Gas and Brine Measurements of Shale Fracture Conductivity: What Is Being Compared?

Dmitriy Alekseyev

Abstract. A gas measurement before aqueous exposure and a gas measurement after brine flow do not describe the same material history. A direct comparison of gas and brine conductivity can additionally be affected by compressibility, saturation, and the flow regime. This note separates measurement fluid from exposure fluid and proposes a controlled comparison sequence. An ideal-gas calculation illustrates a common flow-conversion issue. The objective is to make phase-specific results interpretable without treating every difference as irreversible shale damage.

1. Separate the probe from the treatment

A measurement fluid is used to infer conductivity; an exposure fluid can change the specimen before or during that inference. The two roles may coincide but should be recorded separately. Shale testing procedures explicitly address gas and liquid measurements [9]. Propped-fracture water-damage work examines conductivity after fluid exposure [7]. A reported "nitrogen conductivity" is consequently incomplete without the preceding treatment history.

Kakkar's stress-loading summary concerns nitrogen-flow measurements on preserved shale [3]. Wu and coauthors used nitrogen or brine while investigating fluid sensitivity [8], and the related 2019 study reports substantial aqueous-exposure effects [5]. These records motivate distinguishing the phase used to observe a response from the fluid history responsible for changing the material.

2. Use a flow equation consistent with the phase

For incompressible laminar flow through a uniform equivalent path, Q = C B Delta_p/(mu L), where B is lateral breadth, L is length, and mu is viscosity. The parallel-plate relation provides one geometric special case [6], while rough-fracture theory describes limits of that idealization [12]. Steady gas flow needs a compressible formulation, or an equivalent carefully defined conversion, because volumetric rate changes with pressure.

For an isothermal ideal gas with constant viscosity and conductivity, define q_{ref} at absolute pressure p_{ref} and the same temperature. Integration gives C = 2 mu L p_{ref} q_{ref} / [B (p_{in}^2 - p_{out}^2)]. All pressures must be absolute. This expression assumes no slip, negligible inertial effects, no leakage, and a pressure-independent equivalent geometry along the measured interval. Real-gas or variable-property conditions require an appropriate extension.

Table 1. Proposed labels for a phase-and-history comparison.

Measurement	Prior exposure	Interpretation
Initial nitrogen	Documented preserved state	Gas-probed baseline
Brine during exposure	Specified brine and elapsed time	Combined phase and evolving-state response
Nitrogen after brine	Specified drainage or conditioning	Post-exposure gas response
Repeat reference phase	Time-matched control	Checks drift and repeatability

3. A compressibility bookkeeping example

Take an idealized gas test with p_{in} = 200 kPa, p_{out} = 100 kPa, and q_{ref} defined at p_{ref} = 100 kPa, all absolute and isothermal. Since the mean pressure is 150 kPa, the corresponding volumetric rate at mean pressure is q_{ref} times 100/150. Inserting the unconverted reference rate into an incompressible formula would overestimate conductivity by 50%. This is a synthetic unit-conversion example, not a shale-specific correction factor.

The correction does not address residual water, capillary effects, gas slip, or inertia. Examine rate dependence using more than one flow setting, within a range that does not alter the fracture. If apparent conductivity changes with rate, investigate the assumed flow model before assigning the trend to rock damage. State the reference temperature, pressure, and gas-property convention so another analyst can reconstruct the calculation.

4. Design a comparison that can separate explanations

Maintain the same effective loading schedule and record pressure at both ends. Use preservation controls [14] and a documented shale-fluid screening procedure [4]. Earlier water-based-fluid experiments provide relevant exposure context [2], while longer-duration coupled tests motivate reporting contact time and temperature [10]. For propped paths, record support loading because embedment can contribute to an irreversible change [1].

Use independent neighboring specimens where sequential exposure would irreversibly change the comparison. Barnett tests provide examples of contrasting fracture configurations [13]. The proposed control sequence should include a time-matched repeat in the original phase, a specified aqueous exposure, and a post-exposure measurement under documented conditioning. Broad gas-water modeling data help identify additional phase-related parameters that laboratory reporting should preserve [11].

Do not describe drying-induced recovery as the recovery expected during production unless the field process actually produces an equivalent state. Likewise, lower brine conductance cannot automatically be labeled damage without accounting for viscosity and phase occupancy. Separate the measured observation from the mechanism inferred to explain it.

5. Conclusion

A defensible gas-brine comparison states the probe fluid, previous exposure, saturation or conditioning, pressure convention, and governing flow equation. Once those conditions are controlled, persistent differences can be investigated as material or geometric changes. Until then, "gas versus brine conductivity" combines several questions. The proposed sequence and calculation help disentangle them without claiming a universal conversion between phase-specific measurements.

References

Numbered references correspond to the citations in the text. Links lead to DOI records or the identified source record.

[1] Zhang, J.; Ouyang, L.; Zhu, D.; Hill, A. D. (2015). Experimental and numerical studies of reduced fracture conductivity due to proppant embedment in the shale reservoir. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering, 130, 37-45*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.petrol.2015.04.004

[2] Pedlow, J. W.; Sharma, M. M. (2014). Changes in shale fracture conductivity due to interactions with water-based fluids. *SPE Hydraulic Fracturing Technology Conference, SPE-168586-MS*. https://doi.org/10.2118/168586-MS

[3] Kakkar, P. (2016). Experimental study of the effect of stress and fluid sensitivity on propped and un-propped fracture conductivity in preserved reservoir shale. *Thesis, The University of Texas at Austin*. https://www.pge.utexas.edu/pge-research/2016/

[4] Zhou, J.; Jung, C. M.; Pedlow, J. W.; Chenevert, M. E.; Sharma, M. M. (2013). A new standardized laboratory protocol to study the interaction of organic-rich shales with drilling and fracturing fluids. *SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, SPE-166216-MS*. https://doi.org/10.2118/166216-MS

[5] Wu, W.; Zhou, J.; Kakkar, P.; Russell, R.; Sharma, M. M. (2019). An experimental study on conductivity of unpropped fractures in preserved shales. *SPE Production & Operations, 34(2), 280-296*. https://doi.org/10.2118/184858-PA

[6] Witherspoon, P. A.; Wang, J. S. Y.; Iwai, K.; Gale, J. E. (1980). Validity of cubic law for fluid flow in a deformable rock fracture. *Water Resources Research, 16(6), 1016-1024*. https://doi.org/10.1029/WR016i006p01016

[7] Zhang, J.; Zhu, D.; Hill, A. D. (2016). Water-induced damage to propped-fracture conductivity in shale formations. *SPE Production & Operations, 31(2), 147-156*. https://doi.org/10.2118/173346-PA

[8] Wu, W.; Kakkar, P.; Zhou, J.; Russell, R.; Sharma, M. M. (2017). An experimental investigation of the conductivity of unpropped fractures in shales. *SPE Hydraulic Fracturing Technology Conference and Exhibition, SPE-184858-MS*. https://doi.org/10.2118/184858-MS

[9] Zhang, J.; Kamenov, A.; Zhu, D.; Hill, A. D. (2015). Development of new testing procedures to measure propped fracture conductivity considering water damage in clay-rich shale reservoirs: An example of the Barnett Shale. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering, 135, 352-359*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.petrol.2015.09.025

[10] Song, J.; Xiang, D.; Zhao, S.; Hu, D.; Zhou, H.; Zhang, G. (2021). Shale softening degree and rate induced by fracturing fluid under THMC coupling condition. *Journal of Natural Gas Science and Engineering, 96, 104294*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jngse.2021.104294

[11] Edwards, R. W. J.; Celia, M. A. (2018). Shale gas well, hydraulic fracturing, and formation data to support modeling of gas and water flow in shale formations. *Water Resources Research, 54(4), 3196-3206*. https://doi.org/10.1002/2017WR022130

[12] Zimmerman, R. W.; Bodvarsson, G. S. (1996). Hydraulic conductivity of rock fractures. *Transport in Porous Media, 23, 1-30*. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00145263

[13] Zhang, J.; Kamenov, A.; Zhu, D.; Hill, A. D. (2014). Laboratory measurement of hydraulic-fracture conductivities in the Barnett Shale. *SPE Production & Operations, 29(3), 216-227*. https://doi.org/10.2118/163839-PA

[14] Jung, C. M.; Zhou, J.; Chenevert, M. E.; Sharma, M. M. (2013). The impact of shale preservation on the petrophysical properties of organic-rich shales. *SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, SPE-166419-MS*. https://doi.org/10.2118/166419-MS