#### Hydraulic Fracturing and Formation Damage in a Sedimentary Geothermal Reservoir



A. Reinicke, B. Legarth, G. Zimmermann, E. Huenges and G. Dresen



ENGINE – ENhanced Geothermal Innovative Network for Europe Workshop 3, "Stimulation of reservoir and microseismicity" Kartause Ittingen, Zürich, June 29 – July 1, 2006, Switzerland



### The Geothermal in-situ Laboratory Groß Schönebeck 3/90



POTSDAM

In 2002 hydraulic stimulation experiments were conducted in a remediated Rotliegend-well Groß Schönebeck 3/90.

#### the aim:

Development of technologies to use primary low-productive aguifers for geothermal power generation

#### objectives:

- enhance the inflow performance
- create new highly conductive flow paths • in a porous-permeable rock matrix
- maximise potential inflow area •
- testing the technical feasibility of the fracturing concept



#### Hydraulic Stimulation Technique: Waterfracs (WF)



#### Hydraulic Stimulation Technique: Hydraulic Proppant Fracs (HPF)





#### Lithology, Temperature Profile and Petrophysical Reservoir Parameters



#### Technical Concept and Chronology of Operations of HPF Treatments in 2002



#### HPF Treatments: Datafrac 1 and Mainfrac 1





POTSDAM

# significant upward extension of inflow area due to new axial fractures

- PI<sub>prefrac</sub> : 1.2 m<sup>3</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>MPa<sup>-1</sup>
- PI<sub>postfrac</sub> : 2.1 m<sup>3</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>MPa<sup>-1</sup>
- PI<sub>predicted</sub> : 8.3 m<sup>3</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>MPa<sup>-1</sup> (1)



inflow impairment due to non-Darcy-flow effects and proppant pack damage



#### Potential Damage Effects in a Propped Fracture



#### Experimental Setup for Proppant Rock Interaction Testing







#### Triaxial Test of a Propped Fracture: Permeability and AE-Activity at Different Stress Levels



### Conclusions

HPF treatment in geothermal research well Groß Schönebeck 3/90

- clear productivity (PI) enhancement achieved
- new axial propped fractures were created BUT:
- productivity increase less than expected
- post-job damage (mechanical, non Darcy flow effects)

Proppant rock interaction testing

- Crushing of grains and/or proppants starts at low effective stress (~5 MPa)
- Concentration of AEs at the fracture face
- With increasing effective stress AE activity moves into the proppant pack
- Drastic reduction of sample permeability





- (1) Legarth, B., Huenges, E. and Zimmermann, G., 2005a. *Hydraulic Fracturing in Sedimentary Geothermal Reservoirs: Results and Implications*, Int. Journal of Rock Mech., Vol. 42 p. 1028–1041
- (2) Legarth, B., Raab, S., Huenges, E., 2005b. *Mechanical Interactions* between proppants and rock and their effect on hydraulic fracture performance, DGMK-Tagungsbericht 2005-1, Fachbereich Aufsuchung und Gewinnung, 28.-29. April 2005, Celle, Deutschland, pp. 275-288
- (3) Cinco-Ley, H., Samaniego-V, F., 1977. Effect of Wellbore Storage and Damage on the Transient Pressure Behaviour of vertically Fractured Wells, SPE 6752
- (4) Romero, D.J., Valkó, P.P., Economides, M.J., 2003. *Optimization of the Productivity Index and the Fracture Geometry of a Stimulated Well With Fracture Face and Choke Skin*, SPE 81908





#### Proppant Imprint (Embedment) into Rock Matrix







Triaxial Test of a Propped Fracture Crushed Proppants and Fines







## Lab Testing: Picture of crushed Proppants and Fines







#### Mechanical Induced FFS









[1] Cinco-Ley, et al., 1977







POTSDAM

#### Micrograph of the Created Shear Fracture / Permeability of Damaged Zone







# Lab Testing: AE-Activity



POTSDAM

#### Triaxial Test of a Propped Fracture



#### Hertzien Contact of Proppants



- 1) Triaxial test with intact sample
  - → Determination of Young's Modulus and initial permeability







- 1) Triaxial test with intact sample
  - → Determination of Young's Modulus and initial permeability
- 2) Tensile fracture via 3-Point-Bending-Test
  - $\rightarrow$  Generation of a naturally rough fracture face







- 1) Triaxial test with intact sample
  - → Determination of Young's Modulus and initial permeability
- 2) Tensile fracture via 3-Point-Bending-Test
  → Generation of a naturally rough fracture face
  Triaxial test with fractured sample (small axial load)
  → Determination of permeability of fractured sample







- 1) Triaxial test with intact sample
  - → Determination of Young's Modulus and initial permeability
- 2) Tensile fracture via 3-Point-Bending-Test
  - $\rightarrow$  Generation of a naturally rough fracture face
  - Triaxial test with fractured sample (small axial load)
  - $\rightarrow$  Determination of permeability of fractured sample
- 3) Opening the fracture, filling with proppants, closing fracture aligned







- a) Triaxial test with intact sample
  - → Determination of Young's Modulus and initial permeability
- b) Tensile fracture via 3-Point-Bending-Test
  - $\rightarrow$  Generation of a naturally rough fracture face
  - Triaxial test with fractured sample (small axial load)
  - → Determination of permeability of fractured sample
- c) Opening the fracture, filling with proppants, closing fracture aligned
  - Triaxial test with propped fracture within range of elasticity
  - → Determination of fracture stiffness, fracture width, permeability and AE-activity









Axial Strain [%]

![](_page_29_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### Lab Testing: Step 2) Reloading of the Sample with Fracture

![](_page_31_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### Lab Testing: Step 3) Reloading of the Sample with Proppant Filled Fracture

![](_page_32_Figure_1.jpeg)

POTSDAM

![](_page_33_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### Conceptual Model: Minimum Detectable Depth of a FFS Zone

![](_page_34_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### The new Set-Up

![](_page_36_Figure_1.jpeg)

POTSDAM