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1. Introduction

This document provides a detailed technical writeup for ResFrac. It covers the governing and constitutive equations, specification of initial and boundary conditions, and practical topics such as history matching. Section 15 summarizes the data that you need to collect to set up a ResFrac simulation.

This document is complementary to the other documentation materials provided with ResFrac. The ResFrac Technical Summary provides a more succinct overview of ResFrac capabilities. The Getting Started Guide describes how to use the user interface to set up, run, and visualize simulations. We also provide step-by-step tutorials on performing ResFrac simulations for two applications: (1) hydraulic fracturing and production and (2) diagnostic fracture injection tests. We provide tutorial movies where the computer screen is recorded as we narrate and show how to use ResFrac.

For examples of ResFrac applications, refer to SPE 182593 (McClure and Kang, 2017) and SPE 190049 (McClure and Kang, 2018). There are also blog posts on our website:


Finally, for information on particular input parameters, you can refer to the “Help” buttons built directly into the simulation builder tool.

2. Problem geometry and meshing

Figure 1 shows an example of a ResFrac simulation mesh. Matrix elements are meshed as cuboids; fracture elements are meshed as rectangles, and the well is meshed with line segments. You specify the fracture element length and aspect ratio (length divided by height). All fracture elements have the same length and height. The matrix elements are rectangular, but they do not necessarily have uniform size, as shown in Figure 1. The matrix mesh geometry is specified as part of the simulation setup; ResFrac does not use adaptive mesh refinement. You specify the wellbore element length.
Figure 1: Example of a ResFrac simulation mesh with refinement towards the fracture.

Figure 1 shows an example of mesh that has been refined towards the fracture. In a conventional finite volume/difference simulator, mesh refinement towards the fracture is necessary in order to avoid numerical error. However, ResFrac uses the 1D subgrid method (McClure, 2017) to calculate fluid exchange between the fracture and matrix. The 1D subgrid method enables accurate calculations of fluid exchange between the fracture and the matrix, even with a coarse non-conforming mesh. A non-conforming mesh is a mesh where the edges of the fracture elements do not coincide with the edges of the matrix elements.

If you perform simulations of DFITs or other ‘pressure transient’ simulations, you probably want to refine the mesh towards the fracture, like shown in Figure 1. This is because in pressure transients, you plot the derivative of pressure with respect to logarithmic time. This type of plot magnifies even small numerical imperfections. The 1D subgrid method is not perfect, and if you use it on a DFIT simulation, there can be a few odd wiggles in the derivative plot. But in most field scale simulations of hydraulic fracturing, production, etc., you can use a coarse nonconforming mesh with the 1D subgrid method, and the approximation error is very minor.

Figure 2: Example of a ResFrac simulation mesh that is relatively coarse and does not use refinement towards the fracture. Accurate results are still possible by using the 1D subgrid method (McClure, 2017).

Formation properties such as permeability and porosity are specified by the user within depth intervals – the
simulator assumes lateral homogeneity. Figure 3 shows an example of matrix properties viewed from the side.

![ResFrac](image)

Figure 3: Side view of a matrix region showing formation properties. Porosity and gas saturation are defined by layer. By default, pressure is initialized at hydrostatic equilibrium (though it is possible to specify your own initial pressure profile). This is an isothermal simulation, so temperature is uniform.

You specify the size and location of the matrix region. Fractures cannot propagate out of the matrix region, and so you want to specify it to be large enough that fractures will never reach the edge. If you run a simulation and discover that fractures did, in fact, reach the edge, then should discard that simulation and rerun with a larger mesh (or increase toughness to reduce the fracture size). The sides of the matrix region are ‘no flow’ boundary conditions.

You specify the location and geometry of the well(s) with a series of vertices. You should specify the wellbore all the way to the surface. The matrix region will rarely, if ever, be specified all the way to the surface. In some problems, you will want to specify the matrix region to encompass a large region, such as the entire length of the lateral. But sometimes, you’ll want to focus on one or a few stages along the well. In that case, you can specify the matrix region to be smaller, focusing only on the region of interest.
ResFrac allows you to inject sequentially into stages. When you specify the well vertices, you can assign each vertex to a particular ‘stage’. Then, when you specify the wellbore boundary conditions, you can opt to close off certain stages to flow over different periods of time.

3. The overall system of equations

ResFrac uses the finite volume method for transport. In each timestep, the simulator enforces \( N_c \) component molar balance equations, one energy balance equation, \( N_{pr} \) proppant mass balance equations, and \( N_s \) water solute mass balance equations. The total number of equations in each element is \( N_c + N_{pr} + N_s + 1 \). In addition to these transport equations, wellbore elements have one additional equation, momentum balance. Matrix and fracture elements each have additional equations related to mechanical deformation, as described in Section 10. Boundary condition elements have equations enforcing boundary conditions, described in Section 12. The simulator provides the option to turn off thermal transport (making an isothermal simulation) and neglect poroelastic stress response to pressure change.

Calculations of fluid properties are discussed in Section 14. One of the \( N_c \) components is water. In the black oil model, there are two other components: ‘oil’ and ‘gas.’ In the compositional fluid model, the other components are ‘flash’ components that form one or two phases that are assumed to be immiscible with the water phase. The flash components are defined by molar mass, pseudocritical temperature and pressure, acentric factor, and binary interaction coefficients.

The \( N_s \) water solutes are defined by their molar mass and parameterized in terms of mass fraction within the water component. Hence, the molar mass of the water ‘component’ is not constant; it is a function of water solute mass fraction. The water solutes may be inert tracers such as salts or they may be gel molecules that impart non-Newtonian flow characteristics, as described in Section 9. Proppant types are defined by grain diameter, density, and parameters related to their permeability in a packed bed, described in Section 8. The proppant grains are assumed to have constant density.

Momentum balance is used to calculate flow rate in each wellbore element. The calculation includes friction, hydrostatic head, pressure gradient, momentum advection, and momentum accumulation.

The geomechanics calculations consider stress shadowing from fracture opening and poroelastic stress change.
due to pressure change in the matrix.

The boundary condition equations can be specified at the wellhead or as bottomhole constraints. If you specify a bottomhole constraint, the wellbore is removed from the simulation during the period of time when the bottomhole constraints is specified.

4. Fluid flow in the matrix

4.1 Overview

The molar flow rate of component $c$ from matrix element $i$ to matrix element $j$ is calculated using Darcy’s law (Aziz and Settari, 1979):

$$q_{c,i,j} = T_{ij} \sum_{p=1}^{3} \frac{z_{c,p,i,j} k_{p,i,j} \rho_{M,p,i,j}}{\mu_{p,i,j}} (\Phi_{p,i} - \Phi_{p,j}),$$  \hspace{1cm} (4-1)

where $p$ is the phase, $z_{c,p,i,j}$ is flowing molar fraction, $k_{p,i,j}$ is relative permeability, $\rho_{M,p,i,j}$ is flowing molar density, and $\mu_{p,i,j}$ is viscosity. The parameter $T_{ij}$ includes the geometric effect of element shape and harmonically averages permeability (Karimi-Fard et al., 2004). The fluid potential of each phase, $\Phi_{p}$, drives flow based on fluid pressure and hydrostatic head. Capillary pressure and non-Darcy flow in the matrix are neglected.

There are three ways of specifying relative permeability (in decreasing level of complexity):

1. Tables of drainage and imbibition relative permeability curves for water-hydrocarbon and oil-gas. Three phase relative permeabilities are calculated by interpolating between the two-phase curves using the method of Baker (1988). Hysteresis effects are calculated using the methods of Land (1968) and Killough (1976).
2. Tables of relative permeability versus phase saturation.
3. Power law Brooks-Corey parameters for each phase.

The power law Brooks-Corey relative permeability is calculated as:

$$k_{rp} = k_{rp, multiplier} \left( \frac{S_p - S_pr}{1 - S_pr} \right)^{n_p}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4-2)

Regardless of the value of $k_{rp, multiplier}$, the relative permeability is not permitted to exceed 1.0.

ResFrac allows you to use a dual porosity treatment in the reservoir. In the dual porosity model, each matrix element is divided into two collocated elements. One element, the ‘fracture’ element, has low pore volume. The other element, the ‘matrix’ element, has high pore volume but is only hydraulically connected to its collocated fracture element. The flow between the matrix element and the collocated fracture element is controlled by a ‘shape factor’ and the ‘matrix’ element permeability.

There are two dual porosity options (Zimmerman et al., 1993). Pseudo-steady state dual porosity models the volumetric fluid flow rate (per element volume) between the matrix and fracture elements as:

$$Q_d = -\frac{\alpha k_m}{\mu} (P_f - P_m),$$  \hspace{1cm} (4-3)

where $\alpha$ is a shape factor (units of inverse length squared), $k_m$ is the permeability of the matrix, and $Q_d$ is the
volumetric flow rate per element volume. The permeability of the fracture element is used to calculate flow between adjacent elements.

The transient dual porosity model accounts for transient flow between the ‘matrix’ and ‘fracture’ element. Rather than calculating fluid exchange using the ‘average’ pressure in the matrix element, the transient model attempts to account for the pressure gradient that develops due to fluid flow in/out of the ‘fractures.’ One way to model this transient behavior is through a MINC (multiple interacting continua) model, in which there are multiple nested collocated matrix elements. However, this can be computationally intensive because of the need for a large number of elements. Instead, ResFrac uses the semi-analytical approach proposed by Zimmerman et al. (1993). This approach uses only a single matrix element and approximates transient behavior with a semi-analytical modification to Equation 4-3.

ResFrac supports pressure dependent matrix permeability: reversible, irreversible, or both. In reversible pressure dependent permeability, you input a table of permeability multipliers as a function of pressure change. These multipliers are applied directly as a function of element pressure at every timestep. With irreversible pressure dependent permeability, each element remembers the highest pressure reached in the element. You input a table of irreversible pressure dependent permeability multipliers versus maximum historical pressure. The irreversible multipliers are intended to capture processes such as shear stimulation of natural fractures or formation of secondary unpropped hydraulic fractures. The tables of reversible and irreversible permeability multipliers are specified separately in each facies.

4.2 Adsorption/desorption

Adsorbed gas is calculated according to a Langmuir isotherm (Yu et al., 2014):

\[ v_a(P) = \frac{v_{a,L}P}{P + P_L} \]

where \( v_a \) is the gas volume of adsorption at pressure \( P \), \( v_{a,L} \) is the Langmuir volume, and \( P_L \) is the Langmuir pressure. Adsorption is only available as an option in isothermal models.

5. Fluid flow in the fractures

This section describes general-purpose constitutive equations for calculating fracture aperture and transport properties. The equations consider Darcy and non-Darcy flow, Newtonian and non-Newtonian fluid, multiphase flow, are valid for mechanically open or closed fractures, and are valid for any value of proppant volume fraction.

The literature contains a variety of well-validated equations for describing fracture aperture and flow properties under different conditions. For example, the cubic law describes flow through an open fracture (Witherspoon et al., 1980); joint stiffness laws describe flow through a closed proppant-free fracture (Barton et al., 1985); and flow through a proppant-filled fracture can be modeled as flow through a packed bed of particles. Because simulation codes usually focus on either fracturing or production, they do not need to realistically describe the transition from mechanically open to closed. Because our objective is to simulate fracturing and production within a single framework, we require general-purpose equations that handle transitions between limiting cases.

Dontsov and Peirce (2014; 2015) developed a set of constitutive equations for capturing the transition from slurry flow through an open fracture to fluid flow through packed particles in a closed fracture. They neglected the ability of proppant-free fractures to retain aperture after closure due to roughness. McClure and Horne (2013) developed a framework for modeling the transition from mechanically open to closed, applying a nonlinear joint closure law after closure. However, they did not include the effect of proppant. Their algorithm was applied by McClure et al. (2016b) to achieve very close matches to field data from diagnostic fracture
injection tests (DFITs), including before, during, and after closure. Shiozawa and McClure (2016a) combined the approaches of Dontsov and Peirce (2014; 2015) and McClure and Horne (2013). However, the constitutive equations developed by Shiozawa and McClure (2016a) do not guarantee that the proppant volume fraction cannot exceed unity at high closure stress and are only applicable for single-phase, Darcy, Newtonian flow. The relations developed in ResFrac follow an approach similar to this prior work, but with modifications to ensure physically plausible results under all conditions. Our relations include multiphase flow, non-Darcy flow, and non-Newtonian flow.

In limiting cases, our relations reduce to well-validated and widely used equations for fracture flow (such as the cubic law for a mechanically open fracture). In intermediate cases, the relations smoothly (without discontinuity) transition between the different constitutive laws. The equations always yield results that satisfy physical constraints (such as the requirement that proppant volume fraction cannot exceed unity). Within the overall framework, we apply specific constitutive equations to calculate flow properties. Specific constitutive equations could be replaced, if desired, within the overall framework.

Before providing the equations for flow through the fracture, it is necessary to describe the equations for calculating aperture. A fracture is defined as being mechanically open if the fracture walls have come out of contact because fluid pressure exceeds the normal stress. A fracture is defined as being mechanically closed if the fracture walls are in contact because the fluid pressure is less than the normal stress.

The aperture of a mechanically closed element is calculated as:

\[ E(\sigma_n > P) = E_{\text{res}} + \frac{1-C_{pr,c}}{1-C_{pr}} [E_{cr} + E_b], \]

where:

\[ E_{cr} = E_0 (1 - \gamma_b) \left( \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\phi (\sigma_n - P)}{\sigma_n,\text{ref}}} \right), \]

\[ E_b = (E_0 \gamma_b + E_{pr}) \exp \left( -c_{b,\phi} (\sigma_n - P) \right), \]

\[ \gamma_b = \min(1.0, \frac{C_{pr,c}}{C_{pr,\text{max}}}), \]

When the fracture transitions from open to closed, the aperture is equal to: \( E_{\text{res}} + E_0 + E_{pr} \), or equivalently, \( E_{\text{res}} + E_{cr} + E_b \).

The \( E_{cr} \) term represents the contribution of the unpropped fracture roughness to the aperture (Barton et al., 1985; Willis-Richards et al., 1995). The parameter \( \sigma_n,\text{ref} \) is the effective normal stress at which the \( E_{cr} \) term reaches 10% of its maximum value. \( E_{\text{res}} \) is the irreducible minimum aperture, the fracture aperture at very high effective normal stress.

\( C_{pr} \) is the volume fraction of proppant. \( C_{pr,\text{max}} \) is the maximum possible proppant volume fraction in a packed bed. For random packing and moderately heterogeneous particles, \( C_{pr,\text{max}} \) is around 0.5 - 0.66. \( \gamma_b \) is the fraction of the fracture “roughness” part of the aperture (\( E_0 \)) that is filled with proppant. \( C_{pr,c} \) is the effective proppant volume fraction at closure, equal to the volume of proppant per area divided by \( E_0 + E_{pr} + E_{\text{res}} \) (discussed further below). Ideally, \( C_{pr,c} \) should be less than or equal to \( C_{pr,\text{max}} \). Because \( E_{pr} \) is updated explicitly (discussed below), \( C_{pr,c} \) may exceed \( C_{pr,\text{max}} \) slightly. In this case, \( \gamma_b \) is not permitted to exceed unity. \( E_{pr} \) is excess aperture at closure above \( E_0 + E_{\text{res}} \); it is only nonzero if the fracture contains a large volume of proppant.
The $\frac{1-C_{pr,c}}{1-C_{pr}}$ factor stiffens the fracture as it is compressed (which increases $C_{pr}$) and guarantees the physical constraint that the proppant volume fraction never exceeds unity. As the fracture compresses after closure, $C_{pr}$ may exceed $C_{pr,max}$. This is a physically valid result that corresponds to the case of proppant crushing and embedment into the fracture walls. The values of $c_{b,\phi}$ and $\sigma_{n,ref}$ are chosen such that $E_{cr}$ is much more compliant than $E_0$, consistent with the idea that an unpropped fracture is much more sensitive to changes in closure stress than a propped fracture.

Equation 5-1 is an implicit equation for $E$ because of the dependence of $C_{pr}$ or $C_{pr,c}$ on aperture. This dependence arises from the definition that the mass of proppant per area at closure is equal to the current mass of proppant per area:

$$m_{pr,a} = E C_{pr} \bar{\rho}_{pr} = C_{pr,c} (E_0 + E_{pr} + E_{res}) \rho_{pr}, \quad 5-5$$

where $m_{pr,a}$ is the proppant mass per area. The average proppant density $\bar{\rho}_{pr}$ is constant because the grains are assumed incompressible. If $C_{pr}$ is known, Equation 5-5 is solved for $C_{pr,c}$ (in terms of $E$), which is plugged into Equation 5-1. If $m_{pr,a}$ is known, then Equation 5-5 is solved for $C_{pr}$ (in terms of $E$) and plugged into Equation 5-1.

In either case, after the substitution, Equation 5-1 is a quadratic equation for $E$. For physically realistic input parameters, the quadratic equation always has exactly one positive real root.

$C_{pr,c}$ is equal to the concentration of proppant that would be present if the closed fracture was unloaded to effective normal stress equal to zero (holding all proppant in-place); it is not necessarily equal to the value of $C_{pr}$ when closure actually occurred. The distinction is necessary because it is possible for proppant to flow through a mechanically closed fracture. This could occur if the proppant grains have very low diameter (see Section 8.1 for a discussion of proppant bridging), the fracture is rough (relatively large value of $E_0$), the effective normal stress is low, and the proppant volume fraction is low (so that $C_{pr,c}$ is less than $C_{pr,max}$).

The aperture of a mechanically open fracture is calculated as:

$$E (\sigma_n = P) = E_0 + E_{res} + E_{pr} + E_{open}. \quad 5-6$$

Within each timestep, $E_0$, $E_{res}$, and $E_{pr}$ are constant. If the element is closed, then $E$ is calculated according to Equation 5-1. If the element is open, then $E$ is calculated according to Equation 5-6, with $E_{open}$ as an additional unknown in the system of equations.

It would not be realistic to initiate fracture elements with significant $E_0$ and $E_{res}$. Instead, when a fracture element is initiated, all aperture terms are equal to zero except $E_{res}$, which is given a tiny initial value, 0.00000328 ft. Strictly, this does not conserve mass, but this initial aperture is so tiny that the error is negligible. As fluid flows into the element, pressure increases, causing the aperture to increase. As the fracture opens, an algorithm is used to progressively update $E_0$ and $E_{res}$ until they reach user-defined maximum values. This mimics the process of roughness formation as the fracture surfaces form and separate for the first time. Effectively, elements with $E_0$ and $E_{res}$ less than their maximum value are considered fracture surfaces that have yet fully formed. The vast majority of elements in a simulation have $E_0$ and $E_{res}$ greater than their maximum value.

If $E_0$ and $E_{res}$ are less than their maximum allowed value, they are updated at the end of each timestep. The code determines whether $E_{open}$ exceeds 10% of the total aperture. If so, $E_{open}$ is decreased, and $E_0$ and/or $E_{res}$ are increased by the same amount, in order to enforce that $E_{open}$ equals 10% of $E$. The variables are updated so that the adjustment does not change $E$ overall. $E_0$ is equal to zero until $E_{res}$ reaches its maximum value, $E_{res,max}$. Then, $E_0$ is increased until it reaches its maximum possible value, $E_{0,max}$. The values $E_{0,max}$ and $E_{res,max}$ are user-defined.
within each facies; typical values are 0.00082 ft and 0.0000328 ft, respectively (Barton et al., 1985). Once \( E_0 \) and \( E_{res} \) have reached their maximum value, they do not increase further. Because roughness generation is an irreversible process (the breaking apart of the rock), the adjustment only increases \( E_0 \) and \( E_{res} \); it never decreases them.

Next, \( E_{pr} \) is updated. \( E_{pr} \) is defined such that if fluid was drained from the element until closure (holding the volume of proppant in the element constant), then at the point of closure (when \( C_{pr} \) reached \( C_{pr,max} \)), aperture would be equal to \( E_{res} + E_0 + E_{pr} \) (satisfying Equation 5-1 because \( E_{open} \) reaches zero at the point of mechanical closure). Therefore, if:

\[
\frac{EC_{pr}}{C_{pr,max}} \leq E_0 + E_{res},
\]

then \( E_{pr} \) is set equal to zero. This corresponds to the case where there is so little proppant in the element that the roughness dominated part of the aperture, \( E_{res} + E_0 \), is capable of containing all the proppant in the element at closure at a volume fraction less than or equal to \( C_{pr,max} \). If the inequality in Equation 5-7 is not satisfied, then \( E_{pr} \) is greater than zero and calculated as:

\[
E_{pr} = \frac{EC_{pr}}{C_{pr,max}} - E_0 - E_{res}.
\]

This method of updating \( E_{pr} \) satisfies the physical constraint that \( C_{pr} \) must be less than or equal to \( C_{pr,max} \) at closure. Because \( E_{pr} \) is updated explicitly at the end of the timestep, \( C_{pr} \) may slightly exceed \( C_{pr,max} \) at closure (because closure occurs implicitly during the nonlinear solve within each timestep), but the difference is slight and so is considered acceptable. If the overshoot greater than a few percent, the timestep is discarded and repeated with a smaller timestep duration.

\( q_p \), the volumetric flow rate of phase \( p \), is written as a weighted average of the volumetric flow rate of fluid/proppant slurry flowing through an open fracture, \( q_{p,o} \), and a value that is similar to the flow rate of pure fluid through a closed fracture, \( q_{p,c} \) (defined below). A weighting factor \( \gamma_f \) is defined that equals zero when \( E_{open} \) is equal to zero (so that \( q_p \) is equal to \( q_{p,c} \)) and is asymptotically equal to one when \( E_{open} \) is large (so that \( q_p \) is equal to \( q_{p,o} \)). If \( \gamma_f \) is equal to 0.5, then \( q_{p,c} \) and \( q_{p,o} \) are weighted equally. Equal weighting occurs when \( E_{open} \) is equal to 10\% of \( E_0 + E_{pr} + E_{res} \) (the aperture at closure). As discussed below, if there is no proppant in the fracture, \( q_{p,c} \) is identically equal to \( q_{p,o} \) and so the value of the \( \gamma_f \) is irrelevant because it is a weighting between two identical values. \( q_p \) and \( \gamma_f \) are calculated as:

\[
\gamma_f = \frac{E_{open}}{0.1 (E_0 + E_{pr} + E_{res}) + E_{open}},
\]

\[
q_p = \gamma_f q_{p,o} + (1 - \gamma_f) q_{p,c}.
\]

The flow rate of fluid/proppant slurry through an open fracture in one-dimensional flow over a distance \( \Delta x \), across width \( W \), and driven by difference in flow potential \( \Delta \Phi_p \) is calculated as:

\[
\frac{\Delta \Phi_p}{\Delta x} = -\frac{q_{p,o}}{W} \left( \frac{12 \mu_p}{E^{3/2} k_{rpr,cro}} \right) + sgn(\Delta \Phi_p) \left( \frac{q_{p,o}}{WE} \right)^2 \beta_{cro} \beta_{rpr,cro} \rho_{p,s}.
\]

The fracture conductivity is equal to \( E^2/12 \), the classical cubic law (Witherspoon et al., 1980). The effective phase
viscosity, $\mu_{ps}$, includes an adjustment for the effect of proppant concentration (Section 8.6) and so depends on both fluid properties and proppant concentration. As proppant volume fraction approaches the maximum possible, effective viscosity goes to infinity, representing the immobilization of the slurry into a packed bed of particles (Section 8.6; Dontsov and Peirce, 2014; 2015). The viscosity calculation accounts for non-Newtonian fluid properties caused by fluid additives. The phase relative permeability, $k_{rp,cr}$, is calculated as $S_p^{n_{pcr}}$, where $n_{pcr}$ is an exponent. This calculation assumes there is not any residual saturation in mechanically open fractures. $\beta_{rp,cr}$ is calculated as the reciprocal of the relative permeability, following the recommendation from Fourar and Lenormand (2000; 2001). The phase slurry density $\rho_{ps}$ includes the density of the phase and the density of the proppant flowing in the fluid. It is calculated assuming that the proppant partitions in equal volume fractions into each phase. The operator $sgn$ returns -1.0 if the value in the parentheses is negative and 1.0 otherwise.

$\beta_{cr,ro}$ is calculated as a function of aperture from the correlation developed for non-Darcy fracture flow by Chen et al. (2015). Chen et al. (2015) performed a large number of fracture flow experiments and correlated $\beta$ with aperture:

$$\beta = 0.022 \left( \frac{E}{2E} \right)^{0.66} E^{-1} ,$$

where $\xi$ was defined as the “maximum asperity height” and effectively acted like a tuning parameter.

At large $E$ in a mechanically open fracture, flow becomes analogous to flow through an open duct. Flow through an open duct is described by the Darcy-Weisbach equation (the equation used for calculating frictional pressure gradient for flow through a pipe). Analogy between Equation 5-11 and correlations for the Fanning friction factor used in the Darcy-Weisbach equation indicates that $\beta$ should not be given a value lower than about 0.0194/E, which corresponds with Fanning friction factor for fully developed turbulent flow. Therefore, we use 5-12 to calculate $\beta_{cr,ro}$, but use 0.0194/E as a minimum value.

Phase potential $\Phi$ is the sum of fluid pressure and gravitational head. The same value of $\Delta \Phi_p$ needs to be used in the calculations of both $q_{p,o}$ and $q_{p,c}$. However, for flow through an open fracture, proppant is suspended in slurry with the fluid, and the density of the phase should be calculated including the effect of proppant on mixture density. The effect of proppant on slurry density causes gravitational slurry convection, in which proppant-laden slurry injected into a proppant-free fracture tends to sink to the bottom of the fracture (Section 8.8). On the other hand, when the proppant is wedged between the walls of the fracture and is not supported by the fluid, the phase density in the calculation of $\Phi$ should be equal to the pure fluid density. To define a single, unique value of $\Phi_p$ that can be used in either calculation, we average the pure fluid density and proppant-laden slurry density using $\gamma_f$:

$$\Phi_p = P_p - gz(\gamma_f \rho_p + (1 - \gamma_f)(C_{pr} \bar{\rho}_{pr} + (1 - C_{pr})\rho_p)) ,$$

where $z$ is depth and $\bar{\rho}_{pr}$ is the average density of the proppant grains. $P_p$ is the fluid pressure of phase $p$ (equal to simply $P$ because capillary pressure is neglected in the present work).

If the phase is non-Newtonian (aqueous phase containing gel), the apparent viscosity in Equation 5-11 is calculated using the analytical solution for flow between parallel plates. We have not found an analytical solution for flow of an MPL fluid between parallel plates. However, a solution for an Ellis fluid is available, and the Ellis fluid model yields a rheology curve that is very similar to the MPL. The apparent viscosity of an Ellis fluid flowing through parallel plates is (Matsuhisa and Bird, 1965):
\[
\mu_a = \frac{\mu_0}{2[1 + \frac{3}{a+2} \left( \frac{dp}{dx} \right)_{r^1/2}^{a-1}]}, \quad 5-14
\]

where \(a\) and \(r^1/2\) are Ellis model parameters chosen such that rheology curve is consistent with the equivalent MPL curve.

The relation for \(q_{pc}\) is:

\[
\frac{\Delta \phi_p}{\Delta x} = -\frac{1}{M_{pcr} + M_{pb}} \left( \frac{q_{pc}}{W_0} \right) + sgn(\Delta \phi_p) \left( \frac{q_{pc}}{W_E} \right)^2 \frac{\rho_p}{M_{pcr} + M_{pb}} \cdot \frac{M_{pcr} + M_{pb}}{\mu_{pcr}}.
\]

5-15

In contrast to Equation 5-11, the fluid density used in the non-Darcy term in Equation 5-15 is equal to the pure phase density and does not include the effect of proppant on slurry density.

The parameter \(M_{pcr}\) is defined as:

\[
M_{pcr} = \frac{(E_{res} + E_{cr} + E_{open})^3 k_{cr,pc}}{12 \mu_{pcr}}, \quad 5-16
\]

where \(k_{cr,pc}\) is the relative permeability for crack flow, and \(\mu_{pcr}\) is the phase viscosity for crack flow (Equation 5-14). The fracture conductivity is calculated using the cubic law, but neglecting the \(E_{cr}\) part of the aperture. If there is no proppant, then \(E_{cr}\) is zero and \(E_{cr}\) is equal to \(E_0\) and so 5-15 uses an identical conductivity as 5-11. If the fracture is closed and completely full of proppant, then the conductivity used in Equation 5-16 is based only on \(E_{res}\) and is very small. In this case, Equation 5-15 is dominated by \(M_{pb}\) (defined below), and the equation reduces to Forchheimer’s law for flow through porous media. \(\beta_{cr}\) is calculated from Equation 5-12, and \(\beta_{cr,pc}\) is calculated as the reciprocal of \(k_{cr,pc}\) (Fourar and Lenormand, 2000; 2001).

The parameter \(M_{pb}\) is defined as:

\[
M_{pb} = \frac{E_b k_b k_{rp,b}}{\mu_{pb}}, \quad 5-17
\]

where \(E_b\) is the proppant bed part of the aperture, \(k_b\) is the proppant bed permeability (Equation 5-21), \(k_{rp,b}\) is the relative permeability for flow through the proppant bed, and \(\mu_{pb}\) is the phase viscosity for flow through the proppant bed (Equation 5-22). In the case of a proppant-free fracture, \(M_{pb}\) is equal to zero, Equation 5-15 is dominated by \(M_{pcr}\), and the relation simplifies to Forchheimer’s law for flow through a fracture.

When \(E_b\) and \(E_{cr}\) are both nonzero (indicating a fracture that contains proppant, but not enough to entirely fill the space between the asperities at closure), Equation 5-15 calculates flow assuming fluid is transported in parallel through the “bed” and “crack” parts of the aperture. The effective conductivity for flow in parallel is the sum of the conductivity of each layer. Consequently, the \(M\) terms are summed in Equation 5-15. Next, the \(\beta\) terms are averaged to find an equivalent \(\beta\) for the combined flow. While high \(M\) terms correspond to high flow capacity, high \(\beta\) terms correspond to low flow capacity. Thus, the appropriate average of \(\beta\) for flow in parallel is harmonic, not arithmetic. This is analogous to how conductance and resistance are averaged to find effective values in an electric circuit in series or parallel. In the harmonic average, the terms are weighted according to their corresponding \(M\) terms because the fraction of flow in the bed and crack part of the aperture is approximately equal to their respective \(M\) terms divided by the sum of the \(M\) terms.
$k_{p,cr}$ is calculated from the power-law form of the Brooks-Corey model:

$$k_{rp,cr} = k_{rp,cr,multiplier} \left( \frac{S_{p} - S_{pr,cr}}{1 - S_{pr,cr}} \right)^{n_{p,cr}},$$

where $k_{rp,cr,multiplier}$ is a multiplying factor, $n_{p,cr}$ is a curvature parameter, and $S_{pr,cr}$ is the residual phase saturation. Regardless of the value of $k_{rp,cr,multiplier}$, the relative permeability is not allowed to exceed 1.0.

To ensure consistency with the relative permeability calculation used for mechanically open fractures (which assumes zero residual phase saturations and $k_{p,max}$ equal to 1.0), the values of $S_{pr,cr,max}$ and $k_{rp,cr,max}$ are defined as functions of effective normal stress. When the fracture walls first contact at $\sigma_{n}'$ (effective normal stress) equal to zero, consistency requires that $S_{pr,cr,max}$ and $k_{rp,cr,max}$ must be equal to zero and 1.0, respectively. As effective normal stress increases, they asymptotically approach user-defined limiting values, $S_{pr,cr,max}(\sigma_{n}' \gg 0)$ and $k_{rp,cr,max}(\sigma_{n}' \gg 0)$. The transition is controlled by a hyperbolic relationship, mimicking the relationship for aperture developed by Barton et al. (1985):

$$k_{rp,cr,max}(\sigma_{n}') = k_{rp,cr,max}(\sigma_{n}' \gg 0) + (1 - k_{rp,cr,max}(\sigma_{n}' \gg 0)) \frac{1}{1 + 9\sigma_{n}'/\sigma_{n,ref}},$$

$$S_{pr,cr,max}(\sigma_{n}') = S_{pr,cr,max}(\sigma_{n}' \gg 0)(1 - \frac{1}{1 + 9\sigma_{n}'/\sigma_{n,ref}}).$$

The bed relative permeability is calculated using Equation 5-18. For bed flow, values of $k_{rp,b,max}$ and $S_{pr,b,max}$ are constant, not functions of effective normal stress (unlike Equations 5-19 and 5-20).

There are two ways to calculate proppant bed permeability. If you leave the parameter “proppant pack permeability compressibility” blank when you specify the proppants, then the proppant bed permeability is calculated using a modified Kozeny-Carmen equation (Krauss and Mays, 2014):

$$k_{b} = k_{0,b} \frac{d^{2}(\phi-f_{b})^{3}}{(1-\phi+f_{b})^{2}},$$

where $d$ is the proppant diameter, $f_{b}$ and $k_{0,b}$ are user-defined constants, and $\phi$ is the porosity $(1.0 - C_{p})$. If there are multiple different types of proppant present, then $d$, $f_{b}$, and $k_{0,b}$ are equal to the volume fraction weighted average of the properties of each type.

If you specify the “proppant pack permeability compressibility,” then the permeability of the proppant pack is calculated with the equation:

$$k_{b} = k_{b,sn0} \exp(-c_{b,k}(\sigma_{n} - P)),$$

where $k_{b,sn0}$ is the permeability of the proppant bed at normal stress equal to zero (calculated from Equation 5-21), and $c_{b,k}$ is the “proppant pack permeability compressibility.”

Figure 5 shows fracture conductivity versus effective normal stress for different amounts of proppant mass per area. The calculation is performed using the values specified in the caption. When ResFrac is run, it automatically calculates the table of conductivity versus effective normal stress and outputs them to the comments file. Note that ‘fracture conductivity’ is not a parameter used directly by ResFrac. Instead, it is uses 5-11 and 5-15 to calculate flow. Figure 5 shows the equivalent fracture conductivity is non-Darcy pressure gradient.
Figure 5: Fracture conductivity versus effective normal stress for different amounts of proppant mass per area. Calculated using $E_0$ equal to 0.0015 ft, $\sigma_{n,ref}$ equal to 500 psi, $k_{b,b}$ equal to 0.007, $f$ equal to 0, and $c_{b,k}$ equal to 7e-4 psi$^{-1}$.

If the phase is non-Newtonian, the shear rate for flow in the proppant bed is calculated as (Cannella et al., 1988):

$$\dot{\gamma}_{p,b} = \frac{\alpha c u_p}{\sqrt{k_b k_{p,b} S_p \phi'}}$$

where $\alpha_c$ is a constant (around 1.0 to 15.0). The shear rate is related to viscosity, as discussed in Section 9.

A wide variety of equations are available for predicting $\beta_b$ (Ergun and Orning, 1949; Geertsma, 1974; Martins et al., 1990; Lopez-Hernandez et al., 2004;). Lopez-Hernandez et al. (2004) compared equations and recommended the Martins et al. (1990) equation because it is based on experiments from a variety of types of proppant under different conditions. Based on this recommendation, we adopt the Martins et al. (1990) equation:

$$\beta_b = \frac{0.0000077638}{k_b^{1.836}}$$

where the units of $\beta_b$ are m$^{-1}$ and the units of $k_b$ are m$^2$. The correlation is not dimensionally consistent.

Geertsma (1974) proposed a widely-used an expression for $\beta_{rp}$ for flow through porous media. However, it was developed based on experiments with gas/water flow at water saturation less than 0.5. It scales $\beta_{rp}$ according to phase saturation to the -5.5 power, which implies unrealistically large values of $\beta_{rp}$ at low phase saturation. Also, it does not consider the effect of residual phase saturation, which is unphysical because $\beta$ should approach infinity as relative permeability approaches zero. Fourar and Lenormand (2000) reviewed experiments on multiphase flow through packed bed reactors used in chemical engineering. They found that $\beta_{rp}$ can well-approximated by setting $\beta_{rp}$ equal to the inverse of $k_p$. This is equivalent to the Lockhart and Martinelli (1949) approach for flow through a packed bed (Sáez and Carbonell, 1985). We follow the recommendation of Fourar...
and Lenormand (2000) and set $\beta_{rp,b}$ to be the inverse of $k_{rp,b}$.

6. Fluid flow in the wellbore

Flow velocity is calculated by solving the momentum balance equation (in addition to the component, thermal, water solute, and proppant conservation equations that are solved in all elements). Wellbore flow is calculated using a homogeneous model that assumes that the superficial velocity of each phase is the same (except for gravitational settling of proppant, discussed below). The multiphase viscosity is calculated as the mass fraction weighted average of the viscosity of the individual components (Cicchitti et al., 1959). The homogeneous model is a strong simplification of multiphase flow because it neglects buoyancy and viscosity differences between phases. During multiphase production, it is recommended that you specify the boundary conditions as “bottomhole” boundary conditions, instead of wellhead conditions, which removes the wellbore from the model.

The momentum balance equation in a well is written as (Hasan and Kabir, 2002):

$$\frac{d(\bar{\rho}v)}{dt} - \frac{dP}{dz} - v \frac{d(\bar{\rho}v)}{dz} + g \sin(\theta_w) \bar{\rho} + \frac{fv^2 \bar{\rho}}{D} = 0,$$

where $\bar{\rho}$ is the average density in the element (including all fluid phases and proppants), $D$ is wellbore diameter, $v$ is superficial velocity, $f$ is the Fanning friction factor, $g$ is the gravitational constant, and $\theta_w$ is the angle from vertical.

The hydrocarbon phases are Newtonian, but if the aqueous phase contains gel, it is non-Newtonian and described with the modified power law (Section 9). Correlations for $f$ are available for either Newtonian or power law fluids, but not modified power law fluids (which model the fluid as Newtonian at low shear rate and power law at high shear rate). We calculate $f$ by taking a weighted average of $f_N$ and $f_{PL}$, the friction factors for Newtonian and power law fluids, respectively. The Newtonian friction factor is calculated from the Chen (1979) correlation. The power law friction factor is calculated as the weighted average of the laminar flow power law friction factor (Keck et al., 1992) and the turbulent flow power law friction factor (Dodge and Metzner, 1959). The weighting factor in the average is based on Reynolds number, uses a sigmoidal function, and is centered at Reynolds number of 2000, approximately the transition value to turbulent flow (Keck et al., 1992). The values of $f_N$ and $f_{PL}$ are averaged with weighting calculated from a sigmoidal function of the logarithm of shear rate, with a transition at $\dot{\gamma}_{1/2}$. The effect of proppant on the slurry viscosity in the friction factor calculations is calculated using the method developed by Keck et al. (1992).

Proppant flows through the wellbore due to both convection and gravitational settling. Proppant settling in the wellbore is neglected.

Perforation pressure drop between wellbore elements and fracture elements is modeled using the equation (Cramer, 1987):

$$\Delta P_{pf} = \frac{0.808 Q^2 \bar{\rho}}{C_{pf} N_{pf} D_{pf}^4},$$

where $Q$ is total volumetric flow rate, $N_{pf}$ is the number of perforations in the cluster, $D_{pf}$ is the diameter of the perforations, and $C_{pf}$ is the coefficient of discharge. Note that despite the 0.808 factor, Equation 6-2 is written in consistent units, not field units. Perforation pressure drop between the wellbore and matrix elements is neglected. The parameters in Equation 6-2 are specified for each perforation cluster.

ResFrac implements the perforation erosion correlation from Long and Xu (2017). This correlation models
perforation erosion as being caused by proppant flow. Early on, the discharge coefficient is rapidly increased to a limiting value. Much more slowly, the perforation diameter increases. Both processes are parameterized by coefficients that the user can input or leave at the default values recommended by Long and Xu (2017). Experience has shown that the rapid increase in discharge coefficient predicted by the Long and Xu (2017) correlation results in unrealistically sharp drops in injection pressure at the start of proppant injection. Therefore, this may be removed from the code, or at least, set to not occur by default.

To account for nonuniform perforation diameter, you can input the standard deviation of perforation diameter. ResFrac assumes that the perforations in each cluster are normally distributed with a standard deviation given by this user-input parameter. Because perforation pressure drop scales with the fourth power of diameter, variability in perforation erosion results in an increase in the effective diameter above the mean value.

Proppant may bridge off at perforations, as described in Section 8.1.

In addition to perforation pressure drop, there may be additional pressure drop due to near wellbore tortuosity. This is modeled in the code with the following empirical equation:

$$\Delta P_{nw} = A_{nw}Q^\alpha_{nw}.$$  

In openhole wellbore sections, perforation pressure drop is zero. However, the near wellbore complexity pressure drop applies to all connections between wellbore and fracture elements. The parameters in Equation 6-3 are specified at each wellbore vertex, allowing the near wellbore pressure drop to be different at different points along the wellbore.

During production, flash calculations are performed to simulate surface separation facilities. The separator is held at 200 psia and 120°F. The water and gas phases are removed at the separator. The liquid phase from the separator is then flashed to stock tank conditions, 14.7 psia and 68°F. The stock tank gas is separated and collected with the separator gas. After these separations, the volumes of the produced water, oil, and gas are calculated at standard conditions.

7. Thermal transport

Convective energy transport is calculated assuming constant heat capacity for the water phase and hydrocarbon phases. Heat conduction between elements is calculated using Fourier’s law. Thermal conductivity and the heat capacity and density of the solid grains in the matrix are specified within each facies.

In addition to being used for fluid flow, the 1D subgrid method (McClure, 2018) is also implemented for heat conduction. Therefore, you can get accurate heat conduction calculations between the matrix and fracture elements, even if you use a relatively coarse mesh. A simplification is that the heat conduction calculations with the 1D subgrid method do not account for the effect of heat convection on the temperature distribution in the element at the ‘subgrid’ scale.

The formation surrounding the well is not meshed all the way to the surface. However, conductive heat exchange between the wellbore and the surrounding formation may be significant and so is included in the calculation. Wellbore heat exchange with the surrounding formation is calculated using the boundary element technique described by Zhang et al. (2011). The code calculates the convolution integral of the temperature derivative with respect to time multiplied by the Green’s function for radial heat conduction from a cylinder at constant temperature. This technique requires storing temperatures from all previous timesteps at each element and reevaluating the convolution integral at each timestep. Nevertheless, because the calculation is performed independently for each well element (conduction is assumed radial), the calculation is fast and does
not have a significant effect on simulation runtime. Heat transfer between the fluid in the wellbore and the exterior of the wellbore (outside the casing and cement) is described by a user defined total heat transfer coefficient, $U_{w,tot}$. The code simultaneously calculates the temperature on the outside of the wellbore and the total heat conduction transfer rate.

8. Proppant transport

In this section, we describe the relations implemented in the simulator for proppant transport in the fracture and wellbore. The simulator calculates transport parameters (such as settling rate) for each of the $N_{pr}$ proppant types in the simulation. Some transport properties depend on the overall proppant volume fraction, $C_{pr}$. In this case, the total proppant volume fraction (considering all types of proppant present) is used in the calculation.

8.1 Proppant bridging/screenout

Proppant is unable to flow through a fracture if grain diameter is greater than aperture or if bridging occurs. It is generally accepted that proppant bridging occurs when $E/d$ (aperture divided by grain diameter) falls below a certain factor. However, there is disagreement about the value of the factor. Gruesbeck and Collins (1982) performed experiments on proppant bridging across perforations. They found that bridging occurs if perforation diameter is less than about six particle diameters. Based on these results, it is often assumed that bridging occurs at values of $E/d$ in the range of three to six (Dontsov and Peirce, 2014; 2015; Smith and Montgomery, 2015). On the other hand, Barree and Conway (2001) performed proppant bridging experiments for flow through slots, rather than perforations. They found that bridging did not occur until the particle size was close to the slot aperture and recommend using a bridging factor of $E/d$ close to one.

To avoid numerical problems, it is useful to implement the bridging transition over a range of aperture values. This can be accomplished with a blocking function $\chi$, equal to 1.0 if proppant can flow, 0.0 if it is immobile due to bridging, and between 0 and 1 for values of $E/d$ near the bridging factor.

The blocking function is defined as:

\[ \chi = 1 \text{ if } \frac{E}{d} > \left( \frac{E}{d} \right)_{upper} \]

\[ \chi = 0 \text{ if } \frac{E}{d} < \left( \frac{E}{d} \right)_{lower} \]

\[ \chi = \frac{\frac{E}{d} - \left( \frac{E}{d} \right)_{lower}}{\left( \frac{E}{d} \right)_{upper} - \left( \frac{E}{d} \right)_{lower}} \text{ if } \left( \frac{E}{d} \right)_{lower} < \frac{E}{d} < \left( \frac{E}{d} \right)_{upper} \]

The values of $\left( \frac{E}{d} \right)_{lower}$ and $\left( \frac{E}{d} \right)_{upper}$ are inputs to the simulator. We choose to use default values equal to 1.25 and 1.75, respectively. These values are close to the values recommended by Barree and Conway (2001). Their experiments were performed for slot flow and were more representative of the conditions in a fracture than the experiments of Gruesbeck and Collins (1982).

ResFrac also considers the possibility that proppant could bridge off at the perforations. It is commonly assumed in the industry that proppant may bridge out once perforation diameter becomes smaller than six times, or perhaps 8-10 times the proppant diameter. Similar to fracture bridging, ResFrac allows you to specify upper and lower bridging ratios for perforation bridging.
8.2 Viscous drag

Due to viscous drag, the proppant moves along with the flowing fluid. Proppant tends to accumulate in the center of the aperture (away from the fracture walls), where the velocity is greatest. This allows the proppant to flow at a greater superficial velocity than the carrying fluid (Barree and Conway, 1995; Liu and Sharma, 2005; Dontsov and Peirce, 2014; 2015).

Barree and Conway (1995) performed slot flow experiments with proppant flowing with Newtonian fluid and matched the results with the equation:

\[
\frac{Q_{pr}}{Q} = C_{pr} \left( 1.27 - \left| \left( C_{pr} - 0.1 \right)^{1.5} \right| \right) \tag{8.2-1}
\]

where \(Q_{pr}\) is the volumetric flow rate of proppant, and \(Q\) is the volumetric flow rate. Equation 8.2-1 indicates that at volumetric fraction equal to 0.1, the proppant flows at a superficial velocity 27% greater than the bulk fluid.

Equation 8.2-1 is numerically inconvenient because there is a discontinuity in the derivative at \(C_{pr}\) equal to 0.1. A very close match to Equation 8.2-1 with continuous derivative is possible with a polynomial regression to the equation (Equation 8.2-2).

At concentrations close to \(C_{pr,\text{max}}\), the grains physically interfere with each other, causing screenout, and the particle velocity decreases, reaching zero at \(C_{pr,\text{max}}\). This can be modeled by multiplying \(\frac{Q_{pr}}{Q}\) by a factor:

\[1 - \left( \frac{C_{pr}}{C_{pr,\text{max}}} \right)^s\]

where the sharpness of the screenout transition can be adjusted by varying \(s\). In the limit of very large \(s\), the transition is abrupt — proppant flows freely until \(C_{pr}\) reaches its maximum, and then immediately becomes immobile. A very sharp screenout transition would cause numerical problems and isn’t intuitively reasonable. Therefore, we use \(s\) equal to 20, which yields a sharp transition starting at around \(0.9C_{pr,\text{max}}\).

The combined equation is:

\[
\frac{Q_{pr}}{Q} = C_{pr} \left( 1 - \left( \frac{C_{pr}}{C_{pr,\text{max}}} \right)^{20} \right) \left( -3.74578663C_{pr}^4 + 6.18208260C_{pr}^3 - 4.35820344C_{pr}^2 + 0.660118234C_{pr} + 1.23837722 \right) \tag{8.2-2}
\]

8.3 Gravitational settling

Because proppant is (nearly always) denser than the carrying fluid, gravity causes it to settle downward. Stokes’ law is the simplest and most commonly-used expression for calculating settling rate. However, it is greatly overestimates settling rate in low viscosity fluids. Ferguson and Church (2006) developed an equation for isolated particle settling velocity, \(V_{t,\infty}\), that is valid over the full range of practical values for grain size, density, and viscosity:

\[
V_{t,\infty} = \frac{18p}{\rho_f + \sqrt{0.75Rg d^3}} \tag{8.3-1}
\]
where $R$ is equal to $(\rho_{pr} - \rho_f)/\rho_f$, $\rho_{pr}$ is the density of the grains, and $\rho_f$ is the density of the fluid. The $\infty$ subscript indicates that the equation is valid for isolated particles. Particle shape has an effect on coefficients in Equation 8.3-1. Equation 8.3-1 uses the coefficients recommended by Ferguson and Church (2006) for natural sand grains.

Equation 8.3-1 is not applicable for non-Newtonian fluids. Chien (1994) developed a general equation for settling velocity that can be used for non-Newtonian fluids and at all practical values of grain size, density, and viscosity:

$$V_{t,\infty} = 12 \left( \frac{\mu_a}{d\rho_f} \right) \left[ \sqrt{1 + 7.27dR \left( \frac{d\rho_f}{10\mu_a} \right)^2} - 1 \right]. \quad 8.3-2$$

where apparent viscosity is calculated from a fluid model such as the modified power law.

For Newtonian fluids, Equation 8.3-2 yields predictions within 5% of Equation 8.3-1. For non-Newtonian fluids, Equation 8.3-2 is implicit because the apparent viscosity must be calculated from the settling shear rate. The settling shear rate can be calculated as (Chien, 1994):

$$\dot{\gamma}_s = \frac{V_t}{d}. \quad 8.3-3$$

Equation 8.3-3 assumes fluid shear around the particle is only caused by gravitational settling. This is a simplification because fluid flow through the fracture induces shear in the flowing fluid (Novotny, 1977). Nevertheless, the effect of horizontal flow on particle shear rate is nearly always neglected in fracturing simulators. We believe this is justified for the following reasons. In Newtonian fluids, viscosity is not a function of shear rate and so the effect of flow rate on viscosity is zero. In shear thinning fluids, the particles tend to migrate to the center of the fracture, away from the walls (Tehrani, 1996; Lecampion and Garagash, 2014), where the shear rate is lowest, much lower than near the walls (Novotny, 1977). Therefore, in shear thinning fluid, the effect of convective flow on shear rate around flowing particles is relatively low. In either case, the horizontal velocity of the flowing particles should not have a strong effect on $\dot{\gamma}_s$.

### 8.4 Hindered settling

At high proppant volume fraction, settling is hindered due to hydrodynamic interaction between particles. Richardson and Zaki (1954) discovered that hindered settling is equivalent to the process of particle fluidization. Fluidization occurs when fluid flows upward through a bed of unconsolidated particles. At a threshold fluidization velocity, the particles are lifted by the flow, causing expansion of the bed and a drop in the solid volume fraction. Richardson and Zaki (1954) found that correlations designed to describe fluidization are also valid for hindered settling. Fluidization is an important process in reaction beds used in chemical engineering, and so it is possible to draw on a large and rich literature describing this process.

A large number of correlations are available in the literature to describe fluidization/hindered settling. Chhabra (2007) performed a critical review of these correlations, comparing correlations and experimental data from a variety of sources. Chhabra (2007) recommended the correlation from Garside and Al-Dibouni (1977):

$$V_{t,\mathrm{hind}} = V_{t,\infty} \frac{(1-c_{pr})^2}{1+2.35 \left( \frac{d}{D_f} \right)^{0.5}} \quad 8.4-1$$
where \( D_t \) is the diameter of the tube (the correlation was developed for settling in a cylinder) and \( Z \) is equal to:

\[
Z = \frac{5.09 + 0.2839 \text{Re}_t^{0.877}}{1 + 0.104 \text{Re}_t^{0.877}}
\]

\[8.4-2\]

where \( \text{Re}_t \) is equal to:

\[
\text{Re}_t(V_{t,hind}) = \frac{\rho V_{t,hind} d}{\mu}.
\]

\[8.4-3\]

The wall adjustment in Equation 8.4-1 was developed for settling in tubes, not slots. ResFrac does not use the wall adjustment, which can cause excessive reduction in settling velocity for slot flow.

For non-Newtonian fluids, Chhabra (2007) found that Equations 8.4-1 and 8.4-2 can still be used, as long as Equation 8.4-3 is replaced with the relevant Reynolds number. For power law fluid, the settling Reynolds number is:

\[
\text{Re}_t'(V_{t,hind}) = \frac{\rho V_{t,hind}^2 n d^n}{K}.
\]

\[8.4-4\]

The Reynolds number for a Modified Power Law fluid is:

\[
\text{Re}_{MPD} = \frac{\rho V_{t,hind} d}{\mu_0} \left( 1 + \frac{\mu_0}{K} \left( \frac{V_{t,hind}}{d} \right)^{1-n} \right).
\]

\[8.4-5\]

Similar to the equation for viscous drag (Equation 8.2-2), Equation 8.4-1 can be multiplied by \( 1 - \left( C_p/C_{p,\text{max}} \right)^s \), with \( s \) equal to 20, to enforce a sharp drop in settling velocity to zero at \( C_{p,\text{max}} \). This jamming adjustment is simultaneously applied to both the settling velocity and the horizontal proppant velocity, and so does not greatly extend the distance that proppant can flow before settling into the bed.

**8.5 Clustered settling**

In quiescent, shear thinning fluid, particle grains tend to cluster together, agglomerating into effectively larger particles, which accelerates settling (Clark et al., 1977; Kirkby and Rockefeller, 1985; McMechan and Shah, 2001; Daugan et al., 2004; Liu and Sharma, 2005; Mora et al., 2005). Clustered settling only occurs in quiescent fluid (Liu and Sharma, 2005) and shear thinning fluid (Kirkby and Rockefeller, 1985; Daugan et al., 2004). Clustered settling occurs because of shear thinning in the wake behind settling particles (Daugan et al., 2004; Mora et al., 2005).

We have been unable to find a well-validated general-purpose equation from the literature for predicting clustered settling. Therefore, in this section, we propose an equation that qualitatively and quantitatively matches observations in the literature.

Clustered settling requires time to initiate, as particles cluster into columns. However, these clusters are able to form over settling distances measured at the lab scale (Kirkby and Rockefeller, 1985; Daugan et al., 2004). Therefore, at the field scale, where settling distances are much greater, it is acceptable to assume that clustered settling begins effectively instantaneously, and it is reasonable to use an equation for clustered settling that is not time-dependent.
Figures 10 and 11 in the paper by Kirkby and Rockefeller (1985) show settling velocity as a function of proppant concentration for several different fluids and proppants. Figure 7 in the paper by Kirkby and Rockefeller (1985) provides the fluid rheological information. The Xanthan gum solutions followed power law behavior with $n$ equal to around 0.25. The HPG solutions followed Newtonian behavior at low shear rates and power law fluid at high shear rates with $n$ equal to around 0.5. The Xanthan solutions exhibited power law behavior over the full experimental range (the minimum experimental shear rate is around 0.1 s$^{-1}$). The HPG solutions transitioned towards a low shear rate plateau at around 1 s$^{-1}$.

The following generalizations can be made from the Kirkby and Rockefeller (1985) results: fluids with lower $n$ show greater tendency for clustered settling; clustered settling has a relatively stronger effect for smaller proppant; the peak clustered settling velocity occurs at volume fraction around 0.1; settling velocity decreases as volume fraction increased above 0.1; and settling velocity is lower than the isolated particle settling velocity at volume fractions greater than around 0.3. Kirkby and Rockefeller (1985) also performed experiments with a Newtonian glycerol solution. The Newtonian glycerol solution had monotonically decreasing settling velocity as a function of proppant concentration, consistent with conventional hindered settling in a Newtonian fluid (Section 8.4). This confirms that that clustered settling only occurs in shear thinning fluids. For 45 mesh particles, HPG peak settling velocity was around 10 times larger than isolated settling velocity. In Xanthan, it was 20 times larger than isolated settling velocity. For 20 mesh particles, HPG peak settling velocity was around 5 times larger than isolated settling velocity, and for Xanthan, peak settling velocity was 10 times larger than isolated settling velocity. In contrast, for Newtonian hindered settling, settling velocity should have been reduced by about 50% from isolated settling velocity at a volume fraction of 0.1 (Equation 8.4-1). The low concentration settling velocities in the HPG solutions were consistent with calculated settling velocities from Equations 8.3-1 or 8.3-2 using the zero shear rate viscosity.

Based on these results, we propose to model clustered settling by multiplying settling velocity by the following empirical adjustment factor:

$$V_{t, adj, clust} = 1 + \frac{0.065}{d} \frac{n+1}{2n} C_{pr} \exp\left(-40C_{pr}^{2.2}\right) \frac{\exp\left(-u_0+50\right)}{1+0.1\varphi_{1/2}^{1/2}V_{t,\infty}}$$

where $u$ is the slurry Darcy velocity, $\varphi_{1/2}$ is the shear rate at the transition to power law behavior (Section 9), and $V_{t,\infty}$ is the shear rate for a settling isolated particle. $V_{t, adj, clust}$ is designed to be multiplied by settling velocity after the hindered settling adjustment.

The $0.1\frac{V_{t,\infty}}{d}$ term is used because if the shear rate is so low that the particles are settling in the zero shear rate plateau, then the settling is effectively Newtonian and clustered settling will not occur. In a general-purpose simulator, elements may contain very tiny concentration of gel. Under these conditions, $\varphi_{1/2}$ is very large because the fluid is effectively Newtonian, and clustered settling should not occur. Thus, the $0.1\frac{V_{t,\infty}}{d}$ term enables the equation to smoothly handle situations with all possible concentrations of gel—from very low (effectively Newtonian) to high (modified power law). For a fluid with a non-negligible amount of gel, $0.1\frac{V_{t,\infty}}{d}$ will be significantly smaller than $\varphi_{1/2}$ and clustered settling will occur.

Equation 8.5-1 is equal to 1.0 in the limit of large horizontal velocity, $n$ equal to 1.0 (Newtonian), $C_{pr}$ equal to zero, and $\frac{V_{t,\infty}}{d} \ll \varphi_{1/2}$ (low gel concentration). Equation 8.5-1 assumes that clustered settling ceases to be significant at horizontal velocity around 0.3-0.5 ft/s; this is only a rough estimate. The literature indicates that clustered settling only occurs in quiescent fluid, but we are not aware of experiments that have quantitatively determined the threshold velocity at which clustered settling no longer occurs. The clustering adjustment may scale with particle and fluid density, but there is not sufficient data to include this effect in Equation 8.5-1.
Figure 7 shows the combined clustered and hindered velocity adjustment from Equations 8.4-1 and 8.5-1 for a 20 mesh particle, \( \frac{v_{1,\infty}}{d} \gg 0.1 \dot{\gamma}_{1/2} \), \( n \) equal to 0.25, and at horizontal velocity of 0, 0.0656, 0.164, and 0.492 ft/s. The trend is very similar to shown in Figure 11 from Kirkby and Rockefeller (1985).

8.6 Slurry viscosity

The effective viscosity of solid/liquid slurry increases as a function of concentration. A large number of correlations are available in the literature to describe this process. One commonly used expression is Eiler’s equation (Keck et al., 1992):

\[
\mu_{r,N} = \left\{ 1 + 1.25 \left[ \frac{C_{pr}}{C_{pr,\text{max}}} \right] \right\}^2, \tag{8.6-1}
\]

where \( \mu_r \) is the viscosity divided by the viscosity at solute concentration of zero. The subscript \( N \) indicates that Equation 8.6-1 is only applicable for Newtonian fluid.

Keck et al. (1992) developed the following equation for power law slurry:

\[
\mu_{r,PL} = \left\{ 1 + 0.75(e^{1.5n} - 1)e^{-\left(1-n\right)\dot{\gamma}/1000} \right\} \frac{1.25C_{pr}}{1-C_{pr}/C_{pr,\text{max}}} \right\}^2. \tag{8.6-2}
\]

Equation 8.6-2 is designed so that the shear rate \( \dot{\gamma} \) should be calculated from the Newtonian shear rate, equal to \( 12 Q/(E^2 W) \) for slot flow. Equations 8.6-1 and 8.6-2 predict that the slurry viscosity goes to infinity as the proppant volume concentration approaches \( C_{pr,\text{max}} \), reflecting the immobilization of the proppant slurry as it jams into a packed bed.
There is not a correlation available in the literature for the effective viscosity of proppant slurry in modified power law fluid. A pragmatic choice is to use a weighted average between the values in Equation 8.6-1 and 8.6-2 based on $\dot{\gamma}$ and $\dot{\gamma}_1$. A sigmoidal averaging function $h$ can be defined as:

$$h(f(x), g(x), x, x_t) = \frac{f(x)}{1 + \frac{x}{x_t}} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 + \frac{x}{x_t}}\right)g(x), \quad 8.6-3$$

where $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are the functions being averaged, $x$ is the value input to the functions, and $x_t$ is the transition value. For $x \ll x_t$, $h$ is equal to $f(x)$, and for $x \gg x_t$, $h$ is equal to $g(x)$. Equation 8.6-3 performs an interpolation scaled over the logarithm of the function values. The transition between the functions begins at about $0.1x_t$ and is nearly finished at around $10x_t$.

Therefore, the proppant concentration viscosity adjustment of a modified power law fluid can be approximated as:

$$\mu_{r, MPL} = h\left(\mu_{r,N}(\dot{\gamma}), \mu_{r,PL}(\dot{\gamma}), \dot{\gamma}, \dot{\gamma}_1, \frac{1}{2}\right), \quad 8.6-4$$

### 8.7 Multiphase flow

Fracturing is most often performed with a single phase liquid (usually water-based). However, gas/liquid flow can occur during pumping of energized fracturing fluids and other unconventional fracturing fluids (Jacobs, 2014; Ribeiro et al., 2015). Fracture multiphase fluid flow with proppant transport reaches the limits of the literature, and so it is only practically possible to implement simple first-order approximations. In this section, we briefly review the literature and propose simple and pragmatic approaches.

Hindered particle settling in gas/liquid mixtures is similar to the process of bed fluidization by gas/liquid mixtures (Chapter 8 from Chhabra, 2007). In chemical process reactors using multiphase bed fluidization, fluidized columns are operated with either the liquid or gas as the continuous phase and in either concurrent or countercurrent flow (Muroyama and Fan, 1985). As with multiphase flow in pipes, different flow patterns may be apparent: coalesced bubble flow, dispersed bubble flow, slug flow, etc.

In fluidized bed reactors with a continuous liquid phase, the particles are contained in and supported by the liquid phase. If gas flows upward with the liquid, the bed can be fluidized at a lower liquid superficial velocity, and greater bed expansion occurs at the same liquid superficial velocity. The rapidly flowing gas imparts kinetic energy to the liquid phase and increases the in-situ liquid phase velocity, which creates additional lift (Zhang et al., 1998). The reduction in fluidization velocity is less significant for higher liquid viscosity and for shear thinning fluids (Miura and Kawase, 1997; 1998). For particles with diameter less than a few mm (typical of proppants used during fracturing), the flowing gas phase can actually decrease the bed expansion during fluidization. Larger particles tend to break up gas bubbles. Smaller particles do not break up bubbles, and so they tend to aggregate (Muroyama and Fan, 1985).

These processes may be less significant during flow through a fracture, compared to flow through a packed bed reactor. Viscous forces are relatively stronger during flow in a fracture because of the close proximity of the fracture walls (because Reynolds number scales with aperture). On the other hand, Pan (1999) and Chen and Horne (2006) showed that complex flow patterns can emerge during multiphase flow in fractures, depending on viscous, inertial, capillary, and gravitational forces. These are very complex processes, and significant research efforts would be necessary to develop and validate relations that can be used in a general-purpose hydraulic fracturing simulator.
The simplest treatment of particle settling in multiphase flow is to calculate the settling velocity with the mass fraction weighted average of the phase viscosities. This method is used in homogenous pipe flow models of multiphase flow (Cicchitti et al., 1959; Hasan and Kabir, 2002).

Estimating the shear rate experienced by a non-Newtonian aqueous phase during multiphase flow and particle settling in a fracture would be very challenging and depend on flow pattern. We have chosen to calculate shear rate by scaling the phase superficial velocity by the square root of the product of saturation and relative permeability, following the scaling of the Cannella et al. (1988) equation for multiphase flow in porous media (Equation 5-22; Sharma et al., 2011).

For the effect of proppant concentration on viscosity, we have chosen to apply the viscosity adjustment factors summarized in Section 8.6 to each phase separately and assume the particle volume fraction is the same in each phase. In reality, the solid particles may tend to concentrate into the wetting phase, but there is no literature available investigating this potential effect.

The equations for hindered settling are not functions of fluid properties, and so the simplest treatment is to leave them unchanged. The discussion of fluidization above indicates that hindered settling is not unaffected by multiphase flow. However, because the gas phase can cause either an increase or decrease in the bed expansion, there is not a simple way to even qualitatively include these phenomena in a general-purpose simulator.

### 8.8 Gravitational convection

Fluid convection driven by density differences accelerates downward movement of proppant (Clifton and Wang, 1988; Cleary and Fonseca, 1992; Barree and Conway, 1995; Unwin and Hammond, 1995; Hammond, 1995; Clark and Zhu (1996); Shah and Asadi, 1998; Mobbs and Hammond, 2001; Clark, 2006; Shokir and Al-Quraishi, 2009). Slurry mixture density is significantly increased by the presence of proppant. When proppant-laden slurry enters a fracture that is initially filled only with water, the denser slurry tends to gravitationally convect downward, which increases the overall downward particle velocity. Clark and Zhu (1996) and Clark (2006) demonstrated that the role of convection can be assessed with a dimensionless number. For Newtonian fluids, the dimensionless number is:

\[
N_{gc} = \frac{12Q\mu}{gE^3\rho_{pr} - \rho_f h_f}\]

where \(h_f\) is fracture height. If \(N_{gc}\) is less than one, gravitational slurry convection is significant.

This process is included ResFrac through the inclusion of proppant in the calculation of phase potential (Equation 5-13).

Bed load proppant transport occurs through several processes: saltation, grain rolling, and turbulent suspension above the bed (Kern et al., 1959; Alderman and Wendorff, 1970; Daneshy, 1978; Sievert et al., 1981; Patankar et al., 2002; Wang et al., 2003; Brannon et al., 2005; Woodworth and Miskimins, 2007; Mack et al., 2014; McClure, 2018).

### 8.9 Bed load transport

Some investigators have claimed that bed load transport is a dominant process for proppant transport in slickwater fracturing. Patankar et al. (2002) and Wang et al. (2003) performed laboratory scale experiments of
proppant transport in a slot and used them to derive bed load transport correlations. These correlations have been applied directly to field scale hydraulic fracturing (Woodworth and Miskmins, 2007; Weng et al., 2011; Shiozawa and McClure, 2016b). Mack et al. (2014) proposed to evaluate proppants on the basis of their bed load transport properties and perform hydraulic fracturing design on the basis of correlations for bed load transport.

In contrast, Biot and Medlin (1985) stated that “sand transport in the bed load does not scale up with fracture height ... bed load transport is a significant factor in laboratory-scale experiments but not on the scale of field treatments.” In other words, the rate of bed load proppant transport is the same at the lab scale and at the field scale. In the lab, when a small amount of proppant is circulated through a slot, bed load transport can have a dominant effect. But in the field, when the volumes of proppant are much larger, bed load transport has a minimal effect. The distance that proppant can be transported in viscous drag before settling to the bottom scales directly with the size of the fracture. Therefore, settling distances in small-scale laboratory experiments are small, but in the field, viscous drag can transport proppant significant distances, even in slickwater.

McClure (2018) reviewed the discussion in the literature and applied a variety of literature correlations to published laboratory data on slot flow from Patankar et al. (2002) and Medlin et al. (1985). McClure (2018) concluded that bed load transport is not a significant transport mechanism at the field scale. McClure (2018) reviewed transport correlations from the civil engineering and sedimentary geology literature on the rate of sand transport along flowing rivers. These relations could be readily applied in a hydraulic fracturing simulator. However, calculations confirm that including them would have a negligible effect.

In fracture elements that are located at the top of the proppant bed in the fracture, the element is submeshed vertically in order to accurately calculate the percentage of proppant in the element that has settled into an immobile bed at the bottom of the element. This submeshing calculation avoids discretization dependence that can lead to overestimation of proppant transport along the top row of fracture elements in the proppant bed.

### 8.10 Bed slumping

The angle of repose, $\theta_r$, is defined as the steepest angle that can be supported by a pile of particles without slumping. Some authors have suggested bed slumping may be an important process during hydraulic fracturing (Sahai et al., 2014; Mack et al., 2014). A typical angle of repose for sand is $33^\circ$ (Bolton, 1986). Mack et al. (2014) describes proppants designed to have a lower angle of repose, as low as $23^\circ$.

ResFrac uses a simplified treatment of bed slumping. The code identifies whether or not the proppant in each element is ‘supported’ from below. Supported elements are either at the bottom of the fracture or have an underlying element that is entirely full of proppant or closed. In elements that are ‘supported,’ the calculation in the previous section is used to determine the amount of proppant in the element that has settled into an immobile bed. If there is an element with ‘immobile bed’ horizontally adjacent to an ‘unsupported’ element, then proppant is allowed to slump out of the immobile bed into the adjacent unsupported element. Effectively, this makes the angle of repose mesh dependent. If fracture element height equals length, the angle of repose is effectively $45^\circ$. If fracture element length is double height, the angle of repose is effectively $26.5^\circ$.

### 8.11 Wellbore proppant dynamics

Based on computational fluid dynamics simulations, Wu et al. (2017) argued that proppant may have difficulty ‘turning the corner’ into perforations as it flows at high velocity down the wellbore. To include this effect in ResFrac, a proppant holdup factor is used to calculate proppant flowrate when proppant is flowing out of the well into the formation. The mass rate of proppant transport is multiplied by an adjustment factor:

$$m_{p,adj} = \exp\left(-\frac{v}{v_{pt}}\right),$$
where $v$ is the flow velocity in the wellbore and $v_{pt}$ is a scaling velocity inputted by the user. The default value of $v_{pt}$ in ResFrac is a very high value so that this adjustment does not have an effect.

As discussed by Weddle et al. (2018), proppant can settle into an immobile bed at the bottom of a horizontal wellbore, especially nearer to the toe in each stage, where fluid velocity is lowest. As reviewed by McClure (2018), there is a robust literature describing the settling of particles suspended in a slurry during pipe flow. Correlations from this literature are implemented in ResFrac. In each wellbore element, ResFrac tracks the fraction of each proppant type that has settled into an immobile bed at the bottom of the well. Proppant that has settled into an immobile bed is not permitted to flow.

ResFrac only permits proppant settling in laterals that have dip less than or equal to 30° (horizontal wells have dip of 0°).

The correlation used for predicting proppant settling has been updated from an earlier version. Older ResFrac versions used correlations from Wicks (1968), Thomas (1962), and Wasp et al. (1977). Now, ResFrac uses the correlation from Oroskar and Turian (1980). Literature review indicates that the Oroskar and Turian (1980) correlation is believed to be the most reliable, and it is the most widely used today in a diverse set of engineering applications. The correlation is used to calculate $v_0$, the deposition velocity. If the flow rate (above the immobile proppant bed) is less than the deposition velocity, then proppant will begin to deposit into an immobile bed along the bottom of the pipe. The velocity for homogeneous flow – at which proppant should be entirely suspended through the pipe with no perceptible vertical concentration gradient – is assumed to be double the deposition velocity.

At velocities between $v_D$ and $v_D + 0.5(v_D + v_{c,homogeneous})$, both the settling rate and the erosion rate are assumed to be zero. At velocities between $v_D + 0.5(v_D + v_{c,homogeneous})$ and $v_{c,homogeneous}$, erosion rate is linearly interpolated between 0 at $v_D + 0.5(v_D + v_{c,homogeneous})$ and 100% per second at $v_{c,homogeneous}$.

The equations for settling and erosion are applied separately for each proppant type.

### 8.12 Proppant flowback

Proppant flowback can occur if a sufficiently strong pressure gradient is applied during production. It is mostly likely to occur if there is a thick proppant pack, and the grains can resettle as proppant squeezes out. Note this can occur even if the fracture is mechanically closed onto the proppant! Based on a literature review, the correlations from Canon et al. (2003) appear to be the most realistic. Their correlation has been implemented in ResFrac and can be optionally turned on in the ‘advanced’ section of the proppants panel. The correlation is used to calculate a pressure gradient (psi/ft) above which flowback can occur. If the actual pressure gradient exceeds that threshold, flowback is allowed to occur. If the correlation predicts that flowback should occur, the blocking parameter $\chi$ is modified. Typically, in a mechanically closed fracture, $\chi$ would be zero. But if flowback is predicted, it is increased above zero to allow proppant to entrain in the flowing fluid. The figure below shows the distribution of proppant and aperture before and after flowback.
8.13 Proppant trapping

Fracture closure occurs slowly in unconventionals, giving the proppant a long time to settle. As a result, proppant often settles out all the way to the bottom of the fracture, leaving large areas entirely unpropped. Is this realistic? Proppant definitely settles downward due to gravity, so we should model this effect. But perhaps processes cause some residual trapping of proppant. This could be concentration at points of high leakoff, settling onto ledges or other branch points, etc. Gale et al. (2018) shows core-across results from the Wolfcamp shale that appear to demonstrate these effects. Radioactive proppant tracers have been reported to show the first proppant injected being observed near the wellbore, suggesting some is trapped, rather than being transported far away.

To address these issues, some users of conventional frac simulators stop the simulation at shut-in, and assume proppant is ‘frozen in place’ after shut-in. Surely there is a better way!

We propose to handle this effect by allowing some proppant to be trapped as if flows through the fracture. A certain amount of each proppant type \( i \) can be immobilized, or trapped, in the fracture. The change in immobilization is calculated as:

\[
\frac{dm_{i,imm}}{dt} = K_{imm} (m_i - m_{i,imm}), \tag{8.13-1}
\]

where:
- \( m_{i,imm} \) is mass/area of immobile proppant for proppant type \( i \)
- \( K_{imm} \) is a rate constant (min^{-1})
- \( m_i \) is mass/area for proppant type \( i \)
- \( m_{tot,max} \) is the maximum allowed mass/area for all proppant types

The user specifies two parameters: \( m_{tot,max} \) and \( K \). If you want to test out the new capability, I would suggest using \( K = 0.1 \) min^{-1} and \( m_{tot,max} = 1 \) lbs/ft^3. By default, \( m_{tot,max} \) is set to zero, so that there is not any trapping.

In testing, we have found that running simulations with proppant trapping leads to more proppant being deposited near the wellbore. Proppant can still settle out to the bottom of the fracture, and large regions of the fracture(s) may remain unpropped. But trapping reduces the tendency for extreme settling to the bottom of the fractures and improves proppant placement near the well. This causes more realistic overall results when comparing with field-scale data. With extreme settling, production between clusters becomes extremely erratic unless you set the unpropped fracture conductivity to be a high value, but if you do that, then the simulations (incorrectly in the great majority of cases) will suggest that you can reduce proppant mass without seeing impact on production.
9. Water solutes

The $N_s$ water solutes are convected within the water phase. The water solutes can be inert tracers, or they can impart non-Newtonian rheological characteristics based on the modified power law.

The apparent viscosity of the aqueous phase is modeled with the modified power law model (Capobianchi and Irvine, 1992):

$$\mu_{a,adj} = \frac{\mu_{0,adj}}{1+\frac{K_0}{(\gamma^\prime)}^{1-n}} = \frac{\mu_{0,adj}}{1+\frac{(\gamma^\prime)^n}{(\gamma^\prime)^m}}$$  \hspace{1cm} 9-1

where $n$ is the exponent from the equivalent power-law model, $\gamma^\prime$ is the shear rate, and $\gamma^\prime_{1/2}$ is the shear rate at the transition from Newtonian to power law behavior. The viscosity adjustment parameter $\mu_{0,adj}$ is multiplied by the viscosity of the pure water phase to calculate viscosity. At low shear rate, $\mu_{0,adj}$ is constant. At high shear rate, the apparent viscosity asymptotically approaches power law behavior parameterized by $K$ and $n$. The modified power law model is very similar to the Ellis fluid, though not identical. The two models are identical at low and high shear rate, but differ slightly at the transition. The modified power law model is more convenient for most applications because it is defined in terms of shear rate. The Ellis model is defined in terms of shear stress.

A formulation is needed to calculate $\mu_0$, $\gamma^\prime_{1/2}$, and $n$ as a function of water viscosity and the concentration of fluid additives. To accomplish this, the user specifies three parameters for each modified power law water solute: viscosity multiplier per 0.001 mass fraction, $\gamma^\prime_{1/2}$, and $n$. If multiple water solutes are present, the mixture values of $\gamma^\prime_{1/2}$ and $n$ are calculated as the mass fraction weighted average. As an example, if viscosity multiplier per 0.001 is equal to 5, and the mass fraction of the solute is 0.002, then $\mu_{0,adj}$ is equal to 10. $\mu_{a,adj}$ is not permitted to be less than one.

In each facies, the user inputs a maximum water solute molar mass permitted to flow into the rock. If the water solute molar mass is greater than the maximum, then water solute is not permitted to flow into the matrix. Instead, it forms a filtercake on the fracture walls. ResFrac uses a simple model for formation of filtercake. The thickness of the filtercake, $w_{fc}$, is calculated as the cumulative mass of filtercake screened out per area (on each side of the fracture), divided by filtercake density, $\rho_{fc}$. The permeability of the filtercake is assumed to be a constant, $k_{fc}$. The filtercake modifies the effective permeability for flow between fracture element $i$ and adjacent matrix element $j$. The effective permeability is calculated using the solution for effective permeability for flow in series:

$$(k_{eff})_{ij} = \frac{l_j + w_{fc}}{l_j + \frac{2k_{fc}}{w_{fc}}}$$  \hspace{1cm} 9-2

where $k_j$ is the permeability of element $j$ and $l_j$ is the distance from the fracture wall to the center of element $j$. It is assumed that once the filtercake has formed, it does not erode.

ResFrac can model reactions between water solutes. You define a first-order reaction rate constant $X_{ws1,ws2}$. Water solute 1 converts into water solute 2 at the rate:

$$\frac{1}{\bar{m}} \frac{d\bar{m}}{dt} = X_{ws1,ws2}$$  \hspace{1cm} 9-3

You can use these reactions to capture processes like gel crosslinking and breaking. For example, you could
specify three types of water solutes: ‘not-yet’ cross-linked gel, cross-linked gel, and broken gel. Then define two water solute reactions: a reaction from ‘not-yet’ cross-linked to cross-linked, and a reaction from cross-linked to broken.

10. Fracture stress shadows, geometry, initiation, and propagation

Hydraulic fractures can initiate at perforation clusters, the edges of preexisting fractures, or at ‘initiation points’ placed along openhole wellbore sections. The spacing of the openhole initiation points are a user input. By default, hydraulic fractures do not initiate in mode III from the top and bottom of preexisting fractures (which leads to an en echelon array of cracks, but there is an option to turn this on). To initiate, the fluid pressure at the initiation point must exceed the locally calculated Shmin, plus the formation tensile strength (a user input for each facies). Further, the crack does not form unless the fluid pressure is high enough to propagate the fracture once it has formed. Thus, the fracture toughness has an impact on initiation.

To avoid mesh dependence, the user specifies a minimum initiation radius (by default, 7.5 ft). If the fracture element size is greater than the minimum initiation size, then the crack is initiated as a single element. If the element size is less than the minimum initiation size, then multiple elements are created in order to make the initial crack radius approximately equal to the minimum initiation radius.

When fracture elements are mechanically open, force balance requires the fluid pressure to equal the normal stress (Crouch and Starfield, 1983). Fracture opening induces backstress that increases normal stress. When pressure begins to exceed normal stress, the fracture aperture increases, increasing normal stress and maintaining the system in equilibrium. If normal stress begins to exceed fluid pressure, the fracture aperture decreases and eventually the walls come into contact at mechanical closure. After closure, the fracture retains aperture and conductivity due to roughness of the fracture walls and/or proppant. The aperture of mechanically closed fractures calculated using nonlinear joint closure laws (Section 5).

The stresses induced by fracture opening are calculated according to the three-dimensional displacement discontinuity method described by Shou et al. (1997) using constant displacement rectangular elements. The method assumes that the fracture is contained within an infinite, homogeneous, linearly elastic medium. Displacement discontinuity methods for elastically layered media are available in the literature and will be implemented in future work (Xiao and Yue, 2011). The stresses induced by normal displacements of mechanically closed elements are small, and so are neglected for simplicity and computational efficiency.

The Shou et al. (1997) method is based on the Green’s function for an opening mode displacement discontinuity. The Green’s function for opening mode displacement discontinuity yields solutions that are consistent with analytical solutions from fracture mechanics, such as the solution from Sneddon (1946).

Optionally, ResFrac can use an approximate method to account for heterogeneity of elastic moduli. The interaction coefficient predicting the impact of opening at element i on element j is calculated with the Shou et al. (1997) technique using the moduli at the source location, element i.

ResFrac does not calculate fracture sliding or calculate the stresses induced by sliding. Hydraulic fractures form perpendicular to the minimum principal stress and so do not initially bear any shear stress (or experience shear displacement discontinuity). Because of stress interaction with neighboring fractures, it is possible for shear stress to be induced on hydraulic fractures and for them to experience shear displacement. However, this is a second order effect that is not usually included in hydraulic fracturing simulators (some simulators have included this effect, such as the work by Wu and Olson, 2016, and McClure and Horne, 2013, but it is uncommon). Fracture sliding is more important in discrete fracture network simulations that include preexisting natural fractures because natural fractures are usually oriented at an angle to the principal stresses and initially bear shear stress than is relieved by slip when fluid pressure increases. Even among fracturing simulators that
use a DFN of the natural fractures, the stresses induced by sliding are often neglected (such as in the code described by Weng et al., 2011).

Fractures propagate according to the theory of linear elastic fracture mechanics. The fracture tip extends when the stress intensity factor reaches the fracture toughness. Fracture toughness is permitted to be anisotropic, different in the horizontal and vertical directions, and is permitted to vary by facies. The stress intensity factor is calculated numerically (Sheibani and Olson, 2013). By default, the fracture is assumed to propagate linearly. If you set “straightfractures” to false, ResFrac will allow curving fracture paths. The fracture propagates in the direction of the locally calculated maximum horizontal stress. Fracture propagation is implemented by adding a new element ahead of the crack tip; remeshing is never performed. McClure et al. (2016a) validated this approach by implementing it in a 3D hydraulic fracturing simulator and matching analytical solutions for fracture propagation. Also, the approach is validated by matching ResFrac simulations to analytical solutions in our automated test suite, described below.

Fracture height confinement is primarily controlled by differences in stress between layers (Warpinski et al., 1982). The user can specify different stress in different layers. Height confinement also occurs due to shear along bedding planes (Chuprakov and Prioul, 2015). To mimic this process, our code allows the user to specify the location of delamination planes that are mechanical barriers to fracture propagation. At these layers, the user specifies an elevated fracture toughness that must be exceeded to cross the barrier.

ResFrac allows fracture toughness to scale with fracture size. Field evidence strongly suggests that fracture toughness scales with size (Shylapobersky, 1986). Empirically, you’ll find that if you use a laboratory-derived toughness to simulate fracturing in very low permeability rock, the fracture will be unrealistically long. Elevated, scale-dependent fracture toughness has also been described in the geology literature (Delaney et al., 1986; Scholz, 2010). Following Delaney et al. (1986) and Scholz (2010), scale-dependent fracture toughness is modeled with the equation:

\[ K_{lc} = K_{lc,init} (1 + K_{lc,fac}\sqrt{L_{eff}}), \]  

where \( L_{eff} \) is the length-scale of the fracture, and \( K_{lc,fac} \) is a scaling parameter. By default, \( L_{eff} \) is defined as either height or length, whichever is smaller. However, there is an option to define \( L_{eff} \) to be equal to the larger of the two quantities.
Figure 8: Figure reproduced from Scholz (2010). Illustrates observed relationship between apparent fracture toughness and fracture dimension.

11. Poroelastic and thermoelastic stress changes from depletion

ResFrac can calculate stress changes in response to pressure and temperature changes in the matrix. These stresses are calculated using the thermoelastic potential function described in Chapter 2 of Nowacki (1986) or equivalently, the poroelastic potential function described in Chapter 5 of Wang (2000). The thermoelastic potential function is calculated in the matrix elements using the finite difference method, taking into account the distribution of pressure in every matrix element. The induced stress change in each element is calculated from the second derivatives of the potential function. The resulting changes in stress on fracture elements are calculated with trilinear interpolation onto the fracture using the stresses calculated in the surrounding elements. The thermoelastic potential method is only exact for homogeneous elastic moduli. ResFrac optionally allows the user to specify spatially variable elastic moduli. The impact of heterogeneity on the porothermoelastic stresses is calculated with an approximate method. The ‘source’ term in the elastic potential function is calculated using the moduli at the location of pressure/temperature change. The changes in stress at any given location are calculated from the elastic potential function using the moduli at that location.

As described in Section 4.10 by Wang (2000), in an infinite homogeneous domain, porothermoelastic stress changes do not affect the total volumetric strain (sum of the diagonal of the strain tensor) outside the region where pressure is changed. In other words, if pressure is emplaced or injected in one location, there is not a corresponding volumetric strain or poroelastic pressure response at another location. This decouples the flow and deformation problems in the matrix. This is the underlying justification for the typical assumption in conventional reservoir simulators that pore volume in an element can be calculated solely from pressure in that element. Note that this is only strictly valid in the special case of a homogeneous, elastic, infinite domain (which is currently the assumption used by ResFrac for these calculations). ResFrac allows the user to specify spatially variable elastic moduli. Nevertheless, in all cases, ResFrac uses the assumption that porothermoelastic stress changes do not affect the total volumetric strain.

Even though the volumetric strain (sum of the diagonal of the stress tensor) does not change, the strain and stress in individual directions does change (each individual number in the stress tensor). Therefore, the poroelastic and thermoelastic stresses may strongly affect the normal stress on individual fracture elements. Thus, the poroelastic and thermoelastic stress changes are strongly coupled to the fracture flow/deformation, but are decoupled from the pressure/pore volume calculation in the other matrix elements.
To relate pressure and temperature changes to stress changes, users input the Biot coefficient and thermal coefficient of linear expansion.

12. Boundary conditions

You can specify a variety of boundary conditions: constant rate production, constant rate injection, constant pressure, or shut-in. With each type of boundary condition, you can specify constraints. With constant rate injection, maximum injection pressure can be specified. If the maximum pressure is reached, the simulator switches to a constant pressure constraint as long as the rate remains below the specified target injection rate. If constant rate injection is specified but the well produces at the maximum pressure (an unusual but not impossible scenario), then well is shut-in rather than allowing the well to produce fluid. With constant rate production, you specify a minimum production pressure, and it switches to constant pressure production if that is reached. Again, if it (oddly) tries to inject at the minimum production pressure, the well is shut-in. With constant pressure boundary conditions, you specify a maximum injection rate and a maximum production rate.

The well constraints are imposed implicitly so that if a constraint is violated during a timestep, the boundary condition type is changed and the timestep is repeated.

When specifying production rates, you are given the option of specifying water rate, oil rate, gas rate, liquid rate, or total rate. All of these rates are volumetric rates evaluated at surface conditions after the fluid has been put through the surface separation facilities. When you specify ‘total rate’, this is calculated as STB oil + STB water + Mscf gas. If you are using metric units, it is calculated as m^3 oil + m^3 water + 1000 m^3 gas.

When specifying injection rates, you specify the relative ratios of water, oil, and gas injected (with the black oil model) and water and hydrocarbon (with the compositional model). These are volume ratios, evaluated at standard conditions. Under injection conditions, you specify the composition of injection fluid (which may be pure water or include flash components), concentration of each proppant type, concentration of each type of water solute, and temperature.

The boundary conditions can be specified at the wellhead or as a ‘bottomhole’ constraint. If specified bottomhole, then the wellbore is removed from the model and the conditions are applied directly on connections between the reservoir and the wellbore. This effectively turns off wellbore storage. The bottomhole constraints can be useful for modeling production. ResFrac does not have a detailed multiphase wellbore flow model, and so during multiphase production, it is most convenient to simply produce at a specified bottomhole pressure.

Each wellbore vertex can be assigned to a stage. This effectively divides the wellbore into segments, each assigned to a particular stage number. When you specify boundary conditions, you can specify that all stages are active, some stages are active, or none are active. If all are active, the entire well is open to flow. If some are active, only those stages you specify are open to flow. In the inactive stages, there is no hydraulic connection between the wellbore elements and fracture or matrix elements. In all sections of the wellbore with greater measured depth than the furthest active stage, the wellbore elements are hydraulically isolated from the formation and even from each other. This is intended to capture the isolation created by packers in previously pumped stages.

When the well is shut-in, you can specify a total shut-in by specifying that there are no active stages. If you do this, the simulator acts as if the well does not exist. There is no flow between wellbore elements or between the well and matrix or fracture elements. If you do not specify ‘no active stages,’ and you do not specify a ‘bottomhole’ boundary condition constraint, then there can be crossflow through the well. Fluid may enter the well in some places and flow back out of the well in others. If you specify a bottomhole boundary condition constraint and the well is shut-in, then the net fluid flow in/out of the wellbore is imposed to be zero, but crossflow is permitted.
Production and injection rates are described in terms of volumes – stock tank barrels (STB) of oil and water and standard cubic feet (scf) of gas. This can be confusing to non-petroleum engineers because ‘volume’ is not a conserved quantity. There is conservation of mass and moles, but not conservation of volume (because volume is a function of density, which is non-constant). Our petroleum engineering volumes are evaluated at ‘standard’ conditions. At specified temperature and pressure, density can be considered specified (and constant) and so standard ‘volumes’ are really proxies for mass or moles (because the volumes can be divided by the reference densities to convert to mass or moles). In reality, density is also a function of composition, and so it is an approximation to assume that densities are defined solely by pressure and temperature.

Section 14 describes how reservoir production rates are converted to surface rates (STB and scf) with the black oil model and the compositional model. The calculation accounts for the phase changes occurring in the surface separation units. Section 14 also describes how injection volumes (STB and scf) are converted to reservoir conditions.

13. Initial conditions

Several options are available for specification of initial conditions. By default, pressure is initialized at hydrostatic equilibrium. You specify the pressure at a datum depth and the depth of a water-hydrocarbon contact. The code automatically calculates pressure and composition in every element. Because capillary pressure is neglected, the water-hydrocarbon contact is a sharp interface. If it lies within an element, the element fluid saturation is calculated as an average, assuming that the contact is located at the specified depth. Above the contact, the initial water saturation is set to the connate water saturation from the relative permeability function in each facies (so water is immobile).

Alternatively, you can specify the initial saturation and/or initial pressure in each facies. A third option is that in the specification of ‘formation properties versus depth,’ you can specify initial saturation and pressure as a function of depth. Keep in mind, if you use these options, the simulation may not be initialized at hydrostatic equilibrium. In reality, variable pressure/saturation versus depth is kept in equilibrium by capillary forces. However, ResFrac neglects capillarity. Therefore, if you manually set pressure and/or saturation, you might want to consider setting vertical permeability to zero so that fluid flow only occurs horizontally into the fractures/well and not vertically in from above or below.

With the compositional model, you specify the initial composition of the hydrocarbon phases. With the black oil model, the default is to initialize with an oil phase with ‘composition’ given by the specified initial bubble point. Alternatively, you can tell the model to initialize with 100% gas and no oil. You are not permitted to initialize a model that has two hydrocarbon phases. Natural hydrocarbon deposits are always initially either single phase oil or gas.

The wellbore is always initialized at hydrostatic equilibrium. You are given the option to either initialize wellbore pressure at equilibrium with the reservoir, or to specify a wellhead pressure and initialize in equilibrium with that pressure.

For the thermal initial conditions, you specify the surface pressure and either the temperature at a specified datum depth or a thermal gradient. The initial thermal gradient is assumed to be uniform at all depths.

The initial stress state is initialized by specifying the minimum principal stress and the maximum principal stress at a datum depth. Then, you specify the gradient in minimum and maximum principal stress with respect to depth. In addition, you can specify a ‘stress deviation’, which is a number that is either added or subtracted from both the minimum and maximum principal stresses. Stress deviation is defined for each facies. Alternatively, you can define stress deviation as a detailed function of depth in the ‘formation properties versus depth table.'
14. Fluid properties: the black oil model and the compositional model

Fluid properties can be calculated with either the black oil model or the compositional model. The compositional model is more realistic but is more computationally intensive and more complex to set up. With either model, ResFrac assumes that the water and non-water phases are immiscible (ie, no water enters into the oil/gas phases and no hydrocarbons mix into the water phase).

Real hydrocarbons mixtures contain hundreds or thousands of different types of molecules. Hydrocarbons contain alkanes (hydrocarbon chains with only single bonds), alkenes (hydrocarbon chains containing a double bond, also called olefins), aromatics (hydrocarbon chains containing a conjugated ring), and many others. Within these categories, there are all different types of molecules, broadly categorized by how many carbons they contain (propane, butane, pentane, etc.). Finally, each type of molecule has a wide range of isomers. Isomers are molecules with the same chemical composition (the number of each type of atom) but with different arrangement of the atoms within the molecule. For example, n-pentane is an unbranched chain of five carbons where each carbon is bonded to two carbons (except the carbons at the end of the chain, which are bonded to one other carbon). In contrast, isopentane (aka, 2-methylbutane) has the same chemical composition (C_{5}H_{12}), but the second-to-last carbon on the chain is bonded to three carbons. Even though isomers have the same chemical composition, they can have substantially different macroscopic properties (boiling point, etc.).

It is not practical to keep track of thousands of different types of molecules in a reservoir simulator. The black oil model and the compositional model were developed to mimic the phase behavior of real hydrocarbons while keeping track of a much smaller number of components. The black oil model is simpler and runs faster – it keeps track of only three ‘components’ – oil, water, and gas. The compositional model is more flexible and can more accurately represent the real behavior of mixture. However, compositional simulations run more slowly than black oil simulations.

A rule of thumb is that the black oil model will yield a good description of the reservoir fluid if the initial producing gas-oil ratio is less than around 2000 scf/STB (implying that the fluid is a so-called “black oil” petroleum fluid). Also, the black oil model will be fine if you have only single-phase gas in the reservoir (ie, it is a gas reservoir that does not experience retrograde liquid condensation in the reservoir). A so-called “wet gas” has only single phase gas in the reservoir, but some liquid condensate drops out at the surface. This liquid dropout is not explicitly tracked by ResFrac. However, in a wet gas, the producing gas-oil ratio is constant over time. Therefore, you can easily calculate the amount of liquid dropout by multiplying the simulated gas production by the actual gas-oil ratio. Volatile oils and retrograde condensates have both oil and gas phases in the reservoir, but the initial gas-oil ratio is greater than 2000 scf/STB. These fluids are best described by a compositional model. Also, if you are going to run a thermal simulation or if you are going to simulate enhanced oil recovery with gas injection, you should use a compositional model. The black oil model only works in isothermal calculations.

McCain (1999) provides a detailed description of the black oil model. Pedersen and Christensen provide a detailed description of compositional fluid models.

14.1 The compositional model

The compositional model keeps track of a set of predefined fluid components (typically no more than fifteen). There are three types of ‘components’ in a compositional model: defined components, lumped pseudocomponents, and the plus fraction. A defined component is a specific molecule, like methane or CO2. A lumped pseudocomponent is a mixture of components. This could be a mixture like N2-C1 (a mixture of nitrogen and methane), or a mixture of many different types of molecules like C8-C10 (all molecules that have boiling
point in the range of n-octane to n-decane). The plus fraction is a pseudocomponent representing all molecules that are larger than a certain amount, like C30+ (all molecules with boiling point greater than an unbranched alkane containing thirty carbons). The word ‘pseudocomponent’ is used to denote that it is not a real molecule – a pseudocomponent is a hypothetical model that has properties that are averaged between a mixture of real molecules. However, we often use the words ‘component’ and ‘pseudocomponent’ interchangeably.

A compositional fluid model consists of: (1) a list of the components in the model, (2) molar mass of components, (3) the pseudocritical temperature and pressure of each component, (4) acentric factor of each component, (5) binary interaction coefficients describing interaction between each component, and (6) other optional parameters, such as a Peneloux volume correction factor. You can also specify parameters for calculating properties such as viscosity.

A different compositional model needs to be built for every real hydrocarbon mixture. You don’t need to do it for every well, but if you notice significant differences in GOR between wells in the same formation, you might want to consider having multiple models. Compositional fluid models can be built with a commercial package, such as PVTSim. An excellent practical guide to building compositional models is given by Pedersen and Christensen (2007). You start by taking a fluid sample and measuring the composition. From here, you decide how many pseudocomponents to use. Using more pseudocomponents will yield a model that better matches reality but will result in a simulation that runs more slowly. After you have defined the pseudocomponents, their effective properties are calculated by taking a special type of average of the properties of the underlying components. Finally, regression is used to ‘tune’ the compositional model the any experimental data you may have available. For example, when you sent your fluid sample to the lab, they may have performed a differential vaporization test, a constant composition expansion, and a separator test.

The saturation, density, and composition of the phases are calculated with a cubic equation of state. ResFrac implements the Peng-Robinson equation of state. There are two slightly different versions of the Peng-Robinson equation of state, and ResFrac implements either (defaulting to use the more recent 1978 version). The algorithms described by Michelsen and Mollerup (2007) are used to calculate phase stability (whether the hydrocarbons form one or two phases), and the saturation of each phase.

ResFrac provides two options for calculating viscosity of the hydrocarbon mixture. The default is to calculate the viscosity of the flash phases from the method of Lohrenz et al (1964), the “LBC” correlation. This correlation calculates viscosity from the critical molar volume of each component and using several coefficients. ResFrac has default values for these parameters. Alternatively, you can define your own modifications to the LBC correlations and/or define critical molar volumes for each of your components. You may want to specify these modifications if your fluid lab did viscosity measurements and you have used PVTSim (or another comparable code) to calculate the coefficients that best match the experimental data.

Alternatively, ResFrac provides a simplified viscosity model. In this model, you specify a viscosity for each component. The viscosity of a phase is calculated as the mass fraction weighted average of the viscosity of each of the components. This is not as realistic as an LBC model that has been tuned to experimental data, but provides a quick and easy way of specifying viscosity if more detailed characterization information is not available.

Pure water properties are calculated according to the correlations from the International Association for the Properties of Water and Steam (Cooper, 2007). Viscosity and density are adjusted with correlations to account for the effect of the dissolved solutes (Pedersen and Christensen, 2007). Alternatively, you are permitted to model the water phase as being slightly compressible, in which case you specify the density at a reference pressure and compressibility. You also have the option to specify water viscosity to a constant.

When the simulator calculates the production rate, the simulator must convert molar flow rates to surface volumes (STB of oil and water, and Mcsf of gas). The conversion is performed as follows. Prior to the simulation,
the user specifies the pressure and temperature of the separator and the stock tank. Optionally, the user can specify two separators prior to the stock tank. The simulator takes the produced moles and performs a flash calculation to calculate the phase properties at the separator conditions. The gas phase is removed and sent to ‘sales’. The liquid phase is moved to either the second separator or the stock tank. The process is repeated – a flash calculation is performed and gas goes to ‘sales’. If there is a second separator, the liquid is again moved to the stock tank. In the stock tank, the liquid phase is also sent to ‘sales.’ At the end of this calculation, ResFrac has calculated the number of moles of gas sent to sales and also oil sent to sales. The simulator has also calculated the moles of produced water. These three molar quantities are divided by their molar density at standard conditions to calculate STB of oil and water and Mscf of gas.

Injection rates are also specified in terms of standard volumes. These are converted to moles (which is the quantity conserved in the simulator) by calculating the molar density at standard conditions and dividing the specified injection volumes by molar density.

### 14.2 The black oil model

In the black oil model, you specify a table of oil formation volume factor, solution gas-oil ratio, gas formation volume factor, oil viscosity, and gas viscosity as a function of pressure. McCain (1999) provides an excellent description of the black oil model and how it is built. You also specify the initial bubble point. Bubble point is not necessarily constant throughout the simulation because it is a function of composition. The water viscosity is assumed constant, and the water density is defined from a reference water formation volume factor at the bubble point pressure, water compressibility, and water specific gravity at standard conditions. Finally, you specify the oil and gas specific gravity at standard conditions.

The black oil model assumes that there are three conserved components – water, oil, and gas. Confusingly, these components are distinct from the phases – water, oil, and gas. In other words, there is an oil ‘phase’ and an oil ‘component’ and these are not the same thing. The oil ‘component’ is defined as ‘molecules that will be liquid oil at the surface after going through the surface separation units.’ The gas ‘component’ is defined as ‘molecules that will be gas at the surface after going through the surface separation units.’ When you bring molecules to the surface, some of the molecules in the liquid (oil) phase vaporize up into the gas phase at standard conditions. Thus, the oil phase in the reservoir contains both oil and gas components. In real hydrocarbon mixtures (specifically, in volatile oils and retrograde condensates), some of the molecules in the gas phase can drop out into the liquid phase at the surface. However, in the standard black oil model, it is assumed that the gas phase in the reservoir contains only gas ‘component.’

The key to the black oil table is the table of formation volume factors and solution gas-oil ratio as a function of pressure. These values relate reservoir volumes to surface volumes. Because surface volumes can be converted to moles by dividing by molar density at ‘standard conditions,’ these expressions of formation volume factor and solution gas-oil ratio are (rather indirect) ways of specifying the composition and density of the phases at reservoir conditions. However, these values are more commonly discussed and understood in terms of the macroscopic behavior that they represent.

The oil, water, and gas formation volume factors are defined as:

\[
B_o = \frac{\text{res bbl oil produced}}{\text{STB oil produced}} \tag{14-1}
\]

\[
B_w = \frac{\text{res bbl water produced}}{\text{STB water produced}} \tag{14-2}
\]

\[
B_g = \frac{\text{res bbl free gas produced}}{\text{Mscf gas produced from free gas}} \tag{14-3}
\]
A variety of different unit combinations may be used for defining $B_g$.

Some of the liquid oil in the reservoir converts to free gas at the surface. This is expressed with the solution gas-oil ratio:

\[
R_s = \frac{\text{scf produced at surface from gas coming out of the liquid phase}}{\text{STB oil produced}}.
\]

The water produced at the surface comes only from the water phase in the reservoir. The oil produced at the surface comes only from the oil phase in the reservoir (though some of the molecules in the oil phase convert to gas when the liquid comes to the surface). The gas at the surface comes from free gas in the reservoir and gas out of solution from the liquid oil phase in the reservoir. Therefore, the total gas at the surface is:

\[
\text{scf gas produced at surface} = R_s \text{STB} + V_g/B_g,
\]

where STB is the stock tank barrels of oil produced and $V_g$ is the volume of free gas produced (i.e., volume evaluated at reservoir conditions).

The key assumption of the black oil model is that the formation volume factors and the solution gas-oil ratio can be written solely as a function of pressure. This is a simplification because in reality these properties are also a function of composition. The values in the black oil table are derived from a complex procedure that involves combining the results from several laboratory experiments designed to mimic different processes occurring in the reservoir and in the surface separation units (McCain, 1999). When the pressure is above the bubble point pressure, the oil phase is assumed to be constant compressibility.

With some manipulations (and by exploiting the assumptions of the black oil model), you can convert a black oil table to a table of molar compositions (defined at the pressure specified in each row). The simulator does not actually enforce these compositions. That would be impossible - the simulator is solving molar balance in each element on the water, oil, and gas components, as well as calculating pressure. Composition is calculated from the molar balance calculation. So how is this handled? The table can be interpreted as showing the composition of the mixture when it has the bubble point equal to the pressure in each row. Thus, fluid properties are calculated as follows:

1. From molar composition, calculate the bubble point of the mixture from the black oil table.
2. If the pressure is above the bubble point:
   a. Evaluate the properties from the black oil table, using the bubble point pressure, not the actual pressure.
   b. Adjust the oil formation volume factor to account for the compression of the liquid as it goes from the bubble point to the actual pressure.
3. If the pressure is below the bubble point:
   a. Read the fluid properties directly from the black oil table at the given pressure.

When pressure is between rows of the table (which is nearly always), a spline is used to accurately interpolate between the values.

ResFrac also provides the option to use the modified black oil model. In the modified black oil model, it is assumed that some stock tank oil is vaporized into the reservoir gas phase. When this option is selected, the user is asked to provide $R_v$, the vaporized oil-gas ratio, versus pressure in the black oil table. The user specifies the dry gas formation volume factor in the table. It is not necessary for the user to also specify the wet gas formation volume factor, because it can be derived from the other inputs.
15. **Data needed to set up a ResFrac simulation**

To set up a ResFrac simulation, you need to know (or have reasonable estimates for):

1. **Formation properties versus depth:** permeability, porosity, initial fluid saturations, initial pressure, and the minimum principal stress. ResFrac uses a ‘layer cake’ model. It neglects lateral heterogeneity. You can opt to use a model with only a few facies (with uniform properties within each facies) or you can use the “formation properties versus depth” option to put in vertical heterogeneity at finer resolution.
2. **Location and geometry of the well.** Inner diameter. Location of stages and perforation clusters. Perforation diameter and count per cluster.
3. **Relative permeability curves** (can be different in each facies, which you define by depth intervals).
4. **A fluid model.** This could either be a black oil table or a compositional fluid model.
5. **Your wellbore boundary conditions.** Injection schedule during fracturing (rate, fluid viscosity/type, and proppant type and concentration). During production, an estimate for the producing bottomhole pressure.
6. **Orientation of the minimum principal stress.**

ResFrac simulations have a lot of secondary parameters that you may not be familiar with or may not be sure what values to use. You can use the default values for these parameters. If you would like more information, refer to the “help” button in the builder next to the parameter. You can press the “suggest” button, and the builder will put in a default value (if feasible).

16. **Tips for history matching**

History matching to data can be time consuming, and we don’t recommend that you try get a perfect match. There are a lot of parameters that you could vary, and it can be tedious and not particularly fruitful to be a perfectionist about matching the data. On the other hand, you clearly want to be in the ballpark. This section describes a procedure that is reasonably efficient and effective.

First, try to match the initial shut-in pressure and (if available) fracture length. During injection, there is a complex relationship between the pressure measured in the well (either at the wellhead or even bottomhole) and the pressure in the fracture. Thus, trying to match WHP during pumping will not necessarily going to lead to a much better model. On the other hand, the ISIP is measured after shut-in and is more representative of the true pressure in the fracture during pumping. As long as your minimum stress estimate is reasonable, it should be somewhat below the ISIP. After a full-scale frac job, it might be anywhere from 500-1500 psi lower (with values closer to 500 psi being more likely). The effective fracture toughness controls the net pressure – the difference between the minimum principal stress and the fluid pressure required to propagate the fracture. Fracture toughness is specified in the facies list. We recommend using values between 2500-5000 psi-in$^{1/2}$. But also, you should specify a scale dependent fracture toughness parameter, as described in Section 10 (and found in the “Fracture options” tab in the builder). For the scale dependent toughness parameter, we have had success with values between 0.5 and 1.5. Vary this scale dependent fracture toughness parameter until you match ISIP. Find out of if you have any additional information to constrain fracture length. This could be microseismic or reports on the distances where you typically observe frac hits. You’d like your simulated frac length to be in the ballpark of this estimate. If not, you can lengthen the frac by decreasing the scale dependent toughness parameter, or shorten it by doing the opposite. When matching length, make sure you consider how many perf clusters there are in each stage!

Next, you can (optionally) match the wellhead pressure during pumping. This isn’t really critical because you already matched the ISIP. The relationship between BHP and WHP is controlled by wellbore friction. You don’t really need a perfect wellbore friction calculation to do a good frac simulation. ResFrac has a default correlation for friction, but it certainly isn’t always perfect. There are too many different types of fluid out there, and you are unlikely to have perfect information about how they behave when pumped through a well. You can tune the
wellbore friction up and down with the “wellbore friction adjustment factor” found in the well controls panel.

The last, and most challenging, part of a history match is the production data. Usually, you want to model long-term production with a constant bottomhole pressure constraint. When you specify a bottomhole constraint, the wellbore is removed from the model and the simulation is performed assuming pressure is uniform in the well. Before you get started, make sure that you have a good estimate for that BHP, which may be changing over time. You probably don’t want to vary that to match the data, unless you don’t have a good initial estimate.

Alternatively, you may want to specify the injection volumes and try to match BHP. If so, you can still do this as a ‘constant BHP pressure’ constraint in the builder. Specify ‘total rate’, which is STB oil + STB water + Mscf gas. The code will calculate the BHP and the relative amount of each phase. You typically will have daily production data. You can specify every single one of those daily rates, but this will slow down the simulation because it will be having to change the boundary condition frequently. Instead, you might want to take 10-day averages and change the BC every 10 days. If you have a large number of these specified rate changes, you might want to consider writing a script to directly modify the simulation’s text input file, rather than manually inputting all the controls through the builder.

For history matching, the size of the drainage volume will make a big impact. Look at the proximity of your well to other wells that are nearby. Generally, the drainage volume boundaries should be halfway between the wells. If the neighboring wells are laterals landed at a different depth, you may have to make a judgement call whether or not you think those neighbors are draining the same formation(s) that your well is draining, and whether or not it should be used to specify a drainage volume.

The edges of the matrix region are no-flow boundaries. Therefore, one way to specify the drainage volume is to make the matrix region the same size as the drainage volume. But this is often not the recommended approach. ResFrac does not allow fractures to grow out of the matrix region. Therefore, you generally want to make the model region large enough that it can contain any fractures that might form. Instead, to modify the drainage volume, use the option “zeropermoutsidecube.” You specify both the size and location of the center of this cube. This cube is your drainage volume – permeability is set to zero outside the cube. You can set the ‘zero permeability’ to turn on at a certain time. For example, you may expect fractures to grow outside the cube, and you’d like fluid to be able to leak off along the entire fracture length. You can set ResFrac so that you don’t ‘turn on’ the ‘zero permeability outside cube’ option until you put the well on production.

To vary the relative amounts of the phases, you can vary the relative permeability curves in the facies. To vary the overall pressure drawdown, you could vary either the matrix permeability or the fracture conductivity. To modify the unpropped fracture conductivity, vary “E0max” or “90% closure stress” in the facies list. Higher values result in better unpropped fracture conductivity. E0max controls the overall conductivity, and the 90% closure stress controls the stress sensitivity. I often use values in the vicinity of 0.002 ft for E0max and 500 psi for 90% closure stress. Note that the unpropped fracture conductivity is proportional to the cube of E0max. If you double that value, you will effectively multiply unpropped fracture conductivity by 8x. To modify the propped fracture conductivity, vary k0 and proppant bed compressibility in the list of proppant properties. Propped fracture conductivity is linearly proportional to k0. Proppant bed compressibility affects the sensitivity to effective normal stress.

It is possible to ‘restart’ a ResFrac simulation in the middle, rather than start from scratch. It is even possible to do a restart with different settings than the original simulation. This can be very useful. In a typical simulation, the frac job takes most of the CPU time, and the production period goes quickly at the end. Therefore, if you are matching production data, you can use restarts from the beginning of production, rather than redoing the simulations from scratch.
17. Miscellaneous features

17.1 Accounting for stress shadow from fractures outside the model

Often, when using ResFrac, you would like to run a simulation of just one or a few stages, rather than model every stage in the well. Full well-scale models are useful for certain applications, but many questions can be addressed without needing to simulate 25-50 stages. By running a simulation of fewer stages, you can get faster runtimes and get away with using a finer mesh.

If using ResFrac to model a single stage, you may want to account for the stress shadowing from the previous stages. In other words, the simulation is initialized in a way that accounts for the stress shadow that would be felt by a typical stage along the middle of the well.

This can be accomplished with ‘external fractures’ specified in the simulation setup. For each fracture, you specify the location of the center of the fracture \((x,y,z)\), the volume of fluid injected into the fracture, and the net pressure. Based on other input parameters, the code calculates an effective radius of the fracture. For simplicity, these external fractures are assumed circular and leakoff from the fractures is neglected (so that all of the injected fluid remains in the fracture without leaking off). These simplifying assumptions are adequate solely for this purpose of calculating stress shadow from previous stages. The fractures are assumed to be perpendicular to the minimum horizontal stress. Then, the analytical solution from Sneddon (1946) is used to calculate the stresses within the simulation problem domain. This approximate treatment allows the fractures in the simulation to feel the stress shadow from previous stages, without needing to do a detailed simulation of more than one stage.

Stress shadow decreases rapidly with distance, and so the clusters in your model that are closer to the toe may feel substantially more stress shadow than the clusters closer to the heel. How many of these external fractures should you include in the simulation setup? Typically, field experience shows that ISIP trends along wells plateau after 2-3 stages. I recommend that you put in: (1) one ‘external’ fracture per perf cluster and (2) three stages worth of external fractures. If you have six clusters per 200-foot stage, put in 18 ‘external’ fractures, centered at the location of where those previous 18 perforation clusters would be located. There is negligible computational cost to including these ‘external’ fractures, so there is no practical reason to limit the number that you specify.

17.2 Diverter

Diverter pills are modeled as a temporary reduction in perforation diameter. The user specifies the timing of pills injected in each well. The transport of the pill down the well is not included – the user specifies the time when the pill reaches the perforations. The amount of diverter injected is specified in a unitless quantity. When the diverter is pill is injected, it is placed at the perforations in an amount proportional to the volumetric flow rate at each perf. The perforation diameter is multiplied by an adjustment factor to account for the blockage of the diverter:

\[
D_{pf,adj} = 1 - D_{pf,adj,max} + D_{pf,adj,max} \frac{1}{1+d_m},
\]

where \(D_{pf,adj}\) is the adjustment factor, \(D_{pf,adj,max}\) is the maximum possible adjustment factor (defaults to 0.5), and \(d_m\) is the (dimensionless) amount of diverter present at the perf cluster. Thus, if there are four flowing perf clusters with equal flow distribution and one cluster where the fracture has not broken down, and you inject 4 units of diverter, then 1 unit will be placed at each cluster, resulting in \(D_{pf,adj}\) equal to 0.75. The perforation pressure drop scales with the fourth power of diameter, so it will increase by \(1/0.75^4 = 3.16\). This will cause an increase in injection pressure, probably causing the inactive cluster to break down.

The user also specifies a “diverter decay rate,” \(d_{decay}\), which defaults to 6 hrs\(^{-1}\). The diverter degrades according to the equation:
\[
\frac{d(d_m)}{dt} = d_m d_{\text{decay}},
\]

such that:

\[
d_m = d_m(t = 0)\exp(d_{\text{decay}}t),
\]

where \( t \) is time.

18. Validation simulations

The numerical accuracy of the simulator is checked with a test suite of problems that have known solution. The test suite also includes a variety of simulations designed to test the ability of the simulator to converge through difficult problems. To ensure that ongoing development does not inadvertently introduce errors, a script is used to automatically run the full test suite and compare the results against known solutions. This appendix briefly reviews some of the suite problems that are designed to test accuracy. All results shown below have close match with the known benchmark solution.

1. Sneddon (1946) Solution for Stress Around an Open Crack

Injection is performed at constant pressure (greater than the minimum principal stress) into a circular preexisting fracture in an impermeable formation. The injection rate goes to zero as the pressure in the fracture becomes uniform. A grid of stress observation points is defined, and the calculated stresses are compared against the Sneddon (1946) solution.

![Figure 9: Numerically calculated change in the \( \sigma_{xx} \) stress around a circular crack opening with uniform internal pressure.](image)

2. SPE1 Comparison Problem

The SPE1 comparison problem is a black oil simulation with gas injection. The simulated gas and oil production
rates are compared with the solution provided by (Odeh, 1981).

3. SPE3 Comparison Problem

The SPE3 comparison problem is a compositional simulation with gas injection. The reservoir fluid is a retrograde condensate. Liquid produced at the surface is sent to sales. The produced gas is reinjected to volatilize and sweep out the components dropped out as liquid in the reservoir. The simulated oil production rates are compared with the solution provided by (Kenyon and Behie, 1987). The problem is solved with the ARCO fluid model.

4. Radial Crack Propagation
Radial crack propagation problems are solved for the limiting cases of low toughness and high toughness with no leakoff. To match the analytical solutions, the stress gradient is assumed to be zero, wellbore storage is neglected, non-Darcy pressure drop is neglected, and gravity is neglected. With low toughness, the solution is (Equation 6C-5 from Economides and Nolte, 2001):

\[ R = 0.52 \sqrt[9]{\frac{YQ^3}{(1-\nu^2)\mu}} t^{\frac{4}{9}}. \]  

(A1)

where \( R \) is radius, \( Y \) is Young’s modulus, \( Q \) is volumetric flow rate, \( \nu \) is Poisson’s ratio, \( \mu \) is viscosity, and \( t \) is time.

With high toughness, the solution can be derived by assuming uniform pressure in the crack and combining the solutions for volume and stress intensity factor of a circular crack:

\[ V = Qt = \frac{16R^3(1-\nu^2)}{3Y} \Delta P, \]  

(A2)

\[ K_{IC} = 2\Delta P \sqrt{\frac{R}{\pi}}, \]  

(A3)

\[ R = \frac{2.5 \cdot 3QY}{\sqrt{8(1-\nu^2)\pi}}. \]  

(A4)

\[ \text{Figure 12: Radius versus time for radial crack propagation with no leakoff and low and high toughness. Black lines show numerical result and red lines show the analytical solutions.} \]

5. PKN Crack Propagation with and without Leakoff

The assumptions of the PKN model are not exactly reproduced by a 3D simulator. However, in the limiting case of perfect height confinement and low toughness, a 3D simulator should be expected to approximately match the PKN solution. To match the analytical solution, the stress gradient is assumed to be zero, wellbore storage is neglected, non-Darcy pressure drop is neglected, and gravity is neglected. The analytical solution with leakoff is given by Equations 9.41 and 9.42 from Valko and Economides (1995). The analytical solution without leakoff is given by Equation 9.13 from Valko and Economides (1995). Two simulations of the PKN with leakoff problem are performed. One uses a highly refined mesh toward the fracture. The second uses a coarse mesh and the 1D subgrid method for calculating leakoff (McClure, 2017). In these simulations, the crack initially propagates radially before reaching a maximum height of 328 ft. Once the length is substantially greater than 328 ft, the propagation should be approximately PKN.
Figure 13: Approximate PKN propagation (at later time) with no leakoff. The black line shows the numerical result and the red line shows the analytical result.

Figure 14: Approximate PKN propagation (at later time) with leakoff. The blue lines show the numerical result and the green lines shows the analytical result. The solution on the left uses a refined mesh towards the matrix. The solution on the right uses the 1D subgrid method and a coarse mesh.

6. Thermal conduction into a Crack

Gringarten et al. (1975) provide an analytical solution for produced temperature in a scenario with water flow between two wells through a crack embedded in a zero permeability medium. Injection is performed at constant temperature and rate. The water is heated by conduction as it flows through the crack between the well. The problem domain is sufficiently long perpendicular to the fracture that the problem domain is effectively infinite in the direction perpendicular to the fracture. The Gringarten et al. (1975) solution assumes 1D heat conduction, and so the boundaries of the matrix mesh do not extend beyond the wells.

Figure 15 shows a 3D visualization, with a cross-section cut through the matrix. Figure 16 shows the simulated and analytical solutions for two cases: high refined mesh towards the fracture and a coarse mesh using the 1D subgrid method (McClure, 2017) for heat conduction.
Figure 15: Spatial distribution of temperature at the end of the Gringarten simulation. A horizontal cross-section is cut through the matrix.

Figure 16: Production temperature versus time in the solution to the Gringarten problem. The blue lines show the simulated results, and the green lines show the analytical solution.

7. Estimating Leakoff Coefficient from a Diagnostic Fracture Injection Test

Under ideal conditions, the leakoff coefficient can be estimating from the preclosure transient after shut-in from a diagnostic fracture injection test (Nolte, 1979). In the test, fluid is injected, creating a hydraulic fracture, and then pressure is monitored after shut-in.

To test, we set up an idealized simulation of a diagnostic fracture injection test (single phase and single component, very small residual aperture after closure, no non-Darcy pressure drop, no gravity, perfect height confinement). Figure 17 shows the simulated shut-in transient. Using the equations for calculating leakoff coefficient from the derivative of pressure with respect to G-time (summarized by Marongiu-Porcu et al., 2014), the leakoff coefficient can be estimated from the simulation as 9.8e-6 m/s^{1/2}. The exact value is 1e-5 m/s^{1/2}. 
8. Poroelastic Stresses Around a Cuboid of Constant Pressure Change

Page 73 from Nowacki (1986) provides an analytical solution for the stresses induced outside a rectangular cuboid of uniform change in pressure (or temperature). To match this solution, a simulation is set up with the special condition that permeability is zero outside a cube in the center of the problem domain. Then, injection is performed at constant pressure until the pressure is uniform within the cuboid. The stresses induced by the deformation are calculated numerically (shown in Figure 18) and compared with the analytical solution.

List of variables

- $A_{nw}$: coefficient for the near wellbore complexity pressure drop correlation (Pa/(m$^3$/s)$^\alpha_{nw}$; psi/bpm$^\alpha_{nw}$)
- $C_{pf}$: perforation discharge coefficient
- $C_{pr}$: volume fraction of proppant
\(C_{pr,c}\): effective volume fraction of proppant at closure
\(C_{pr,max}\): maximum possible volume fraction of proppant in a packed bed
\(c_{b,\phi}\): proppant bed porosity compressibility (Pa\(^{-1}\); psi\(^{-1}\)
\(c_{gel}\): mass concentration of gel solute (g/m\(^3\); ppg)
\(D\): wellbore diameter
\(D_p\): perforation diameter (m; ft)
\(D_{p,f,adj}\): perforation diameter diverter adjustment factor (dimensionless)
\(D_{p,f,adj,max}\): maximum possible perforation diameter diverter adjustment factor (dimensionless)
\(D_t\): tube diameter (m; ft)
\(d\): proppant grain diameter
\(d_m\): dimensionless amount of diverter
d\(_{decay}\): diverter decay rate
\(f\): Fanning friction factor
\(f_b\): factor used in calculating \(k_b\)
\(f_N\): Fanning friction factor assuming Newtonian fluid
\(f_R\): Fanning friction factor assuming power law fluid
g: gravitational constant (m/s\(^2\); ft/s)
\(E\): fracture aperture (m; ft)
\(E_0\): portion of proppant-free fracture aperture at closure that is dependent on aperture (m; ft)
\(E_{0,max}\): maximum value of \(E_0\) (m; ft)
\(E_{b,\phi}\): “proppant bed” portion of the fracture aperture (m; ft)
\(E_{cr}\): “crack” portion of the fracture aperture (m; ft)
\(E_{open}\): portion of the fracture aperture in excess of the aperture at mechanical closure (m; ft)
\(E_{pr}\): portion of the mechanically closed fracture aperture in excess of \(E_0\) and \(E_{res}\) (m; ft)
\(E_{res}\): residual fracture aperture at infinite normal stress (m; ft)
\(E_{res,max}\): maximum residual fracture aperture at infinite normal stress (m; ft)
h: sigmoidal average function described in Equation 8.6-3
\(h_t\): fracture height (m; ft)
\(K_{fc}\): Fracture toughness (MPa-m\(^{1/2}\); psi-in\(^{1/2}\))
\(K_{fc,init}\): Initial (scale independent) fracture toughness (MPa-m\(^{1/2}\); psi-in\(^{1/2}\))
\(K_{fc,fac}\): Fracture toughness scaling factor (m\(^{-1/2}\); ft\(^{1/2}\))
\(K\): viscosity constant from the power law or modified power law (Pa-s\(^{n}\); cp/s\(^{n}\))
\(K_{imm}\): rate constant for proppant immobilization (min\(^{n}\)-1)
\(k\): permeability (m\(^2\); md)
\(k_{0,b}\): factor used for calculating \(k_b\)
\(k_b\): proppant bed permeability (m\(^2\); md)
\(k_{eff}\):: effective permeability for flow between element \(i\) and element \(j\) (m\(^2\); md)
\(k_{fc}\): filtercake permeability (m\(^2\); md)
k\(_m\): matrix permeability in a dual porosity model (m\(^2\); md)
k\(_{pp,b}\): relative permeability of phase \(p\) in flow through a closed, proppant filled fracture
k\(_{pp,cr}\): relative permeability of phase \(p\) in flow through a proppant-free crack
k\(_{pp,cr,max}\): maximum relative permeability of phase \(p\) in flow through a proppant-free crack at the maximum residual saturations of the other phases
k\(_{pp,cro}\): relative permeability of phase \(p\) in flow through an open fracture
k\(_{p,ij}\): relative permeability of phase \(p\) for flow from element \(i\) to element \(j\)
\(L_{eff}\): fracture length scale, either length or height, whichever is smaller (m; ft)
l\(_i\): distance from center of element \(i\) to the interface (m; ft)
\(M\): molar mass (g/mol; lbs/lbmol)
\(M_{p,b}\): absolute mobility factor for phase \(p\) for flow through a closed, proppant-filled crack (m\(^3\)/(Pa-s); md-ft/cp)
\(M_{p,cr}\): absolute mobility factor for phase \(p\) for flow through a proppant-free crack (m\(^3\)/(Pa-s); md-ft/cp)
\(\bar{m}_{gel}\): gel mass fraction
\(m_i\): mass of proppant per area (kg/m\(^2\); lbs/ft\(^2\))
\( m_{\text{m,imm}} \): mass of immobile proppant per area (\( \text{kg/m}^2 \); \( \text{lbs/ft}^2 \))

\( m_{\text{tot,imm,max}} \): maximum allowed mass of immobile proppant per area (\( \text{kg/m}^2 \); \( \text{lbs/ft}^2 \))

\( m_{\text{pr,a}} \): mass of proppant per fracture area (\( \text{kg/m}^2 \); \( \text{lbs/ft}^2 \))

\( N_c \): number of components in the simulation

\( N_{gc} \): dimensionless number expressing the tendency for gravitational bulk slurry convection

\( N_{pr} \): number of proppant types in the simulation

\( n \): exponent from the power law or modified power law model

\( n_{p,c} \): Brooks-Corey power law relative permeability exponent for flow through a crack

\( P \): pressure (MPa or Pa; psia)

\( P_L \): Langmuir pressure (MPa or Pa; psia)

\( P_{\text{p}},p \): fluid pressure of phase \( p \) (MPa or Pa; psia)

\( Q \): total volumetric flow rate (\( \text{m}^3/\text{s} \); bpm)

\( Q_{\text{Q}} \): volumetric flow per element volume in the dual porosity model (\( \text{1/s} \); \( \text{1/s} \))

\( q_{\text{c,ij}} \): molar flow rate of component \( c \) from element \( i \) to element \( j \) (moles/s; lbmoles/s)

\( q_{c,p} \): volumetric flow rate of phase \( p \) (\( \text{m}^3/\text{s} \); bbl/day)

\( q_{p,c} \): volumetric flow rate of phase \( p \) in a mechanically closed fracture (\( \text{m}^3/\text{s} \); bbl/day)

\( q_{p,o} \): volumetric flow rate of phase \( p \) in a mechanically open fracture (\( \text{m}^3/\text{s} \); bbl/day)

\( R \): relative buoyancy factor used in the Ferguson and Church (2006) correlation

\( Re \): Reynolds number

\( Re_{\text{e}} \): particle Reynolds number in a Newtonian fluid

\( Re_{\text{e}}' \): particle Reynolds number in a power law fluid

\( Re_{\text{MPL}}' \): particle Reynolds number in a modified power law fluid

\( S_p \): saturation of phase \( p \)

\( S_{pr,cr} \): residual saturation of phase \( p \) in a proppant-free fracture

\( S_{-pr,cr} \): residual saturation of phases other than \( p \) in a proppant-free fracture

\( s \): exponent used for proppant jamming adjustment

\( T_{ij} \): transmissibility factor for flow from element \( i \) to element \( j \) (\( \text{m}^3/\text{s} \); md-ft)

\( t \): time (s; hrs)

\( u \): overall mixture Darcy velocity (volumetric flux) (\( \text{m/s} \); ft/s)

\( u_{c,p} \): Darcy velocity (volumetric flux) of phase \( p \) (\( \text{m/s} \); ft/s)

\( V_{t,\text{adj},\text{clust}} \): settling velocity adjustment for clustered settling

\( V_{t,\text{hind}} \): hindered particle settling velocity (\( \text{m/s} \); ft/s)

\( v \): superficial flow velocity (volumetric flux) of the mixture in the wellbore (\( \text{m/s} \); ft/s)

\( v_{c,\text{homogeneous}} \): velocity at which a flowing proppant slurry in a pipeline becomes homogeneous (\( \text{m/s} \); \( \text{ft/s} \))

\( v_{D} \): critical deposition velocity for proppant settling in the wellbore (\( \text{m/s} \); \( \text{ft/s} \))

\( v_{D,0} \): critical deposition velocity for proppant settling in the wellbore, with dilute proppant concentration (\( \text{m/s} \); \( \text{ft/s} \))

\( v_{a} \): gas volume of adsorption (\( \text{m}^3 \); \( \text{ft}^3 \))

\( v_{a} \): Langmuir volume (\( \text{m}^3 \); \( \text{ft}^3 \))

\( v_{w} \): reference value of wellbore superficial velocity used for calculating proppant holdup as due to inertia as it flow out of the well (\( \text{m/s} \); \( \text{ft/s} \))

\( W \): width for flow (m; ft)

\( W_f \): thickness of filtercake layer on one side of the fracture wall (m; ft)

\( X_{\text{int},w}\) : first order reaction rate constant between water solute 1 and 2 (s; hrs)

\( Z \): exponent used in the Garside and Al-Dibouni (1977) hindered settling correlation

\( z \): depth (m; ft)

\( \xi_{c,p,ij} \): molar fraction of component \( c \) in phase \( p \) for flow from element \( i \) to element \( j \)

\( \alpha \): parameter in the Ellis fluid model
αₐ: shape factor in the dual porosity model (m²; ft²)

αₜ: parameter in the Cannella equation for shear rate during flow through porous media

αₜₚ: exponent for near wellbore complexity

β: Forchheimer coefficient (1/m; 1/ft)

β₁: single phase Forchheimer coefficient for flow through a closed, proppant-filled crack (1/m; 1/ft)

β₁ᵣ: single phase Forchheimer coefficient for flow through a proppant-free crack (1/m; 1/ft)

βᵣ: single phase Forchheimer coefficient for flow of phase p through a proppant-free crack

βᵣᵢ: single phase Forchheimer coefficient for flow of phase p through a closed, proppant-filled crack

γ: shear rate (s⁻¹; s⁻¹)

γ₁: transition shear rate from Newtonian and power law behavior in the modified power law (s⁻¹; s⁻¹)

γ₂: weighting factor indicating the fraction of the roughness dominated part of the fracture that is filled with proppant at closure

γₚ: weighting factor indicating whether the fracture flow is mechanically open or closed

γₚ₂: shear rate of a settling particle (s⁻¹; s⁻¹)

ΔPᵣ: pressure drop across perforations (Pa; psia)

ΔPᵣᵢ: pressure drop between the well and a fracture due to near wellbore complexity (Pa; psia)

Δx: flow distance (m; ft)

ΔΦᵣ: hydraulic potential difference driving flow of phase p (Pa; psi)

θᵣ: proppant angle of repose

θᵣ: wellbore angle from vertical

μ: viscosity (Pa-s; cp)

μ₀: viscosity parameter from the modified power law (Pa-s; cp)

μᵣ₀: adjustment factor used in calculating μ₀ at non-standard conditions

μᵣ₀: apparent viscosity of a flowing non-Newtonian fluid (Pa-s; cp)

μᵣᵢ: viscosity of phase p for flow from element i to element j (Pa-s; cp)

μᵣᵢ: viscosity of phase p in flow through a proppant bed (Pa-s; cp)

μᵣᵢ: viscosity of phase p flowing through a proppant-free fracture (Pa-s; cp)

μᵣᵢ: viscosity of phase p in slurry with entrained proppant (Pa-s; cp)

μᵣᵢ: viscosity adjustment factor for the effect of proppant concentration in a Newtonian fluid

μᵣᵢ: viscosity adjustment factor for the effect of proppant concentration in a power law fluid

ξ: maximum asperity height parameter from the Chen et al. (2015) correlation (m; ft)

ρ̅: average slurry density including all phases and proppant types (kg/m³; lbs/ft³)

ρ₉: fluid density (kg/m³; lbs/ft³)

ρ₉: filtercake density (kg/m³; lbs/ft³)

σ₉₄₉: minimum principal stress (Pa; psia)

ρ₄₉: molar density of phase p for flow from element i to element j (moles/m³; lbmoles/ft³)

ρ₄₉: density of phase p (kg/m³; lbs/ft³)

ρ₄₉: proppant density (kg/m³; lbs/ft³)

ρ₄₉: average proppant density (kg/m³; lbs/ft³)

ρ₄₉: density of phase p in slurry with proppant (kg/m³; lbs/ft³)

σ₉: fracture normal stress (Pa; psia)

σ₉: fracture effective normal stress (Pa; psia)

σ₉: fracture 90% closure stress (Pa; psia)

τ₁: shear stress at the transition from Newtonian to power law behavior (Pa; psia)

Φ: phase hydraulic potential (Pa; psia)

Φᵣᵢ: hydraulic potential of phase p in element i (Pa; psia)

φ: porosity

χ: blocking function used for modeling proppant bridging in the fracture
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