



### **Fundamental Mechanisms for Smart Water in Sandstone and Carbonate**

Tor Austad, Skule Strand and Tina Puntervold Smart Water EOR Group, IPT, UoS / IOR Aqua

Presentation given at Force Seminar, NPD, February 14. 2017.

### What is "Smart Water"?

- <u>"Smart water"</u> can improve/change wetting properties of oil reservoirs and optimize fluid flow/oil recovery in porous medium during production.
- <u>"Smart water"</u> can be made by modifying the ion composition of injected fluid.
  - No expensive chemicals are added.
  - Environmental friendly.
- Wetting condition dictates:
  - Capillary pressure curve; P<sub>c</sub>=f(S<sub>w</sub>)
  - Relative permeability;  $k_{ro}$  and  $k_{rw} = f(S_w)$

### **Different names**

- BP: LoSal <sup>TM</sup>
- Shell: Designed Water <sup>™</sup> (Not allowed)
- Exxon: Advanced Ion Management, AIM<sup>SM</sup>
- Saudi Aramco: "Smart Water"
- Researchers: Ion Tuned Water

### Water flooding

- Water flooding of oil reservoirs has been performed for a century with the purpose of:
  - Pressure support
  - Oil displacement
- Question:
  - Do we know the secret of water flooding of oil reservoirs??
  - If <u>YES</u>, then we must be able to explain why a "Smart Water" sometimes increases oil recovery and sometimes not.
- If we know the chemical mechanism, then the injected water can be optimized for oil recovery.
- Injection of the "Smartest" water should be done as early as possible, preferentially from the production start.

# Smart Water in Sandstone

#### **LS EOR effect in Sandstone**

Low Salinity EOR-effect under forced displacement



#### **General information/knowledge**





### Adsorption onto clay



Initial pH of FW = 6-6.5

### **Suggested mechanisms**

- Wettability modification towards more water-wet condition, generally accepted.
  - Release of clay fines (Tang and Morrow 1999).
  - Multicomponent Ion Exchange (MIE) (Lager et al. 2006).
- Mechanisms not linked to wettability modification
  - Increase in pH lower IFT; type of alkaline flooding (Mcguri et al. 2005).
  - Migration of clay fines in analogy with linked polymer particles, microscopic flow diversion (Skauge et al. 2008)
    - Later Skauge and others observed that this effect was also present at HS conditions
  - Osmotic effects due to salinity gradient in pores (should be observed using model oil and cores without clay)

### Increase in pH important

	NaCl (mole/l)	CaCl <sub>2</sub> .2H <sub>2</sub> O (mole /l)	KCI (mole /l)	MgCl <sub>2</sub> .2H <sub>2</sub> O (mole /l)
Connate Brine	1.54	0.09	0.0	0.0
Low Salinity Brine-1	0.0171	0.0	0.0	0.0
Low Salinity Brine-2	0.0034	0.0046	0.0	0.0
Low Salinity Brine-3	0.0	0.0	0.0171	0.0
Low Salinity Brine-4	0.0034	0.0	0.0	0.0046



### **Suggested mechanism**



Proposed mechanism for low salinity EOR effects. Upper: Desorption of basic material. Lower: Desorption of acidic material. The initial pH at reservoir conditions may be in the range of 5 - 6.5

### **Chemical equations**

- Desorption of cations by LS water (slow)  $- \text{Clay-Ca}^{2+} + \text{H}_2\text{O} = \text{Clay-H}^+ + \text{Ca}^{2+} + \text{OH}^- + \text{heat}$
- Wettability alteration (fast)
  - Basic material
    - Clay-NHR<sub>3</sub><sup>+</sup> + OH<sup>-</sup> = Clay + R<sub>3</sub>N: + H<sub>2</sub>O
- Acidic material (fast)
  - Clay-RCOOH + OH<sup>-</sup> = Clay + RCOO<sup>-</sup> +  $H_2O$

#### Active species versus pH

 The pK<sub>a</sub> values of protonated base and carboxylic acid are quite similar, pK<sub>a</sub>≈ 4.5

 $- BH^+ \leftrightarrow H^+ + B$ 

 $- \text{ RCOOH} \leftrightarrow \text{H}^+ + \text{ RCOO}^-$ 

 The concentration of the active species (BH<sup>+</sup>, and RCOOH) will have a similar variation versus pH.

# **Clay minerals**

- Clays are chemically unique
  - Permanent localised negative charges
  - Act as cation exchangers
    - General order of affinity:

Li<sup>+</sup> < Na<sup>+</sup> < K<sup>+</sup> < Mg<sup>2+</sup> < Ca<sup>2+</sup> << H<sup>+</sup>

 Kaolinite and Illite are regarded as nonswelling clays

#### Adsorption of basic material Quinoline



Burgos et al. *Evir. Eng. Sci.,* **19,** (2002) 59-68.





Swelling (2:1 clay, similar in structure to

Montmorillonite

Nonsweeling(1:1 Clay)

illite/mica)

Kaolinite

15

#### Kaolinite: Adsorption reversibility by pH

Quinoline Samples 1-6: 1000 ppm brine. Samples 7-12: 25000 ppm brine



#### Adsorption of acidic components onto Kaolinite

Adsorption of <u>benzoic acid</u> onto kaolinite at 32 °C from a NaCl brine (Madsen and Lind, 1998)

pH <sub>initial</sub>	Γ <sub>max</sub> μmole/m <sup>2</sup>
5.3	3.7
6.0	1.2
8.1	0.1

Increase in pH increases water wetness for an acidic crude oil.

#### LS water increases oil-wetness



Adsorption of Quinoline vs. pH at ambient temperature for LS (1000 ppm) and HS (25000 ppm) fluids.

Ref. Fogden and Lebedeva, SCA 2011-15 (Colloids and Surfaces A (2012) Adsorption of crude oil onto kaolinite

# It is not a decrease in salinity, which makes the clay more water-wet, but an increase in pH

#### Lower initial pH by CO<sub>2</sub> increses the low salinity effect

Core No.	S <sub>wi</sub> %	T <sub>Aging</sub> ° C	T <sub>Floodin</sub> ° <sup>g</sup> C	Oil	LS brine	Formation Brine
B18	19.7 6	60	40	TOTAL Oil Saturated With CO₂ at 6 Bars	NaCl: 1000 ppm	TOTAL FW 100 000 ppm
B14	19.4	60	40	TOTAL Oil	NaCl:1000 ppm	TOTAL FW 100 000 ppm



 $CO_2 + H_2O \leftrightarrow H_2CO_3 + OH^- \leftrightarrow HCO_3^- + H_2O_{19}$ 

#### **Small LS EOR effects after flooding with SW**

Morrow et al. (2012) SPE 154 209 Torrijos et al. (2015 ) SPE 179625-MS

FW = SW : 35 604 ppm;Ca<sup>2+</sup> 13 mM; LS: 20x diluted SW Oil: AN= 1.46 and BN = 2.49 mgKOH/g  $T_{res}$ = 60 °C

Core plug sample	Kaolinite (Mass %)	Clays & micas (Mass %)	Albite (Mass %)	Microcline (Mass %)	∆ <b>R</b> <sub>t</sub> ** %OOIP	Initial pH	∆pH
Briar Hill	4.5	4.5	0	2.5	3.65	7.0	0
Idaho Gray	6.0	6.9	29	22	3.05	7.3	0.5*
Leopard	2.5	3.7	0,5	1.2	1.05	7.2	0.5*
Cedar Creek	5.0	8.6	7,5	8.0	0.74	6.6	0.5
Boise	5.0	5.7	29	22	1.09	7.2	1*
Sister Gray	7.0	7.6	1.4	7.0	0	8.0	0

Table 3. Detailed mineralogy, tertiary recovery, initial pH and  $\Delta$ pH.

\*\*  $\Delta R_t$ : Amount of oil recovered in the tertiary LS EOR process, (ref: SPE 154209) \* The pH increment was not stable during the LS flooding (decreasing trend).

#### <u>∆pH versus LS EOR effect</u>



Fig. 5. pH screening for an Idaho gray core at 60 °C, flooding sequence SW-LS<sub>d20</sub>-SW.



Fig. 7. pH screening for a Cedar creek core at 60 °C, flooding sequence SW-LS<sub>d20</sub>-SW. LS EOR effect:0.74



Fig. 6. pH screening for a Boise core at 60 °C,

flooding sequence SW-LS<sub>d20</sub>-SW.





### **Effect of FW salinity**



**Fig 8.** Oil recovery for a Cedar creek core at 60 °C, flooding sequence FW-LS-FW. LS EOR effect: **5% of OOIP** 

### **PS!!** Difficult to obtain tertiary LS EOR effects after flooding with SW.

#### Effect of Reservoir Temperature on the Tertiary LS EOR Potential

#### **Relationship: T and** <u>ApH</u>

(Aksulu et al. Energy & Fuel 26 (2012) 3497-3509)

Wettability alteration of clay by LS water:

Clay-Ca<sup>2+</sup> + H<sub>2</sub>O  $\leftrightarrow$  Clay-H<sup>+</sup> + Ca<sup>2+</sup> + OH<sup>-</sup> + heat

- Desorption of active cations from the clay surface is an exothermic process,  $\Delta$ H<0.
  - Divalent cations (Ca<sup>2+</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup>) are strongly hydrated in water, and as the temperature increases the reactivity of these ions increases, and the equilibrium is moved to the left.
    - The change in pH will decrease as the temperature increases.
  - Dissolution of anhydrite,  $CaSO_4(s)$ , will move the equilibrium to the left.

**Gamage, P., Thyne, G.** Systematic investigation of the effect of temperature during aging and low salinity flooding of Berea sandstone and Minn, 16th European Symposium on Improved Oil Recovery, Cambridge, UK, 12-14 April, 2011.

#### **Temperature – pH screening**



#### Desorption of Ca<sup>2+</sup> slow process Adsorption of Ca<sup>2+</sup> fast process

**PS! LS brine only contained NaCl** 

### **Reservoir minerals**

Reservoir minerals minerals that can affect the equilibrium:

Clay-Ca<sup>2+</sup> + H<sub>2</sub>O  $\leftrightarrow$  Clay-H<sup>+</sup> + Ca<sup>2+</sup> + OH<sup>-</sup> + heat

## **Presence of Anhydrite**

- Reservoirs at high T<sub>res</sub> and salinity my contain Anhydrite, CaSO<sub>4</sub>(s)
- Offshore reservoirs at high T<sub>res</sub> and salinity flooded by SW may also contain precipitated Anhydrite, CaSO<sub>4</sub>(s)

#### <u>Yme RC1: pH – HS – LS scan</u>



Brines: HS2: 100 000 ppm (CaCl<sub>2</sub> and NaCl) LS2: 1000 ppm (NaCl)

#### Presence of anhydrite in reservoir core



#### Plagioclase as reactive reservoir mineral

- Anionic poly silicate (Feltspar type), which is charged balanced mainly with Al<sup>3+</sup>, but also with Ca<sup>2+</sup> or Na<sup>+</sup>.
- Albite, NaAlSi<sub>3</sub>O<sub>8</sub>, is a common member of the Plagioclase group. Na<sup>+</sup> can be exchangeable with H<sup>+</sup> which will have impact on the pH of the brine.

#### Chemical equilibrium: Albite as example

(Aksulu et al. *Energy Fuels* **2012**, *26*, 3497-3503).

- Chemical equilibrium:
  - $NaAlSi_3O_8 + H_2O \leftrightarrow HAlSi_3O_8 + Na^+ + OH^-$
- Initial FW conditions
  - Low saline FW (Alkaline solution pH>7)
    - Equilibrium moved to the right
  - High saline FW (May have acidic solution pH<7)</li>
    - Equilibrium moved to the left, i.e. no cation exchange
- Impact on initial wetting conditions and the potential for LS EOR effects
- Hydrolysis of Albite is not very sensitive to temperature (small hydration energy of Na<sup>+</sup>)

### **Outcrop: pH-HS-LS scan**



#### PS!! $\Delta pH$ not sensitive to the temperature due to Eq. (1):

(1) NaAlSi<sub>3</sub>O<sub>8</sub> + H<sub>2</sub>O 
$$\leftrightarrow$$
 HAlSi<sub>3</sub>O<sub>8</sub> + Na<sup>+</sup> + OH<sup>-</sup>  
(2) Clay-Ca<sup>2+</sup> + H<sub>2</sub>O  $\leftrightarrow$  Clay-H<sup>+</sup> + Ca<sup>2+</sup> + OH<sup>-</sup> + heat

## **Snorre field**

(Reinholdtsen, et al. 16th European EOR Symp., Cambridge, UK,12-14 April, 2011.)

- Lab work
  - Negligible tertiary low salinity effects after flooding with SW, on average <2% extra oil.</li>
  - $T_{res}=90 \ ^{\circ}C$
- Single well test by Statoil
  - Confirmed the lab experiments
- Question:
  - Why such a small Low Salinity effect after flooding Snorre cores with SW ?

#### New study at UoS: Lunde formation

	Table	1.	Mineral	composition
--	-------	----	---------	-------------

Core	Quartz [wt%]	Plagioclase	Calcite [wt%]	Kaolinite [wt%]	Illite/mica [wt%]	Chlorite [wt%]
13	28.2	32.1	1.4	2.6	9.3	3.6
14	36.0	35.2	2.4	3.9	7.4	2.9

Table 5. Properties of the oil.

AN	BN	Density (20°C)	Viscosity (30°C)	Viscosity (40°C)
[mgKOH/g oil]	[mgKOH/g oil]	[g/cm <sup>3</sup> ]	[cP]	[cP]
0.07	1.23	0.83653	5.6	4.0

- Salinity of FW: 35 000 ppm
- PS!! The oil was saturated with  $CO_2$  at 6 bar.
- The core was flooded FW diluted 5x and the pH of the effluent stayed above 10.
- Plagioclase/Albite can give initial alkaline solution: pH>7

### Snorre (Lunde) Core 13

#### CO<sub>2</sub> was added



- Low salinity EOR effect of about 3 % of OOIP with SW
- Initially, too water wet , pH>7, for obtaining LS EOR effects

### **Excellent LS EOR conditions**

(Quan et al. IEA EOR Symposium 2012, Regina, Canada)

Minerals: Plagioclase  $\approx$  22%, Total clay  $\approx$  25% (mostly Illite and kaolinite) FW: Ca<sup>2+</sup>: 0.061 mole/l, **Total salinity 57114 ppm** T<sub>res</sub> = 65 °C k = 1-2 mD,  $\Phi$ =0.11


# **Outcrop core containing Albite**

(Torrijos et al. (2015) Paper under review)

Core properties: Total clay: 10 wt%; Albite: 33 wt% Brines: HS 100 000 ppm (Ca<sup>2+</sup> and Na<sup>+</sup>); LS 1000 ppm (NaCl) LS EOR effect: 60 °C 9.1 and 120 °C 8.7 %OOIP pH gradient very similar at 60 and 120 °C



Figure 4. Oil recovery test at 60° C and 120° C



Figure 3. pH Increment during the oil recovery test, flooding sequence Total FW-LS-LS High rate.

# **Response time for the LS EOR effect**

(Torrijos et al. Energy & Fuels (2016) accepted)

- More than 500 papers are published on LS EOR effects in sandstone.
- Field applications: very few, Why ????
- Tertiary LS EOR effect
  - Varying LS EOR effect: usually between 0 10% OOIP
  - Very long response time
    - Many PVs of LS brine must be injected to reach 5-10% extra oil
- Secondary LS EOR effect
  - Usually larger EOR effect
  - Much shorter response time
  - Extensive lab work is needed to verify the effect.

# **Test conditions**

Table 2. Mineralogical properties of the outcrop cores, given as wt %.

Quartz	Albite	Chlorite	Illite	Anatase	Apatite	Calcite	Pyrite
57.0	32.0	1.7	8.2	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.1

Table 3. Crude oil properties.

Crude Oil	AN	BN	Density*	Viscosity*
	(mg KOH/g)	(mg KOH/g)	(g/cm³)	(cP)
Total oil	0.10	1.80	0.846	17.6

HS= FW: 100 000 ppm (CaCl<sub>2</sub> and NaCl) LS: 1000 ppm NaCl Test temperature: 60 °C

# pH scan: FW-LS-FW

TOTAL outcrop B series: Important minerals: Illite clay and Plagioclase/Albite  $Clay-Ca^{2+} + H_2O \iff Clay-H^+ + OH^- + Ca^{2+}$ LS brine:  $NaAlSi_{3}O_{8} + H_{2}O \iff HAlSi_{3}O_{8} + OH^{-} + Na^{+}$ HS brine:  $Clay-H^+ + Ca^{2+} \leftrightarrow Clay-Ca^{2+} + H^+$  $HAISi_{3}O_{8} + Na + \leftrightarrow NaAISi_{3}O_{8} + H^{+}$ 10 LS FW FW 9 8 Hd 7 6 +FW-pH +LS-pH 5

**Fig. 2.** pH scan at 60 °C for core B-21. Flooding sequence: FW-LS-FW. Flooding rate: 4 PV/D

20

24

28

12 16 PV Injected

8

0

4

# **Tertiary LS EOR effect**



**Fig. 1.** Oil recovery test from core B-21 at 60 °C. The core was successively flooded with FW-LS at 4 PV/D, at the end the injection rate was increased to 16 PV/D.

# **Mechanism for oil displacement**



**Fig. 3.** Oil recovery test for core B-24 at 60 °C. The core was successively flooded with FW-LS (2PVs) - FW - LS at 4 PV/D, at the end the injection rate was increased to 16 PV/D.



# **Pore size distribution**



Fig. 6. Pore size distribution of a core from the same block as the tested core material. Data submitted by TOTAL E&P. The core material has heterogeneous pore size distribution, with pores ranging from ~0.01 to 100  $\mu$ m. The majority of the pores is in the range of 10  $\mu$ m.

# **Secondary LS EOR effect**



**Fig. 7.** Oil recovery test from core B-26 at 60 °C by <u>secondary injection of LS</u> brine. a) First restoration (left) b) Second restoration of core B-26 after mild cleaning with LS in secondary mode followed by a LSP flood (right).

The secondary LS EOR effect increased by 10% of OOIP compared to tertiary LS injection.

PS!! Restructuration of residual oil saturation after a secondary LS flood can have great effect on oil displacement using LS polymer or LPS, even when the LS EOR effect is small

# **Modelling**

# Electrostatics and low salinity effect in sandstone reservoirs.

Brady, Morrow, Fogden et al. *Energy & Fuels 2015, pp.* 666-677.

PS! Induced pH gradient was incorporated in the modelling for the first time.

# Smart Water in Carbonate

# **Wetting properties in carbonates**

- Carboxylic acids, R-COOH
  - AN (mgKOH/g)
- Bases (minor importance)
  - BN (mgKOH/g)
- Charge on interfaces
  - Oil-Water
    - R-COO-
  - Water-Rock
    - Potential determining ions
      - Ca<sup>2+</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup>,
      - (SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>, CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2-</sup>, pH)





# **Impact of AN on spontaneous imbibition**

(Standnes and Austad, J. Pet. Sci. Eng. 28 (2000) 111-121)



# Seawater as Smart EOR fluid in carbonates

# **Questions asked**

- Why is injection of seawater such a tremendous success in the fractured Ekofisk field? T<sub>res</sub> = 130 °C
- Can SW act as a wettability modifier in chalk at high temperatures?

### **Model brine composition**

Comp.	Ekofisk	Seawater	
	(mole/l)	(mole/l)	
Na⁺	0.685	0.450	
K⁺	0	0.010	
Mg <sup>2+</sup>	0.025	0.045	
Ca <sup>2+</sup>	0.231	0.013	
Cl-	1.197	0.528	
HCO <sub>3</sub> - SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	0	0.002	
<b>SO</b> <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	0	0.024	

# **Potential determining ions**

(Zhang and Austad, Coll. and Surf. A 279 (2006) 179-187)



- Fig.2 Zeta potential measurements on an aqueous chalk suspension system by adding  $SO_4^{2-}$  or  $Ca^{2+}$ (pH = 8.4). Initially 4wt% milled chalk powders were mixed with brine ZP.
- **Fig.3** Zeta potential measurements on a aqueous chalk suspension system (pH=8.4) by varying  $[SO_4^{2-}]$  (keeping  $[Ca^{2+}]=0.013$ mole/l) or varying  $[Ca^{2+}]$  (keeping  $[SO_4^{2-}]=0.012$ mole/l). Initially 4wt% milled chalk powders were mixed with brine ZP at room temperature.

### **Effect of Sulfate in SW**

- •Crude oil: AN=2.0 mgKOH/g
- •Initial brine: EF-water
- •Imbibing fluid: Modified SW (SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>: 0-4x SW conc.)
- •Spontaneous imbibition at 100 °C



# Effect of Ca<sup>2+</sup> in SW

Crude oil: AN=0.55 mgKOH/g

- Imbibing fluid: Modified SW
- T = 70 °C



#### **Co-Adsorption of SO**<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup> and Ca<sup>2+</sup> vs. Temperature



#### **Method:**

- Core saturated with SW without SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>
- 2. Core flooded with SW spiked with SCN<sup>-</sup> (Chromatographic separation of SCN<sup>-</sup> and  $SO_4^{2-}$ )

# Affinities of Ca<sup>2+</sup> and Mg<sup>2+</sup> towards the chalk surface

NaCI-brine; [SCN<sup>-</sup>] = [Ca<sup>2+</sup>] = [Mg<sup>2+</sup>]= 0.013 mole/l



 $CaCO_{3}(s) + Mg^{2+} = MgCO_{3}(s) + Ca^{2+}_{56}$ 

#### Effects of potential determining ions and temperature on spontaneous imbibition

#### Zhang et al. Colloids and Surfaces A: 301 (2007) 199-208)



### **Suggested wettability mechanism**

Zhang et al. Colloids and Surfaces A: 301 (2007) 199-208)



# Can SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup> compensate for low T<sub>res</sub>? (Zhang and Austad Colloids and Surfaces A: 279 (2006) 179-187)



Maximum oil recovery from chalk cores when different imbibing fluids were used (SW with varying  $SO_4^{2-}$  conc.). Oil: AN=2.07 mgKOH/g).

# **lon composition of brines**

#### Molar compositions (mole/l) of PW/SSW-mixtures for Ekofisk

	SSW	PW*	FW*
HCO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	0.002	0.008	0.004
Cľ	0.525	0.765	1.423
<b>SO</b> <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	0.024	0.007	0.000
$Mg^{2+}$	0.045	0.021	0.022
Ca <sup>2+</sup>	0.013	0.049	0.100
Na <sup>+</sup>	0.450	0.635	1.156
<b>K</b> <sup>+</sup>	0.010	0.007	0.007
Ba <sup>2+</sup>	0.0E+00	8.2E-06	0.002
Sr <sup>2+</sup>	0.0E+00	2.2E-03	0.009
Li <sup>+</sup>	0.0E+00	9.8E-04	0.000
Ionic strength	0.657	1.150	1.559
TDS (g/l)	33.39	45.81	83.09

\* Data received from ConocoPhillips, Norway.

## **Ion composition in PW from Ekofisk**

PW contained 73.6 vol% SW and 26.4 vol%FW

T<sub>res</sub>=130 °C



# **Question**

# Can SW be improved as a wettability modifier?

### "Modified SW" as EOR-fluid

Fathi et al. Energy & Fuels: 24 (2010) 2514-2519; 25 (2011) 5173-5179)

Spontaneous imbibition: T<sub>res</sub>=90 °C; Crude oil AN=0.5; S<sub>wi</sub>=10%



- Formation water: VBSeawater: SWSeawater depleted in NaCI
- •Seawater depleted in NaCl and spiked with 4x sulfate

### **Chromatographic wettability test**



Chromatographic wettability analysis after spontaneous imbibition at 90°C by using formation brine, the cores was saturated with Oil–B with acid number of 0.5 mgKOH/g.

### **Relationship: Wettability-Oil recovery**



Relationship between oil recovery and water–wet fraction of the rock surface <u>after spontaneous imbibition</u> with VB, SW, SW0NaCl, and SW0NaCl– $4SO_4^{2-}$  at 90 °C.

# "Smart Seawater" in Chalk



# EOR-potential by "Smart Seawater" (depleted in NaCl) in Ekofisk may increase recovery by 10 % of OOIP.

### **Effect of Salinity and Ion concentration**



The access of potential determining ions to the calcite surface is affected by the concentration of non active ions in the double layer

# Effects of NaCl and SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>

(Puntervold et al. JPSE: 133 (2015) 440-443)



### Forced displacement from reservoir limestone core



Fig. 5. Oil recovery by forced displacement from the composite core, Core 2 and Core 3. Successive injection of FW-0S, SW and SW-0NaCl.  $T_{test}$ : 100°C; Injection rate: 0.01 ml/min ( $\approx 0.6$  PV/D).

# **North Sea Chalk Fields**

- Suggestions
  - Upper Ekofisk most oil-wet.(130 °C, not flooded ??)
    - Injection of SW depleted in NaCl could increase recovery in the range of 10% of OOIP compared to SW.
  - Valhall (90 °C)
    - Injection of SW depleted in NaCl and spiked by SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup> can increase the recovery significantly compared to SW (20% of OOIP).
  - Involve service companies to make modified SW cheaply by membrane technology.

# Is dissolution of chalk a mechanism for wettabilit alteration???

Hiorth, A.; Cathles, L. M.; Kolnes, J.; Vikane, O.; Lohne, A.; Madland, M. V. *A chemical model for the seawater-CO<sub>2</sub>-carbonate system - Aqueous and surface chemistry*, Paper SCA2008-18 presented at the International Symposium of the Society of Core Analysts, Abu Dhabi, U. A. E., 29 Oct - 2 Nov, 2008.

Austad, T.; Strand, S.; Puntervold, T. *Is wettability alteration of carbonates by seawater caused by rock dissolution?*, Poster SCA2009-43 presented at the International Symposium of the Society of Core Analysts, Noordwijk, The Netherlands, 27-30 September, 2009.

Mahani, H.; Keya, A. L.; Berg, S.; Bartels, W.-B.; Nasralla, R.; Rossen, W. *Driving Mechanism of Low Salinity Flooding in Carbonate Rocks*, Paper SPE 174300 presented at EUROPEC 2015, Madrid, Spain, 1-4 June, 2015. 10.2118/174300-MS.

# Low salinity EOR-effects in carbonates: What is the condition?
### Low salinity EOR-effects in carbonates



SPE 137634 Ali A. Yousef et al. (Saudi Aramco)

# **Presence of CaSO**<sub>4</sub>



Concentration profiles of Ca<sup>2+</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup>, and SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup> when flooding reservoir limestone core with DI water, after aging with FW.  $T_{test}$ : 100°C, Injection rate: 0.1 ml/min.

# Codition for observing low salinity EOR-

#### effects in carbonates

Austad et al. Energy & Fuels 26 (2012) 569-575)

- The carbonate rock must contain anhydrite, CaSO<sub>4</sub>(s)
- Chemical equilibrium:  $CaSO_4(s) \leftrightarrow Ca^{2+}(aq) + SO_4^{2-}(aq) \mapsto Ca^{2+}(ad) + SO_4^{2-}(ad)$
- The concentration of  $SO_4^{2-}(aq)$  depends on:
  - Temperature: Decreases as T increases
  - Brine salinity/composition: Decreases as Ca<sup>2+</sup> concentration increases
- Wettability alteration process:
  - Temperature: (increases as T increases)
  - Salinity: (increases as NaCl conc. decreases)
- Is it an optimal temperature window?
  - 90-110 °C ?

# FW: Low salinity EOR-effect

(Austad et al.: Energy & Fuels 2015)



Oil recovery by forced displacement from a reservoir limestone core containing anhydrite. Successive injection of FW, and 100× diluted FW.  $T_{test}$ : 100°C. Injection rate: 0.01 ml/min (≈1 PV/D).

Simulated dissolution of  $CaSO_4(s)$  when exposed to FW-0S, 10× and 100× diluted FW at different temperatures.

## **SW: Low salinity EOR in Carbonates**





## **Diluted FW and SW as EOR fluid**

**Table 5** The relationship between extra oil recovery and effluent concentration of sulfate and NaCl under tertiary water flood using 100x dil. FW-0S, SW, 10x and 30x diluted SW, after the core was first flooded with FW-0S. T=100 °C.

	FW-0S	100× dil. FW-0S	SW	10× dil. SW	30× dil. SW
Extra oil (%	-	22	5	5	18
of OOIP)					
Sulfate (mM)	2.8	5.3	10	7.5	4
NaCl (mM)	2580	25.8	796	79.6	26.6
Salinity (ppm)	213000	2130	57760	5776	1925

#### **Anhydrite: Impact on Initial wetting condition**

Farzad et al. *Energy & Fuel* 25 (2011) 3021-3028

#### $CaSO_4(s) \leftrightarrow Ca^{2+} + SO_4^{2-}(aq) \leftrightarrow CaCO_3(s) - SO_4^{2}(ad)$

**Table 2.** Equilibrium between  $SO_4^{2-}(aq)$  and  $SO_4^{2-}(ad)$  at different temperatures, when VB-2 (2 mM  $SO_4^{2-}$ )was used as formation water

Temp.	<b>SO</b> <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> (aq)	<b>SO</b> <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> (ad)	$SO_4^{2-}(aq)+SO_4^{2-}(ad)$	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> (aq)/ SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> (ad)
°C	mg	mg	mg	
20	1.6	3.0	4.6	0.69
50	1.4	3.1	4.5	0.53
90	0.36	3.4	4.0	0.26
130	0.03	2.8	2.9	0.10

## Quantification of $SO_4^{2-}(aq)$ and $SO_4^{2-}(ad)$



and sulfate adsorbed onto the rock at different temperature. The cores was saturated and aged at elevated temperatures in VB-2 and then flooded at the same temperature with DI water. Injection rate: 0.2 ml/min.



Fig. 13. Relative amount of sulfate dissolved in the pore water and sulfate adsorbed onto the rock at 130 °C and room temperature using 10 times diluted VB-2. The core was flooded with DI water. After switching to room temperature, the core was aged for 3 days prior to further flooding with DI water. Injection rate: 0.2 ml/min.

#### Anhydrite: Impact in Initial wetting and oil recovery



VB-1=VB-2: 2 mM SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup> VB-3 : 17 mM SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>

## **Recent work**

- Patrick et al. (*J. Pet. Sci. Eng. 2012*)
  - Modelling showed that SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup> protected actitve Ca<sup>2+</sup>-sites on carbonate from beeing adsorbed by carboxylic material.
- Zeng et al. (Enery & Fuels 2012)
  - Experimental verification that SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup> decreased adsorption of carboxylic acids onto calcium carbonates.
- ShamsiJazeyi et al. Colloids and Surfaces A. (2014 ??)
  - Used polyacrylate as sacrificial agent to lower adsorption of anionic surfactant.
  - Functioned badly when anhydrite was present
  - Sulfate prevented adsorption of polyacrylate onto the rock

# <u>Modelling of oil recovery by</u> <u>wettabily alteration</u>

- The Univ. of Texas at Austin.
  - Al-Shalabi, Sepehrnoori, Pope, Mohanty, J. Pet. Sci. Eng. (2014?)
  - Termed their model: LSWI Fundamental Model for Carbonates
    - Modelled data from Yousif and Mohanty successfully
  - The model incorporates wettability alteration effect through contact angle and trapping parameter, which are supposed to be dictated only by salinity.
  - Thus, changes in parameters like  $P_c$ ,  $k_{ro}$ ,  $k_{rw}$ , are linked to salinity gradients only.
- This <u>is not</u> a fundamental understanding of the mechanism. The model must contain:
  - Interaction between carboxylic material and the rock surface
  - Impact of specific ions, Ca<sup>2+</sup>, SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup>
  - Impact of temperature
  - Dissolution of Anhydrite, CaSO<sub>4</sub>.

# <u>Modelling of oil recovery by</u> <u>wettabily alteration</u>

- Pennsylvania State Univ.
  - Qiao, Li, Johns, Xu, SPE 170966 (2014)
- Some comments
  - The model was based on our understanding of the chemical mechanism.
  - The use of advanced geochemical models is not the best tool for modelling EOR effects by wettability modification.
  - Salinity should not be a single factor for the efficiency of chemically tuned water.
- Recent work: SPE-175018-MS
  - Modelling LS EOR effects; Dissolution of Anhydrite, CaSO<sub>4</sub>.

# **Conceptual model used**



Slide 5

# **Chemical equilibria used**

Slide 6

#### Methodology: Representative Reactions

Number	Reactions	*log <i>K<sub>eq</sub></i>				
Oil-water interface reactions						
1	$-COOH \leftrightarrow -COO^- + H^+$	-3.98				
2	$-COOH + Ca^{2+} \leftrightarrow -COOCa^{+} + H^{+}$	-2.20				
3	$-COOH + Mg^{2+} \leftrightarrow -COOMg^{+} + H^{+}$	-3.30				
Solid-water interface reactions						
4	$> CaOH + H^+ \leftrightarrow > CaOH_2^+$	9.81				
5	$> CaOH_2^+ + SO_4^{2-} \leftrightarrow > CaSO_4^- + H_2O$	3.30				
6	$> CaOH_2^+(-COO^-) \leftrightarrow > CaOH_2^+ + -COO^-$	-5.40				
Aqueous phase reactions						
7	$H_20 \leftrightarrow H^+ + 0H^-$	-12.25				
8	$HCO_3^- \leftrightarrow H^+ + CO_3^{2-}$	-10.08				
9	$H_2CO_3 \leftrightarrow H^+ + HCO_3^-$	-6.39				

#### K<sub>6</sub> is adjusted to match the base case.

Society of Petroleum Engineers Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition

170968 · A Mechanistic Model for Wettability Alteration · Changhe Qiao

# **Dolomite**

- Does Dolomite respond like calcite towards Smart Water ?
- The affinity between R-COO<sup>-</sup> and Ca<sup>2+</sup> and Mg<sup>2+</sup> is a factor of 10 in favour of Ca<sup>2+</sup>

## **Dolomite outcrop: Affinity of Sulfate**



**Fig. 7.** Surface reactivity test on outcrop dolomite rock. The core SIL#7 was equilibrated with SW0T prior to SW½T injection at a rate of 0.1ml/min. The affinity of  $SO_4^{2-}$  towards rock surface was chromatically verified at 20 and 130 °C.

# **Oil recovery by SI**



**Fig. 9.** Oil recovery from dolomite cores SIL#6 and SIL#9 by using FW,  $S_{wi}$ =0.15; salinity 222 000 ppm, as formation water. Oil 3 with AN=0.52 mgKOH/g was used. The cores were spontaneous imbibed at 70°C, with FW, SW and  $d_{10}$ SW.

# **Review papers available**

#### Water based EOR from Clastic Oil Reservoirs by Wettability Alteration: A Review of Chemical Aspects. JPSE 2016, Tina Puntervold, Skule Strand, Tor Austad

# **"Smart Water" EOR Effects in Carbonates: A Chemical Review of Wetting Properties and Oil Recovery.**

To be submitted to JPSE, Tina Puntervold, Skule Strand, Tor Austad

Request of pdf files to : tina.puntervold@uis.no skule.strand@uis.no

## **Acknowledgement**

Statoil, ConPhil, NFR Total, Talisman, BP, Maersk, Shell, Saudi Aramco, **DNO** International.





#### **Smart Water EOR**

Smart Water injection could improve oil recoveries by 10 - 50 % and significant reduce reservoir and production scale

#### In Carbonate:



#### In Sandstone:



#### IOR Aqua AS in collaboration with University of Stavanger, Norway, offers:

- Screening of Smart
  Water EOR potential in
  Sandstone or Carbonate
  reservoirs
  - Desk evaluation of Smart Water EOR potential
  - Core screening tests evaluating Smart
     Water EOR potential
  - Oil Recovery tests evaluating Smart Water EOR potential
  - Optimization of injection water composition



For further information:

- Skule Strand, <u>skule.strand@uis.no</u>, +4790721585
- Tor Austad, <u>toraustad44@gmail.com</u>, +4791348510
- Tina Puntervold, <u>tina.puntervold@uis.no</u>, +**Pf99%12%52**
- «Prisverdig krittgjennombrudd» -Morten Lerbrekk Morten Lerbrekk Morten Lerbrekk@tyrfing.no, +4795052663 journal, nr. 2, 2011
- Strand, S., Puntervold, T. and Austad, T. 2016. Water based EOR from clastic oil reservoirs by wettability alteration: a chemical evaluation. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering* (accepted).
- RezaeiDoust, A., Puntervold, T. and Austad, T. 2011. Chemical verification of the EOR mechanism by using low saline/smart water in sandstone. *Energy* & *Fuels* **25**: 2151-2162.
- Puntervold, T., Strand, S., Ellouz, R. and Austad, T. 2015. Modified seawater as a smart EOR fluid in chalk. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering* **133**: 440-443.

## **BP: Endicott field test SPE 129692**

## Background data

- Clay content ranged from a few to 20 wt%
- Kaolinite dominated followed by Illite
- Average permeability: 1400 mD
- Average porosity: 22%
- Initial oil saturation: 95%
- Injection of HS brine:  $S_{or}$ =41%
- Tertiary LS brine injection:  $S_{or}$ =27%
- Increased LS EOR displacement efficiency: 26%

## **Endicott two well field test observations**

- LS EOR effect: 10% of total PV in swept area
- Produced water observations:
  - Increase in alkalinity, i. e.  $HCO_3^-$ 
    - $CO_2(g) + H_2O \leftrightarrow [H_2CO_3] \leftrightarrow H^+ + HCO_3^-$
    - $H^+ + OH^- = H_2O$
  - Decrease in  $H_2S(g)$ 
    - $H_2S + OH^- \leftrightarrow H_2O + HS^-$
  - Increase in Fe<sup>2+</sup>
    - $FeS(s) + OH^{-} \leftrightarrow [FeOH]^{+} + S^{2-}$   $K_1 = 10^{5.7}$
  - Decrease and increase in Mg<sup>2+</sup>

# Solubility of Mg(OH)<sub>2</sub> vs. pH



Fig. 11. Schematically change in  $Mg^{2+}$  concentration in the produced water during a low salinity flood. The concentration of  $Mg^{2+}$  is suggested to be quite similar for the initial FW and low saline brine.



Modeling solubility of  $Mg(OH)_2$  and  $Ca(OH)_2$  versus pH at 50 and 100 °C in a 50 000 ppm NaCl brine and 6 bars.

# Mg²+: 10-3 M, 100 °C:At pH< 8:</td>No precipitation of Mg(OH)2At pH >8:Precipitation:Mg²+ + 2OH- = Mg(OH)2(s)HS brine:Clay-H+ + Ca²+ = Clay -Ca²+ + H+Mg(OH)2 + 2H+ = Mg²+ + 2 H2O

# **BP: Clare Ridge LS EOR prospect**

Upstream Technology, Q1 2013

- Investments: \$ 7.3 billions
- On steam 2016, oil production up to 120 000 bbl/D at peak
- Reversed osmosis desalt capacity: 45 000 bbl/D
- Estimated oil recovery
  - Flooding with SW: 640 millon bbl
  - Additional 42 million bbl by LS EOR, i. e. 6.6% extra oil.
  - Cost: \$ 3 per bbl of extra oil compared to about 20 for other EOR techniques.