Characterization of Partially Formed Polymer Gels for Application to Fractured Production Wells for Water-Shutoff Purposes

R.D. Sydansk, SPE, **Y. Xiong,** SPE, **A.M. Al-Dhafeeri,** SPE, **R.J. Schrader,** SPE, and **R.S. Seight,** SPE, New Mexico Petroleum Recovery Research Center

Summary

A laboratory study characterized partially formed chromium(III)-carboxylate/acrylamide-polymer (CC/AP) gels for water shutoff in fractures. These partially formed gels showed much lower effective viscosities during placement than comparable fully formed gels. During placement, leakoff rates through fracture faces were low for gelants and partially formed gels. During the first brine injection after gel placement, the pressure gradient required to breach the gel increased with the increasing polymer concentration. Most gel remained in the fracture and did not wash out. During brine flow through "wormholes" in the gel, stabilized residual-resistance factors (F_{rr}) were large and increased with increasing polymer concentration.

Introduction

During this laboratory study, we characterized water-shutoff polymer gels of the type that are to be injected in the partially formed state into fractures that are connected to production wells. Findings of this study should also be relevant to other high-permeability anomalies that are connected to petroleum production wells. Other than fractures, these high-permeability anomalies could include solution channels, interconnected vugs, karstic features, joints, faults, rubble zones, and ultrahigh-matrix rock permeability. These features generally have permeabilities greater than two darcies.

For water-shutoff applications in fractured production wells (i.e., during field applications), injected polymer gels are usually in the "partially formed" state during transit from the wellbore into the formation. For classical bulk-gel treatments applied to reservoir fractures, the injected polymer-gel solution should develop enough gel structure (including a microgel structure) to minimize detrimental gel-solution leakoff into the matrix-reservoir rock that is adjacent to the fractures. On the other hand, the gel should not be "fully formed" during placement because excessive injection pressures may be encountered. Use of partially formed gels permits manageable injectivities during placement and causes minimum damage to matrix rock when properly formulated, yet ultimately yields strong gels that will function as required to shut off water production. Gels must be in the partially formed state when injecting strong gels that will ultimately be "rigid and rubbery" in nature.

The objective of this paper is to characterize the performance of polymer gels that are injected into fractures in the partially formed state. This study was intended to investigate the properties of gel that resides in the near- and intermediate-wellbore region and gel that is part of relatively small-volume gel treatments (i.e., treatments usually pumped in less than a day) that are applied to fractured-production wells. During the flooding experiments of this study that were conducted in 2-ft-long fractured cores, 40 fracture

volumes (FVs) of gel fluid were injected as rapidly as possible (i.e., injected within about 7 minutes using a superficial velocity within the fracture of 16,600 ft/D). An explicit goal during this gel injection was to minimize time-dependent gel dehydration.[1] For these particular experiments, the resultant mature gels residing in the fractures were 1.2 to 2.5 times more concentrated than the injected-gel formulation (as will be noted later in this paper). During the experiments conducted in 4-ft-long fractured cores, 80 FVs of gel formulation were injected at a superficial velocity of 4,130 ft/D within the fracture.

Experiments in this paper addressed five objectives:

• Determination of the effective viscosity of partially formed gel formulations in fractures during gel injection.

• Estimation of damage to fracture-wall porous rock from gel-solution leakoff.

• Determination of the peak or critical pressure gradient at which the gel is first breached during brine injection after gel placement in a fracture.

• Determination of the stabilized (the equilibrium or final) F_{rr} for water or oil flow through a gel-filled fracture.

• Characterization of disproportionate permeability reduction (DPR) during oil and water flow through gel-filled fractures.

Experimental

Our flooding experiments were conducted in 1.5×1.5 in. by either 2.0- or 4.0-ft-long rectangular, 700-md, 19% porosity, unfired Berea sandstone cores in which a 1.0-mm-wide (0.04-in.-wide) clean-sawed fracture ran down the middle of the length of the core. An earlier study[2] showed that it makes little difference for this type of flooding experiment whether the fracture surface is "rough" (as occurs during core splitting) or "smooth" (as occurs with a cleaned-sawed rock surface). During all floods, the fracture was oriented vertically. In all cases, gel (and other fluids) exiting from the downstream end of the fracture flowed into a chamber in the core's acrylic end cap that was ≈4 mm (≈0.16 in.) deep and ≈26×26 mm (≈1.0×1.0 in.) square. The gel then flowed into a stainless steel effluent-port fitting having an inside diameter of 4.5 mm (0.18 in.).

Two ports for the flow of fluids from the matrix rock were placed at the downstream end of the core material. The injected fluids, including gel fluids, were distributed over the majority of the injection face, which included both the fracture and the matrix sandstone rock. The matrix-rock effluent end of the core slab was sealed such that fluids could only flow out of the fracture at this point and could not flow out of the matrix rock. All effluent fluid flow out of the matrix rock occurred by exiting the downstream matrix-rock effluent ports. The fractured Berea sandstone slab was cast in epoxy. During each flooding experiment, the rates of fluid production from both the fracture and the matrix-rock effluent ports were recorded vs. time. Differential pressures along the fracture length were continuously monitored during all flooding experiments using Honeywell Series 100e quartz differential-pressure transducers. Several equally spaced pressure taps allowed measurement of pressures along the fracture. The 2-ft-long cores had three internal pressure taps placed along the fracture, dividing the fractured core into four 6-in.-long sections. The 4-ft-long cores

Fig. 1—Fractured core used during the gel/fracture floods.

had four internal pressure taps, dividing the fractured core into five 9.6-in.-long sections. **Fig. 1** shows a 2-ft-long fractured core before casting it in sand-filled epoxy resin. The core and flooding equipment and the procedures were similar to those discussed in Ref. 2.

All flooding experimental work was conducted at 105°F (41°C). The brine and gel formulations contained 1.0 wt% NaCl and 0.1 wt% $CaCl_2$. The oil used was Soltrol 130* (mixed C10-C13 isoparaffins). The chromium(III)-acetate-hydrolyzed polyacrylamide (CC/AP) gels[3,4] in this study employed chromic triacetate as the chemical crosslinking agent. No pH adjustment was made to any of the solutions. The crosslinking agent, chromic triacetate, was obtained from McGean as a 50 wt% active aqueous solution and was added to the polymer solutions in this form. The polymer was Ciba Alcoflood 935** commercial hydrolyzed polyacrylamide (HPAM). This acrylamide polymer has a nominal molecular weight of 5×10^6 daltons and is 5 to 10 mol% hydrolyzed. The concentration of active polymer was 91 to 92%. Pertinent information regarding the three CC/AP gel formulations employed in this study is provided in **Table 1.**

In the 2-ft-long cores, 40 FVs ($\approx 1,000$ cm³) of gel formulation were injected at a rate of 8,000 cm³/h (16,600 ft/D superficial velocity within the fracture). In the 4-ft-long fractures, 80 FVs ($\approx 4,000$ cm³) of gel formulation were injected at 2,000 cm³/h (4,130 ft/D superficial velocity within the fracture). In this paper, superficial velocities for brine or oil flow through gel-treated fractures will be reported in units of ft/D. These superficial velocities were calculated assuming that all fluid flow occurred through the original fracture without any gel present. As will become evident later in this paper, the actual velocities of brine or oil flow through the gel-treated fractures were probably more than 10 times larger than the stated superficial velocity because the fluid flow actually occurred through relatively small channels in the gel.

For the flooding experiments involving the injection of the gel solution at a superficial velocity of 16,600 ft/D within the fracture, the gel-injection delay time (i.e., time from crosslinker addition to the polymer solution to initiating gel-fluid injection) was selected using the bottle-testing procedure that is described in Ref. 5. These included the 2X and 3X gels described in Table 1 and the one 7-hour-old 1X gel. Using the gel-strength-code assignment as a function of gel aging time at 41°C (105°F), the injection delay time

---

* Soltrol 130 is a trademark of Phillips Petroleum Co. (now ConocoPhillips), Houston.
** Alcoflood 935 is a trademark of Ciba Specialty Chemical Co., Tarrytown, New York.

was selected to be when the first visually detectable gel formation occurred. At this aging time, we estimated very roughly that 10% of full gel maturation and gel strength was attained. At a minimum, substantial microgel formation occurred by this time. For quality control, a sample (in a bottle) of the gel to be injected was set in the air bath alongside the core to verify that the newly prepared gel formulation matured (crosslinked) at the proper rate and that the final gel attained the expected ultimate strength.

Additional details of the core preparation and flooding experiments can be found in Refs. 2 and 6.

Effective Viscosity of Partially Formed Gels During Injection

In all experiments during placement of the gel fluid, pressure gradients rapidly stabilized after brine was displaced from the fracture. As reported earlier,[1] no screenout or progressive-plugging behavior was ever observed during injection of the gel fluid.

Fig. 2 plots the effective viscosities in the studied fractures for 1X gels in the partially and fully formed states. The fully formed gel was aged 24 hours before injection into the fracture. The partially formed gel was aged 7 hours. The gel solutions were injected at 16,600 ft/D superficial velocity within the fracture. Note that the effective viscosities were fairly stable during the course of injecting 27 to 29 FVs of gel fluid.

The effective viscosities of all of the studied gel formulations (in the fracture) are plotted in **Fig. 3** as a function of the gel aging or the injection delay time (i.e., the time between chromium addition to the polymer solution and the start of gel injection into the fracture).

From viscosity measurements and bottle testing, the gelation-onset time for our 1X gel was estimated to be about 5 hours at 41°C. Note in Fig. 3 that for injection delays of 4 hours or less, the apparent viscosities (17 to 30 cp) of the 1X gels in the fractures were only moderately greater than the viscosity of the uncrosslinked polymer solution (15 cp). For the 7-hour-old 1X gel (injected at 16,600 ft/D), the apparent viscosity was also relatively low—approximately 32 cp. This should be a manageable solution viscosity during gel placement. For longer times, Fig. 3 demonstrates that the apparent viscosity increased rather abruptly to more than 1,300 cp for injection delays of 16 hours or more. The effective viscosities of partially formed gels can be up to 100 times less than those for fully formed gels. Thus, partially formed gels (i.e., gels entering the fractures shortly after their gelation-onset times) exhibit substantially higher injectivities and lower placement pressures. This better-injectivity feature is of major importance during field applications in which injection-pressure constraints limit rates and volumes during gel treatments. In addition, when a conformance-improvement treatment involves the ultimate placement of a strong, rigid gel, it is mandatory to inject the gel in a partially formed state.

In Fig. 3, the solid triangle and square show apparent viscosities for the substantially stouter 2X (with 1% polymer) and 3X (with 1.5% polymer) gels. Again, these gels were formulated and injected so that placement occurred while the gels were partially formed. The effective viscosities in the fractures were about 70 and 110 cp for the 2X and 3X gels, respectively. For comparison, the viscosities of the uncrosslinked polymer solutions for the 2X and 3X gels were 63 and 180 cp, respectively (Table 1). Note that the apparent viscosities of the partially formed 2X and 3X gels were more than 10 times less than the values for the fully formed 1X

TABLE 1—CC/AP GELS USED IN THIS STUDY			
Gel Designation	1X	2X	3X
Concentration of the 91 to 92% active HPAM, wt%	0.5	1.0	1.5
Concentration active chromium(III), wt%	0.0095	0.015	0.020
Aging time before injection, hour	0.2 to 240	2.5	1.0
Viscosity of the polymer solution without crosslinker added (at 28 sec⁻¹ shear rate and 41°C), cp	15	63	180

Fig. 2—Effective viscosity during injection of fully and partially formed 1X gels.

Fig. 3—Effective viscosity vs. gel-injection delay for CC/AP gels.

gels. The effective viscosity of 110 cp for the partially formed 3X (1.5 wt% polymer) gel should not substantially adversely impact the ability to inject this gel solution into most fractures during water-shutoff treatments.

Damage to Porous Rock From Gelant Leakoff

One concern with injecting either gelants or partially formed gels is that leakoff conceivably could damage the porous rock adjacent to the fracture. Could this damage significantly impede hydrocarbon flow into the fracture when the well is returned to production (especially in the near-wellbore region, when the gel has been overdisplaced from this FV at the end of the gel-treatment injection)? This question is best addressed by answering two related questions: how far does the gelant or partially formed gel formulation leak off from the fracture faces? and how much does the gel reduce permeability to water vs. hydrocarbon?

The distance of gelant leakoff can be estimated using results from our experiments. In particular, by monitoring fluids produced from our matrix ports, we determine leakoff rates during the course of gelant or gel-fluid injection. **Fig. 4** shows these leakoff rates as a function of gel aging or injection delay time for 12 separate experiments in which our 1X gel was forced through 1-mm-wide fractures at 4,130 ft/D (superficial velocity in the fracture). The y-axis plots the leakoff rate (in units of ft/D or ft^3 of fluid leakoff per ft^2 of fracture surface per day) averaged during the 2-hour course of injecting ≈4,000 cm^3 of gel formulation. Notice that the highest leakoff rates (≈0.5 ft/D) occurred for gel-injection delays of 12 hours and longer. In previous works,[1,2,7] we demonstrated

Fig. 4—Leakoff rates during gelant/gel placement.

that this leakoff is strictly brine with no crosslinked polymer. Thus, this water leakoff causes no significant damage to the porous rock. (Of course, dehydrated gel that accumulates on the fracture faces can impede flow.)

In contrast, for injection delays of 5 hours or less, the leakoff that occurs is, presumably, gelant, and might be of concern. Fortunately, Fig. 4 indicates that leakoff rates are low for the 1X gel when the gelant is less than 5 hours old. Given an average leakoff rate of 0.013 ft/D, the average distance of gelant penetration from the fracture face was about 20 μm for the 2-ft-long fractures (in which ≈1,000 cm^3 of partially formed gel was injected at 8,000 cm^3/h) and about 0.3 mm for the 4-ft-long fractures (in which ≈4,000 cm^3 of gel formulation was injected at 2,000 cm^3/h). With this same leakoff rate, the estimated gelant leakoff distance is less than 4 mm if injection continued for 24 hours. The 4-mm estimate may be high because most polymer should be sufficiently crosslinked by the gelation time so that gel penetration into porous rock is severely limited.[2] Because the gelation time of the 1X gel is 5 hours at 41°C, 1 mm might be a better estimate of the maximum distance of gelant leakoff for this gel (under our laboratory conditions). These small distances of gelant leakoff and damage in the porous rock provide encouragement for the use of partially formed gels in field applications in which gel placement lasts less than 1 day.

For gel injection that exceeds 1 day and gels that have a gel-onset time of less than 1 day, there should be little gel leakoff after the first day of injection. After 1 day of gel injection, freshly injected gel will see only fractured rock-face surfaces that have been sealed by previously injected gel (provided the gel is flowing down one single-fracture flow channel or flow-channel set).

To assess the damage from any possible gelant leakoff, the permeability reduction (residual resistance factors) must be considered after gel placement. For 700-md Berea, we typically observed water residual-resistance factors (F_{rrw}) around 10,000 and oil residual-resistance factors (F_{rro}) of 200 or less.[8,9] For a 1-mm distance of gel penetration into the rock, these permeability reductions provide resistances equivalent to flowing through an additional 30 ft of rock for the water and 8 in. of rock for the oil. This DPR is favorable but would probably not have a large impact on either oil or water productivity in this particular case.

The primary conclusion from this section is that for fractures in which gel had been injected and flowed, but are subsequently gel-free, damage to oil flow caused by gelant leakoff may be relatively small (i.e., near-wellbore fracture volumes that have been overdisplaced at the end of a gel water-shutoff treatment so as to be gel-free). With lessened concern about damage from gelant leakoff, we increase confidence in the use of gelants and partially formed gels for treating fractures.

Fig. 5—Peak or critical pressure gradients during first brine flow after gel placement.

Peak Pressure Gradient for First Gel Breaching

After gel placement and a 1-day shut-in, brine was injected at a fixed rate of 100 cm^3/h (206 ft/D superficial velocity within the fracture). In each experiment, the pressure gradient rose to a peak, followed by a pressure gradient decline to a more or less stabilized value. (Greater detail on this behavior can be found in Ref. 6.) The peak pressure gradient indicates the point at which brine first breached the gel in the fracture. (As will be discussed shortly, breaching the gel does not constitute total washout—the flow capacity of the fracture remains dramatically less than before gel placement.)

As shown in **Fig. 5,** the peak pressure gradient was greatest (99 psi/ft) for the 3X gel. This large pressure gradient should be sufficient to resist gel failure for most common fractured-well production rates and pressure drawdowns. Of course, this conclusion applies to 3X gels in 1-mm-wide fractures. Presumably in wider fractures, the peak or critical pressure gradient for breaching the gel would be lower for the 3X gel. On the other hand, for fractures with widths below 1 mm, less concentrated (and therefore less expensive) gels would usually be more appropriate. After placement in 1-mm-wide fractures, Fig. 5 indicates peak pressure gradients of 32 psi/ft for the 2X gel and up to 9 psi/ft for the 1X gels. These values should be sufficient to prevent gel breaching under many circumstances.

Until the peak pressure gradient was exceeded, no measurable brine flow occurred through the gel-filled fracture. The pressure gradient for brine flow in fractures in the intermediate- and far-wellbore region of many naturally fractured reservoirs is quite small (<10 psi/ft). Thus, if these polymer gels completely filled the FV, water flow through the fracture should be completely blocked (and we expect oil flow to be completely blocked in the gel-filled fractures as well).

Interestingly for the 1X gel, Fig. 5 indicates a maximum of ≈9 psi/ft in the peak pressure gradient occurred for gels that were aged about 24 hours before placement. For gels placed as gelants, the peak pressure gradient was as low as 1.3 psi/ft. After placing partially formed 1X gels (i.e., injection delays of 4 to 8 hours), 3 to 5 psi/ft was required for brine to first breach the gel. Although the latter pressure gradients were one-third to one-half those for

the 24-hour-old gels, the lower pressure gradients during placement will often favor use of the partially formed gels (Fig. 3).

The maximum shown for the 1X gel in Fig. 5 may result from the combined influence of gel dehydration and mechanical degradation. When crosslinked polymers are forced through fractures, gel can dehydrate (lose water). The free water leaves the fracture by leaking off through the rock faces. However, the crosslinked polymer remains in the fracture to become increasingly concentrated as more dehydration occurs.[1,2] This concentrated gel is stronger (more resistant to being breached) than the original gel.[10] Also, during deposition of the concentrated gel, the original gel flows through small wormhole pathways (through the dehydrated gel).[1] For most practical circumstances, the dehydrated gel is not mobile. The only mobile gel is that with the original gel composition in the wormhole pathways.[1,2,7] These pathways do not form during flow of uncrosslinked polymer (i.e., fresh gelant). These wormholes become smaller as the age of the injected gel increases (because of an increasingly unfavorable mobility ratio).[7] Because these wormholes were filled with the original gel (i.e., not dehydrated), they probably provide the pathway for first breaching of the gel by brine.[10] With smaller-diameter wormholes as the gel injection delay increases, the breaching pressure should increase.

On the other hand, this dehydration effect may be countered by mechanical degradation. Crosslinked polymer can experience mechanical degradation (bond rupture) during flow. For gels placed with small injection delays, additional crosslinking can occur after gel placement to heal any mechanical damage. With long injection delays, mechanical degradation may be more severe during the extrusion process (because many more crosslinks have formed) and fewer free-crosslinkers remain to heal the mechanical damage. Consequently, the mechanically damaged gel is more susceptible to breach during brine flow. These arguments could explain the maximum for the 1X gel (approximately 24-hour injection delay) in Fig. 5.

Stabilized Residual Resistance Factors

In each experiment, after establishing the peak pressure gradient for brine to first breach the gel, we determined the stabilized (i.e., the equilibrium or final) residual-resistance factor (i.e., the F_{rrw} or the permeability-reduction factor) for brine flow through the gel-filled fracture.

Table 2 shows the stabilized F_{rr} for the experiments involving the 1-mm-wide, 2-ft-long fractured cores (in which partially formed gel fluids were placed at 16,600 ft/D superficial velocity in the fractures). For this set of flooding experiments, the stabilized F_{rr} values for brine flow were comparable to the 1X gel injected into the gelant, the partially formed state, and the fully formed states, and the stabilized F_{rr} values increased with increasing polymer concentration within the gel formulation. The brine was injected at a superficial velocity of 206 ft/D within the fracture (100 cm^3/h).

The complete set of the stabilized F_{rr} values for the first post-gel-placement brine floods in both the 2- and 4-ft-long fractured cores are plotted in **Fig. 6.** Qualitatively, these stabilized F_{rr} followed the same trends observed in Fig. 5. The values for the 2X and 3X gels were generally greater than those for the 1X gel. One series of experiments with the 1X gel (the open circles in Fig. 6) showed maximum stabilized F_{rrw} values for injection delays from 8 to 24 hours. It is interesting that the stabilized F_{rrw} values for the 1X gels (injected at 4,130 ft/D in the fracture) and the 2X gel (injected at 16,000 ft/D) were somewhat similar.

Using an equation from Ref. 11, the permeability of the original unobstructed 1-mm fracture was calculated to be 84,000 darcy. A fracture aperture of 1 mm is fairly typical of the average fracture

TABLE 2—STABILIZED F_{rr} VALUES DURING THE FIRST BRINE FLOOD THROUGH 2-ft-LONG GEL-FILLED FRACTURES					
Gel State When Injected	Fully Formed	Gelant	Partially Formed	Partially Formed	Partially Formed
Time gel aged before injection, hour	24	≈0.25	7.0	2.5	1.0
Polymer concentration in the gel, wt%	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.0	1.5
Final F_{rr} value	7,000	6,500	6,400	9,300	22,000

Fig. 6—Stabilized residual resistance factors after first brine injection at 206 ft/D.

Fig. 7—Post-gel-treatment wormhole channels in the gel.

aperture that is found in many naturally fractured oil reservoirs in the Big Horn basin of Wyoming and the Permian Basin of Texas. In wells with moderate or narrow fractures, the F_{rr} shown in Fig. 6 should be sufficient to greatly reduce water production. However, for wide fractures, larger F_{rr} may be needed to reduce the fracture-flow capacity to an acceptable level.

The results in Figs. 5 and 6 differ from results in Ref. 12, which reported that similar gels did not form in fractures when leakoff was not permitted. However, gel-mixing procedures and a number of experimental factors differed between the experimental studies of Ref. 12 and those of the present study.

As an aside, we briefly mention an experiment involving 16,600 ft/D superficial velocity placement of the 1X gel in a 1.0-ft-long fractured core in which no effluent ports were present in the matrix sandstone. In all other respects, this flood was comparable to the experiment for the 1X 7-hour-old gel that is cited in Figs. 3, 5, and 6 (details of this experiment can be found in Ref. 6). For the 1.0-ft-long core (with no matrix-effluent ports), both the peak (breaching) pressure gradient and the stabilized F_{rr} for the post-gel brine were comparable to those values for the 1X partially formed gel experiments of Figs. 3, 5, and 6 and in which matrix-effluent ports were present.

Very Little Gel Was Displaced From the Fractures

The relatively large stabilized F_{rr} values shown in Fig. 6 suggest that only a small portion of the gel residing in the fracture was displaced (washed out) and that the brine formed relatively small flow channels or "fingers" through (or around) the gel in the fracture. Several additional observations suggest that the brine-flow channels through the gel are relatively small (probably <10% FV).

First, no gel was visually observed in the produced brine, no blue color was visually noted in the produced brine [qualitatively indicating little or no dissolved chromium(III)], and there was no slippery feeling to the produced brine (a qualitative indication that little or no polymer or gel was present). During first brine flow after gel placement, four of the five analyzed effluent-brine samples contained less than 5% of the injected gel's chromium or polymer concentration (the exception contained 7% polymer concentration). In fact, the majority of effluent samples contained less than 1% of the chromium or polymer concentration in the injected gel. Thus, very little gel was produced from the fracture during the first post-gel-placement brine flood.

Second, brine breakthrough occurred substantially before one FV was injected. During all experiments, brine breakthrough indicated that the brine flow channel was a small fraction of the FV. The brine breakthrough volume was determined from the volume of fluid that had been injected when the peak differential pressure for brine injection passed through the furthest downstream of the pressure taps.

Third, the large stabilized (i.e., final and equilibrium) F_{rr}, as shown in Fig. 6, could only occur if the final-flow channels were small. Assuming a single cylindrical brine pathway through the gel, standard calculations[13] indicated effective tube diameters typically between 0.06 and 0.11 mm. These values suggest that more than 99% of the gel remained in the fracture after brine injection.

Fourth, upon termination of the experiment, the fracture was opened and visually inspected. For the gels that were aged less than 12 hours before injection, the fracture was filled with gel having qualitatively the same consistency and strength as the mature form of the gel. Little of the gel was displaced from the fracture during brine flow. In fact, chromium analysis of gel samples taken from the fracture after termination of the experiments (specifically those involving gel injection at 16,600 ft/D superficial velocity through the fracture) indicated that the gel was concentrated by 1.2 to 2.5 times. Several small flow channels through the gel were noted (as will be discussed in the next paragraph).

Fifth, at the end of the experiments, several wormhole channels were observed through the gel. The wormhole flow channels within the gel were easy to observe because the last fluid injected was Soltrol 130 oil that was dyed red. The relatively small wormhole channels (<10% FV) appeared similar to the wormhole channels that were reported for fully formed gels in similar fractures.[7,10]

The photograph in **Fig. 7** shows the wormhole channels after the fracture was split open. In this instance, the experiment involved the 2X CC/AP gel and the photo was taken after four cycles of brine and oil flooding. During the final flood of the experiment, red-dyed oil was injected into the gel-filled fracture. Flow occurred from left to right in the photograph. In this photo, the core material resides in roughly the middle half of the photo, with the remaining outer material (top and bottom) being core-holder materials.

In Fig. 7, immediately adjacent to the oil-flow channels, a series of short, dead-end flow channels appear to emanate perpendicular to the direction of the main oil-flow channels. These "railroad track" features may be an artifact. When a fracture and associate gel were split open, the resulting gel surface was not perfectly smooth. The freshly opened gel surface had alternating series of inward and outward protruding dimples. After splitting open the fracture and gel, a portion of the oil from within the wormhole may have accumulated in the inwardly protruding gel dimples (that were immediately adjacent to the wormhole channels)—thus forming the railroad tracks.

Pressure Gradients for Other Brine Rates

For many experiments with the 1X gel, after brine injection at 100 cm^3/h (206 ft/D), the injection rate was doubled, and the measurements were repeated. This process was repeated in stages up to a final brine-flow rate of 16,000 cm^3/h (33,000 ft/D). The final stabilized pressure gradients at other brine rates are shown in **Fig. 8.** In this figure, the heavy solid line indicates the behavior expected if the core contained no fracture, while the dashed line shows the behavior if the fracture was open and unaffected by the gel. In all experiments, the pressure gradients were substantially larger (by factors ranging from 65 to 8,600) than the values expected for an open fracture. Consequently, all gels caused significant conductivity reductions in the fracture. In particular, F_{rr} ranged from 2,000 to 8,600 at 100 cm^3/h and from 65 to 337 at 16,000 cm^3/h.

Fig. 8—Final stabilized pressure gradients at various brine rates.

For most of the data curves, the pressure gradient varied with the rate raised to the 0.3 power. This variation indicates that some incremental erosion or compaction of the gel occurred with each increase in brine injection rate. If no gel erosion or compaction occurred, the slopes of the curves should have been equal to 1.

For a given brine-injection rate, the pressure gradients generally increased with increasing injection delay, up to 24 hours. For injection delays beyond 24 hours, the pressure gradients were lower.

For a given brine injection rate, the largest pressure gradient (typically associated with the 16-hour delay) was 5 to 6 times greater than the lowest pressure gradient. Presumably, brine forced at least one pathway through the gel for each experiment shown in Fig. 8. Although the exact shapes of these pathways are not known, we note that flow capacity varies with the third power of width for slit openings and with the fourth power of diameter for circular openings. The data in Fig. 8 represent a relatively narrow range of brine pathways sizes. For example, assuming tube-shaped brine pathways, the diameters ranged from 0.07 to 0.11 cm for the experiments at 16,000 cm^3/h (33,000 ft/D) in Fig. 8.

Healing a Fracture

An important point from the preceding discussions was that the gel caused substantial reductions in the fracture conductivities (i.e., residual resistance factors were between 750 and 22,000 at a brine flux rate of 206 ft/D). These reductions occurred because very little gel washed out when brine was injected after gel placement. Ideally, a gel treatment should "heal" the fracture (i.e., the fracture conductivity is reduced to near zero) without damaging the porous rock. In that case, the final composite permeability of the core, plus the fracture, would revert to the permeability of the unfractured core. The last row of **Table 3** lists composite permeabilities (after injecting 30 FV of brine) for the five cases considered (experiments involving gel injection at 16,600 ft/D superficial velocity). Interestingly, these overall permeabilities were insensitive to the gel state when injected (aged 0.25 to 24 hour) and polymer concentration in the gel formulation. In all cases, the overall fractured-core permeabilities were somewhat less than the 700-md permeability of the Berea sandstone. It is not surprising that the gel reduced the permeability of the matrix rock somewhat, because most of the inlet core face was exposed during gel injection. Thus, the core inlet face was damaged to some extent by the injected gel.

It should be noted that reduction of the composite fracture-core permeability below 700 md does not necessarily ensure that the fracture was healed. In theory, it is possible that the fracture may still be open to some extent and the rock matrix is damaged enough so that the composite permeability falls below 700 md.

Flow Diversion

The extent to which brine is diverted away from the fracture and into the matrix can be assessed by examining the ratio of brine produced from the fracture vs. from the matrix. For the experiments of Table 3, the final rate of brine production from the matrix effluent ports ranged from 14 to 21% of the total flow rate. In contrast, at the time of the peak pressure, 21 to 92% of the total flow rate was produced from the matrix ports. Before gel placement, no measurable amount of fluid was produced from the matrix ports. Thus, the gel diverted brine flow away from the fracture and into the matrix sandstone rock. Of course, in the ideal case, all flow would be produced from the matrix port after the gel treatment.

Fig. 9 plots the percent of the brine that was produced from the matrix during the various experiments with the 1X gels in the 4-ft-long fractures (gel injection at 4,130 ft/D superficial velocity).

The 24-hour experiment showed the best behavior, with 100% of the brine being forced to flow through the matrix (i.e., no flow occurred in the fracture) at rates of 413 ft/D and lower. In general, longer gel-injection delays (up to 24 hours) lead to better fluid diversion. For all injection delays, the favorable diversion properties deteriorated substantially upon exposure to successively greater brine-injection rates.

However, on a more positive note, we routinely observed that very little, if any, brine was produced from the fracture during the first brine injection after gel placement—so long as the gel in the fracture had not been breached (i.e., the peak pressure described in Fig. 5 had not yet been exceeded). Thus, prevention of the first gel breach (i.e., the data from Fig. 5) may be an extremely important factor for many gel water-shutoff applications in fractures and fracture systems. If this peak pressure is not exceeded and the gel completely fills the target FV, then no significant water (or oil) flow within the fracture should occur.

Gel-Treated Fractures Exhibit DPR

In previous literature, DPR and its synonym, relative permeability modification, refer to polymers or gels that reduce the permeability to water more than that to oil or gas in porous rock.[8,9]

A series of experiments was conducted during this study to determine if CC/AP polymer gels promote DPR within a fracture. During six experiments involving three gel formulations (gel injection at 16,600 ft/D superficial velocity), the CC/AP gels that were placed in a partially formed state exhibited varying degrees of DPR in the fractures (k_{of}/k_{wf} ranged from 22 to 88). Details can be found in Ref. 6.

However, as a cautionary note in advance, these gels are probably better characterized as total-shutoff or sealing agents (not DPR agents) because of the large permeability reductions imparted to oil flow through the gel-filled fractures. See the "DPR" subsection of the "Additional Discussion Relating to Water-Shutoff Gel Characterization" section near the end of this paper for a discussion of DPR significance and implications during water and oil flow through gel-filled fractures.

1X and 3X Gels Exhibit DPR. For two additional flooding experiments (one involving a 1X gel aged for 7 hours before place-

TABLE 3—COMPOSITE STABILIZED FRACTURE-CORE PERMEABILITY FOR THE FIRST BRINE FLOOD					
Gel State When Injected	Fully Formed	Gelant	Partially Formed	Partially Formed	Partially Formed
Gel designation	1X	1X	1X	2X	3X
Aging time before injection, hour	24	≈0.25	7.0	2.5	1.0
Polymer concentration in gel, wt%	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.0	1.5
Composite stabilized permeability, md	330	380	380	300	440

Fig. 9—Percent of brine flowing through the matrix.

TABLE 4—DPR BY 1X AND 3X GELS		
Gel Designation	1X	3X
Polymer concentration in gel, wt%	0.5	1.5
Final brine permeability, md	12,000	3,900
Final oil permeability, md	2,000,000	300,000
Ratio, k_{of}/k_{wf}	166	77
Brine F_{rrw}	7,000	22,000
F_{rro}	42	280

ment and the other involving the 3X gel that was aged for 1 hour before placement), we examined the gel's ability to reduce permeability to water more than that to oil in fractures. In each case, after the first brine flood following gel placement in 1-mm-wide fractures, we performed an oilflood at a rate of 500 cm³/h. Results of these experiments are summarized in **Table 4.** Final permeability in this table refers to the permeability after injection of 30 FV of brine or oil.

In Table 4, the ratio of oil permeability to water permeability (k_{of}/k_{wf}) was 166 for the 1X gel and 77 for the 3X gel. Thus, CC/AP gel placed in the partially formed state reduced the permeability to water in the fracture to a much greater extent than the permeability to oil. As expected, the F_{rr} values for brine and oil for the 3X gel were significantly larger than the F_{rr} values for the 1X gel.

It should be noted that the above k_{of}/k_{wf} value of 166 is one of the largest that we have observed to date for gel placed in a fracture. Shortly, we will discuss examples and conditions for which the DPR was substantially less. The value of 166 was determined during experiments conducted at relatively low flow rates during which the brine was flooded before oil.

We repeated the water/oilflooding sequence three more times for each experiment. **Figs. 10 and 11** plot brine and oil F_{rr} for the four series of post-gel-placement brine and oilfloods. During each cycle, 30 FV of brine and oil were injected into the gel-filled fracture. All these floods were conducted at an injection rate of 500 cm³/h.

At the end of the first oilflood for the 1X gel, the final fracture permeability to oil was 2,000,000 md, yielding a permeability reduction factor of only 42. During the next three flooding series, the final permeability to oil remained constant, within experimental error. However, brine F_{rr} values progressively declined from 7,000 to 180 (i.e., by a factor of 38). The final-fracture permeability

to brine flow progressively increased from 12,000 to 460,000 md. The same general type of DPR behavior as depicted in Fig. 10 has been previously reported for a CC/AP gel residing in porous media.[8]

As was observed with the 1X gel, the oil F_{rro} values and the permeabilities for the 3X gel remained fairly constant during the four series of oilfloods. However, final brine F_{rr} values progressively declined from 22,000 to 1,000.

A final brine-permeability reduction factor of 1,000 should be adequate for many water-shutoff applications in 1-mm fractures. In wider fractures, larger F_{rr} may be needed.

Additional Discussion Relating to Water-Shutoff Gel Characterization

Injection of Partially Formed Gels. CC/AP gel water-shutoff treatments that are applied to fracture problems in the field are normally injected in the partially formed state. The objective is to ensure that the gel solution has relatively low viscosity (and good injectivity) as it exits the wellbore and enters the fracture(s), yet has developed enough crosslinked-gel structure (i.e., microgel structure) so the gel cannot appreciably enter and damage the matrix rock adjacent to the treated fracture(s). Subsequent to when gelation has been first detected visually for CC/AP gels, sufficient gel structure has occurred to prevent substantial penetration of the gel into matrix reservoir rock of normal permeabilities (<1,000 md).

Typically during field application of CC/AP gel water-shutoff treatments, the gelant solution resides in the injection tubing for 10 to 45 minutes before exiting the wellbore into the petroleum formation. However, situations can be easily envisioned in which the gel-residence time in the injection tubing could fall outside of the 10- to 45-minute range.

Ideally, for any given fracture-problem CC/AP gel water-shutoff treatment that is to be injected at a given rate, the gel formulations should be designed such that initial gelation has already occurred when the gel solution exits the wellbore and enters the fracture(s). The rate of gelation can be controlled in most instances by the appropriate addition to the CC/AP gel formulation of a chemical gelation-rate accelerator (e.g., CrCl₃) or chemical gelation-rate retarder (e.g., sodium lactate).

The placement and propagation of partially and fully formed CC/AP gels in fractures are discussed in Refs. 1 and 2.

DPR. Although DPR occurred for water and oil flow through the gel-filled fractures of this study, it is doubtful that this effect can

Fig. 10—Four post-gel-placement water/oilfloods for the 1X gel.

Fig. 11—Four post-gel-placement water/oilfloods for the 3X gel.

be effectively exploited during most field applications of fracture-problem water-shutoff treatments. This is because the permeability reduction to oil is so large that all oil flow in gel-filled fractures is effectively shut off.

Nevertheless, the DPR that we observed for fluid flow within gels that are placed in fractures is significant because it might be usefully exploited under limited circumstances, and it might lead to an improved understanding of the mechanism for DPR in matrix rock, as well as in fractures.

Gel Washout? Terms such as gel washout and gel failure have often been invoked to describe the partial brine breaching of gels in fractures. In a sense, these terms are misleading (as demonstrated in this study) because the vast majority of the FV remains filled with gel that can substantially reduce water flow through the fracture.

Suboptimum Field Performance and What Is Needed. Considering our laboratory findings, why do we not see near-complete reduction in brine production during field applications of polymer-gel water-shutoff treatments in fractured reservoirs? There are a number of possible explanations. First, if a well is not pumped off (even if the water is being produced from a single fracture), the reduction in the water-production rate will probably be less than the permeability reduction factor that the gel imparted to the treated fracture. For example, consider a well that can produce 10,000 B/D of water through a single fracture when fully drawn down, and the well's pump can only produce 1,000 B/D of fluid. Thus, the well produces 1,000 B/D of fluid. For the sake of simplicity in this example, we assume no oil production and that all the fluid production occurs from the single fracture. Now, we successfully apply a polymer-gel treatment that reduces the permeability and fluid-flow capacity of the fracture by 80%. If the well is put back on production with the same pumping unit, the water-production rate will not be reduced by 80%. Instead, the well will still produce 1,000 B/D of water.

Second, the reservoir fractures may have sufficiently large apertures such that the applied gel does not have enough mechanical strength to withstand the prevailing pressure gradients and/or is not appropriate for application to such wide fractures.

Third, complete filling of the FV with gel can be more difficult in the field than in our laboratory experiments. For example, in large-aperture vertical fractures, the gel formulation may gravity segregate to the bottom of the fracture during placement on the field scale (especially if there is oil in the fracture). Because the top part of the fracture remains open, water flow to the well will likely not be totally shut off. In the field setting, this third explanation is probably a major contributor to less-than-optimum performance of polymer-gel water-shutoff treatments in fractured production wells.

This paper demonstrated that polymer gels can impart large permeability-reduction factors for water flow in gel-treated fractures. Our results and discussion imply that ineffective and/or incomplete filling of the FV during gel placement is often responsible for attaining smaller water-shutoff values in the field than in the laboratory. Mastering how to more completely fill fractures with a gel may be the key to improving the success rate and the effectiveness on the field scale of water-shutoff polymer gels that are placed in fractures and fracture systems.

Oil Production Through Gel-Treated Fractures. As indicated and demonstrated in this study, essentially no water (and presumably no oil) will flow through a gel-treated and -filled fracture, provided the critical pressure gradient for partially breaching the gel has not been exceeded. For those instances in which the injected gel has minimally invaded and damaged the matrix rock that is adjacent to the gel-treated fracture, oil in the reservoir matrix rock is free to flow to the producing well through the reservoir matrix rock.

However, in many cases, it is believed that much of the oil production from a water-shutoff gel-treated well in a naturally fractured reservoir is being produced to the wellbore, at least in part, by fractures. As discussed in the previous section, the full

volumetric placement of gels within many fractures during actual-field polymer-gel water-shutoff treatments is probably far from perfect within the treated FV. Possibly the gel fluid tends to gravity segregate within the treated FV and permits oil to be produced to the wellbore through the upper portion of the treated FV.

In addition, CC/AP gels of water-shutoff treatments tend to selectively treat (be placed in) the widest-aperture, and often most offending, water-producing fractures first.[14] In these instances, gel water-shutoff treatments may leave open and untreated the secondary and small-aperture fractures that, during post-gel treatment, become significant conduits for oil production to the producing well.

Thus, it is possible and is expected that CC/AP gels of water-shutoff treatments can block oil production to the wellbore in some instances. However, successful fracture-problem CC/AP gel water-shutoff treatments that do reduce excessive and detrimental water production can still, under certain circumstances, provide oil-production flow conduits through fractures to the production well.

In fact, fracture-problem CC/AP gel water-shutoff treatments have been applied recently to a large number of producing wells in the Arbuckle formation of Kansas, U.S.A., and oil-productivity indexes increased significantly in a number of wells following the application of the treatments.[15] The mechanism by which these treatments increased the oil-productivity index is not fully understood at this time.

Brine Flow Rates and Fracture Apertures. The post-gel-placement brine flow rates investigated during this study were often relatively low. At higher brine flow rates and associated higher pressure drops, gel erosion or compaction (dehydration) can occur—increasing fracture flow capacity and reducing gel effectiveness. However, as shown in Ref. 16, polymer gels can be formulated to help mitigate these concerns.

The 1-mm fracture aperture, which was used in this experimental study, is not exceptionally large.

Wormholing. This study found that brine and oil usually wormhole through water-shutoff gels that reside in fractures. This finding is not surprising because the brine and oil are tremendously more mobile than the gels. Fingers (for the case of liquids displacing liquids) and wormholes (for the case of fluids destructively penetrating into solids) are well known to occur for displacements involving unfavorable mobility ratios. In previous work,[7,10] we reported a special type of wormholing when a 1-day-old gel was extruded into fractures. During the extrusion process, the gel dehydrated or concentrated, forming an immobile gel within the fracture that became increasingly concentrated with time. Gel of the original concentration was forced to wormhole through the concentrated immobile gel to continue propagating through the fracture. Consequently, at the end of the gel-placement process, most of the fracture was filled with a strong, concentrated gel, but the wormholes were filled with less-concentrated and less-rigid gel. During brine or oil flow after gel placement, the first breach of the gel occurred in these pre-established wormholes.

In contrast, when a gel formulation was placed as a gelant or partially formed gel, these pre-established wormholes were not necessarily present. Thus, during brine or oil flow, different breach points occurred within the gels. Nonetheless, for all the experiments to date, the wormhole pathways had a similar appearance, regardless of whether the gels were placed as gelants, partially formed gels, or fully formed gels.

The wormhole fluid-flow pathways within the gel residing in the fractures of this study are not (in concept) too unlike the finger fluid-flow channels—observed by U. of Kansas researchers—for CC/AP gel residing in tubes.[12,17]

Conclusions
The following conclusions are limited to the polymer gels and the experimental conditions of this study.
1. Partially formed (<8-hour-old) 1X (0.5% polymer) CC/AP gels showed much lower (as much as 100 times lower) effective viscosities (17 to 35 cp) during flow through a 1-mm-wide fracture than fully formed (>15-hour-old) gels with the same

chemical composition. Thus, partially formed gels exhibit substantially higher injectivities and lower placement pressures. This feature is of major importance during field applications in which pressure constraints limit rates and volumes during gel treatments.

2. For gelants and partially formed gels that were 5 hours old or younger, the rates of gelant leakoff through fracture faces were very low (about 0.013 ft^3/ft^2/d). Thus, field applications that inject relatively small volumes of gelant or partially formed gels will generally experience small gelant leakoff distances and will not significantly inhibit oil from entering gel-free near-wellbore fractures.

3. During the first brine injection after gel placement in 1-mm-wide fractures, the pressure gradient required to first breach mature gel increased significantly with increased polymer concentration in the gel, ranging from roughly 5 psi/ft for 1X (0.5% polymer) partially formed gels to 99 psi/ft for 3X (1.5% polymer) partially formed gels. For 1X gels, the breaching pressure gradient was greatest (≈9 psi/ft) when the gel was aged from 12 to 24 hours before injection. Before exceeding the breaching pressure gradient, no detectable brine flowed through the fracture.

4. During the limited brine flow after the gel placement and gel breaching, most (>90%) of the gel remained in the fracture and did not wash out.

5. The stabilized F_{rr} (i.e., permeability-reduction factors) for the first brine flow through the fracture (following gel placement and maturation) ranged from 750 to 22,000—increasing with increased polymer concentration and gel strength.

6. For the 1X gel, the stabilized permeability-reduction factors (for brine flow in a gel-treated fracture) were comparable for formulations injected in the gelant state, the partially formed state, and the "fully formed" state.

7. The large stabilized (final and equilibrium) F_{rr} for brine flow through the gel-filled fractures resulted from the brine flowing through relatively small channels (wormholes) residing within the gel.

8. The CC/AP gels exhibited DPR during brine and oil flow through the gel-filled fractures. However, the gels of this study are probably better characterized as total-shutoff or sealing agents (not DPR agents) because of the large permeability reduction imparted to oil flow through the gel-filled fractures.

9. During one experiment with the 1X gel, brine permeability in the fracture was reduced 166 times more than that for oil. In this case, brine was flooded first, followed by oil.

10. For the studied 1X and 3X gels, the permeability reduction factor for oil flow remained constant (within experimental error) during four cycles of brine and oil injection. In contrast, the permeability reduction factor for brine decreased by more than a factor of 10 during these cycles.

Nomenclature

F_{rr} = residual-resistance factors
F_{rro} = oil residual-resistance factors
F_{rrw} = water residual-resistance factors
k_{of}/k_{wf} = ratio measuring degree of DPR
w_f = fracture width, in. [m]
1X = gel containing 0.5 wt% polymer
2X = gel containing 1.0 wt% polymer
3X = gel containing 1.5 wt% polymer

Acknowledgments

References

1. Seright, R.S.: "Gel Propagation Through Fractures," *SPEPF* (November 2001) 225.

2. Seright, R.S.: "Mechanism for Gel Propagation Through Fractures," paper SPE 55628 presented at the 1999 SPE Rocky Mountain Regional Meeting, Gillette, Wyoming, U.S.A., 15–18 May.

3. Sydansk, R.D.: "A Newly Developed Chromium(III) Gel Technology," *SPERE* (August 1990) 346.

4. Sydansk, R.D. and Southwell, G.P.: "More Than 12 Years' Experience With a Successful Conformance-Control Polymer-Gel Technology," *SPEPF* (November 2000) 270.

5. Sydansk, R.D.: "Acrylamide-Polymer/Chromium(III)-Carboxylate Gels for Near Wellbore Matrix Treatments," *SPE Advanced Technology Series* (April 1993) **1,** No. 1, 146–152.

6. Seright, R.S.: "Conformance Improvement Using Gels," U.S. DOE Report DOE/BC/15316-4, Annual Technical Progress Report, Contract No. DE-FC26-01BC15316, U.S. DOE, Washington, DC (September 2003).

7. Seright, R.S.: "An Alternative View of Filter Cake Formation in Fractures Inspired by Cr(III)-Acetate-HPAM Gel Extrusion," *SPEPF* (February 2003) 65.

8. Liang, J.T., Sun, H., and Seright, R.S.: "Why Do Gels Reduce Water Permeability More Than Oil Permeability?" *SPERE* (November 1995) 282.

9. Seright, R.S. *et al.:* "Characterizing DPR Using Synchrotron X-Ray Computed Microtomography," *SPEREE* (October 2002) 355.

10. Seright, R.S.: "Washout of Cr(III)-Acetate-HPAM Gels from Fractures," paper SPE 80200 presented at the 2003 SPE International Symposium on Oilfield Chemistry, Houston, 5–7 February.

11. Bass, D.M.: "Properties of Reservoir Rocks," *Petroleum Engineering Handbook*, H.B. Bradley (ed.), SPE, Richardson, Texas, U.S.A. (1987) Chap. 26, 26–16.

12. Ganguly, S. *et al.:* "The Effect of Fluid Leakoff on Gel Placement and Gel Stability in Fractures," *SPEJ* (September 2002) 309.

13. Bird, R.B., Stewart, W.E., and Lightfoot, E.N.: *Transport Phenomena*, John Wiley & Sons, New York City (1960) 46–62.

14. Seright, R.S. and Lee, R.L.: "Gel Treatments for Reducing Channeling in Naturally Fractured Reservoirs," *SPEPF* (November 1999) 269.

15. Willhite, G.P. and Pancake, R.E.: "Controlling Water Production Using Gelled Polymer Systems," paper SPE 89464 presented at the 2004 SPE/DOE Symposium on Improved Oil Recovery, Tulsa, 17–21 April.

16. Sydansk, R.D. *et al.:* "Polymer Gels Formulated with a Combination of High- and Low-Molecular-Weight Polymers Provide Improved Performance for Water-Shutoff Treatments of Fractured Production Wells," *SPEPF* (November 2004) 229.

17. Krishnan, P. *et al.:* "Dehydration and Permeability of Gels Used in In-Situ Permeability Modification Treatments," paper SPE 59347 presented at the 2000 SPE/DOE Symposium on Improved Oil Recovery, Tulsa, 3–5 April.

SI Metric Conversion Factors

cp × 1.0*	E−03	= Pa·s
ft × 3.048*	E−01	= m
ft^2 × 9.290 304*	E−02	= m^2
ft^3 × 2.831 685	E−02	= m^3
ft/D × 3.528	E−06	= m/s
°F × (°F−32)/1.8		= °C
in. × 2.54*	E+00	= cm
m^3/D × 2.863 640	E−02	= scf/D
in.^{3}/hr × 6.102 374	E−02	= cm^3/hr
md × 9.869 233	E−04	= μm^2
psi × 6.894 757	E+00	= kPa
psi/ft × 2.262 059	E+01	= kPa/m

*Conversion factor is exact.

Robert D. Sydansk has been the head of Sydansk Consulting Services in Centennial, Colorado, U.S.A. since 2000. (e-mail: RDSydansk@msn.com.) Previously, he conducted R&D for 33 years for Marathon Oil Co. in almost all areas of chemical improved oil recovery (IOR), with his most recent focus there on conformance improvement and polymer gels. He is the holder or coholder of 60 U.S. patents and has authored or coauthored 39 technical papers. Sydansk holds a BS degree in

chemistry from the U. of Colorado. He is an SPE Distinguished Member and was an SPE Distinguished Lecturer from 1997–1998. **Yin Xiong** worked as a research assistant in the Reservoir Sweep Improvement Group of the Petroleum Recovery Research Center of New Mexico Tech. (e-mail: kikixy@yahoo .com.) She holds a BS degree in storage and transportation of oil and gas from the Southwest Petroleum Inst. (China) and an MS degree in petroleum engineering from New Mexico Tech. **Abdullah M. Al-Dhafeeri** is a research scientist with the Saudi Aramco R&D Center in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. (e-mail: abdullah.dhafeeri@aramco.com.) His current research inter-

ests include water shutoff, well stimulation, IOR processes, and rheology. Al-Dhafeeri holds a BSc degree from King Saud U. and holds an MSc degree and a PhD degree from New Mexico Inst. of Mining and Technology. **Richard S. Schrader** is a senior lab associate at New Mexico Petroleum Recovery Research Center at New Mexico Tech. (e-mail: rich@prrc.nmt .edu.) **Randall S. Seright** is a senior engineer at the New Mexico Petroleum Recovery Research Center at New Mexico Tech in Socorro. (e-mail: randy@prrc.nmt.edu.) He was an SPE Distinguished Lecturer for 1993–1994 and holds a PhD degree in chemical engineering from the U. of Wisconsin at Madison.