in porous media) or residual resistance factors (permeability reduction in porous media) that are greater than those for the same polymer formulation without the crosslinker. As with most particulate materials, gel particles that approach the size of pore throats are quickly filtered from solution during flow through porous media [108]. Gel particles that are too small have no significant effect on liquid mobility.

**2.4.6. Microorganisms, emulsions, particulates, precipitates, and nanoparticles.** A number of other materials have been proposed for use in conformance improvement, and especially for in-depth profile modification, including microorganisms, emulsions, particulates, precipitates, and nanoparticles [13,106,109-115]. The potential and claims for these materials must be viewed in the same light as for conformance improvement gels. Specifically, whenever a material is considered for in-depth profile modification [111], one should ask (1) why should the material not enter less-permeable, hydrocarbon-productive strata? (2) How far will the material penetrate into the less-permeable, hydrocarbon-productive strata? And (3) how much loss of flow capacity will the material cause to the less-permeable, hydrocarbon-productive strata after the material is in place? For the materials listed in the title of this section, they are very much in the research and development stage. None of them should be considered proven technologies. For the particular case of nanoparticles, one must ask, what advantage would a nanoparticle have or other conformance materials (especially gels). The small size of nanoparticles is of no obvious value in penetrating into formations. Further, nanoparticles have shown high adsorption/retention in porous rock [110]—suggesting difficulties with penetration very far into a given geologic stratum.


### 3. USE OF DISPROPORTIONATE PERMEABILITY REDUCTION

### 3.1. What is it and why does it occur?

Some polymers and gels can reduce permeability to water more than to oil or gas. Many different mechanisms have been suggested to explain this phenomenon [116-123]. A coherent and generally accepted gel dehydration mechanism has been offered to explain disproportionate permeability reduction for pore-filling gels in porous media [119-123]. A pore-filling gel is simply a gel that completely fills all the aqueous pore space after the gelation reaction is complete. The gel typically contains more than 90% water—and often more than 99% water. These aqueous pore-filling gels are actually porous media in themselves and thus have a very low but finite permeability to water—ranging from nano-darcys to micro-darcys, depending on the concentration of polymer [124]. One can think of the polymer strands that make up the gel to basically be a filter made from fibers. The more fibers (i.e., the higher the concentration of polymer), the lower the permeability. If pressure gradients are kept sufficiently low, so that injected water does not fracture through the gel, the water can enter one side of the gel and come out the other side—while leaving the gel's structure intact with its original (very low) permeability. Thus, if the gel forms in a stratum where only water flows, the permeability can permanently be lowered to a very low value, and the water production is efficiently shutoff from that zone. In a stratum where oil or gas flows, gelant can also enter during placement, and the aqueous gel forms in the aqueous pore space [125]. Oil or gas cannot enter the aqueous gel structure, so the gel's effective permeability to oil or gas is zero. However, under a pressure gradient, the oil or gas can deform the gel. This deformation forces a small amount of water out the opposite side of the gel and forms a small dimple on the oil and gas side of the gel. With time under the pressure gradient, this dimple grows to form a finger or wormhole through the gel—with more water being forced from the gel as the wormhole grows (basically dehydrating a pathway through the gel). Eventually, the oil or gas wormhole penetrates all the way through the gel—restoring a relatively high effective permeability to oil or gas [119,120,126,127]. The rate of restoration of effective permeability for a gelant-invaded hydrocarbon strata increases with increased pressure gradient, decreased polymer content in the gel, and decreased distance of gel penetration into the hydrocarbon strata [126,127].

Disproportionate permeability reduction (also called relative permeability modification) can also be observed with adsorbed polymers [128] and weak or particulate-form gels [129-131]. Weak or particulate-form gels are usually the product of incomplete gelation, so that the gel does not fill most or all of the aqueous pore space [130,131]. They provide permeability reduction dominantly by lodging in pore throats and causing some degree of flow restriction. On the positive side, their level of permeability reduction is modest—typically in the range from a factor of 2 to 100. However, a major disadvantage of these materials is that their level of permeability reduction is usually extremely variable [127]. In one example, nine nearly identical tests of a commercial product in ~300-mD Berea sandstone gave permeability reductions ranging from 1.5 to 400. In contrast, a pore-filling gel have very consistent permeability reductions (down to about 200  $\mu$ D in cores ranging from 100 to 7000 mD, regardless of wetting properties of the core [127]). Because particle-form gels are commonly the product of an uncontrolled and incomplete gelation reaction, the concentration of particles produced and the size and size distribution of the particles produced is not controlled or predictable. Since their mechanism of permeability reduction involves clogging pore throats, this makes their level of permeability reduction unpredictable.

Most previous field applications of disproportionate permeability reduction (by service companies) have targeted vertical wells with no reported fractures. Their goal was to avoid zone isolation during gelant placement, and rely on disproportionate permeability reduction to reduce water production with minimum damage to hydrocarbon zones [125,127]. However, simple calculations using Darcy's law for radial flow reveal that in order for this idea to work, the gel must reduce permeability to hydrocarbon by no more than a factor of two (Figure 1.14), while at the same time providing at least a factor of ten permeability reduction to water.



**Figure 1.14.** Permeability reduction requirements for treatment of unfractured vertical wells without zone isolation.

It is important to understand that disproportionate permeability reduction is of no value if all fluids are flowing within a single stratum [125]. Even if the gel could reduce permeability to water without causing ANY permeability reduction to hydrocarbon, a mass balance dictates that the fractional flow of water and hydrocarbon must remain the same within a given zones (at least over the short-term). If a gel or magic membrane could allow hydrocarbon to pass without allowing water, the water saturation would accumulate—driving the hydrocarbon saturation down, driving the relative permeability to hydrocarbon down, and thus forming a water block. Disproportionate permeability reduction will only be of value in production wells. It has no value in injection wells (because usually only water is injected there).


### 3.2. Misleading parallel linear corefloods.

At present, no known material will significantly reduce permeability to water without causing some permeability reduction to oil [116-125]. However, one can easily manipulate laboratory parallel linear corefloods to make it appear that a given material has reduced water permeability in a high-permeability core without causing any damage to a parallel less-permeable core. Thus, the buyer should beware of any attempt to use parallel linear corefloods to prove the conformance merits of a product.

To understand why parallel linear corefloods can be misleading, consider Figure 1.15. First, consider the perfect theoretical case (involving only mathematical calculations and no actual

experimentation). Assume two sets of parallel corefloods—one linear and one radial (as illustrated in Figure 1.15). Within each set, two cores have exactly the same dimensions and porosity, but Core 1 has 10 times the permeability of Core 2 (i.e.,  $k_1/k_2=10$ ). Also assume that both cores in a given set are initially filled only with water. A gelant is injected that has the same viscosity as water (i.e., the resistance factor of the gelant is one,  $F_r=1$ ). Within a given core set, the gelant provides a perfect piston-like displacement until it reaches the outlet of the most-permeable core. For the radial case, the gelant is injected into a shared injection well until it reaches the outer radius of Core 1. For both the linear and radial cases, the volume of gelant injected into Core 2 will be 10% of that injected into Core 1. For linear flow, the gelant penetrates 10% of the way through Core 2. In contrast, in radial flow, the gelant penetrates in Core 2 to a radius that is about one-third of the radius in Core 1—because of the  $\pi r^2$  relation associated with radial flow.

After the gelant has been placed, the gel is allowed for form. Assume that wherever the gel does form, it reduces permeability to subsequent water flow by a factor of 10 (i.e., the residual resistance factor is 10,  $F_{rr}=10$ ). At this point, Darcy's law for flow in parallel and series is used to calculate the loss of flow capacity (i.e., injectivity) in the various cores [107,121]. As indicated by the table in Figure 1.15, Core 1 experiences a 90% loss of flow capacity for both the linear and radial cases (because the entire core is completely filled with gel that reduces permeability by a factor of 10). In the Core 2 for the linear case, the flow capacity is reduced by 47%. Thus, for the parallel linear corefloods, the gel treatment reduced flow capacity considerably more in the high-permeability core than in the low-permeability core—so the flow profile was improved considerably. The downside of this treatment, however, was there was a 47% loss of flow capacity in Core 2. If Core 2 represented an oil zone, the result would translate to a substantial loss of oil productivity.



**Figure 1.15.** Theoretical comparison of permeability reduction in linear versus radial flow.

Now consider the case of radial flow. Here, Core 2 experiences an 87% loss of flow capacity, while Core 1 experiences a 90% loss of flow capacity. Thus, for the radial case, both Cores were damaged to about the same extent, so no significant improvement in flow profile occurred. Thus,

the gel treatment was pointless for the radial case. The net result of the gel treatment was only to substantially damage the flow capacity of both zones. The point of this exercise is that even if parallel linear corefloods worked in a theoretically perfect way, the result would be grossly unrepresentative of expectations in an unfractured vertical well. Thus, even in the ideal case, parallel linear corefloods are a very poor way to imitate what might be expected for an unconfined (i.e., no zone isolation) gelant placement in an unfractured vertical well.

Next, consider an experiment performed using parallel linear corefloods. Typically, a flow line leads from the gelant pump and splits before reaching the inlets of the two cores (as indicated by the lines preceding the linear cores in Figure 1.15). The correct way to perform this experiment is to fill the flow lines completely with gelant all the way to the entrance of both cores before starting the experiment. In contrast, too many reported experiments had these lines filled with water at the start of the experiment. For the latter cases, the gelant rapidly fills the flow line leading to the high-permeability core—and much (or all) of the high-permeability core. But because the low-permeability core is much less permeable, the gelant requires much more time to fill the flow line leading to Core 2. It is possible that little or no gelant entered Core 2 by the end of gelant placement—thus giving the false impression that the gelant would not damage the less-permeable core.

Even if the experiment is performed correctly (meaning the flow lines are completely filled with gelant before the start of the experiment), diffusion can distort the results in an overly optimistic way. For small molecules (as in a monomer-based gelant, such as silica, acrylamide monomer, or phenol-formaldehyde), the diffusion coefficient is on the order of  $10^{-5} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$ —translating to about 1 cm/day for movement at a concentration front [132]. For field gelant treatments, this rate of movement is insignificant compared to the sizes of the gelant banks in both high- and low-permeability zones [111,125,132-134]. In contrast, the very small gelant bank in the less-permeable core in a laboratory experiment could be diluted enough by diffusion to compromise the gelant bank—thus, again giving the false impression that the gelant treatment might not damage less-permeable zones. Other phenomena can also lead to overly optimistic interpretations of parallel linear corefloods [111,125,132-134].

In summary, we strongly recommend that parallel linear corefloods NOT be used to evaluate the potential for materials as agents for profile modification.

### **3.3. Disproportionate permeability reduction in fractures.**

Disproportionate permeability reduction has its greatest potential in treating fractures that cut through both water and hydrocarbon zones [66-68]. Figure 1.16 illustrates this concept for the case where hydraulic fracturing was used to stimulate an oil zone, but inadvertently cut through a shale barrier into an underlying aquifer. During gelant injection, the gelant will flow very rapidly down the length of a fracture, while leaking off a short distance into the porous rock matrix next to the fracture. The degree of gelant leakoff will be dictated by the strata permeabilities and fractional flow concepts [66,67,125]. However, to a first approximation, one should expect the gelant to leak off significantly into both oil and water zones. The reduction of flow capacity in a given zone is dictated by the product of permeability reduction and the distance of gelant leakoff [66]. For example, assume that a gelant leaks off 0.2 ft into both the oil zone and the water zone in Figure 1.16. Also assume that after gelation, the gel reduces permeability to oil by a factor of

50, while reducing permeability to water by a factor of 5000. Pore-filling gels are able to provide this level of disproportionate permeability reduction [126,127]. For this example, the gel barrier would provide resistance equivalent to flowing through  $0.2 \text{ ft} \times 5000 = 1000 \text{ ft}$  of additional rock in order to enter the fracture. Thus, the gel substantially retards water flow into the fracture. In contrast, in the oil zone, the gel barrier provides resistance equivalent to flowing through  $0.2 \text{ ft} \times 50 = 10 \text{ ft}$  of additional rock in order to enter the fracture. Certainly, some loss of flow capacity has occurred in the oil zone, but not enough to significantly impair oil productivity.




Figure 1.16. Gelant treatments of fractured production wells.

Although the concept shown in Figure 1.16 has tremendous potential, it has not been applied much to date. A service company sold a qualitative version of this concept by incorporating a disproportionate-permeability-reduction polymer into fracturing fluids [135]. The concept was that if a hydraulic fracture inadvertently cut into a water zone, the disproportionate-permeability-reduction polymer would automatically inhibit water entry into the fracture. Unfortunately, the concept, as sold, had two major technical flaws. First, the distance of leakoff from the fracture faces was not known or estimated. Second, no attempt was made to quantify the permeability reduction in the oil and water zones. Thus, the process had no control over the reduction of flow capacity in either the oil or water zones.

A quantitative design procedure for application of the concept in Figure 1.16 was developed for hydraulically fractured vertical production wells [66]. Extensions of this procedure were also developed for application in hydraulically fractured horizontal production wells [136] and in naturally fractured production wells [68].

## 4. GEL EXTRUSION THROUGH FRACTURES

Use of gels for water shutoff has conventionally involved injecting gelant solutions, and relying on the process of gelation to form a plug after placement of the material. Gelant is defined as the fluid chemical solution before gelation, while gel is technically the product of the gelation reaction.

### 4.1. Field Observations

In this section, we focus on extrusion of formed gel material through fractures. This topic has an interesting history. In the early 1980s, Marathon implemented conventional polymer floods in Wyoming [137]. However, because the target reservoirs were highly fractured, much of the polymer solution simply channeled directly from injectors and producers through the natural fracture systems. To slow down the movement of the polymer through the reservoir, a chromium crosslinker was added. During this time, R.D. Sydansk [71,138,139] developed the Cr(III)-acetate-HPAM gel system. In the same time frame, Phillips [140,141] developed the analogous Cr(III)-propionate-HPAM gel system. These gel systems were a major advance over previous gels for EOR, because their performance was reasonably insensitive to pH and salinity. Previous gels had little buffering capacity and gelled optimally at non-neutral pH values. For example, the Cr(VI)-HPAM system gelled optimally around pH=4 [131], and phenolic-based gels formed optimally around pH=9 [130,142]. Because the older gel systems did not have much buffer capacity, contact with carbonate and clay minerals quickly changed the formulations' pH shortly after injection. Thus, the gels did not form well (and sometimes did not form at all) inside the reservoir. The Cr(III)-acetate and propionate systems greatly improved the predictability and controllability of gel systems [138-146].

Key field applications of the Cr(III)-acetate-HPAM gel involved injecting large gel volumes, notably by Marathon in the Oregon Basin field in Wyoming [71,138,139], by Amoco in the Wertz field in Wyoming [148], and by Chevron in the Rangely field in Colorado [72,76,147]. Injected gel volumes ranged from 5000 to 37000 bbl over the course of 1 week to 1 month, with an average around 15000 bbl over the course of two weeks [71-74]. Under the conditions in the particular field applications, gelation of the Cr(III)-acetate-HPAM formulations occurred from 1 hour (e.g., at 60°C) to 15 hours (e.g., at room temperature). Thus, the gel formulations were injected for substantially longer than the gelation time. Once gelation takes place, the product of the crosslinking (i.e., the gel) will not flow through porous rock (i.e., less than 10 darcys) using any realistic field pressure gradient (i.e., <10 psi/ft) [148-153]. These facts lead to the realization that formed gels must extrude through fractures during most of the gel injection during the field applications. For practical reasons, it is best to keep the formulations fluid (i.e., as gelant) in the surface facilities and during the initial part of pumping downhole. However, the formulations exist as gel, partially formed gel, or preformed gel during most of the process of gel placement within the reservoir. That fact raises the question: What are the properties of gels as they extrude through fractures?

### 4.2 Stable pressure behavior during extrusion.

This question led to a number of experiments where gels were extruded through fractured cores after gel formation [148-159]. A key question was whether a gel would propagate through a

fracture in a stable way, or whether screen-outs would occur in the early part of the fracture (as happens with sand, cement, and other relatively rigid materials). Figure 1.17 reveals that a one-day-old gel with 0.5% HPAM (5 million g/mol Mw with 5-10% degree of hydrolysis) and 0.0417% Cr(III) acetate does propagate stably through a 1-mm-(0.04-inch) wide, 122-cm (48-inch) long fracture (i.e., a fracture in a Berea sandstone core) at 41°C [158]. When injecting at a fixed rate, the pressure gradient remained stable (without wild swings in the pressure gradient) over the course of injecting 75 fracture volumes of gel. The highly stretchy nature of this gel promotes this behavior. More rigid gels (and other materials) would screen out early within the fracture [20,58,148].




Figure 1.17. Stable extrusion of a Cr(III)-acetate gel through a fracture.

#### 4.3. Rate insensitivity during extrusion.

An interesting feature of gel extrusion is that it shows very different rheology than conventional fluids. In particular, for a given gel composition and fracture width, the gel will not extrude if the pressure gradient is below some critical value [150,152]. Above that critical value, the pressure gradient during gel extrusion is quite insensitive to the rate of extrusion. Table 1.2 illustrates this point for the same one-day-old Cr(III)-acetate-HPAM gel used in Figure. 1.17. Even though the flow rate increased by a factor of 80, the pressure gradient averaged about 30 psi/ft (actually ranging from 18 to 40 psi/ft). This effect has practical consequences. Normally, there is always a desire to inject fluids quickly—either because of time constraints or because of a desire to push oil out faster. However, this desire is tempered by a fear that injecting too fast will cause fractures to extend too far, and possibly accentuate channeling between wells [61,160,161]. This fear is predicated on higher injection rates causing higher pressures and pressure gradients. In contrast, Table 1.2 suggests that the pressures and pressure gradients generated will be insensitive to injection rate.

Table 1.2. Effect of rate on gel extrusion through 1-mm-wide, 122-cm long fractures.

Injection flux, ft/d	413	1030	4130	33100
Pressure gradient, psi/ft	28	29	40	18

Gel breakthrough, fracture volumes	15	6.0	4.0	1.7
Average gel dehydration factor, C/Co	27	17	11	4

The minimum pressure gradient for gel movement impacts the distance that a gel can be expected to propagate in a given fracture [150-152]. For example, assume that a pressure gradient of 10 psi/ft is needed to initiate flow for a gel in a fracture. If the downhole injection pressure is limited to 2000 psi (perhaps because of regulations or equipment constraints) and if the reservoir pressure is 1000 psi (so there is a 1000 psi pressure differential between the injector and the reservoir), the gel will stop flowing once it reaches 100 ft along the fracture [i.e.,  $(2000 \text{ psi} - 1000 \text{ psi})/(10 \text{ psi/ft}) = 100 \text{ ft}$ ]. After propagating 100 ft along the fracture, the pressure gradient will fall below the minimum 10 psi/ft needed to move the gel.

#### 4.4. Dependence on fracture width.

As expected qualitatively, the pressure gradient required to extrude a gel through a fracture decreases with increased fracture width [152]. Based on a force balance [155,156], one might expect the pressure gradient for gel extrusion to vary inversely with fracture width [155,156]. However, experimental observations [152] indicate that the required pressure gradient varies closer to the inverse square of the fracture width (see Figure 1.18). For the extrusion experiments shown in Figure 1.18, the pressure gradient for gel extrusion did not depend on the permeability or lithology of the porous rock that contained the fracture (between 1.5 mD and 650 mD). The trend in Figure 1.18 also has implications for field applications of gels—specifically that gels will propagate much farther in wide fractures than in narrow fractures. For the example given in the previous paragraph, assume the pressure gradient for gel extrusion is 10 psi/ft in a 1-mm-wide fracture but 2.5 psi/ft in a 2-mm-wide fracture. Given the same conditions as above, the gel is expected to extrude 100 ft in the 1-mm-wide fracture but 400 ft in the 2-mm-wide fracture.





Figure 1.18. Pressure gradient for gel extrusion versus fracture width.

#### 4.5. Dependence on polymer concentration and temperature.


As expected, the pressure gradient for gel extrusion increases with increased concentration of polymer in the gel [153]. Figure 1.19 shows an empirical correlation between pressure gradient

for gel extrusion and HPAM concentration in the gel. For these experiments, the ratio of HPAM to Cr(III) acetate was fixed at 12:1. The figure also shows that the ratio of elastic modulus of the gel ( $G'$ , measured in a rheometer) to fracture width ( $w_f$ ) follows a trend that parallels the pressure gradient trend—but has values that are two orders of magnitude lower (for a given polymer concentration in the gel.)



**Figure 1.19.** Pressure gradient for gel extrusion versus polymer concentration.

For a one-day old Cr(III)-acetate-HPAM gel (with 0.5% HPAM and 0.0417% Cr(III) acetate), Figure 1.20 reveals that the pressure gradient for gel extrusion is insensitive to temperature between 20°C and 80°C [162]. This finding was somewhat unexpected since the viscosity of water decreased by a factor of 2.8 between 20°C and 80°C.




**Figure 1.20.** Pressure gradient for gel extrusion versus temperature.

#### 4.6. Gel dehydration during extrusion.

Gels dehydrate during extrusion through fractures [150-153]. Gels used for water shutoff typically contain over 90% water—and often over 99% water [142,143]. As the gel extrudes through a given fracture, the water leaves the gel and leaks off through the fracture faces into the

porous rock. In contrast, the crosslinked polymer cannot enter the porous rock [148-153], so it remains behind in the fracture—making a more concentrated gel. These points can be appreciated by considering the Table 1.2. Note in the four experiments that the gel did not arrive at the end of the fractures after injecting only one fracture volume of gel. Instead, it took 15 fracture volumes of gel to fill the fracture at the slowest gel injection rate and 1.7 fracture volumes at the highest rate. Further, at the end of each experiment, the fracture was opened—revealing a concentrated rubbery gel. These gels in the fractures were analyzed (for polymer and crosslinker) to reveal that they were considerably more concentrated than the gel that was injected [150]. For the slowest experiment, the gel was 27 times more concentrated than the injected gel, while for the fastest experiment, the gel was concentrated by a factor of 4. Gels have been concentrated by factors up to 40 times by this extrusion process [150]. Interestingly, the gel that exits the end of the fracture had the same composition and rheological properties as the gel that was injected—even after extruding 32 feet through a 1-mm-wide fracture [152,153]. This finding indicates that the gel that moves within the fracture has the same composition as the injected gel. In other words, once an element of gel dehydrates and concentrates, it remains immobile at that point in the fracture. Since the injected gel is far less concentrated than the dehydrated/concentrated gel, the injected gel is far more mobile than the dehydrated gel—resulting in a very unfavorable mobility ratio and displacement process. Thus, the mobile injected gel forms viscous fingers or wormholes through the dehydrated/ concentrated gel [153]. Figure 1.21 shows a picture of this worm-holing process. In this experiment, two Berea sandstone slabs (each 15x15x8 cm in dimension) were placed together, separated by a 1-mm gap (to make the fracture). A large volume of clear 1-day-old Cr(III)-acetate-HPAM gel (containing 0.5% HPAM and 0.0417% Cr(III) acetate) were extruded through the fracture (top to bottom in Figure 1.21). Near the end of the procedure, injection was switched to a gel with exactly the same composition and age—except the gel contained a blue dye. Then the experiment was stopped, and the fracture was pried open to reveal the fracture faces and gel inside the fracture—seen in Figure 1.21. This figure clearly shows the wormhole pattern. Gel samples were analyzed throughout the fracture—revealing that gel in the blue wormholes had the same composition as the injected gel, but the colorless gel was 12 times more concentrated [152,153].




**Figure 1.21.** Less-concentrated gel worm-holing through more-concentrated gel.

#### 4.7. Water leakoff during gel extrusion and predicting gel propagation through fractures.

During these gel extrusion experiments, taps in the rock matrix (located away from the fracture) allowed collection of the water of dehydration from the gel [152,153]. Analysis of this fluid

confirmed that no crosslinked polymer penetrated any significant distance into the porous rock during the extrusion process. Collection of this leakoff fluid also allowed determination of the rate of leakoff as a function of time, although *in-situ* imaging could also be necessary in some experiments [154]. Leakoff rates from a large number of experiments is shown in Figure 1.22 [153]. Although there is some scatter, most of the leakoff data followed the green line and equation shown, where the leakoff rate ( $u_l$ , expressed in ft/d or  $\text{ft}^3$  of fluid leaking off per  $\text{ft}^2$  of fracture area per day) varied inversely with time ( $t$ ) raised to the 0.5 power. This type of relation is consistent with leakoff behavior during hydraulic fracturing and during filtration experiments [153]. This relation can be combined with a mass balance to predict (1) the distance of gel propagation through a fracture as a function of time and volume of gel injected ( $q_{tot}$ ) and (2) the degree of concentration of gel within the fracture ( $C/C_0$ ). Specifically, assuming that a vertical fracture (of height,  $h_f$ , and width,  $w_f$ ) contains two wings, the rate of gel propagation ( $dL/dt$ ) is:


This differential equation has been solved and presented in excel spreadsheets, to allow convenient predictions at <http://www.prrc.nmt.edu/groups/res-sweep/gel-treatments/>.



**Figure 1.22.** Leakoff rates during gel extrusion through fractures.

Figure 1.23 plots predictions of gel propagation through a two-wing 1-mm-(0.04-inch) wide vertical fracture for three volumetric injection rates. This plot reveals several points that are of practical significance in a field application. First, the distance of gel penetration into a fracture is not linearly dependent on the gel volume injected. Normally, one might think that a fracture would be filled with gel after injecting one fracture volume. However, because of the dehydration effect, substantially more gel may be required (as revealed in Table 1.2). Detailed consideration of the slopes of the curves in Figure 1.23 reveals that doubling the distance of gel penetration along a fracture requires approximately tripling the injected gel volume. The figure also reveals that for a given volume of gel injection, the distance of gel propagation will be maximized by injecting at the highest practical injection rate. Put another way, if the goal was to reach a given distance along a fracture, injecting faster requires less gel to reach the objective. For example, in this case, if the desired distance of gel penetration is 200 ft along a 1-mm-wide fracture, 400 bbl of gel are required when injecting at 1 barrel per minute (BPM), but only 80 bbl of gel are needed when injecting at 10 BPM. On the other hand, injecting at a faster rate reduces

the degree of dehydration for the gel after placement. One might wish to inject slower to make the gel stronger, and perhaps more resistant to washout during subsequent injection of water or other fluid after gel placement [152].



**Figure 1.23.** Predicted gel propagation through a two-wing 1-mm-wide vertical fracture.

The behavior described in Figures 1.17 through 1.23 were based on work with moderately-to-high molecular-weight HPAM crosslinked with Cr(III) acetate. However, we anticipate that the behavior will be mimicked by any gel formed from polymers with a similar degree of polymerization and using any crosslinker, including guar-borate gels [153], HPAM crosslinked with polyethylene imine [163-169], phenol-formaldehyde [68,170], hydroquinone-hexamethylenetetramine [171-173], and preformed particle gels (PPGs) [174-181].

A model of filter-cake formation was developed based on observations during gel extrusion through fractures. Many people know of the Carter filter-cake model [182] that has been a cornerstone of hydraulic fracturing. The Carter model assumes that the filtrate or fluid-loss material will build up in thickness evenly (from an areal viewpoint) on a fracture surface as the fracture fluid leaks off into the porous rock (left side of Figure 1.24). With some thought, one should realize that this cannot happen if the fracture has a fixed or confined width. To correct this deficiency, an alternative model was proposed [153] where the filter cake builds up unevenly over the fracture area (right side of Figure 1.24). Whereas in the Carter model, the filter cake increases in thickness with time, the new model assumes that the filter-cake thickness is generally about the width of the fracture, but the area covered by filtrate decreases with time. The new model is consistent with Figure 1.21, while the Carter model is not. Details of the development of this new model are in Reference [153], but the solid red curve in Figure 1.22 compares predictions from the new model with those of the Carter model (solid green curve in Figure 1.22). As can be seen, both curves are consistent with the experimental observations. When presented with the new model, one famous hydraulic fracturing pioneer asked, If the two models predict the same thing, big deal—why bother? The only response available was that the new model incorporates more-correct physics of the leakoff process than the Carter model. There may be circumstances where that becomes important. That point will be revisited in the next section.





Figure 1.24. Old Carter model versus new gel-extrusion model.

## 5. GEL BLOCKING EFFICIENCY

When the purpose of polymer gel placement in fractures is to reduce conductivity during chase-floods (e.g., subsequent water injection), the behavior and properties of dehydrated gel are of considerable importance. Gel ability to block fractures depend on several factors, which we will summarize in this section. An important and logical deduction, common for all factors, is that gel is only capable of completely blocking a fracture as long as the entire fracture volume is filled with gel.

### 5.1 Rupture pressure


Subsequent injections of chase fluids (e.g., water) will implement a pressure gradient across the gel-filled fracture, which may reduce the gel volume [123,178-184]. The gel will maintain fracture blocking and complete filling of the fracture at pressure gradients below the rupture pressure. When the rupture pressure is reached, however, water (or other injected fluids) are again allowed to pass through some parts of the fracture. The rest of the fracture will remain gel-filled. Gel rupture pressure measurements [157,185,186] reflect the complex nature of gel, and the rupture pressure cannot be directly projected based on injection parameters. Repeated core floods have shown that the rupture pressure in a given segment of the fracture increases with increased gel throughput and decreased gel placement rates (summarized in Figure 1.25). This follows directly from Section 4 of this chapter: the leakoff rate is insensitive to the gel flow rate. Hence, gel propagating slowly through a fracture will dehydrate more compared to faster moving gel, consequently increasing its concentration and pressure resistance. This finding should not be perceived as a suggestion to reduce the gel placement rate: because gel extrusion pressure is also insensitive to the placement rate, the gel propagation distance in a fracture may be maximized by injecting gel at the highest practical injection rate. When a longer segment of the fracture is gel-filled, the overall expected rupture pressure for the gel treatment will also increase. Thus, gel dehydration is beneficial for gel blocking efficiency during subsequent floods, where the manner in which dehydration occurs is also highly important.




**Figure 1.25:** Dehydrated gel can withstand higher pressure gradients during subsequent chase floods. Gel dehydration within a specific segment of the fracture is maximized by injecting more gel or using lower injection rates.

## 5.2 Blocking ability of ruptured gel

Both filter-cake models (Carter and new model, Section 4.7) assume gel dehydration during extrusion through fractures, resulting in a concentrated gel that is more rigid and with a higher tolerance towards imposed pressure compared to gel of original composition. Macroscopically, the models predict similar leakoff rates, but the filter-cake formation within the fracture volume takes place in a quite different manner. This distinction becomes important during chase floods. According to the Carter model, gel dehydration and deposition occur on the fracture surfaces, with less concentrated gel present in the middle of the fracture. The least concentrated gel is first washed out of the fracture during subsequent injections. Consequently, the active water flow path will resemble a narrow version of the fracture according to the Carter model (see Figure 1.24), and its width will determine fracture flow capacity. The permeability reduction provided by gel (residual resistance factor) would in this case decrease quickly towards one, as gel occupancy decreases and the active flow path expands (Figure 1.26). Experimental observations do not correspond with these low expectations; and gel permeability reduction remains high although water flow occupies up to 40% of the fracture volume (Figure 1.26). Gel blocking ability has also been observed to vary with flow rate (i.e., implemented pressure gradient, Figure 1.27), which cannot be explained by the Carter model. The new leakoff model proposes a volumetrically uneven filter-cake, where less concentrated gel resides in wormholes within dehydrated gel. Gel rupture will in this case occur when less-concentrated gel is displaced out of the wormholes. The wormholes will thereafter conduct the flow of water through the fracture. Observations such as resistance factor dependency on flow rate (Figure 1.27) supports the new filter cake model; which attribute this behavior to the elasticity of the gel filter-cake, allowing wormholes to collapse and expand depending on the imposed pressure gradient [153].




**Figure 1.26:** Calculated residual resistance factor for a fracture initially filled with concentrated gel, using the cubic law  $k_f = \frac{\text{fracture width}^2}{12}$  [187]. Gel washes out of the middle of the fracture first according to the Carter model, and fracture conductivity is determined by the width of the active flow path. Experimental observations [188] do not corroborate the quickly decreasing gel permeability reduction.



**Figure 1.27:** Permeability reduction provided by gel remains high over time and vary with injection rate and pressure. Full data set available in [185].

Gel blocking ability during chase floods is often studied using core floods, where differential pressure measurements and effluents produced from matrix and fractures give information about

flow paths within the fracture. Direct visualization of wormholes was previously not possible within opaque porous media to confirm either filter-cake model. However, new in-situ imaging methods give insight to local flow patterns, and can be used to visualize water flow through gel-filled fractures [189]. In-situ imaging by magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) or positron emission tomography (PET) showed the formation and development of wormholes during chase waterfloods, and strongly supported the new leakoff model [188-191]. Wormhole development after gel rupture is exemplified in Figure 1.28. Gel rupture created a heterogeneous active flow path through the gel-filled fracture. Increasing injection rates expanded the initial wormhole, occasionally adding new rupture paths [188]. The wormholes remained in the same shape and location for the entire waterflood, and changes in the active flow path were mainly attributed to gel erosion and elasticity. Expansion of the wormholes was observed with increasing flow rates, as expected, but the residual resistance factor (the factor by which the effective permeability was reduced by the gel) was maintained. The wormhole covered almost 35% of the fracture after long term waterflooding—i.e., water flows through more than one third of the fracture. The gel permeability reduction was still maintained at a high level (residual resistance factor  $> 22000$ , Figure 1.26 experimental observations are based on this experiment). Gel permeability reduction increased when the flow rate was decreased as expected (see Figure 1.27), but no visual evidence of significant wormhole collapse was found using imaging. Imaging did, however, confirm the existence of wormholes, and showed that they had significant variations in width within the fracture. Because the wormholes represent the active flow path for water, narrow constrictions in the wormholes (measured to  $< 0.001$  cm) may act as natural chokes on fluid flow. This mechanism is only possible when the filter-cake forming during gel dehydration is heterogeneous. Consequently, the wormholes forming during gel rupture are naturally non-uniform and dependent on local gel concentrations.



**Figure 1.28:** wormhole development within a 1-mm wide fracture captured by PET imaging.

Injected water was labelled with positron-emitting isotope  $^{18}\text{F}$ -FDG. Upon combinations between emitted positrons and adjacent electrons, a photon pair with 511keV energy is emitted, and this event can be spatially and temporally determined. Details are provided in [188].

### 5.3 Gel shrinking

The volume of gel filling a fracture may clearly be influenced by mechanical stimuli, as described in the previous section, but can also interact with its surroundings. Shrinking of gel may open parts of the fracture to fluid flow and be detrimental to gel blocking efficiency, as shown in Figure 1.29. The possible reasons for gel shrinking after placement in fractures are briefly summarized here.

*Syneresis* [192-195] expels water from the gel structure, consequently shrinking the gel by up to 90%. The main cause for syneresis is excess cross-linker in the gel solution or increased cross-link density over time, which may be prevented by formulating the gel without exceeding the optimum crosslinker concentration [194]. Chemical modifications of the polymer may also cause syneresis, and may occur when gel is in contact with sea water over time at high temperatures [195]. For convenience in field applications, bulk gel tests may be performed to assess the sensitivity of gel towards brine formulations and temperature, where test parameters may be designed to target specific reservoirs [139]. *Gel degradation*, which causes solvent to separate from the gel, may also be assessed through bulk gel tests [196].

*Spontaneous imbibition* of gel solvent into an adjacent matrix has been observed on the core scale [197], shrinking the gel volume by up to 99%. Capillary forces are the driving force for spontaneous imbibition, and this effect will therefore mainly prevail in oil zones at water-wet conditions. A spontaneous reduction of the gel volume by imbibition may be an advantage in some applications because fractures will be blocked more efficiently in water-zones (no imbibition) compared to oil zones (imbibition of water from gel induces gel shrinkage and opens part of the fracture volume to oil flow). Gel treatments in production wells may become less efficient with time if oil-banks move into the vicinity of gel-filled fractures. Spontaneous imbibition of solvent can theoretically be reduced by formulating gel with surfactants to reduce the interfacial tension between oil and gel solvent, but this has not yet been practically investigated. We strongly suggest factoring in reservoir wettability during gel treatment design and assessment of its success.

Changing *external conditions* around a gel volume may influence the gel volume without altering its concentration. Gel shrinking (and swelling, discussed in the next section) can be attributed to changes in temperature, solvent composition, ionic strength and external electrical field [198]. Interactions between gel and formation brine are of special importance. The viscosity and long-term stability of polymer solutions are generally known to decrease with increasing salinity in the surrounding brine [199,200]. Bulk gel studies also showed that crosslinked gel volume changed when the salinity or pH of surrounding brine differed from the gel [201-203]. Specifically, the presence of mono- and multivalent cations in formation water can shrink a gel [202]. This phenomenon should be considered when formulating gels for fracture conductivity control. Fresh water is commonly used as gel solvent, so the resulting gel may shrink considerably in contact with formation water—making the gel blocking ability lower than expected.





Figure 1.29: shrinkage of gel and its influence on fracture conductivity for different fracture widths. The fracture is assumed to be filled by concentrated gel initially.

#### 5.4 Gel swelling

Bulk gels generally shrink if contacted by water with a higher salinity than the gel solvent, and swell when the salinity in the surrounding water phase is decreased [181,201-204]. Formulating gels based on higher-salinity water may therefore be an advantage. Recent laboratory studies have shown that injection of low-salinity water may repair a ruptured gel treatment [205-207]. This favorable effect occurs when the salinity of the injected water is lower than that of the gel solvent, which cause the fracture-filling gel to swell. Gel swelling was demonstrated to improve the gel blocking ability, and the injection pressure could be increased above the initial gel rupture pressure without compromising the gel treatment (Figure 1.30). High-salinity gel remained stable for long time periods during continuous low-salinity water injection.



**Figure 1.30:** Water may flow through the fracture after gel rupture. When there is no salinity contrast between the gel and injected water, the permeability reduction provided by gel will decrease with water throughput. The opposite trend is observed when the salinity in the injected water phase is decreased compared to the gel and the permeability reduction provided by gel increased with time.

## 6. FIELD APPLICATIONS

### 6.1 General approach

A large number of field applications of water shutoff and conformance improvement have occurred, including those referenced in this paper. In recent years, many attempts have been made to specify how field applications should be approached and evaluated. We caution that care should be exercised when using “statistics”, “artificial intelligence,” and “machine learning” to make these judgements. A large number of gel treatments or “polymer-augmented waterfloods” were applied in the USA during the 1980s to gain a tax benefit associated with the Windfall Profits Tax Act of 1980 [208]. Because a substantial financial gain was realized regardless of the technical merits and performance, the projects were dominantly implemented with minimum (or no) engineering, surveillance, or credible evaluation. Most of these projects baselessly reported/claimed a “significant” increase in oil projection (e.g., 1 %OOIP) simply as a legal defense to convince the USA Internal Revenue Service that their project deserved the tax benefit. Unfortunately, since these many projects were applied in literally all imaginable conditions, statistical analyses that include these projects in their database may be skewed to make “best practice” trends gleaned from the analysis valueless. Even after the 1980s, many (perhaps most) water-shutoff/conformance-improvement projects were designed and implemented with such tight budgets, that definitive conclusions are not possible. The concept of “garbage-in/garbage-out” is extremely applicable here. Many operators rely entirely on vendors to design and implement their projects. A case in southeast New Mexico is recalled where an oil company received proposals from three vendors for a particular project. The first vendor proposed injecting 100 bbl of a gel containing ~5% HPAM (actually acrylamide monomer). A second vendor proposed injecting 1000 bbl of a gel containing ~0.5% HPAM (with chromium crosslinker). The third vendor proposed injecting 10000 bbl of a “colloidal dispersion gel” that contained 0.03% HPAM. All three bids gave about the same dollar amount. Obviously, the vendors were tipped off on approximately how much the operator was willing to spend, and designed their treatments based on the technology with which they were familiar and had to sell. No consideration was given to the actual reservoir engineering required for the project. A key point here is that the operator of the field must lead the design of the water-shutoff/conformance improvement project, especially since the vendors are not familiar with detailed characteristics and performance of the field.

In view of the above, consideration of a very few well-designed projects is preferred to examining a large number of poorly implemented and poorly monitored projects. Building on the concepts presented earlier in this chapter, we recommend that the following questions be asked when developing a field application of water shutoff/conformance improvement:

1. Why did you decide that there was a problem?
2. What did you do to diagnose the problem?
3. What additional information do you need to properly diagnose the problem and how will you get it?
4. What types of solutions did you consider?
5. Why did you choose your solution over other possibilities?
6. How did you size and place the treatment or method?
7. How will you know if it works?

## 6.2 A case history: the Rangely Field in Colorado

The Rangely field in Colorado provides an interesting case history because (1) many papers have been written about the reservoir, (2) many different conformance methods have been tried, and (3) the picture of the reservoir has evolved over time. The Rangely field in northwest Colorado was produced by primary production from 1944-1949, hydrocarbon gas re-injection from 1949-1956, waterflooding from 1958-1986, and CO<sub>2</sub> flooding beginning in 1986 [209]. Estimated OOIP was 1.9 billion bbls, with 21% OOIP produced from primary production, 21% produced from secondary means, and ~7% OOIP estimated ultimate production from CO<sub>2</sub> flooding. Oil was produced from the Weber formation, which is interbedded eolian sandstones and fluvial siltstones and shales between 5500 and 6500-ft depth. Within the formation, six major producing intervals were identified, separated by five areally-extensive shale barriers. The average gross thickness of the reservoir is 526 ft, with an average effective thickness of 189 ft. The field has a significant dip (6°-30°) and a sizeable gas cap (130 ft maximum original thickness). Average porosity is 12%, and average permeability is 8 md (ranging from 0.1 to 200 md).

The CO<sub>2</sub> flood was planned, anticipating injection of a 30% PV slug of CO<sub>2</sub> using 1:1 ratio of water-alternating gas (WAG).[209] Thus, the WAG cycles were one of the first means to control conformance during the CO<sub>2</sub> flood (to reducing channeling of the very mobile gas). Within a few years, the operator (Chevron) noted increased gas channeling. As a remedy, the length of the water portions of a given WAG cycle were increased, while the gas portions were decreased [209]. Field experiments examined the effectiveness of decreasing the frequency of the WAG cycles (from 1.5 to 0.25% PV), yielding positive results.

In spite of the WAG cycles, inefficient recycling of injected CO<sub>2</sub> was reported in 1991.[210] Franks described the use of selective injection equipment—packers, mandrels, and chokes—to control the amount of fluid injected into the six producing intervals. Although some improvement in sweep efficiency was noted, corrosion limited the lifetime of the selective injection equipment (especially associated with the WAG cycles used during the CO<sub>2</sub> flood).

A program of infill drilling occurred throughout the life of the Rangely field. Of course, this process can be viewed as a means of conformance control—drill new producers where oil has been bypassed, and shut-in or convert producers to injectors if they become watered out. Interestingly, the operator noted that the producing water-oil-ratio (WOR) increased significantly as the well spacing increased (e.g., from 40- to 20-acres). Shut-in of key injection wells effectively realigned the flow pattern in some cases, resulting in significant reductions in channeling.[211]. Prior to the 1990s, natural fractures were not considered a significant contributor to channeling at Rangely. Natural fractures were more commonly associated with carbonate reservoirs, not sandstones. Subsequent to 1990, a greater appreciation was gained of the importance of natural fractures [209].

Injection of gel conformance methods have been attempted at Rangely since the 1960s [72]. Small-volume gel treatments (along with mechanical isolation methods and recompletions) were applied in both injectors and producers to mitigate flow from the gas cap and to reduce channeling through lower zones. However, the most extensive and successful application of gels began with large-volume Cr(III)-acetate-HPAM treatments in the mid-1990s. Treatment volumes

were typically around 15000 bbl of gel per treatment, requiring between 1 and 3 weeks to inject. Since the gelation time of the gelant formulations was about 1 hour at the reservoir temperature (60°C), the gel placement times greatly exceeded the gelation times. This observation was one of the key inspirations for realizing that formed gels were extruding through fractures during most of the placement process [124, 148-153]. During this time at Rangely, it was noted that inter-well tracer transit times were very rapid (hours to days) in some cases, but gel breakthrough in producers was rarely seen, in spite of the large gel volumes. These observations were consistent with laboratory observations of substantial gel dehydration during extrusion through fractures [149-153]. The close interaction between laboratory and field personnel was key to the development of gels and gel placement concepts during the 1990s.

A specialized workflow and set of screening criteria were developed at Rangely that fit the individual needs of gel applications in that field [72]. Based on a large number of gel treatments that were applied, a range of responses were observed, including (1) oil rate increase, (2) reduction in water production, (3) reduction in gas production, (4) areal sweep improvement, (5) reduction or elimination of oil decline rate, (6) “smoothing” of production, (7) improved pattern CO<sub>2</sub> retention and utilization, and (8) in some cases, no apparent effect. A three-year campaign of gel injection in 44 injectors resulted in 685,000 bbl of incremental oil from an investment of ~\$2 million. Treatment success rates were given at 80% [72]. Important lessons learned from the project included (1) rapid communication and associated poor CO<sub>2</sub> economic performance were the most important candidate selection criteria, (2) larger-volume (>15000 bbl) treatments were the most successful, (3) repeat treatments of gel in the same well were very successful, (4) the best results occurred in parts of the field with the best reservoir quality, (5) treatments worked best for wells where both gas and water were known to channel, (6) the water injection rate should be kept below 1200 BWPD, (7) areas of the field with high bottom-hole pressure should be avoided, and (8) post-treatment reservoir management was critical.

Foam-gel treatments were also applied at Rangely [76,147]. The major motivation for using foam gels instead of gels was a hope that the chemical costs associated with the large gel volumes could be reduced by up to 80% (because much of the liquid gel volume was replaced with gas). However, a major finding of these applications was that costs associated with compressing the gas for the foam outweighed the cost-savings from the reduced volume of gel.

## 7. FINAL COMMENTS

There are an immense number of materials that have been proposed for conformance improvement or water shutoff [13,15,23,24,30,31,68,77,109-115,139-143,165,13-176,193]. Rather than try to discuss them all, we suggest that the key question to be asked is: What do you want the material to do in your particular application? Plug a fracture or plug porous rock? Exhibit disproportionate permeability reduction or not? Provide mobility control? Be resistant to high temperatures? Have a slow gelation time at reservoir conditions or not? Penetrate deep into a fracture or fracture system? Penetrate deep into porous rock? Not washout from fractures given a certain fracture width? Resist washout from a porous medium given a certain pressure gradient, salinity, H<sub>2</sub>S level, or other condition? Be compatible with other oilfield chemicals in use (like corrosion or scale inhibitors)? Be inexpensive and/or locally available? Finally, one should realize that these materials are not black magic. Effectively reducing excess water production or

channeling within a reservoir requires that the operator have significant knowledge of the reservoir and conformance-improvement materials before application. One caution should be mentioned: You should hold onto your wallet if someone tries to sell you a chemical that they claim (1) can be injected into any well without precautions and will shut off water or water channels without damaging hydrocarbon flow or (2) will act like a super-polymer flooding agent (i.e., provide effective mobility control) without peer-reviewed proof.

## References

- [1] B. Bailey, M. Crabtree, J. Tyrie, *et al.* Water Control. *Oilfield Review* **12**(1) (2000) 30-51.
- [2] C.E. Clark, J.A. Veil. Produced Water Volumes and Management Practices in the United States. US Department of Energy, Office of Fossil Energy. Contract DE-AC02-06CH11357. (September, 2009).
- [3] John Veil. Produced Water Volumes and Management in 2017—an Update. GWPC Annual Forum. Oklahoma City, OK. (September 15-17, 2019).
- [4] K. Benko, J. Drewes. Produced Water in the Western United States: Geographical Distribution, Occurrence, and Composition. *Environmental Engineering Science* **25**(2) 2008) 239-246.
- [5] Martha Cather. Personal communication based on examination of the data base of the Oil Conservation Commission of New Mexico. (March 4, 2020).
- [6] R.S. Seright, R. Lane, R.D. Sydansk. A Strategy for Attacking Excess Water Production. *SPE Prod & Fac* **18**(3): (2003) 158-169. SPE 84966.
- [7] J. Elphick, R.S. Seright. A Classification of Water Problem Types. Paper 1 presented at the PNC 3rd International Conference on Reservoir Conformance, Profile Control, Water and Gas Shut Off, Houston (Aug. 6, 1997).
- [8] S.I. Chou, J.H. Bae, F. Friedmann, *et al.* Development of Optimal Water Control Strategies. Paper SPE 28571 presented at the SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, New Orleans (Sep. 25-28, 1994).
- [9] J. Pappas, P. Creel, R. Crook. Problem Identification and Solution Method for Water Flow Problems. Paper SPE 35249 presented at the Permian Basin Oil & Gas Recovery Conference, Midland (March 27-29, 1996).
- [10] T. Love, A. McCarty, M.J. Miller, *et al.* Problem Diagnosis, Treatment Design, and Implementation Process Improves Waterflood Conformance. Paper SPE 49201 presented at the SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, New Orleans (Sep. 27-30, 1998).

[11] A. Mennella, L. Chiappa, T.P. Lockhart, G. Burrafato. Candidate and Chemical Selection Rules for Water Shutoff Polymer Treatments. Paper SPE 54736 presented at the SPE European Formation Damage Conference, The Hague (May 31-June 1, 1999).

[12] M.Y. Soliman, S. Rester, R. Sigal, *et al.* Integration of Technology Supports Preventive Conformance Reservoir Techniques. Paper SPE 62553 presented at the SPE/AAPG Western Regional Meeting, Long Beach (June 19-23, 2000).

[13] A.H. Kabir. Chemical Water & Gas Shutoff Technology - An Overview. Paper SPE 72119 presented at the SPE Asia Pacific Improved Oil Recovery Conference, Kuala Lumpur (Oct. 8-9, 2001).

[14] D.D. Smith, M.J. Giraud, C. Kemp, *et al.* The Successful Evolution of Anton Irish Conformance Efforts. Paper SPE 103044 presented at the SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition. San Antonio, Texas. (24-27 September, 2006). doi:10.2118/103044-MS.

[15] R.D. Sydansk, L. Romero-Zeron. Reservoir Conformance Improvement. An Interdisciplinary Approach to Topics in Petroleum Engineering and Geosciences. Society of Petroleum Engineers (2011).

[16] G. Aamodt, S. Abbas, S., D.V. Arghir, *et al.* Identification, Problem Characterization, Solution Design and Execution for a Waterflood Conformance Problem in the Ekofisk Field - Norway. Paper SPE 190209 presented at the SPE Improved Oil Recovery Conference. Tulsa, Oklahoma. (14-18 April, 2018). doi:10.2118/190209-MS.

[17] F.P. Wang, W.A. Ambrose, T.F. Hentz, *et al.* Engineering and Geologic Characterization of Giant East Texas Oil Field: North and South Pilot Studies. Paper SPE 115683 presented at the SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition. Denver, Colorado. (21-24 September, 2008).

[18] F.F. Craig. *The Reservoir Engineering Aspects of Waterflooding*. Monograph Series, Society of Petroleum Engineers, Richardson, Texas **3**. (1971)

[19] G.P. Willhite. *Waterflooding*. Textbook Series, Society of Petroleum Engineers, Richardson, Texas **3**. (1986)

[20] D.K. Smith. Cementing. Monograph Volume 4, Henry L. Doherty Series. Society of Petroleum Engineers. (1990)

[21] A.D. Hill. Production Logging—Theoretical and Interpretive Elements, SPE Monograph Vol. 14, Society of Petroleum Engineers, Richardson (1990).

[22] Z. Bassiouni. Theory, Measurement, and Interpretation of Well Logs, SPE Textbook Series Vol. 4, Society of Petroleum Engineers, Richardson (1994).

[23] Whitney, D.D., Montgomery, D.W., and Hutchins, R.D. Water Shutoff in the North Sea: Testing a New Polymer Gel System in the Heather Field, UKCS Block 2.5. *SPE Production & Facilities* **11**(2): (May 1996) 108-112. doi:10.2118/30426-PA.

[24] Perez, D., Fragachan, F.E., Ramiirez, A., Ferraud, J.P. Applications of a Polymer Gel for Establishment of Zonal Isolations and Water Shut-Off in Carbonate Formation. Paper SPE 37622 presented at the 1997 SPE/IADC Drilling Conference, Amsterdam, (March 4-6, 1997). doi:10.2118/37622-MS.

[25] Odorisio, V.G, and Curtis, S.C. Operational Advances from Field Application of Short-Radius Horizontal Drilling in the Yates Field Unit. Paper SPE 24612 presented at the SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, Washington, D.C. (Oct. 4-7, 1992). doi:10.2118/24612-MS.

[26] Macrae, J. Zero Extrusion Casing Patch. Paper SPE 37650 presented at the IADC/SPE Drilling Conference, Amsterdam (March 4-6, 1997). doi:10.2118/37650-MS.

[27] Ernens, D., Pérez-Ràfols, F., Van Hoecke, D., Roijmans, R.F.H., van Riet, E.J., Vande Voorde, J.B.E., ... Pasaribu, H.R. On the Sealability of Metal-to-Metal Seals with Application to Premium Casing and Tubing Connections. Paper 194146 presented at the SPE/IADC International Drilling Conference and Exhibition. The Hague, Netherlands (5-7 March, 2019). doi:10.2118/194146-PA.

[28] Al-Dhafeeri, A.M., A., Zkery, F.A., Khafji, S., Al-Aklubi, A., Al Sdeiri, A. Effectiveness Well Integrity Management for Casing Leak Detection Utilizing Temperature Profile in Offshore Oil Field. Paper IPTC-19907 presented at the International Petroleum Technology Conference. Dhahran, Saudi Arabia (13-15 January, 2020) doi:10.2523/IPTC-19907.

[29] Urdahl, H. Ketti, F.C., Crossley, E.G., Eialliams, T.A. Experience with Temporarily Sealing Leaking Tubing Annuli With Extended-Life Polymer Gel Plugs in the Greater Ekofisk Area. Paper SPE 24982 presented at the European Petroleum Conference. Cannes, France (Nov. 16-18, 1992). doi:10.2118/24982-MS.

[30] Creel, P., Crook, R. Gels, Monomer Solutions Fix Pinhole Casing Leaks, Oil & Gas J. (Oct. 13, 1997) 44-46.

[31] Jurinak, J.J., Summers, L.E. Oilfield Applications of Colloidal Silica Gel. *SPE Production Engineering* (Nov. 1991) 406-412. doi:10.2118/18505-PA.

[32] Jia, H., Chen, H., Zhao, J.-Z. Development of a Highly Elastic Composite Gel through Novel Intercalated Crosslinking Method for Wellbore Temporary Plugging in High-Temperature Reservoirs. *SPE Journal* (March 2020) doi:10.2118/201090-PA.

[33] Ward, S.L., Allen, T.T., Chavers, R.D., Robertson, T.N., Schultz, P.K. Diagnosing Production Problems with Downhole Video Surveying At Prudhoe Bay. *SPE Journal* **46**(11): (November 1994). doi:10.2118/26043-PA.

[34] J.E. Johns, C.G. Blount, J.C. Dethlefs, J. *et al.* Applied Ultrasonic Technology in Wellbore-Leak Detection and Case Histories in Alaska North Slope Wells. *SPE Production & Operations* **24**(2): (May 2009). doi:10.2118/102815-PA.

[35] S.V. Plahn, F.G. Stevens, P.G., Enkababian, *et al.* A Novel Dual Injection System for Water Shut-Off Treatments *SPE Production & Facilities* **13**(4): (Nov. 1998) 243-249. doi:10.2118/52393-PA.

[36] R.J. Fulleylove, J.C. Morgan, G.G. Stevens, *et al.* Water Shut-Off in Oil Production Wells—Lessons from 12 Treatments. Paper SPE 36211 presented at the International Petroleum Exhibition and Conference, Abu Dhabi (Oct. 13-16, 1996). doi:10.2118/36211-MS.

[37] D. Cramer, K. Frieauf, G. Roberts, *et al.* Integrating Distributed Acoustic Sensing, Treatment-Pressure Analysis, and Video-Based Perforation Imaging to Evaluate Limited-Entry-Treatment Effectiveness. *SPE Production & Operations* (March 2020). doi:10.2118/194334-PA.

[38] K. Yoshioka, D. Zhu, A.D., Hill, *et al.* A New Inversion Method to Interpret Flow Profiles from Distributed Temperature and Pressure Measurements in Horizontal Wells. *SPE Production & Operations* **24**(4): (November 2009). doi:10.2118/109749-PA.

[39] J. Cui, D. Zhu, M. Jin. Diagnosis of Production Performance After Multistage Fracture Stimulation in Horizontal Wells by Downhole Temperature Measurements. *SPE Production & Operations* **31**(4): (November 2016). doi:10.2118/170874-PA.

[40] J. Thompson, L. Fan, D. Grant, *et al.* An Overview of Horizontal-Well Completions in the Haynesville Shale. *J. Canadian Petroleum Technology* **50**(6): (June 2011). doi:10.2118/136875-PA.

[41] K. Furui, D. Zhu, A.D. Hill, *et al.* Optimization of Horizontal Well-Completion Design with Cased/Perforated or Slotted Liner Completions. *SPE Production & Operations* **22**(2): (May 2007). doi:10.2118/90579-PA.

[42] M. Aljubran, R. Horne. Prediction of Multilateral Inflow Control Valve Flow Performance Using Machine Learning. *SPE Production & Operations* (April 2020). doi:10.2118/196003-PA.

[43] A.A. Daneshy, B. Guo, V. Krasnov, *et al.* Inflow-Control-Device Design: Revisiting Objectives and Techniques. *SPE Production & Operations* **27**(2): (February 2012). doi:10.2118/133234-PA.

[44] A. Dikshit, G. Woiceshyn, L. Hagel. A Systematic Approach to the Design and Development of a New ICD to Minimize Erosion and Erosion-Corrosion. *SPE Drilling & Completions* (February 2020). doi:10.2118/197601-PA

[45] J.D. Montero Pallares, C. Wang, M. Haftani, *et al.* Experimental Correlations for the Performance and Aperture Selection of Wire-Wrapped Screens in Steam-Assisted Gravity

Drainage Production Wells. *SPE Production & Operations* (January 2020). doi:10.2118/200473-PA.

[46] J.R. Augustine, S.P. Mathis, H.T. Nguyen, *et al.* World's First Gravel-Packed Inflow-Control Completion. *SPE Drilling & Completions* **23**(1): (March 2008). doi:10.2118/103195-PA.

[47] Z. Li, P.X. Fernandes, D. Zhu. Understanding the Roles of Inflow-Control Devices in Optimizing Horizontal-Well Performance. *SPE Drilling & Completions* **26**(3): (September 2011). doi:10.2118/124677-PA

[48] K. Langaas, E. Jeurissen, H.K. Abay. Combining Passive and Autonomous Inflow-Control Devices in a Trilateral Horizontal Well in the Alvheim Field. *SPE Production & Operations* **34**(3): (August 2019). doi:10.2118/187288-PA.

[49] F.T. Al-Khelaiwi, V.M. Birchenko, M.R. Konopczynski, *et al.* Advanced Wells: A Comprehensive Approach to the Selection Between Passive and Active Inflow-Control Completions. *SPE Production & Operations* **25**(3): (August 2010). doi:10.2118/132976-PA.

[50] J.R. Augustine, R. Meijs. Modeling the Dynamic Pressure Response of Ball-Actuated Stimulation Sleeves. *SPE Production & Operations* **26**(2): (May 2011). doi:10.2118/127821-PA.

[51] M. Yang, X. Wu, Y. Yue, *et al.* Design and Analysis of a New Profile Control Tool: Swirling Autonomous Inflow-Control Device. *SPE Production & Operations* (May 2020). doi:10.2118/199364-PA.

[52] M.A. Al-Zubail, R.H. Al-Nasser, S.A. Al-Umran, *et al.* Rigless Water Shut-off Experience in Offshore Saudi Arabia. Paper 81443 presented at the Middle East Oil Show. Bahrain. (June 9-12, 2003). doi:10.2118/81443-MS.

[53] Y.Y. Al-Ghasham. Assessment of Rig-less Water Shut-off Using Through-Tubing Bridge Plug in a Large Onshore Oil Field in Saudi Arabia. Paper 92883 presented at the SPE Middle East Oil and Gas Show and Conference. Bahrain. (March 12-15, 2005). doi:10.2118/92883-MS.

[54] A.A. Dashash, I. Al-Arnaout, S.M. Al-Driweesh, *et al.* Horizontal Water Shut-Off for Better Production Optimization and Reservoir Sweep Efficiency (Case Study). Paper SPE 117066 presented at the SPE Saudi Arabia section Young Professionals Technical Symposium. Dharan, Saudi Arabia (March 29-30, 2008). doi:10.2118/117066-MS.

[55] F.F. Al-Shahrani, Z.A. Baluch, N.M. Al-Otaibi, *et al.* Successful Water Shut-off in Open Hole Horizontal Well Using Inflatables. Paper SPE 110968 presented at the SPE Saudi Arabia Section Technical Symposium. Dhahran, Saudi Arabia (May 7-8, 2007). doi:10.2118/110968-MS.

[56] A.M. Al-Dhafeeri, T. Mohammed, T., Moawad. Lesson Learned From A Water Shutoff Technique For Cross Flow Between Two Perforation Intervals In Al-Khafji Field. Paper 158747

presented at the SPE Asia Pacific Oil and Gas Conference and Exhibition. (October 22-24, 2012). doi:10.2118/158747-MS.

[57] A. Al-Zain, M. Al-Atwi, A. Al-Jandal, *et al.* Advancements in Well Conformance Technologies Used in a Major Field in Saudi Arabia: Case Histories. Paper SPE 178194 presented at the SPE/IADC Middle East Drilling Technology Conference and Exhibition. Abu Dhabi, UAE (January 26-28, 2016). doi:10.2118/178194-MS.

[58] J.L. Gidley, S.A. Holdiditch, D.E. Nierode, R.W. Veatch. Recent Advances in Hydraulic Fracturing. Monograph Volume 12, Henry L. Doherty Series. Society of Petroleum Engineers. Richardson, Texas (1989).

[59] P.J. Van den Hoek, R.A. Al-Masfry, D. Zwarts, *et al.* Optimizing Recovery for Waterflooding Under Dynamic Induced Fracturing Conditions. *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering* **12**(5): (October 2009). doi:10.2118/110379-PA.

[60] R. Aguilar. Naturally Fractured Reservoirs, Pennwell, Tulsa (1980). Chapters 3-4, 125.

[61] R.S. Seright. How Much Polymer Should Be Injected during a Polymer Flood? Review of Previous and Current Practices. *SPE Journal* **22**(1): (2017) 1-18. [doi:10.2118/179543-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/179543-PA).

[62] O.R. Wagner. The Use of Tracers in Diagnosing Interwell Reservoir Heterogeneities--Field Results, *Journal of Petroleum Technology* **29**(11): (Nov. 1977) 1410-1416. doi:10.2118/6046-PA.

[63] R.S. Seright. Aperture-Tolerant, Chemical-Based Methods to Reduce Channeling. Annual Technical Progress Report. Report No. DOE/NT/15519-2, U.S. DOE, Office of Fossil Energy, Washington, D.C. (September 2005) Chapter 2.

[64] E. Macaulay, C. Reilly, H. Anderson, *et al.* Predicting Realistic Natural Fracture Distributions Using Structural Modelling - Best Practice Workflows for Evaluating Prospects and Targeting Sweet Spots in Unconventional Reservoirs. Paper URTEC-216-2461243 presented at the Unconventional Resources Technology Conference. San Antonio, Texas. (August 1-3, 2016). doi:10.15530/URTEC-2016-2461243.

[65] R.S. Seright, R. Lee. Gel Treatments for Reducing Channeling Through Naturally Fractured Reservoirs. *SPE Production & Facilities* **14**(4): (1999) 269–276. doi:10.2118/59095-PA.

[66] R. Seright, J. Liang, M. Seldal. Sizing Gelant Treatments in Hydraulically Fractured Production Wells, *SPE Production & Facilities* **13**(4): (1998) 223–229. [doi:10.2118/52398-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/52398-PA).

[67] R.S. Seright, J. Liang, H. Sun. Gel Treatments in Production Wells with Water Coning Problems, *In Situ* **17**(3): (1993) 243–272.

[68] A. Marin, R. Seright, M. Hernandez, *et al.* Connecting Laboratory and Field Results for Gelant Treatments in Naturally Fractured Production Wells. Paper SPE 77411 presented at the

2002 SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, San Antonio, Texas. (September 29–October 2, 2002). doi:10.2118/77411-MS.

[69] R.H. Lane, G.S. Sanders. Water Shutoff Through Fullbore Placement of Polymer Gel in Faulted and in Hydraulically Fractured Producers of the Prudhoe Bay Field. Paper SPE 29475 presented at the SPE Production Operations Symposium, Oklahoma City (April 2-4, 1995).

[70] W.J. O'Brien, J.J. Stratton, R.H. Lane. Mechanistic Reservoir Modeling Improves Fissure Treatment Gel Design in Horizontal Injectors, Idd El Shargi North Dome Field, Qatar. Paper SPE 56743 presented at the SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, Houston (Oct. 5-8, 1999). doi:10.2118/56743-MS.

[71] S.D. Sydansk, G.P. Southwell. More Than 12 Years' Experience with a Successful Conformance-Control Polymer-Gel Technology. *SPE Production & Facilities* **15**(4) (Nov. 2000) 270-278. doi:10.2118/66558-PA.

[72] G.P. Hild, R.K. Wackowski. Reservoir Polymer Gel Treatments to Improve Miscible CO<sub>2</sub> Flood. *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering* **2**(2): (April. 1999) 196-204. doi:10.2118/56008-PA.

[73] R.D. Sydansk, P.E. Moore. Gel Conformance Treatments Increase Oil Production in Wyoming. *Oil & Gas J.* (Jan. 20, 1992) 40-45.

[74] D.C. Borling. Injection Conformance Control Case Histories Using Gels at the Wertz Field CO<sub>2</sub> Tertiary Flood in Wyoming, USA. Paper SPE 27825 presented at the SPE/DOE Symposium on Improved Oil Recovery. Tulsa, Oklahoma. (April 17-20, 1994). doi:10.2118/27825-MS.

[75] R.S. Seright. Gel Placement in Fractured Systems. *SPE Production & Facilities* **10**(4): (1995) 241–248. doi:10.2118/27740-PA.

[76] T.L. Hughes, F. Friedmann, D. Johnson, *et al.* Large-Volume Foam-Gel Treatments to Improve Conformance of the Rangely CO<sub>2</sub> Flood. *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering* **2**(1): (February 1999) doi:10.2118/54772-PA.

[77] A. Kantzas, D.F. Marentette, K. Allsopp. Utilization of Polymer Gels, Polymer Enhanced Foams, And Foamed Gels For Improving Reservoir Conformance. Paper PETSOC-97-01 presented at the Petroleum Society of Canada Annual Technical Meeting. (June 8-11, 1999) doi:10.2118/99-13-58.

[78] A. Haugen, N. Mani, S. Svenningsen, *et al.* Miscible and Immiscible Foam Injection for Mobility Control and EOR in Fractured Oil-Wet Carbonate Rocks. *Transport in Porous Media* (104): (2014) 109-131.

[79] J.G. Richardson, J.B. Sangree, R.M. Sneider, R.M. Coning. *J. of Petroleum Technology* **39**(8): (August 1987). doi:10.2118/15787-PA.

[80] Q. Jiang, R.M. Butler. Experimental and Numerical Modelling of Bottom Water Coning to a Horizontal Well. Paper PETSOC-95-143 presented at the Petroleum Society of Canada Technical Meeting/Petroleum Conference of the South Saskatchewan Section, Regina. (October 16-18, 1995). doi:10.2118/98-10-02

[81] D.G. Russell, M. Prats. The Practical Aspects of Interlayer Crossflow. *J. of Petroleum Technology* **14**(6): (June 1962). doi:10.2118/369-PA.

[82] K.S. Chan. Water Control Diagnostic Plots. Paper SPE 30775 presented at the SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, Dallas. (Oct. 22-25, 1995). doi:10.2118/30775-MS.

[83] M. Seldal. Using Water/Oil Ratios to Diagnose Excessive Water Production Mechanisms. Master of Science Thesis, New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology (May 1997).

[84] R.S. Seright. Improved Methods for Water Shutoff. Annual Technical Progress Report (U.S. DOE Report DOE/PC/91008-4), U.S. DOE Contract DE-AC22-94PC91008, BDM-Oklahoma Subcontract G4S60330 (Nov. 1997).

[85] K. Sorbie, R. Seright. Gel Placement in Heterogeneous Systems with Crossflow. Paper SPE 24192 presented at the SPE/DOE Symposium on Enhanced Oil Recovery, Tulsa, Oklahoma. (April 22–24, 1992). [doi:10.2118/24192-MS](https://doi.org/10.2118/24192-MS).

[86] R.S. Seright. Potential for Polymer Flooding Viscous Oils. *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering* **13**(4): (2010) 730–740. doi:10.2118/129899-PA.

[87] D.W. Green, G.P. Willhite. Enhanced Oil Recovery. Textbook Series, Society of Petroleum Engineers, Richardson, Texas **6**: (1998) 100–185.

[88] A.J.P. Fletcher, S. Flew, I.N. Forsdyke, *et al.* Deep Diverting Gels for Very Cost-Effective Waterflood Control. *J. Petr. Sci. Eng.* **7** (1992) 33-43.

[89] R. Seright, G. Zhang, O. Akanni, D. Wang. A Comparison of Polymer Flooding with In-Depth Profile Modification. *J. Canadian. Petroleum Technology* **51**(5): (2012) 393–402. [doi:10.2118/146087-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/146087-PA).

[90] J. Pritchett, H. Frampton, J. Brinkman, *et al.* Field Application of a New In-Depth Waterflood Conformance Improvement Tool. Paper SPE 84897 presented at the SPE International Improved Oil Recovery Conference, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia (20-21 October, 2003). doi:10.2118/84897-MS.

[91] K-T. Chang, H. Frampton, J.C. Morgan. Composition and Method for Recovering Hydrocarbon Fluids from a Subterranean Reservoir. U.S. Patent 6,454,003 B1. (September 24, 2002).

[92] H. Frampton, J.C. Morgan, J.C., S.K. Cheung, S.K., *et al.* Development of a Novel Waterflood Conformance Control System. Paper SPE 89391 presented at the SPE/DOE Fourteenth Symposium on Improved Oil Recovery, Tulsa, Oklahoma. (April 17-21, 2004). doi:10.2118/89391-MS.

[93] F. Ghaddab, K. Kaddour, M. Tesconi, *et al.* EI Borma-In-Depth Profile Modification: A Tertiary Method for Enhanced Oil Recovery for a Mature Field. SPE 136140 presented at the SPE Production and Operations Conference and Exhibition, Tunis, Tunisia. (June 8-10, 2010). doi:10.2118/136140-MS.

[94] M. Husband, D. Ohms, H. Frampton, *et al.* 2010. Results of a Three-Well Waterflood Sweep Improvement Trial in the Prudhoe Bay Field Using a Thermally Activated Particle System. Paper SPE 129967 presented at the SPE Improved Oil Recovery Symposium. Tulsa, Oklahoma. (April 24-28, 2010). doi:10.2118/129967-MS.

[95] D. Ohms, J. McLeod, C.J., Graff, *et al.* Incremental Oil Success from Waterflood Sweep Improvement in Alaska. *SPE Production & Operations* **25**(3): (August 2010) 247-254. doi:10.2118/121761-PA.

[96] P.A.P. Yanez, J.L. Mustoni, M.F. Relling, *et al.* New Attempt in Improving Sweep Efficiency at the Mature Koleul Kaike and Piedra Clavada Waterflooding Projects in the S. Jorge Basin in Argentina. Paper SPE 107923 presented at the SPE Latin American and Caribbean Petroleum Engineering Conference, Buenos Aires, Argentina. (April 15-18, 2007). doi:10.2118/107923-MS.

[97] J. Taber, F. Martin, R. Seright. EOR Screening Criteria Revisited Part 2: Applications and Impact of Oil Prices. *SPE Reservoir Engineering* **12**(3): (1997) 199–205. doi:10.2118/39234-PA.

[98] G. Zhang, R.S. Seright. Conformance and Mobility Control: Foams versus Polymers, paper SPE 105907 presented at the SPE International Symposium on Oilfield Chemistry, Houston, Texas. (February 28–March 2, 2007). [doi:10.2118/105907-MS](https://doi.org/10.2118/105907-MS).

[99] D. Wang, J. Cheng, Z. Yang, *et al.* Successful Field Test of the First Ultra-Low Interfacial Tension Foam Flood. Paper SPE 72147 presented at the SPE Asia Pacific Improved Oil Recovery Conference. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. (October 6-9, 2001). doi:10.2118/72147-MS.

[100] R. Li, W. Yan, S. Liu, *et al.* Foam Mobility Control for Surfactant Enhanced Oil Recovery. *SPE Journal* **15**(4): (December 2010). doi:10.2118/113910-PA.

[101] S.A. Zhdanov, A.V Amiyan, L.M. Surguchev, *et al.* Application of Foam for Gas and Water Shut-off: Review of Field Experience. Paper SPE 36914 presented at the European Petroleum Conference. Milan Italy. (October 22-24, 1996). doi:10.2118/36914-MS.

[102] M. Sharma, M.Z.P. Alcorn, S.B. Fredriksen, *et al.* Foam for CO<sub>2</sub> EOR in a Carbonate Reservoir; Scale-up from Lab to Field, In: Singh K, Joshi R. (eds)Petro-Physics and Rock Physics of Carbonate Reservoirs: (2020) 71-92, Springer Singapore.

[103] Z.P. Alcorn, S.B. Fredriksen, M. Sharma, *et al.* An Integrated Carbon-Dioxide-Foam Enhanced-Oil-Recovery Pilot Program with Combined Carbon Capture, Utilization, and Storage in an Onshore Texas Heterogeneous Carbonate Field. *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering* **22**(4): (November 2019). doi:10.2118/190204-PA.

[104] H.L. Chang, X. Sui, L. Xiao, *et al.* Successful Field Pilot of In-Depth Colloidal Dispersion Gel (CDG) in Daqing Oil Field. *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering* **9**(6): (2006) 664–673. SPE-89460-PA. doi:10.2118/89460-PA.

[105] E. Manrique, S. Reyes, J. Romero, *et al.* Colloidal Dispersion Gels (CDG): Field Projects Review. Paper SPE 169705 presented at the SPE EOR Conference at Oil and Gas West Asia, Muscat, Oman. (March 31–April 2, 2014). [doi:10.2118/169705-MS](https://doi.org/10.2118/169705-MS).

[106] K. Spildo, A. Skauge, M.G. Aarra, *et al.* New Polymer Application for North Sea Reservoirs. *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering* **12**(3): (2009). doi:10.2118/113460-PA.

[107] R.S. Seright. Examination of Literature on Colloidal Dispersion Gels for Oil Recovery. <http://prrc.nmt.edu/groups/res-sweep/> (May 2015).

[108] R. Ranganathan, R. Lewis, C.S. McCool, *et al.* Experimental Study of the Gelation Behavior of a Polyacrylamide/Aluminum Citrate Colloidal-Dispersion Gel System. *SPE Journal* **38**(6): (1998) 337–343. [doi:10.2118/52503-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/52503-PA).

[109] K.S.M. El-Karsani, G.A. Al-Muntasher, I.A. Hussein. Polymer Systems for Water Shutoff and Profile Modification: A Review Over the Last Decade. *SPE Journal* **19**(1): (February 2014) doi:10.2118/163100-PA.

[110] N.S. Lenchikov, M. Slob, G. Glasbergen, *et al.* Propagation of Polymer Nanospheres in Outcrop Cores. *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering* **22**(1): (2019). doi:10.2118/194489-PA.

[111] R.S. Seright. Placement of Gels to Modify Injection Profiles. Paper SPE/DOE 17332 presented at the SPE/DOE Enhanced Oil Recovery Symposium. Tulsa, Oklahoma (April 17–20, 1988). doi:10.2118/17332-MS.

[112] R.S. Seright, J. Liang. A Comparison of Different Types of Blocking Agents. Paper SPE 30120 presented at the 1995 SPE European Formation Damage Control Conference, The Hague. (May 15–16, 1995). [doi:10.2118/30120-MS](https://doi.org/10.2118/30120-MS).

[113] J.H. Bae, K.T. Chambers, H.O. Lee. Microbial Profile Modification with Spores. *SPE Reservoir Engineering* **11**(3): (1996). doi:10.2118/28617-PA.

[114] D.P. Schmidt, H. Soo, C.J. Radke. Linear Oil Displacement by the Emulsion Entrapment Process. *SPE Journal* **24**(3): (1984). doi:10.2118/11333-PA.

[115] K.S. Chan. Reservoir Water Control Treatments Using a Non-Polymer Gelling System. Paper SE 17674 presented at the Offshore South East Asia Show Singapore. (February 2-5, 1988). doi:10.2118/17674-MS.

[116] J. Liang, H. Sun, R.S. Seright. Why Do Gels Reduce Water Permeability More Than Oil Permeability? *SPE Reservoir Engineering* **10**(4): (1995) 282–286. [doi:10.2118/27829-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/27829-PA).

[117] R.S. Seright. Reduction of Gas and Water Permeabilities Using Gels. *SPE Production & Facilities* **10**(2): (1995) 103–108. doi:10.2118/25885-PA.

[118] J. Liang, R.S. Seright. Wall-Effect/Gel Droplet Model of Disproportionate Permeability Reduction. *SPE Journal* **6**(3): (September 2001). doi:10.2118/74137-PA

[119] R. Seright, M. Prodanovic, W. Lindquist. X-Ray Computed Microtomography Studies of Fluid Partitioning in Drainage and Imbibition Before and After Gel Placement: Disproportionate Permeability Reduction. *SPE Journal* **11**(2): (2006) 159–170. SPE 89393-PA. doi:10.2118/89393-PA.

[120] G.P. Willhite, H. Zhu, D. Natarajan, *et al.* Mechanisms Causing Disproportionate Permeability in Porous Media Treated With Chromium Acetate/HPAM Gels. *SPE Journal* **7**(1): (2002) 100-108. doi:10.2118/77185-PA.

[121] S. Ganguly, G.P. Willhite, C.S. McCool. Effect of Flow Rate on Disproportionate Permeability Reduction. Paper SPE 80205 presented at the SPE International Symposium on Oilfield Chemistry, Houston, Texas. (February 5-7, 2003). doi:10.2118/80205-MS.

[122] T.Q. Nguyen, D.W. Green, G.P. Willhite, *et al.* Effects of Gelant Composition and Pressure Gradients of Water and Oil on Disproportionate Permeability Reduction of Sandpacks Treated with Polyacrylamide-Chromium Acetate Gels. *SPE Journal* **11**(2): (2006). doi:10.2118/89404-PA.

[123] H.H. Al-Sharji, C.A. Grattoni, R.A. Dawe, *et al.* Pore-Scale Study of the Flow of Oil and Water through Polymer Gels. Paper SPE 56738 presented at the SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, Houston, Texas. (October 3-6, 1999). doi:10.2118/56738-MS.

[124] R.S. Seright. Mechanism for Gel Propagation Through Fractures. Paper SPE 55628 presented at the Rocky Mountain Regional Meeting, Gillette, Wyoming. (May 15–18, 1999). doi:10.2118/55628-MS.

[125] J. Liang, R. Lee, R.S. Seright. Gel Placement in Production Wells. *SPE Production & Facilities* **8**(4): (1993) 276–284; *Transactions AIME* **295**. [doi:10.2118/20211-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/20211-PA).

[126] R.S. Seright. Clean Up of Oil Zones after a Gel Treatment. *SPE Production & Operations* **21**(2): (2006) 237–244. [doi:10.2118/92772-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/92772-PA).

[127] R.S. Seright. Disproportionate Permeability Reduction with Pore-Filling Gels. *SPE Journal* **14**(1): (2009) 5–13. [doi:10.2118/99443-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/99443-PA).

[128] P. Barreau, H. Bertin, D. Lasseux, *et al.* Water Control in Producing Wells: Influence of an Adsorbed-Polymer Layer on Relative Permeabilities and Capillary Pressure. *SPE Reservoir Engineering* **12**(4): (1997). doi:10.2118/35447-PA.

[129] W. Wang, Y. Gu, L. Liu. Applications of Weak Gel for In-Depth Profile Modification and Oil Displacement. Petroleum Society of Canada paper PETSOC-03-08-06. *Journal of Canadian Petroleum Technology* **42**(6): (2003). doi:10.2118/03-06-04.

[130] R.S. Seright, F.D. Martin. Impact of Gelation pH, Rock Permeability, and Lithology on the Performance of a Monomer-Based Gel. *SPE Reservoir Engineering* **8**(1): (1993) 43–50. doi:10.2118/20999-PA.

[131] R.S. Seright. Impact of Permeability and Lithology on Gel Performance. Paper SPE 24190 presented at the 1992 SPE/DOE Symposium on Enhanced Oil Recovery, Tulsa, Oklahoma. (April 22–24, 1992). [doi:10.2118/24190-MS](https://doi.org/10.2118/24190-MS).

[132] R.S. Seright. Impact of Dispersion on Gel Placement for Profile Control. *SPE Reservoir Engineering* **6**(3): (1991) 343–352. [doi:10.2118/20127-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/20127-PA).

[133] R.S. Seright. Effect of Rheology on Gel Placement. *SPE Reservoir Engineering* **6**(2): (1991) 212–218; *Transactions AIME* **291**. [doi:10.2118/18502-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/18502-PA).

[134] M. Ye, R.S. Seright. Gel Placement in Anisotropic Flow Systems. *In Situ* **20**(2): (1996) 115–135.

[135] J. Vasquez, L. Eoff. Field Implementation of a Relative Permeability Modifier during Stimulation Treatments: Case Histories and Lessons Learned After More than 3,000 Treatments. Paper 164804 presented at the EAGE Annual Conference & Exhibition incorporating SPE Europec. London, UK. (June 10–13, 2013). doi:10.2118/164804-MS.

[136] B. Liang, H. Jiang, M. Li, *et al.* Sizing Gelant Treatment for Conformance Control In Hydraulically-fractured Horizontal Wells. Paper SPE 200338 presented at the SPE Improved Oil Recovery Symposium. Tulsa, Oklahoma. (April 20–22, 2020) doi:10.2118/200338-MS.

[137] H.W. Milton, P.A. Argabright, W.B. Gogarty. EOR Prospect Evaluation Using Field Manufactured Polymer. Paper SPE 11720 presented at the SPE California Regional Meeting. Ventura, California (March 23–25, 1983). doi:10.2118/11720-MS.

[138] R.D. Sydansk, P.E. Moore. Production Responses in Wyoming's Big Horn Basin Resulting from Application of Acrylamide-Polymer/Cr(III)-Carboxylate Gels. Society of Petroleum Engineers. Paper SPE 21894. (1990).

[139] R.D. Sydansk. A Newly Developed Chromium(III) Gel Technology. *SPE Reservoir Engineering* **5**(3): (1990). doi:10.2118/19308-PA.

[140] N.A. Mumallah. Chromium (III) Propionate: A Crosslinking Agent for Water-Soluble Polymers in Hard Oilfield Brines. *SPE Reservoir Engineering* **3**(1): (1988). doi:10.2118/15906-PA.

[141] A. Moradi-Araghi, G. Bjornson, P.H. Doe. Thermally Stable Gels for Near-Wellbore Permeability Contrast Corrections. *SPE Advanced Technology Series* **1**(1): (April 1993). doi:10.2118/18500-PA.

[142] R.S. Seright. Effect of Rock Permeability on Gel Performance in Fluid-Diversion Applications. *In Situ* **17**(4): (1993) 363-386.

[143] L. Marty, D.W. Green, G.P. Willhite. The Effect of Flow Rate on the In-Situ Gelation of a Chrome/Redox/Polyacrylamide System. *SPE Reservoir Engineering* **6**(2): (May 1991). doi:10.2118/18504-PA.

[144] C.S. McCool, D.W. Green, G.P. Willhite. Permeability Reduction Mechanisms Involved in In-Situ Gelation of a Polyacrylamide/ Chromium (VI)/Thiourea System. *SPE Reservoir Engineering* **6**(1): (1991). doi:10.2118/17333-PA.

[145] C.S. McCool, D.W. Green, G.P. Willhite. Fluid/Rock Interactions Between Xanthan/Chromium(III) Gel Systems and Dolomite Core Material. *SPE Production & Facilities* **15**(3): (2000). doi:10.2118/65067-PA.

[146] R. Jain, C.S. McCool, D.W. Green, *et al.* Reaction Kinetics of the Uptake of Chromium(III)Acetate by Polyacrylamide. *SPE Journal* **10**(3): (2005). doi:10.2118/89399-PA.

[147] F. Friedmann, T.L. Hughes, M.E. Smith, *et al.* Development and Testing of a Foam-Gel Technology to Improve Conformance of the Rangely CO<sub>2</sub> Flood. *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering* **2**(1): (1999). doi:10.2118/54429-PA.

[148] R.S. Seright. Gel Placement in Fractured Systems. *SPE Production & Facilities* **10**(4): (1995) 241–248. [doi:10.2118/27740-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/27740-PA).

[149] R.S. Seright. Use of Preformed Gels for Conformance Control in Fractured Systems, *SPE Production & Facilities* **12**(1): (1997) 59–65. [doi:10.2118/35351-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/35351-PA).

[150] R.S. Seright. Gel Dehydration During Extrusion Through Fractures. Paper SPE 39957 presented at the Rocky Mountain Regional Meeting/Low-Permeability Reservoirs Symposium, Denver, Colorado, (April 5–8, 1998). [doi:10.2118/39957-MS](https://doi.org/10.2118/39957-MS).

[151] R.S. Seright. Polymer Gel Dehydration During Extrusion Through Fractures, *SPE Production & Facilities* **14**(2): (1999) 110–116. [doi:10.2118/56126-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/56126-PA).

[152] R.S. Seright. Gel Propagation Through Fractures. *SPE Production & Facilities* **16**(4): (2001) 225–232. [doi:10.2118/74602-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/74602-PA).

[153] R.S. Seright. An Alternative View of Filter Cake Formation in Fractures Inspired by Cr(III)-Acetate-HPAM Gel Extrusion. *SPE Production & Facilities* **18**(1): (2003) 65–72. [doi:10.2118/81829-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/81829-PA).

[154] B. Brattekås, R. Seright, G. Ersland. Water Leakoff During Gel Placement in Fractures: Extension to Oil-Saturated Porous Media. *SPE Production & Operations* (May 2020). [doi:10.2118/190256-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/190256-PA).

[155] J. Liu, R.S. Seright. Rheology of Gels Used for Conformance Control in Fractures, *SPE Journal* **6**(2): (2001) 120–125. [doi:10.2118/70810-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/70810-PA).

[156] Y. Wang, R.S. Seright. Correlating Gel Rheology with Behavior during Extrusion through Fractures. Paper SPE 99462 presented at the 2006 SPE/DOE Symposium on Improved Oil Recovery, Tulsa, Oklahoma. (April 22–26, 2006). [doi:10.2118/99462-MS](https://doi.org/10.2118/99462-MS).

[157] R.S. Seright. Washout of Cr(III)-Acetate-HPAM Gels from Fractures. Paper SPE 80200 presented at the SPE International Symposium on Oilfield Chemistry, Houston, Texas. (February 5–7, 2003). [doi:10.2118/80200-MS](https://doi.org/10.2118/80200-MS).

[158] R.D. Sydansk, A. Al-Dhafeeri, Y. Xiong, *et al.* Characterization of Partially Formed Polymer Gels for Application to Fractured Production Wells for Water-Shutoff Purposes. *SPE Production & Facilities* **20**(3): (2005) 240–249. [doi:10.2118/89401-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/89401-PA).

[159] R.D. Sydansk, A. Al-Dhafeeri, Y. Xiong, *et al.* Polymer Gels Formulated with a Combination of High- and Low-Molecular-Weight Polymers Provide Improve Performances for Water-Shutoff Treatments of Fractured Production Wells, *SPE Production & Facilities* **19**(4): (2004) 229–236. [doi:10.2118/89402-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/89402-PA).

[160] P.B. Gadde, M.M. Sharma. Growing Injection Well Fractures and Their Impact on Waterflood Performance. Paper SPE 71614 presented at the SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, New Orleans, Louisiana, (September 30–October 3, 2001). [doi:10.2118/71614-MS](https://doi.org/10.2118/71614-MS).

[161] R.S. Seright, M. Seheult, T. Talashek. Injectivity Characteristics of EOR Polymers, *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering* **12**(5): (2009) 783–792. [doi:10.2118/115142-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/115142-PA).

[162] R.S. Seright. Using Chemicals to Optimize Conformance Control in Fractured Reservoirs. Annual Technical Progress Report. Report No. DOE/BC/15110-6. U.S. DOE, Office of Fossil Energy, Washington, D.C. (September 2001).

[163] S. Jayakumar, R.H. Lane. Delayed Crosslinked Polymer Flowing Gel System for Water Shutoff in Conventional and Unconventional Oil and Gas Reservoirs. Paper SPE 151699 presented at the SPE International Symposium and Exhibition on Formation Damage Control. Lafayette, Louisiana. (February 15–17, 2012). [doi:10.2118/151699-MS](https://doi.org/10.2118/151699-MS).

[164] S. Jayakumar, R.H. Lane. Delayed Crosslink Polymer Gel System for Water Shutoff in Conventional and Unconventional Oil and Gas Reservoirs. Paper SPE 164046 presented at the SPE International Symposium on Oilfield Chemistry. The Woodlands, Texas, USA. (April 8-10, 2013). doi:10.2118/164046-MS.

[165] G.A. Al-Muntasher, H.A. Nasr-El-Din, J. Peters, *et al.* Investigation of a High Temperature Organic Water Shutoff Gel: Reaction Mechanisms. *SPE Journal* **11** (4): (2006) 497–504. [doi:10.2118/97530-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/97530-PA).

[166] G.A. Al-Muntasher, I.A. Hussein, H.A. Nasr-El-Din, *et al.* Viscoelastic Properties of a High Temperature Crosslinked Water Shut-Off Polymeric Gel. *J. Pet. Sci. Eng.* **55** (1–2): (2007) 56–66. [doi:10.1016/j.petrol.2006.04.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.petrol.2006.04.004).

[167] G.A. Al-Muntasher, H.A. Nasr-El-Din, I.A. Hussein. A Rheological Investigation of a High Temperature Organic Gel Used for Water Shut-Off Treatments. *J. Pet. Sci. Eng.* **59** (1–2): (2007) 73–83. [doi:10.1016/j.petrol.2007.02.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.petrol.2007.02.010).

[168] G.A. Al-Muntasher, H.A. Nasr-El-Din, P.L.J Zitha. Gelation Kinetics and Performance Evaluation of an Organically Crosslinked Gel at High Temperature and Pressure. *SPE Journal* **13** (3): (2008) 337–345. [doi:10.2118/104071-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/104071-PA).

[169] D. Zhu, J. Hou, Y. Chen, *et al.* Evaluation of Terpolymer-Gel Systems Crosslinked by Polyethylenimine for Conformance Improvement in High-Temperature Reservoirs. *SPE Journal* **24**(4): (2019). doi:10.2118/194004-PA.

[170] I. Alvarez, M.G. Espinoza, A. Marin, A., *et al.* Water Control Experiences in the Motatan Field Using Specially Designed Gels. Paper SPE 695454 presented at the SPE Latin American and Caribbean Petroleum Engineering Conference. Buenos Aires, Argentina. (March 25-28, 2001). doi:10.2118/69545-MS.

[171] H.T. Dovan, R.D. Hutchins, B.B. Sandiford. Delaying Gelation of Aqueous Polymers at Elevated Temperatures Using Novel Organic Crosslinkers. Paper SPE 37246 presented at the International Symposium on Oilfield Chemistry. Houston, Texas. (February 18-21, 1997). doi:10.2118/37246-MS.

[172] M. Unomah, S. Thach, R. Shong, *et al.* Performance of Conformance Gels Under Harsh Conditions. Paper SPE 190266 presented at the SPE Improved Oil Recovery Conference. Tulsa, Oklahoma. (April 14-18, 2018). doi:10.2118/190266-MS.

[173] G. Glasbergen, I. Abu-Shiekah, S. Balushi, S., *et al.* Control Treatments for Water and Chemical Flooding: Material Screening and Design. Paper SPE 169664 presented at the SPE EOR Conference at Oil and Gas West Asia. Muscat, Oman. (March 31-April 4, 2014). doi:10.2118/169664-MS.

[174] X. Sun, Y. Long, B. Bai, *et al.* Evaluation and Plugging Performance of Carbon Dioxide-Resistant Particle Gels for Conformance Control. *SPE Journal* (preprint, March 2020). doi:10.2118/200493-PA.

[175] Z. Wang, B. Bai, Y. Long, *et al.* An Investigation of CO<sub>2</sub>-Responsive Preformed Particle Gel for Conformance Control of CO<sub>2</sub> Flooding in Reservoirs with Fractures or Fracture-Like Channels. *SPE Journal* **24**(5): (2019). doi:10.2118/197046-PA.

[176] J. Pu, B. Bai, A. Alhuraishawy, *et al.* A Recrosslinkable Preformed Particle Gel for Conformance Control in Heterogeneous Reservoirs Containing Linear-Flow Features. *SPE Journal* **24**(4): (2019). doi:10.2118/191697-PA.

[177] A.K. Alhuraishawy, B. Bai, M. Wei, *et al.* Preformed Partial Gel Injection Chased by Low-Salinity Waterflooding in Fractured Carbonate Cores. *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering* **22**(1): (2019). doi:10.2118/191364-PA.

[178] Z. Wang, B. Bai. Preformed-Particle-Gel Placement and Plugging Performance in Fractures with Tips. *SPE Journal* **23**(8): (2018). doi:10.2118/193997-PA.

[179] A. Imqam, Z. Wang, B. Bai. Preformed-Particle-Gel Transport Through Heterogeneous Void-Space Conduits. *SPE Journal* **22**(5): (2017). doi:10.2118/179705-PA.

[180] A. Imqam, B. Bai, M. Al Ramadan, *et al.* Preformed-Particle-Gel Extrusion Through Open Conduits During Conformance-Control Treatments. *SPE Journal* **20**(5): (2015). doi:10.2118/169107-PA.

[181] B. Bai, H. Zhang, H. Preformed-Particle-Gel Transport Through Open Fractures and Its Effect on Water Flow. *SPE Journal* **16**(2): (2011). doi:10.2118/129908-PA.

[182] G.C. Howard, C.R. Fast. *Hydraulic Fracturing*, Monograph Series, SPE, Dallas, (1970) **2**, 32-42.

[183] R.A. Dawe, Y. Zhang. Mechanistic Study of the Selective Action of Oil and Water Penetrating into a Gel Placed in a Porous Medium. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering* **12**(2): (1994) 113-125.

[184] P. Krishnan, K. Asghari, G.P. Willhite, *et al.* Dehydration and Permeability of Gels Used in In-Situ Permeability Modification Treatments. Paper SPE 59347 presented at the SPE/DOE Improved Oil Recovery Symposium. Tulsa, OK (April 3-5, 2000) doi:10.2118/59347-MS.

[185] B. Brattekås, S.G. Pedersen, H.T. Nistov, *et al.* Washout of Cr(III)-Acetate-HPAM Gels From Fractures: Effect of Gel State During Placement. *SPE Production & Operations* **30**(2): (2015) 99-109. doi:10.2118/169064-PA.

[186] S. Ganguly, G.P. Willhite, D.W. Green, *et al.* The Effect of Fluid Leakoff on Gel Placement and Gel Stability in Fractures. *SPE Journal* **7**(3): (September 2002). [doi:10.2118/79402-PA](https://doi.org/10.2118/79402-PA).

[187] P.A. Witherspoon, J.S.W. Wang, K. Iwai, *et al.* Validity of Cubic Law for Fluid Flow in a Deformable Rock Fracture, *Water Resources. Research* **16**(6): (1980) 1016-1024.

[188] B. Brattekås, M. Steinsbø, A. Graue, *et al.* New Insight Into Wormhole Formation in Polymer Gel During Water Chase Floods With Positron Emission Tomography. *SPE Journal* **22**(1): (2017) 32-40. doi:10.2118/180051-PA.

[189] B. Brattekås, M.A. Fernø. New Insight from Visualization of Mobility Control for Enhanced Oil Recovery Using Polymer Gels and Foams. Chemical Enhanced Oil Recovery (cEOR) - a Practical Overview. L. Romero-Zeron, *InTech*. (2016).

[190] B. Brattekås, R.S. Seright. Implications for Improved Polymer Gel Conformance Control during Low-Salinity Chase-Floods in Fractured Carbonates. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering* **163**: (2018) 661-670.

[191] B. Brattekås, R.S. Seright. The Mechanism for Improved Polymer Gel Blocking During Low-Salinity Waterfloods, Investigated Using Positron Emission Tomography Imaging. *Transp Porous Med* **133**, 119–138 (2020). doi:10.1007/s11242-020-01417-w.

[192] L.B. Romero-Zeron, F.M. Hum, A. Kantzas. Characterization of Crosslinked Gel Kinetics and Gel Strength by Use of NMR. *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering* **11**(3): (2008) 439-453. doi:10.2118/86548-PA.

[193] S. Vossoughi. Profile Modification Using In Situ Gelation Technology- A Review. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering* **26**(1-4): (2000) 199-209.

[194] S.M. Vargas-Vasquez, L.B. Romero-Zerón, B. MacMillan. Analysis of Syneresis of HPAm/Cr(II) and HPAm/Cr(III) Acetate Gels Through <sup>1</sup>H Nuclear Magnetic Resonance, Bottle Testing, and UV-vis Spectroscopy, *Petroleum Science and Technology*, **27**:15, (2009) 1727-1743, doi:10.1080/10916460802611564.

[195] R.D. Sydansk. *Polymers, Gels, Foams and Resins: Petroleum Engineering Handbook B(13)*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, (2007) Richardson, TX, SPE.

[196] P. Albonico, T.P. Lockhart. Divalent Ion-Resistant Polymer Gels for High-Temperature Applications: Syneresis Inhibiting Additives. Paper SPE 25200 presented at the SPE International Symposium on Oilfield Chemistry. New Orleans, Louisiana. (March 2-5, 1993) doi:10.2118/25220-MS.

[197] B. Brattekås, A. Haugen, A. Graue, A., *et al.* Gel Dehydration by Spontaneous Imbibition of Brine from Aged Polymer Gel. *SPE Journal* **19**(1): (2014) 122-134. doi:10.2118/153118-PA.

[198] F. Horkay, I. Tasaki, P.J. Basser. Osmotic Swelling of Polyacrylate Hydrogels in Physiological Salt Solutions. *Biomacromolecules* **1**: (2000) 84-90.

[199] S.K. Choi, M.M. Sharma, S. Bryant, *et al.* pH-Sensitive Polymers for Novel Conformance-Control and Polymer-Flood Applications. *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering* **13**(6): (2010). doi:10.2118/121686-PA.

[200] J.T. Uhl, T.Y. Ching, J.H. Bae. A Laboratory Study of New, Surfactant-Containing Polymers for High-Salinity Reservoirs. *SPE Advanced Technology Series* **3**(1): (1995). doi:10.2118/26400-PA.

[201] R. Rydzewski. Swelling and Shrinking of a Polyelectrolyte Gel Induced by a Salt Solution. *Continuum Mechanics and Thermodynamics* **2**: (1990) 77-97.

[202] J. Aalaie, A. Rahmatpour, E. Vasheghani-Farahani. Rheological and Swelling Behavior of Semi-interpenetrating Networks of Polyacrylamide and Scleroglucan. *Polym. Adv. Technol.* **20**: (2009) 1102-1106.

[203] T.N. Tu, B. Wisup. Investigating the Effect of Polymer Gels Swelling Phenomenon under Reservoir Conditions on Polymer Conformance Control Process. International Petroleum Technology Conference. Bangkok, Thailand, International Petroleum Technology Conference (2011).

[204] B. Bai, L.X. Li, Y.Z. Liu, *et al.* Preformed Particle Gel for Conformance Control: Factors Affecting Its Properties and Applications. *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering* **10**(4): (2007) 415-422. doi:10.2118/89389-PA.

[205] B. Brattekås, A. Graue, R. Seright. Low-Salinity Chase Waterfloods Improve Performance of Cr(III)-Acetate Hydrolyzed Polyacrylamide Gel in Fractured Cores. *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering* **19**(2): (2016) 331-339. doi:10.2118/173749-PA.

[206] B. Brattekås, R.S. Seright. Implications for Improved Polymer Gel Conformance Control during Low-Salinity Chase-Floods in Fractured Carbonates. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering* **163**: (2018) 661-670.

[207] B. Brattekås, R. Seright. The Mechanism for Improved Polymer Gel Blocking During Low-Salinity Waterfloods, Investigated Using Positron Emission Tomography Imaging. *Transport in Porous Media* **133**(1): (2020) 119-138.

[208] R. S. Seright, J-T. Liang, J. A Survey of Field Applications of Gel Treatments for Water Shutoff. Paper SPE 26991 presented at the 1994 SPE III Latin American & Caribbean Petroleum Engineering Conference, Buenos Aires, Argentina (April 27-29, 1994). doi:10.2118/26991-MS.

[209] R.K. Wackowski, L.O. Masoner. Rangely Weber Sand Unit CO<sub>2</sub> Project Update: Operating History. *SPE Reservoir Engineering* **10**(3): (1995) 203-207. doi:10.2118/27755-PA.

[210] A.P. Franks. The Use of Selective Injection Equipment in the Rangely Weber Sand Unit. Paper SPE 169664 presented at the SPE Production Operations Symposium, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. (April 7-9, 1991) doi:10.2118/21649-MS.

[211] R.C. Collings, G.P. Hild, H.R. Abidi.. Pattern Modification by Injection-Well Shut-in: A Combined Cost-Reduction and Sweep-Improvement Effort. *SPE Reservoir Engineering* **11**(2): (1996) 69-72. doi:10.2118/30730-PA.