

Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

# Final Report – March 2018

Thermal Shock Technology E16PC00010 BSEE March 15 2018

**Document Revision History** 

Revision No.	Revision Date	Revision Description	Prepared By	Approved By
Α	Jan 12 2018	Issued for BSEE comment	NTP	AEG
В	Mar 15 2018	BSEE Comments Addressed	NTP	AEG

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 1 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE

Project: Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Table c	of Contents	2
Abbrev	iations and Nomenclature	4
1 EX		5
1.1	Overall Project Summary:	5
2 IN	TRODUCTION AND PROJECT OBJECTIVES	8
3 FC	DRMATION OF INDUSTRY ADVISORY GROUP	10
3.1	Industry Advisory Group - Feedback	12
4 LIT	TERATURE REVIEW	14
4.1	Literature Review Of Thermal Shock Of Well Barriers	14
4.2	Literature Review Of Computer Models Investigating Thermal Shock	16
4.3	Literature Review Of Failure and Risk Assessments Of Thermal Shock	19
5 DE	TERMINE THERMAL SHOCK AND WELL LOAD HISTOGRAMS	20
5.1	Objectives	20
5.2	Obtain Wellbore Schematics for OCS Wells	
5.3	Categorize OCS Wells	23
5.4	Develop Temperature Profiles and Load History for Wells	23
5.5	WellCAT Analysis	25
5.6	ABAQUS FEA	28
5.7	Task Findings	29
6 WI	ELL AND BARRIER RESPONSE	30
6.1	Summary	30
6.2	FEA Global Response Modelling And Tie In Known FEA Model Data	31
6.3	Local FEA Modelling and Tie in known Data	78
6.4	Conclusions	83
7 La	boratory scale testing	85
7.1	Physical Property Testing	85
7.2	FEA Modelling	89
7.3	Small Scale Lab Tests	100
7.4	Large Scale Lab Tests	106
7.5	Large Scale Thermal Shock Testing - Conclusions	109

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 2 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

8 propose mitigation techniques	
8.1 Cement barrier failure modes	
8.2 Mechanical barrier failure modes	111
9 guidelines and barrier risk ranking	
10 Academic Scrutiny	
11 REFERENCES	
Appendix A – Cement Material Characteristics	
APPENDIX B – task 2 definition	

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 3 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

#### **Abbreviations and Nomenclature**

API	American Petroleum Institute		
BOP	Blow Out Preventer		
BSEE	Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement		
CFD	Computational Fluid Dynamics		
СОР	ConocoPhillips		
FEA	Finite Element Analysis		
GOM	Gulf of Mexico		
HSE	Health, Safety and Environment		
HPHT	High Temperature High Pressure		
OCS	Outer Continental Shelf		
UH	University of Houston		
WWC	Wild Well Control, Inc.		
LT	Lower Tertiary		
UTA	University of Texas at Austin		
SCP	Sustained Casing Pressure		
MD	Measured Depth		
TVD	True Vertical Depth		
k	Thermal conductivity		

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 4 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:Final ReportClient:BSEEProject:Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

#### I EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Historically, the concern of thermal stresses induced in a well by completion and production operations was not considered early in the developing petroleum industry. Wells were completed and assumed to remain functional and intact for the producing lifetime. As well integrity problems appeared, they were fixed, but a holistic evaluation of thermal stresses induced on a well by completion, production, and intervention operations was not routinely considered. Considering the comparatively low thermal and mechanical gradients imposed on early wells, this is not surprising. In the second half of last century, well depths increased along with temperatures and pressures. Along with this development, awareness of safety hazards and desire to establish best practices, guidelines and regulations governing well construction and operation was emerging.

The advent of geothermal wells, HPHT wells and thermal stimulation of viscous hydrocarbons greatly increased awareness of thermal induced hazards. Instances of casing buckling or wellheads growing out of the ground emphasized the potential of thermal effects. Additionally, conventional wells were drilled deeper, hydraulic fracturing treatments were larger in volume, and workover operations became more frequent. All these factors increased the effect of temperature changes in the well.

It is proposed that the occurrence of a thermal shock may be defined as a magnitude of temperature change over the time at which it changes. Therefore thermal shock may or may not occur depending on various conditions in the wellbore.

The intent of this project is to investigate whether or not thermal shock has been adequately considered in the design and operation of OCS wells and to establish whether or not whether there are any gaps in knowledge. This final report covers the completion of the Thermal Shock Technology E16PC00010. The summary of findings is shown below.

#### I.I Overall Project Summary:

The summary of findings of the overall project goals and objectives are summarized with the initial objective to investigate whether or not thermal shock has been adequately considered in the design and operation of OCS wells and to establish whether or not whether there are any gaps in knowledge:

# 1 Identify source and magnitudes of thermal gradients produced during OCS well drilling, completion and production.

• Stimulating a well results in significantly higher thermal gradients in the well than drilling, completion and production. Stimulation also causes more damage to the cement than a normal production/shut-in cycle and that damage can extend a significant distance up the well bore.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 5 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

- 2 Develop an acceptable definition of thermal shock and identify operating conditions that could result in a thermal shock.
  - Wells with a bottom hole temperature of 350°F or above combined with a minimum ambient temperature as low as 40°F.
  - Thermal shock could be initiated by shutting in a producing well and allowing it to cool to ambient or by stimulating a well. The thermal shocks are more severe during stimulation and damage is mainly caused by the cyclical nature of the load.
  - Thermal shock depends primarily on the temperature range of that shock but also the rate at which temperature changes. The rate of cooling of the well depend on the operations considered, e.g. natural cooling post shut-in or cooling during well stimulation for example.

### 3 Evaluate thermal shock damage potential to well bore components and barriers.

• Thermal shock can potentially cause damage to various well bore components. The consideration of thermal effects is much better understood with regards to tubulars and is typically accounted for in well design software such as WellCAT and StressCheck. These are programs that are used for the design of the casing and tubing used within a well. The damage potential to settable barriers such as cement carries a greater uncertainty due to the inherent material characteristics of cement. The severity of this damage to cement is highly dependent on factors such as cement composition used, quality of the cement itself and placement of cement. It should be noted that damage does not necessarily result in an actual loss of barrier/zonal isolation

# 4 Assess applicability of previously-reported computer simulation or failure analyses to address thermal shock risks.

• The reports recognizes that well design software WellCAT is widely used within the industry in the design of the components of a wellbore. It is noted that WellCAT is well suited for the determining the thermal loads on the various components as this is one of its main functions. WellCAT and its module StressCheck are very applicable to designing the tubulars for thermal shock. However, these programs assume competent cement sheaths are in place. It would be prudent to examine the sensitivity of the tubular design to cement barrier breakdown over the course of the well life and revisit the cement design if the results of that sensitivity analysis warrant it.

# 5 Identify ways to mitigate thermal shock effects and ways to avoid the creation of a thermal shock environment.

• While thermal shock environments may not be completely unavoidable due to the inherent nature of oil and gas wells, proper design of tubulars and the tubular connections in accordance to current industry recommended practices will help mitigate against thermal shock. The cement composition,

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 6 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:Final ReportClient:BSEEProject:Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

uniformity of cement mixing and quality of placement of cement is crucial to mitigate the thermal shock effects. The potential for thermal shock damage to cement should be examined across the entire well bore.

# 6 Evaluate thermal shock resistance of various well barriers utilized in the industry, both mechanical and settable fluid.

- Tubulars, when thermal loading is accounted for in the design have very good thermal shock resistance when considering typically used steel grades, etc. In addition there are established guidelines for de-rating steel for various temperature exposures. It was found that the cements used in OCS wells have a range of resistances; some cements performed poorly against thermal shock while some performed very well. Thermal shock resistance is needed throughout the cement barrier system and isn't just an issue at bottom of the well.
- 7 *"Identify gaps in current well design methods contributing to loss of well integrity caused by thermal shock."* 
  - The findings of this project show that the industry has made good strides in ensuring that technology used in the past for shallower Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) wells is suitable for these deeper and hotter wells that will experience thermal shock. However a better understanding of the conditions faced in the deeper and hotter wells and the need to increase the performance of the cement barriers throughout the well is a knowledge gap that exists.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 7 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)

Title:



**Final Report** Client: BSEE

Project: Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

#### 2 INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The background to this project was a request by BSEE for research into the effects of thermal shock on oil wells, specifically in the outer continental shelf (OCS). In its broad agency announcement, [1], BSEE posed a potential problem that required further research as follows:

"If a High Temperature well (greater than 350° F) is shut in, the well may go into thermal shock when the temperature of the well drops to equilibrium."

In an OCS deep water well, equilibrium could be as low as 35° F (i.e. sea water temperature at the sea bed). The temperature of the well fluids could be as high as 350° F. Therefore large temperature gradients and temperature changes can exist during the operation of a well. The magnitude of temperature changes during well operations as well as the rate of change of temperature could be considered a thermal shock.


The aim of this project was to explore whether shut in and other operations could lead to a thermal shock event in an oil and gas well, research the circumstances under which a such events could occur and most importantly quantify whether thermal shock could damage the well barrier systems in place. Well barriers are the means by which the pressurised fluids in the reservoir are controlled to prevent the unintended release of reservoir fluids into the environment.

Figure 1 illustrates a Deepwater HPHT well showing various temperature gradients experienced throughout the life of a well.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 8 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010



#### **Figure I**

#### **Deepwater well gradients**

The geothermal gradient (orange) traces the temperature under static conditions from the surface at 80°F, to the subsea mudline surface at 39°F, to the bottom of the well at 350°F or greater. The production gradient (blue) traces the temperature during production from the bottom of the well at 350°F to the mudline at 321°F, to the surface at 72°F. The stimulation gradient (red) simulates a stimulation operation showing a temperature change from surface at 80°F, mudline at 65°F, bottom of the well at 127°F, followed by perforation at 350°F. These three gradients, while illustrative only, are demonstrations of the various temperature profiles potentially experienced in all wells. This illustration also shows the potential temperature change stat can occur along the entire well bore during different well operations. The rate of temperature change was also thought to be an important in consideration in a thermal shock.

A single definition of thermal shock has not yet been widely adopted across the oil and gas industry. A thermal shock definition must therefore be better defined. Working with the project team and BSEE that definition and quantification was developed within this project.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 9 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)

Title:



**Final Report** Client: BSEE

Project: Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

#### 3 FORMATION OF INDUSTRY ADVISORY GROUP

Several major operators with wells in the Gulf of Mexico were contacted to be members of the industry advisory group (IAG). As expected, there was mixed response for IAG membership, as a significant amount of time and effort is required on a voluntary basis.

The focus for this task was attracting interest from major operators. While it may be beneficial to also gain input from drilling contractors and equipment vendors, it was considered a better strategy to wait until the project had developed specific questions. This approach to seek advice was used rather than adopting a blanket invite approach.

Some operators had indicated a willingness to participate in the project but expressed concern over some of the terminology used in the project description with 'thermal shock' in particular causing some concern, particularly in the context of shut-in. Some operators do not consider a shut-in as an event that will provide a significant thermal shock.

The following operators were willing to participate in the project:

- ConocoPhillips
- Chevron
- Apache

The following shows companies and their respective personnel that represented the IAG for the project.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 10 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

## Project Industry Advisory Group

Company	Job Title
ConocoPhillips	Principal Engineer, Well Integrity
Chevron	Cementing Specialist
Chevron	Cementing Specialist
Apache	Senior staff Technical Advisor – geomechanics and pore pressure
Wild Well Control	Well Operations Manager, Marine
Wild Well Control	VP Advanced Engineering
CSI Technology	Chief Engineer
Wild Well Control	Senior Engineer
University of Texas at Austin	Senior Research Scientist
	ConocoPhillips Chevron Chevron Apache Wild Well Control Wild Well Control CSI Technology Wild Well Control

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 11 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title: **Final Report** Client: BSEE Project:

Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

#### 3.1 **Industry Advisory Group - Feedback**

Feedback on the literature review of current guidelines and proposed thermal shock load histograms respectively was received from Chevron and ConocoPhillips (COP) and was considered in the project:

### **ConocoPhillips:**

The definition of thermal shock was queried by ConocoPhillips; maximum and minimum temperatures at depth are common well design parameters, however rate of change of temperature is not. COP suggested clarifying the definition of thermal shock being used for the project and to provide some plausible examples of how "thermal shock" can be detrimental to the well.

## Chevron:

- Chevron suggested that some of the failure modes such as radial cracking from tensile failure, shear failure, de-bonding, etc. are defined. Also, suggested emphasizing that failure of the cement does not necessarily result in loss of isolation.
- Chevron queried the bottom hole temperature for Lower Tertiary operations in Deepwater suggesting 350°F was on the high side for static temperature, with 250°F being more typical with some starting to approach 300°F. Also reaching 350°F at 25,000 ft as the initial well schematic depicts would be a very high temperature gradient to achieve for Deepwater.
  - WWC increased the true vertical depth (TVD) of the wells to reflect Chevron's input.
- Chevron also suggested that surface pipes be cemented to mudline, as per CFR 250.421 ٠
  - Since this well is based very closely on an OCS well completed in the GOM it was decided to have only \_ the cement in the 36x28 annulus cemented to mudline.
- Chevron questioned how the FEA model is managing the mud left behind pipe above the top of cement.
  - This was addressed within Section 6 Well Barrier Design and Response.
- Chevron also suggested conditioning the hole for days seemed long and would have expected this period to be measured in hours but accepted that things vary from operator to operator.
  - The times listed were initial estimates and the sensitivity to this was addressed in the FEA.
- The initial temperature profiles provided to the IAG were just the starting position. The speed at which temperature changes occur was explored in the FEA, however it was found that analysis convergence issues limited the rates of change that could be achieved in certain cases.
- Chevron also questioned the well schematics showing each string cemented back into the previous string and pointed out that this is not very common. To assist in alleviating annular pressure build up, those annuli are typically left open on purpose to act as a relief point.
  - Feedback was be taken into account in future well configurations

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 12 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

- Chevron also questioned the choice of 5 <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>" and also suggested that the use of vacuum insulated tubing be considered in the project as it is often utilized to reduce annulus temperatures to reduce annular pressure build-up.
  - This can be taken into consideration for future well configurations, the original 5 <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>" tubing was used since it is based on an actual design.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 13 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title: Final Report Client: BSEE Project: Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

#### 4 LITERATURE REVIEW

The task definition used for this report is complex and is attached as Appendix B, this differed slightly from the task definition originally supplied at time of tender. The key items adjusted were the definition of thermal shock being used in the review, the initial well configuration and the materials used to drive the literature search.

The intent of this task was to ensure that the objectives of this project had not been met by other published research and to determine whether previously published work would be of use to the current project.

### 4.1 Literature Review Of Thermal Shock Of Well Barriers

Document searches were primarily conducted online in using various key word combinations generated from the task definition.

This flagged tens of thousands of possible technical paper titles from sources including:

- Society of Petroleum Engineers
- Offshore Technology Conference
- American Petroleum Institute
- American Rock Mechanics Association
- International Petroleum Tech Conference
- International Society for Offshore and Polar Engineering
- International Society for Rock Mechanics
- Petroleum Society of Canada

In order to sort through such a large number of titles the searches were restricted, when possible, to peer reviewed papers only. This restriction enabled a list of a few hundred papers to be generated that meriting further review.

It was clear from the literature that thermal shock in the context of wells in general has been examined by others. But the literature review also suggests that thermal shock, as defined in Appendix B and as it effects the entire well barrier system, has not been thoroughly investigated for OCS wells and the further research within this project is justified.

The literature review identified a number of key areas of research and sources of relevant information that will be given further discussion, namely:

• Researched published literature on thermal stimulation to enhance rock fracturing. [3 et al].

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 14 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

- Research into the effects of injecting cold fluid into cased or uncased holes, [4 et al]. Similar research work that was identified during the previous BSEE project, [7], "Well Stimulation Effects on Annular Seal of Production Casing in OCS Oil and Gas Operations" also appeared during this review.
- There are many technical papers relating to thermal shock in the context of geothermal and steam assisted gravity drainage (SAGD) wells that have been published by multiple authors, [4 and 6 et al].
- Thermal effects on well tubular design is well recognized in literature, [12, 13 et al]
- Guidelines already exist for design and construction of well heads and wells in general for HPHT condition, [18, 19 and 20]

### 4.1.1 Thermal Shock Due To Cold Fluid Injection

Since the increased usage of unconventional oil extraction methods, such as fracking, multiple authors have investigated the effects of injecting cold fluid into the well bore, [3, 4, 7and 11]. This is clearly relevant to this project as well stimulation will be part of the load history for the OCS wells. However, the literature review suggests that most if not all of the work of this type is focused on the open hole or last cased hole section of the well, where the temperature difference are typically the greatest (perhaps understandably).

Objectives 1 through 5 of this project were to examine thermal shock more widely both in terms of location within the well and the circumstances where a thermal shock can occur and do damage to the barrier systems within the well, particularly the cement. There appears to be little attention paid to the upper sections of the well during stimulation, presumably because the assumption has always been that lower temperature deltas result in less damage. Therefore it is reasonable to state that the project objectives have not been met elsewhere.

#### 4.1.2 Thermal Wells and SAGD - Lessons to be Learned

The temperatures involved in Thermal wells may exceed those likely to be encountered in OCS wells, even those with HPHT, nevertheless it was felt prudent to review this arena to confirm whether or not relevant information or lessons learned could be applied to the current project.

The review found a number of papers that looked at the well in its entirety including the interaction of all the constituent parts, [5 is typical]. This was generally contrary to what had been found in literature relating to OCS wells where individual parts have been considered by many but the well as a system less so. It should be pointed out that many of these wells, particularly of the SAGD type are typically much shallower and their construction differs from typical OCS wells in a number of ways, e.g. fewer casings. Nevertheless, lessons were learned from this work to apply to the current project, particularly in terms of the possible merits of adopting a more holistic approach to numerically modelling the well.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 15 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title: Final Report Client: BSEE Project: Thermal Shock Te

Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

#### 4.1.3 Thermal Shock on Well Components and Barriers

Design of well tubulars is well documented throughout literature and the importance of thermal effects is also clearly recognised and design guidelines exist for well tubulars and other well components all acknowledging the importance of temperature and temperature cycling in the loads to be considered in the design, [18,19 and 20]. There does not appear to be much if any literature concerning the specific effects of thermal shock on a well bore as a whole. As per Section 4.1.1, the focus seems to have been on the bottom hole section. Based on the limited returns during the literature search from the key phase "thermal shock" there does not appear to be a consensus within the oil and gas industry over what that term means and therefore objective 2 remains to be satisfied within this project.

#### 4.1.4 Thermal Shock due to Shut-in

Note that also within the objectives for this project is the need to examine the temperature changes caused by shutting in a well and what damage they may do to the barrier systems. Literature review has uncovered very little work specific to shutting in a well and any negative consequences that may have. API recommended practice identifies that in an HPHT context shut-in temperature effects may be relevant, [19], and identifies a survival load condition post shut-in when cooling of the tubulars at the top of the well may increase tension while shut-in pressures are still acting. This is the closest description to what BSEE outlined in its BAA found in regulatory related documents. This is also supported by work done by a joint industry project (JIP) for the Minerals Management Service in 2001, [16].

Otherwise, literature review has not uncovered any particular concerns over shut-in. In fact most of the papers reviewed did not identify shut-in as a design driver, at least for well tubulars, [13 is typical]. This supports one operators view that shut-in does not result in a thermal shock.

Other literature examines the temperature effects of shut-in on well bore and annular fluids but doesn't describe a thermal shock.

It is clear from the design guidelines that are available that the cold shut-in condition may be important to certain barriers, tubing in particular, and merits further investigation.

### 4.2 Literature Review Of Computer Models Investigating Thermal Shock

The purpose of this subtask is to review the capabilities of the simulation tools proposed, identify any gaps and make recommendations on how to fill those gaps.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 16 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title: Final Report Client: BSEE Project: Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

Research was done to explore the capabilities of commercially available software that is specifically used for the design and planning of oil and gas wells.

After reviewing various commercially available software packages it was identified that very few offer a combined capability that can accommodate the entire wellbore system throughout all phases of its life cycle. It was determined that of the software's reviewed WellCAT, [22], is best suited to handle the tasks involved in modelling the wellbore architecture relevant to this project. A potential gap identified was the modelling of the cement with regards to a stress analysis of the cement interaction with the casings. The only material properties used as inputs for cement are density, specific heat and conductivity. It assumes that axial loads in cemented casing sections result in no axial displacement. This assumption is reasonable for casing analysis, but the cement in the annulus needs to be analysed as part of the system to determine if there is any damage to the cement or potential for de-bonding/micro-annuli development in the cement.

Therefore a combination of WellCAT and ABAQUS, [23], were used to model the wellbores. This will allow for the use of the capabilities of WellCAT such as the load sequencing, thermal profile development for inputs in ABAQUS. The use of ABAQUS will allow for more detail modelling and analysis of the cement and failure of the cement. The modelling techniques used in ABAQUS in the FEA was an extension of the FEA performed in "Well Stimulation Effects on Annular Seal of Production Casing in OCS Oil and Gas Operations" (BSEE#728) and was validated by physical testing.

The literature review of this software included the following:

#### 4.2.1 Drill Bench – Schlumberger

Drill Bench, [25], is software that is used for understanding the hydraulics during all phases of the drilling operations. Its core function is built around the well-control workflow, covering pressure control, well control and blowout control. The functions of this software would not be considered directly applicable to the type of modelling that is required for this project since it is not a tool typically used for the casing design of a well.

#### 4.2.2 EDrilling - EDrilling AS

EDrilling, [25], has various modules of software available that are used for planning to deliver a "Life Cycle Drilling Simulation with advanced dynamic drilling models and diagnosis technology. It is similar to Drill Bench as it is primarily focused on the hydraulics during drilling and also production. The functions of this software would not be considered directly applicable to the type of modelling that is required for this project since it is not a tool typically used for the casing design of a well.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 17 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title: Final Report Client: BSEE Project: Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

#### 4.2.3 TubeFlowPIC – BTechSoft

TubeFlowPIC, [26], is software that is designed for wellbore intervention, drilling and completions. It has the capability to model complex well configurations with its database of standard pipe sizes for configuring well tubulars, capillary strings, coiled tubing and drill strings. It has the capability to calculate the transient temperature history of a well, but it currently does not have this information available as an output. The company is currently modifying the software to add this output, but it will not be available in time for use in this project. At this time the availability is not known.

#### 4.2.4 WellCAT – Landmark Solutions

WellCAT, [22], is software that is intended to design and model the entire wellbore. It has the capability to handle most, if not all loading situations that a well might experience throughout its life cycle. This includes drilling loads, cementing loads, production loads and external loads applied to the well head such as loadings on the blowout preventer (BOP). It has the capability to analyse tubing/casing loads and movement, buckling behavior, design integrity and can simulate fluid flow and heat transfer to allow for full transient analysis. It also has the capability to model various tubing hangers, packers, connections.

WellCAT is widely used throughout the industry to design wells both onshore and offshore and is used in HPHT well design. WellCAT software is suited for the tasks of this project due to its vast capabilities and is used by many operators.

#### 4.2.5 ABAQUS – Dassault Systemes

The general purpose FEA software ABAQUS, [23], will be used in combination with WellCAT to fill in any gaps. ABAQUS is well suited to the type of analysis required as it can accommodate advanced models for all the materials likely to be encountered from the steel casing to the cement and the formation. It has an extensive failure modelling capability which can include de-bonding, fracture and crack growth as well as cyclic plasticity.

#### 4.2.6 Proprietary software developed by others

The literature review did uncover work done by others that is similar in principal of designing for thermal shock which is similar to the work required for this project. Total developed a coupled thermal and structural model of a SAGD well to improve the design of such wells, [5]. This software is the property of the operator and so will not be available to this project, but the principals guiding its development may be of use.

There are also other FE software tools that have been used by others investigating well structural behaviour, [27], but these don't offer anything above and beyond what ABAQUS can provide.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 18 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:Final ReportClient:BSEEProject:Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

#### 4.3 Literature Review Of Failure and Risk Assessments Of Thermal Shock

The search for literature concerning failure of well barriers uncovered limited published information concerning the failure of well barrier elements as a result of thermal shock. There is much literature concerning well barrier and well integrity failure in general. As recently as 2016, Wu et al, [118], performed a study that provides failure rates for well barriers, but does not attribute failure to a specific mechanism, though failure mechanisms are categorised. King et al, [14], also conducted a review of well and well barriers though concluded that the failure rate of oil and gas wells that result in a release of hydrocarbons to the environment as extremely low and while barrier failures occur with greater frequency, provided a multi-barrier philosophy had been adopted in the well design this rarely led to a loss of well integrity. This work also categorises the failures by barrier type, age of the well, its geographic location and its type. Tubular connections were found to be the dominant barrier failure type but modern connection designs have drastically reduced their prevalence. High Pressure/High Temperature wells were found to have a higher failure rate than their lower pressure and temperature counterparts.

There have been various studies surrounding the prevalence and management of sustained casing pressure (SCP). A 2001 JIP, [16] looked at best practice for the prevention and management of SCP and recognised the importance of temperature cycling and designing all pressure barriers for the correct temperature extremes. While there was no mention of thermal shock per se, the need to consider the cold shut-in condition, (when production fluids have cooled during an extended shut in), in the design of tubing and casing strings was recognised and provides the closest description yet found of the BSEE BAA posed definition of thermal shock, [1].

More recently, work has been performed to predict SCP build-up and gas influx rates as functions of time given a cement column of known permeability exists in the annulus, [17]. However, the assumption here is that even an intact undamaged cement column will allow gas migration through it. The gas influx rate being inversely proportional to the length of the cement column. This doesn't account for damaged cement or the presence of a micro-annulus between cement and casing nor the causes of the same.

US regulatory guidelines recognize the challenges of SCP and that all parts of the well should be designed with extreme temperature considerations per API, [21]; although thermal shock is never mentioned explicitly.

It would reasonable to conclude that thermal shock has not specifically been investigated in the context of SCP and that the current research work was not repeating previous work.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 19 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)

Title:



**Final Report** Client: BSEE

Project: Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

#### 5 DETERMINE THERMAL SHOCK AND WELL LOAD HISTOGRAMS

The section outlines the approach used to develop the thermal loads and wellbore load histogram that were used to investigate the effects of thermal shock in OCS well bore integrity. Thermal shock refers to thermal changes generated during well construction or operation that contribute to stresses in various well barriers. The well and its barriers must withstand these stresses and remain a closed flow path for produced well fluids.

The process used for this task was to use the information gathered as part of the literature review and to develop the various following subtasks:

- Obtain wellbore schematics of a well that would be typical for a HPHT well in the OCS;
- It was intended that wells would be categorized to account for water depth, target depth and pressure and temperature ranges; shelf, deep-water and HPHT would seem a sensible split of likely well profiles and construction and analyzed. However, due to the complex nature of modelling the entire well a single well design with varying cement mixes was used.

These various subtask lead to the development of the well load histograms and well configurations that will be used in the more detailed modelling of wells subsequent tasks if required.

It is proposed that the occurrence of thermal shock may be defined as a magnitude of temperature delta over the time at which it changes. Therefore thermal shock may or may not occur depending on various conditions in the wellbore. The results of this task will be used to investigate the potential of thermal shock in Task 4. Depending on the results of Task 4, the definition of thermal shock may be modified as needed.

#### 5.I **Objectives**

The objective of this task was to develop and present the proposed well schematics and well loading histograms developed from information compiled earlier in the project. The results will be used for the modelling of various well configurations in subsequent tasks.

#### 5.2 **Obtain Wellbore Schematics for OCS Wells**

Various searches for publicly known wellbore schematics of a HPHT OCS in the GOM were performed. This included online searches using the BSEE well data query as well as discussions with operators. Wellbore schematics are considered proprietary information and are not public knowledge, especially if the well is still under construction or still in the production phase. Information regarding various HPHT wells throughout the world is available, particularly in the North Sea. Using available information from various sources a "generic" well was developed. The casing/tubing, hangers, connections etc. will be comprised of commonly used sizes

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 20 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)




Title:Final ReportClient:BSEEProject:Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

and material grades. This generic schematic will be considered a base case and may be modified as required based on the feedback from the industrial advisory group and BSEE and or if analysis findings warrant.

The focus for this project is OCS wells. In particular it was felt that the Lower Tertiary (LT) GOM would be a good starting point given the target depths in that play, (25000°F t to 35000°F t TVD range) would be deep enough to generate the bottom-hole temperature of 350°F to be compatible with the definition of thermal shock shown in Appendix B.

Figure 2 shows a well design similar to GOM wells. Since actual well schematics are proprietary and generally not available to the public, WWC presented the proposed configuration to the advisory group for feedback.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 21 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



#### Figure 2

#### **Representative Wellbore Schematic**

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 22 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

#### 5.3 Categorize OCS Wells

At least 3 categories of wells were originally envisaged to account for water depth, target depth and pressure and temperature ranges to provide a sensible split of likely well profiles and construction; for example shelf, deep-water and HPHT. However, the project team considered it more appropriate to start with the generic wellbore as defined previously and obtain feedback from the advisory group to categorize as necessary and to allow for sensitivity studies to analyze the effects various well depths, casing programs, etc., have on the response to thermal shock. After initial results it was determined that it is more beneficial to the project objectives to focus on varying the cement mixes and stimulation rates.

The use of a generic wellbore still provides the ability to achieve the project objective but allows a more efficient analysis approach in the FEA.

### 5.4 Develop Temperature Profiles and Load History for Wells

Primary outputs from this subtask are appropriate load histograms and a clear definition of thermal shock. This sub-task made use of the range of tools available. Since developing a single computer model of the well and all barriers is not feasible due to the length scales involved in the well; and the potential need to resolve the temperature and pressure fields and subsequently the stress field in 3D. Therefore a combination of models and tools was used. For this study the commercially available well design software. Any gaps found in the software with regards to thermal shock of a well is addressed by the use of the general purpose FEA software ABAQUS.

The drilling and completions phase of a well is a small part of the life a well when compared to the production phase. Also in the production phase the fluid flows through the well at different temperatures, pressures and viscosity than that is used for drilling/completions. However, to fully understand the effects thermal shocking may have on the well, this phase must be considered. The load history has been simplified to assume that there were minimal issues during this phase. Table 1 shows a representation of the load sequencing histogram for the drilling and completion phase of the well. This histogram was considered as the base load history for the wells and was modified as required based on feedback from the industrial advisory group and BSEE regarding the proposed well schematic. However, based on modelling limitations the drilling and completion phase did not include the actual temperature changes from circulation during cementing.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 23 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)

Title:



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE

BSEE

Project: Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

### Table IWell load histogram for drilling and completion phase of well life cycle

Operation	Time Duration (Scale)	Comments
1. Drill Surface Casing Hole	Days	
2. Log Surface Casing Hole	Hours	
3. Condition Surface Casing Hole	Hours	
4. Run Surface Casing	Hours	
5. Cement Surface Casing	Hours	
6. Drill Intermediate Casing Hole	Days	Thermal shock of surface casing ^
7. Log Intermediate Casing Hole	Hours	
8. Condition Intermediate Casing Hole	Hours	
9. Run Intermediate Casing	Hours	
10. Cement Intermediate Casing	Hours	
11. Drill Production Casing Hole	Days	Thermal shock of intermediate casing
12. Log Production Casing Hole	Hours	
13. Condition Production Casing Hole	Hours	
14. Run Production Casing	Hours	
15. Cement Production Casing	Hours	
16. Drill Production Liner Hole	Days	Thermal shock of production casing
17. Log Production Liner Hole	Hours	
18. Condition Production Liner Hole	Hours	
19. Run Production Liner	Hours	
20. Cement Production Liner	Hours	
21. Clean-up Production Liner for Tie-back	Hours	
22. Run and Set Production Tie-back	Days	

^ depends on shoe depth

The majority of the well life is in the production phase which may be anywhere from 10-20 years for a deepwater well. For this investigation at life cycle of 20 years has been assumed for the development of the loading histogram. The main purpose of this histogram is capturing a set and sequence of likely loads a well will be subjected to during its lifespan, such as shut-ins, well stimulations, etc. The load history was based on experience for wells in the GOM region. It includes mandatory shut-ins when testing safety equipment, storms and planned

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 24 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

stimulations/reservoir management. The base load histogram for the production phase is shown in Table 2. This load history was considered a base case to study the entire production life of the well. Other comparative cases were performed as well.

Operation	Events per year	Duration (Scale)	Comments
Shut in to test actuated master valve	12	Hours-Days	Potential for thermal
Shut in to test subsurface safety valve	2	Hours-Days	shock during any shut-in
Shut in due to weather induced events	3	Days	Shut-m
Shut in due to production/equipment problems	4	Hours-Days	
Shut in for reservoir management	1 / 1.5 years	Days	
Stimulation	1 / 4 years	Days	Thermal shock

### Table 2 Well load histogram for 20 year production phase of well life cycle

#### Potential number of shut ins over a 20 year life cycle

Additional casing loads from BOP's, over-pull, etc. is accounted for well configurations. It is anticipated that these loads will have a small contribution to overall loading when compared to the thermal loads.

438

#### 5.5 WellCAT Analysis

The commercial software tool WellCAT was used to develop the global thermal profiles for the well. The loading histogram previously mentioned was used as input for both the drilling and production phases. Temperature profiles for the well were generated for the various construction and production operations. A temperature vs time history profile is generated for the entire depth of the wellbore for the various strings. The temperature profiles and preload conditions will be applied to a global and local FEA model in The FEA. A various range of temperature conditions will be assessed. Initial temperature profiles are based on ambient air temperature of 80 deg. Fahrenheit, mudline temperature of 40 deg. Fahrenheit and bottom hole static temperature of 350 deg. Fahrenheit.


Figure 3 shows the representative temperature versus depth profile of the wellbore at various points in time during the drilling and completion phase for the production casing string. Profiles for the annulus, conductor,

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 25 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

surface casing, etc. are generated and used for input as well. The resulting profiles for the wellbore temperatures are used as inputs into the FEA models in the FEA.



Temperature of casing ['F]

Figure 3

## Temperature profile for well during final cementing phase of drilling

Figure 4 shows the representative temperature versus depth profile of the wellbore at various points in time duration the production phase for the production casing string. Profiles for the annulus, conductor, surface casing, etc. were generated as well. The resulting profiles for the wellbore temperatures were used as inputs into the FEA models in the FEA.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 26 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010







Figure 5 shows the representative temperature versus depth profile of the formation near the wellbore at various points in time during the production phase. The resulting profiles for the wellbore temperatures were used as inputs into the FEA models in The FEA to set initial geostatic conditions and use as validation of the resulting temperature distribution in the formation in the FEA model.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 27 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)







Temperature profile in formation near wellbore

#### 5.6 ABAQUS FEA

ABAQUS FEA was used to develop further the thermal profile and load histogram of the well and its constituents. The intent of this subtask was to develop efficient methods for building a global FEA model that the loading history and conditions is applied.

A global axisymmetric finite element model of the entire wellbore was selected as this best modelled the global wellbore system while maintaining computational efficiency. This model could simultaneously account for thermal and mechanical loads imposed on the well.

The formation surrounding the wellbore was explicitly accounted for in the axisymmetric model. The formation is modelled as a homogenous solid which is vary in layers vertically along the wellbore to allow for varying the elasticity of the formation.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 28 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

#### 5.7 Task Findings

Potentially there are various thermal loadings and well configurations that could cause a thermal shock scenario for OCS wells that could result in a loss of one or more well barriers. However, based on the temperature profiles; stimulating operations particularly when injecting with a fluid that is substantially cooler than the temperature of the producing wellbore, seem to pose the highest risk to damaging components of the well. It was observed that stimulation operations generate a larger temperature gradient from the production temperatures when compared to the gradients caused by the production phase followed by shut-in conditions at the same time points.

#### 5.7.1 Thermal Shock Definition

At the outset of the project the definition of thermal shock was developed from the statements in the BSEE BAA, [1] as:

- Wells with a bottom hole temperature of 350°F or above combined with a minimum ambient temperature as low as 40°F.
- Thermal shock could be initiated by shutting in a producing well and allowing it to cool to ambient or by stimulating a well.
- Thermal shock not only depends on the temperature range but also the rate at which temperature changes. The rate of cooling of the well would depend on the operations considered, e.g. natural cooling post shut-in or cooling during well stimulation for example.

It is proposed that thermal shock may be defined as a magnitude of temperature change over the time at which it changes. Therefore thermal shock may or may not occur depending on various conditions in the wellbore. The results of this task were used to investigate the damage potential of various thermal shocks in the FEA.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 29 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE

Project: Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

### 6 WELL AND BARRIER RESPONSE

#### 6.1 Summary

The FEA modelling performed revealed some significant findings, namely:

- That a shut-in of a producing Deepwater HPHT well does represent a thermal shock that can damage cement, particularly in the upper part of the well, however a large accumulation of production/shut-in cycles is required to significantly damage the barrier.
- The HPHT well investigated was able to maintain zonal isolation for a complete production life of 20 years, assuming a good cement job had been completed in the first instance.
- Stimulating a well does significantly more damage to the cement than a normal production/shut-in cycle and that damage can extend a significant distance up the well bore. It therefore represents a greater risk to the well barrier.
- Because the FE model encompasses the entire wellbore, damage locations can be readily identified in one well model. To WWC's knowledge this is the first time this has been achieved for a deep water well.
- The modelling indicates that production/shut-in damage is restricted to the upper cement annuli whereas stimulation damages the deeper cement barriers because the temperature changes are greatest in each case at the top and bottom of the well respectively.
- The cement designs and quality of placement of cement in the wellbore during completions is critical to the performance of the well. Although one cement mix design is not always adequate for all situations and environments it was found that in general more brittle cements are less durable and failure will occur at fewer cycles. This is true for all wells but is more pronounced in the HPHT variety. A high compressive or tensile strength does not always indicate the ability to withstand a greater number of load cycles; rather a balance of high compressive strength or tensile strengths coupled with a lower elastic modulus seemed to perform the best.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 30 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)

Title:



**Final Report** Client: BSEE

Project: Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

#### 6.2 FEA Global Response Modelling And Tie In Known FEA Model Data

A finite element model of the full measured depth (MD) of the well bore has been constructed, see Figure 6. This takes into account all tubular strings from conductor to production tubing along with both liquid and cement filled annuli through the full depth of the well.

The Explicit FEA solver was used in the scale modelling performed in the previous BSEE work "Well Stimulation Effects on Annular Seal of Production Casing in OCS Oil and Gas Operations" (BSEE#728) as it is better suited to handle the extreme non-linearity behavior of cement. However when modelling the entire wellbore geometry there are considerations regarding the selection of the FEA solver used due to the computational requirements of the large model involved. To reduce the computational expense required of modelling an entire well an axi-symmetric model was used and was therefore only able to model vertical well configurations. In addition, the Explicit solver was not compatible with axi-symmetric models and thus the Standard Implicit FEA solver within ABAQUS was used. Material models used in Task 4 and 5 were selected to allow for interoperability between the Standard and Explicit solvers. Due to the complexity and convergence issues that were encountered during the project a single geometry wellbore was investigated instead of multiple configurations to achieve the objectives of the project.

Various cement designs based on mixes in use today in various OCS cementing operations for surface, intermediate, and production depths were utilized in the analysis to study the effects of cement these designs on the response of the wellbore when exposed to thermal events.

Large departure well effects were studied using local FEA model to compare a deviated versus non-deviated section of a well and are discussed in Section 6.3.

The model also included an appropriate representation of the formation, with stiffness varying as appropriate with depth.

The material strength properties defined for laboratory scale testing were used; to help with convergence issues and model stability the individual components were assembled using "hard contact" or tie constraints. Debonding and micro-annulus cracking are therefore investigated using the individual damage intensities in tension or compression respectively as well as the cracking strains.


The run in and cementing sequence for each tubular is accounted for by performing a series of analysis steps that form the open hole and progressively activates elements representing the tubulars according to the well construction sequence. The cementing process is reflected during the well construction steps in a similar fashion.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 31 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

Cement is added to the annulus to ensure the string buoyant weight is correct and then either tie constraints or hard contact between the cement and tubulars is activated after the cement placement has occurred.



Wellbore and surrounding formation

Wellbore at start of run in

Wellbore after run in

## Figure 6

Global FE model

The analysis included a 20 step process to simulate the well construction phase as follows:

- Step 1 Geostatic equilibrium of formation
- Step 2 Remove open hole material
- Step 3 Run-in conductor
- Step 4 Cement conductor
- Step 5 Run-in casing 1
- Step 6 Cement casing 1
- Step 7 Run-in casing 2
- Step 8 Cement casing 2
- Step 9 Run-in casing 3 / liner
- Step 10 Cement casing 3
- Step 11 Run-in casing 4 / liner
- Step 12 Cement casing 4
- Step 13 Run-in casing 5

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 32 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

- Step 14 Cement casing 5
- Step 15 Run-in casing 6 / liner
- Step 16 Cement casing 6/liner
- Step 17 Run-in casing 7
- Step 18 Cement casing 7
- Step 19 Run-in production tubing
- Step 20 Lock production tubing at packer.

Intermediate steps were also included during the cementing process not shown in the above list.

The well was modelled as an uncoupled heat transfer problem. The temperature field is calculated without consideration of the stress/deformation of constituent parts of the well, which is reasonable in the context of an oil well as the deformation of the steel tubulars does not alter the heat transfer characteristics of the well.

The FE model also accounted for thermal convection as well as conduction for any fluid filled cavities such as annuli. The effects of fluid convection could not be captured explicitly by the FE solid model. However, the effective conductivity of the fluid regions was been modified to account for this. See later discussion under validation, Section 6.2.2.

Once the well run- in sequence was complete the well was brought onto production and the well warmed up to its steady state production temperature. Thermal shock load cases were then carried out.

#### 6.2.1 Thermal Shock Load Cases:


The entire well structure was initialised with the geostatic temperature profile, in this case assuming a mulline temperature of  $40^{\circ}$ F and bottom-hole temperature of  $350^{\circ}$ F, see Figure 7.

- Production bottom hole temperature = 350°F, well flow rate set as 20,000 bpd. Solved until steady state delivery temperature was reached, see Figure 8.
- Shut-in well flow was halted and the well allowed to cool to ambient, Figure 9 and Figure 10 show profile at 5 days and 60 days respectively
- Stimulation post shut-in well flow direction was reversed and surface ambient fluid injected rates 20,000 bpd for 48 hours and 60,000 bpd for 24 hours cooldown of the hot end of the well, Figure 13 show contours after 48 hours injection at 20,000 bpd, 60,000 bpd is similar.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 33 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010



## Figure 7


Global FE model – Initial temperature profile

Note this view has the x and z coordinates magnified x100 for clarity.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 34 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010



## Figure 8


Global FE model – Production temperature profile 20kbpd

Note this view has the x and z coordinates magnified x1000 for clarity.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 35 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010



### Figure 9


Global FE model - Shut in temperature profile at approximately 5 days

Note this view has the x and z coordinates magnified x1000 for clarity.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 36 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010




## Figure 10

Global FE model - Shut in temperature profile at approximately 60 days

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 37 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010




#### Figure II Global FE model – Well production/shut-in temperature response for 10kbpd

Figure 11 shows typical temperature histories at different casing shoe depths throughout the well during a production/shut-in cycle. Despite the low ambient temperature at the top of the well the higher temperatures at the base of the well, the maximum temperature range occurs some distance down the well, in this case at the 18" casing shoe.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 38 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010



#### Figure 12

Global FE model - Well stimulation temperature profile

Note this view has the x and z coordinates magnified x100 for clarity

#### 6.2.2 FEA v CFD modelling – convective heat transfer verification

The mechanical stresses introduced as a result of temperature effects are dependent upon both the temporal and spatial temperature gradients in addition to temperature magnitudes. Therefore it was considered critical to the objectives of this project that temperature effects were accounted for as accurately as possible.

Finite element models typically can only model conductive heat transfer. Convection within a fluid cannot be simulated directly using solid based finite element models. A fluid's ability to transfer heat may be dominated by convection (fluid movement) if heated from below or from the side. To overcome this, the effective thermal conductivity,  $k_{eff}$ , can be adjusted so that the solid transmits thermal energy at the same rate its fluid counterpart. However, the  $k_{eff}$  value changes with temperature gradient and hence time, so a single effective conductivity value could not be used here.


Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 39 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

To determine appropriate  $k_{eff}$  values for both the production tubing and any liquid filled annuli a series of simulations were performed using computational fluid dynamics (CFD) to determine the correct thermal response. A finite element analysis was them compared against the CFD to confirm the correct  $k_{eff}$  had been determined.

An example is shown in Figure 13. Here a test model, comprising a 30m section of production tubing was filled with flowing water. Flow and temperature was solved to achieve a delivery temperature using both an FE model and a CFD model. The k value within the FE model was varied. The flow is then stopped and the model is allowed to cool.



#### Figure 13

#### Local FE model – cooldown response

It is clear from the cooldown response that the k value chosen made a significant difference. It was also apparent that a single value of k in the FE model fails to match the cooldown response of the CFD model.


However, when the same test was repeated with a variable k value, a good match was achieved. See Figure 14.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 40 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE

Project: Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010




## Figure 14

#### Local FE model - cooldown response matching

A series of larger CFD models of different sections of the wellbore were developed to determine  $k_{eff}$  for different elevations and wellbore cross-sections. An example is shown in Figure 15. The fluid with the main bore and the annuli is being cooled following a shut-in. The velocity vectors within the main bore and the two adjacent annuli are shown. As can be seen the vectors within the annuli travel upwards near a warmer wall at smaller radius and downwards near the cooler wall at bigger radius due to density variations (i.e. natural convection).

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 41 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)





## Figure 15 Local CFD model – thermal response matching – velocity vectors in multiple annuli

The thermal response model was checked against WellCAT with good agreement.

#### 6.2.3 Global Model Mesh Sensitivity Check


To ensure that the finite element mesh used in the global well models was suitably refined, local highly refined mesh models were used to compare to the thermal response of the coarser global model. See Figure 16. In this case the local model represented a 2D horizontal slice at 1000°F t below mudline.


The 2D local and global models were in very good agreement.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 42 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010





## Figure 16

Mesh refinement checks – Global v Local FEA model

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 43 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)

Title:



**Final Report** Client: BSEE

Project: Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

#### 6.2.4 Thermal Shock Response and tie in known FEA model data

The ABAQUS FE model that solves the thermal and structural response used a similar finite element mesh, simply swapping heat transfer elements for their structural equivalent. The temperature field from the thermal analysis was mapped onto the structural model and the structural response solved. A nominal annular pressure ranging from 25-250 psi due to the thermal expansion of the annular fluids was applied. It was assumed that the annular pressure was monitored and managed per API requirements.

The global model also includes damage models for the cement to identify when and where cement damage occurs. These damage models are validated against experiments - see Task 5.

The cement damage can cause solution stability issues in the global response model that can been difficult to predict. As a result some of the cement materials defined in Task 5 was found to have convergence difficulties in the global model. However, some of the cement properties previously known and validated were used to analyse the well's response with various cement mixes.

ID		Young's	Poisson's	Strength	
		Modulus [psi]	Ratio	Comp. [psi]	Tensile [psi]
HDV09675-5-2c	"2c"	2.20E6	0.26	6310	706
Previously defined in prior BSEE project E14PC00037	"A"	4.80E5	0.31	324	58
Previously defined in prior BSEE project E14PC00037	"В"	1.93E6	0.23	3207	387

Table 3 Cements use in global well

To evaluate the response and performance of the well over its lifespan the loading histogram as defined in Table 2. The cement used in this load case was the 2c design as shown in Table 3.

In addition to the twenty year life cycle case, a case to perform a comparative analysis to check the well's response to different stimulation rates and cement mixes was completed. In this scenario the well was cycled 4 times with each complete cycle consisting of production, shut-in and stimulation. Due to long analysis times no

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 44 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

intermediate production/shut-in cycles were included, however these cases provide valuable information. Table 4 shows the load cases analysed.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 45 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010
-	

#### Table 4 Well load cases investigated

Case	Cement	Injection Rate	Comments
Full 20yr life cycle	"2c"	20,000 bpd	
Cycle-4x-20-6310	"2c"	20,000 bpd	No intermediate prod/shut-in
Cycle-4x-60-6310	"2c"	60,000 bpd	No intermediate prod/shut-in
Cycle-4x-20-3207	"B"	20,000 bpd	No intermediate prod/shut-in
Cycle-4x-60-3207	"B"	60,000 bpd	No intermediate prod/shut-in
Cycle-4x-20-324	"A"	20,000 bpd	No intermediate prod/shut-in

#### 6.2.4.1 Thermal shock response results

The results of the twenty year life cycle case indicate some damage in the lower portions of the cement in the well. However, the damage does not propagate the entire height of the cement column. It is also observed that the magnitude of damage from stimulating the well is much greater than a typical production and shut-in cycle and occurs at the lower end of the well.


The damage in the cement from after the first year of production/shut-in cycles is shown in Figure 17; and after four years of production/shut-in cycles (prior to the first stimulation occurrence) is shown in Figure 18.

The damage to the element (SDEG) shown is not an indicator that loss of isolation has occurred, a more complete explanation of SDEG is given in Figure 27.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 46 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010




#### Figure 17

#### Cement damage after first year of cycles

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 47 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010



# Figure 18


Cement damage after first four years of cycles

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 48 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

The damage in the cement immediately after the first stimulation and warm-up occurrence is shown in Figure 19.



#### Figure 19


Cement damage after first stimulation occurrence

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 49 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

The damage in the cement after four more years (8 total) of production/shut-in cycles (prior to the second stimulation occurrence) is shown in Figure 20.



## Figure 20


## Cement damage after eight years of cycles

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 50 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

The damage in the cement immediately after the second stimulation and warm-up occurrence is shown in Figure 21.



# Figure 21


Cement damage after second stimulation occurrence

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 51 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

The damage in the cement after four more years (12 total) of production/shut-in cycles (prior to the third stimulation occurrence) is shown in Figure 22.



#### Figure 22


## Cement damage after 12 years of cycles

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 52 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

The damage in the cement immediately after the third stimulation and warm-up occurrence is shown in Figure 23



#### Figure 23

Cement damage after third stimulation occurrence

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 53 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

The damage in the cement after four more years (16 total) of production/shut-in cycles (prior to the forth stimulation occurrence) is shown in Figure 24.




Figure 24


## Cement damage after 16 years of cycles

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 54 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

The damage in the cement immediately after the fourth stimulation and warm-up occurrence is shown in Figure 25.



# Figure 25


Cement damage after fourth stimulation occurrence

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 55 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

The damage in the cement after four more years (20 total) of production/shut-in cycles (end of assumed production life) is shown in Figure 26



#### Figure 26

#### Cement damage after 20 years of cycles

Note this view has the x and z coordinates magnified for clarity.

This represents the highest localized damage (SDEG) in the cement. The SDEG values from the FEA have been normalized with respect to 100%, meaning that elements that have reached 100% damage in the model are areas that indicate likelihood for the development of localized cracks/micro-annulus etc. and not a loss of isolation. The validation performed in Task 5 show that it is the magnitude of damage couple with the extent and location of damage is a better indicator of a seal barrier failure. The maximum damage in the cement over the life of the well is shown graphically in Figure 26.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 56 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)






Figure 27


#### Maximum local cement damage progression

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 57 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

The results of the Cycle-4x-20-6310 case are shown in Figure 28 to Figure 31




# Figure 28

Cycle-4x-20-6310 Case cement damage after first stimulation

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 58 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)






# Figure 29

Cycle-4x-20-6310 Case cement damage after second stimulation

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 59 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010




# Figure 30

## Cycle-4x-20-6310 Case cement damage after third stimulation

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 60 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010



## Figure 31

# Cycle-4x-20-6310 Case cement damage after fourth stimulation

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 61 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

The results of the Cycle-4x-60-6310 case are shown in Figure 32 to Figure 35.





Figure 32

Cycle-4x-60-6310 Case cement damage after first stimulation

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 62 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010



# Figure 33


Cycle-4x-60-6310 Case cement damage after second stimulation

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 63 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technol

Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010




## Figure 34

Cycle-4x-60-6310 Case cement damage after third stimulation

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 64 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010




# Figure 35


Cycle-4x-60-6310 Case cement damage after fourth stimulation

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 65 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010






#### Figure 36

Cycle-4x-20-3207 Case cement damage after first stimulation

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 66 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010




#### Figure 37

Cycle-4x-20-3207 Case cement damage after second stimulation

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 67 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010




# Figure 38

Cycle-4x-20-3207 Case cement damage after third stimulation

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 68 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010



# Figure 39


Cycle-4x-20-3207 Case cement damage after fourth stimulation

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 69 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

The results of the Cycle-4x-60-3207 case are shown in Figure 40 to Figure 43.




## Figure 40

Cycle-4x-60-3207 Case cement damage after first stimulation

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 70 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010




# Figure 41

Cycle-4x-60-3207 Case cement damage after second stimulation

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 71 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010




# Figure 42

Cycle-4x-60-3207 Case cement damage after third stimulation

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 72 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010



# Figure 43

Cycle-4x-60-3207 Case cement damage after fourth stimulation

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 73 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

The results of the Cycle-4x-20-324case are shown in Figure 44 to Figure 47.





Figure 44

Cycle-4x-20-324 Case cement damage after first stimulation

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 74 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)






## Figure 45

Cycle-4x-20-324 Case cement damage after second stimulation

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 75 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)





## Figure 46

Cycle-4x-20-324 Case cement damage after third stimulation

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 76 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010




Figure 47


### Cycle-4x-20-324 Case cement damage after fourth stimulation

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 77 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

The SDEG values from the FEA have been normalized with respect to 100%, meaning that elements that have reached 100% damage in the model are areas that indicate likelihood for the development of localized cracks/micro-annulus etc. and not a loss of isolation. The validation performed in Task 5 show that it is the magnitude of damage couple with the extent and location of damage is a better indicator of a seal barrier failure. The maximum localized damage in the cement for each case configuration is shown graphically in Figure 48.



### Figure 48

Maximum localized cement damage comparison

#### 6.3 Local FEA Modelling and Tie in known Data

Since a deviated well cannot be modelled axi-symmetrically a segment representing a down-hole section of a well was generated for a vertical well and a well that contains a departure angle approximately 0.5 deg/ft. The techniques used to create the structural models and the heat transfer models are similar to the scale modelling and are detailed in the Task 5 section. The computational expense of the local models was reduced by modelling a 375ft diameter x 1,000°F t depth section of soil assumed to be about 30,000°F t below the ocean floor. The formation temperature was assumed to be 350°F and an injection temperature for the stimulation fluid case was assumed to be 80°F.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 78 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)




Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

The well was assumed to have a casing size of 7-5/8" outer diameter with a wall thickness of 3/8". The diameter of the hole was assumed to be 9-5/8" diameter with the casing placed concentrically.

The models were constructed using the same element types and element count for each. The formation was assumed to be fixed in the vertical direction at the top and bottom of the down-hole segment and fixed in the horizontal direction around the perimeter of the formation limits. To facilitate the comparison of the deviated versus non-deviated wells only thermal effects from the injection case into a very hot environment were considered. To limit analysis run times only one cycle was considered. This allows for a comparison of the two wells.

#### 6.3.1 Local FEA Modelling-Results

The heat transfer analysis results for both the non-deviated well and the deviated well are shown in Figure 49 to Figure 50 respectively.




#### Figure 49

Heat transfer analysis results for vertical well

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 79 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010



## Figure 50

Heat transfer analysis results for deviated well

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 80 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



٦	Title:	Final Report
(	Client:	BSEE
I	Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

The cement element damage results for both the non-deviated well and the deviated well are shown in Figure 51 to Figure 52 respectively.





Figure 5 I

Cement damage results for vertical well

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 81 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)





## Figure 52

Cement damage results for deviated well

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 82 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:Final ReportClient:BSEEProject:Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

#### 6.4 Conclusions

The FEA modelling performed has indicated that the definition of "thermal shock" as defined in Task 2 and Appendix A is a reasonable definition. It also confirmed some of the response from operators in the advisory group that production/shut-in is not as significant driver of damage in the well as stimulation. The long term durability of the well is highly associated with proper cement selection and quality of the cement placement.

A shut-in of a producing deep water HPHT well does represent a thermal shock that can damage cement, particularly in the upper part of the well, however a large accumulation of production/shut-in cycles is required to significantly damage the barrier. This is in line with the opinions from some of the members of the advisory group.

Stimulating a well does significantly more damage to the cement than a normal production/shut-in cycle and that damage can extend a significant distance up the well bore. It therefore represents a greater risk to the well barrier system. However, damage in the wellbore cement does not always indicate a loss of isolation.

The HPHT well investigated was able to maintain zonal isolation for a complete production life of 20 years. As mentioned above stimulating the well did significantly more harm to the well than just production/shut-in cycles alone. It was noticed that after a stimulation event the damage in the upper portion of the well would undergo a slight increase for the first couple of cycles then level off and hold steady until the next stimulation occurs. This further suggests that stimulation is more significant concerning damage in the well.

The two injection rates investigated of 14 bpm and 42 bpm (20 kbpd and 60 kbpd) revealed that the rate of injection increase of three times did cause an increase in damage in the cement, however the increase in the damage was around 10%. This indicates that the wellbore is likely more sensitive to the change in temperature than rate of change.

The stresses in the tubulars were well within the working limits for typical grades of steel used in a wellbore. Based on findings from Task 2, it appears that standard practices in the design of the tubulars, while not explicitly calling it thermal shock, do account for it in the process of checking them against thermal induced stresses. In addition the behavior of steels at higher temperatures also has been better understood historically.

The cement designs and quality of placement of cement in the wellbore during completions is very critical to the performance of the well barrier system. Although one cement mix design is not always adequate for all situations and environments it was found that in general the more brittle the cement is, the less durable and failure will occur at fewer cycles. This is true for all wells but is more pronounced in HPHT wells. A high compressive or tensile strength does not always indicate the ability to withstand a greater number of load cycles;

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 83 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:Final ReportClient:BSEEProject:Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

rather a balance of high compressive strength or tensile strengths coupled with a lower elastic modulus performed the best.

It was also revealed that a deviated well is potentially more susceptible to a higher magnitude of damage compared to a vertical well when compared under identical loading scenarios.

Mitigation recommendations are included in Task 6.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 84 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

### 7 LABORATORY SCALE TESTING

#### 7.1 Physical Property Testing

A series of mechanical tests have been performed to characterize material properties for the cement for input to the FEA. These are listed below:

- Shear Bond
- Tensile Strength Indirect "Brazil test" + Direct pull
- Tensile Modulus
- Compressive strength
- Compressive modulus / Poisson's ratio
- Impact resistance

Significantly more effort was placed on this stage of the testing than in previous projects. Previously the quality of the mechanical properties, particularly the tensile strength and modulus were not at the desired level, meaning that the FE work has to estimate certain characteristics. For this project the higher fidelity achieved to gather the tensile strength and modulus means better inputs to the FE have been established.

The shear bond test apparatus used both for curing and testing the samples is shown in Figure 53, impact testing in Figure 54 and compression testing in Figure 55.

The direct tensile test utilized a new test sample set up. Instead of the more usual "dog bone" type test, a cylinder of cement was cast and cured with steel bolts embedded into it was used, see Figure 57. This allowed for a more accurate measurement of the tensile strength and modulus.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 85 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010






Figure 53








Figure 54

Impact testing set-up LEFT / Compression testing RIGHT

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 86 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

An example of the compression testing is shown in Figure 3.



Figure 55

Compression testing - pre-failure LEFT / post failure RIGHT



Figure 56

Tensile testing - Indirect Tension - "Brazil Test"

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 87 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010





Tensile testing - direct test mould and test sample

Cement blend samples judged to be representative of various depths through the well, typical of those used on GOM, were cured and tested. The data sheets for those cement blends are provided in Appendix A. The results and mechanical properties are summarized below.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 88 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

	Table 5 Cement Property Summary						
ID	TVD	0		Young's	'oung's Poission's Iodulus Ratio [psi]	Strength	
	[ft]	Liner	[lb/gal]			Compressive	Tensile
						[psi]	[psi]
HDV09675-5-4d	4500	20 in	16.4	1.11E6	0.21	1309	243
HDV09675-5-1b	4200	14 in	12.0	3.18E5	0.26	448	69
HDV09675-5-5a	6700	I6 in	13.5	7.35E5	0.28	1858	253
		Liner					
HDV09675-5-2c	12100	9 5/8 in	17.0	2.20E6	0.26	6310	706
HDV09675-5-3b	16500	5 in	-	1.67E6	0.27	5044	571
		Liner					
HDV09675-5-6d	17000	9 5/8 in	16.4	1.67E6	0.27	10732	1114

#### 7.2 FEA Modelling

3D finite element models of the test setups were created using ABAQUS 2017 [23] and solved using the Explicit solver. The Explicit solver was chosen as modelling unreinforced concrete/cement materials can sometimes cause convergence problems in the Standard (Implicit) solver due to the extreme non-linearity caused by cracking, ( as was encountered in the global model), which is even more pronounced on the smaller scaled models. The Explicit solver is computationally efficient for analysis of extremely discontinuous events, such as cracking in cement, and can be used to perform quasi-static analyses with complicated contact conditions. Time increments in the Explicit solver are influenced by the overall event time scale, element shape and mass of the system; therefore in order to reduce solve time a combination of mass scaling and reduction of step times were used. To ensure that this method did not influence the solution, energy histories for the systems were checked and the mass scaling used was varied as required.


To reduce computational expense, a one-fourth of the test setup was modelled by using symmetry planes in both the small and large scale models. The extent of the sand bed at the bottom of the cement was limited to reduce the computational expense of the model. The sand is to allow for the placement of cement in the pipes and create a space where the bottom of the cement can be pressurized when testing.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 89 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

The small scale assembly is shown in Figure 58 and the large scale assembly is shown in Figure 59.





Small scale FEA model assembly

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 90 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010




Figure 59

Large scale FEA model assembly

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 91 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

Where possible, 8 node reduced integration brick elements (C3D8R) were used. General views of the mesh used in the models are shown in Figure 60 and Figure 61.




Figure 60

Small scale FEA element mesh

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 92 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010



### Figure 61

Large scale FEA element mesh


Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 93 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

# 7.2.1 Boundary Conditions and Initial Conditions

The small scale and large scale models were restrained by fixing the base of the outer pipe in the vertical and horizontal directions. Symmetry planes were used in the X and Y planes. Boundary conditions for the small scale model are shown in Figure 62. Note that the large scale model is similar.



#### Figure 62

#### Small scale boundary conditions

## 7.2.2 Contact Interactions

The assembly of parts used to create the test model was held in space using contact interactions true to how the parts interact in reality. Surface to surface contact definitions were defined at the cement to coil tubing interface and at the cement to formation pipe interface. In previous lab validation the contacts were assigned a cohesive

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 94 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title: Final Report Client: BSEE Project: Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

behavior utilizing a traction separation based contact enforcement method. However, the cement designs that were applied to the global model contact was modelled as either "hard contact' or using tie constraints for the scale models since contact damage was not explicitly modelled in the global model due to convergence issues. De-bonding and micro-annulus formation is still accounted for by other diagnostic means such as element damage in either tension or compression as well as the plastic strains in close proximity to the cement to pipe locations.

See Figure 63 for typical contact pairs in the small scale model, the large scale model is similar.




Figure 63

Small scale interactions

## 7.2.3 Cement damage modelling

The cement sheaths were modelled using the concrete damaged plasticity model in ABAQUS. It provides a general capability for modelling concrete and other quasi-brittle materials in all types of structures by using the concepts of isotropic damaged elasticity in combination with isotropic tensile and compressive plasticity to represent the inelastic behavior of concrete. It consists of the combination of non-associated multi-hardening plasticity and scalar (isotropic) damaged elasticity to describe the irreversible damage that occurs during the

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 95 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:Final ReportClient:BSEEProject:Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

cracking process. The concrete damaged plasticity material model is interoperable between the Explicit and Standard solvers, therefore the defined materials can also be used in the global FEA models.

The model is a continuum, plasticity-based, damage model for concrete and cements. It is based on the assumption that the main two failure mechanisms are tensile cracking and compressive crushing of the material. The evolution of the failure surface is controlled by two hardening variables, tensile and compressive equivalent plastic strains that are linked to failure mechanisms under tension and compression loading, respectively.

The fracture energy criterion was used to model the cements brittle behavior by using a stress-displacement relationship. The stress-strain behavior of the cement in uniaxial compression outside of the elastic range is modelled by using compression hardening and strain softening.

The concrete compression damage and concrete tension damage optional parameters were used to simulate the loss of stiffness of the cement as damage occurs. Maximum compressive stiffness reduction was set to 99% and 90% for tension. Once these values are reached a complete loss of stiffness is assumed to occur. Element deactivation was enabled to remove these elements from the stiffness matrix at complete failure.

# 7.2.4 Thermal analysis approach

Thermal loads were applied by means of a sequentially un-coupled thermal stress analysis. To accomplish this, a transient heat transfer analysis was first solved. The nodal temperature values from the heat transfer analysis were then mapped onto the structural solution model. The material definition in the structural model included a thermal expansion coefficient and thus the model developed thermal strains with the addition of a  $\Delta T$  and thermal stresses when expansion was resisted by the stiffness of the structure. Since the heat transfer analysis and stress analysis are in different time period thermal properties and convection coefficients were converted into the appropriate time scale.


A heat transfer analysis was performed for the small and large scale models. The temperature was varied over time using the load amplitude feature within ABAQUS to replicate the thermal cycling that was performed in the lab testing. A complete thermal cycle for the small scale testing consisted of activating the interior heating element for 150 minutes at approximately 215°F, then turning the heating off and then chilling the exterior of the testing fixture at 50°F for 150 minutes. The heat transfer analysis results were then mapped on to the structural model and allowed to cycle up to 50 complete cycles. The small scale testing consisted of curing the cement in the fixture at 190°F and then allowing the fixture to cool back to ambient; therefore the initial temperature of the large scale model was assumed to be at an ambient temperature of 72°F. The results from the

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 96 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

small scale heat transfer analysis are shown in Figure 64. Note that the cooldown from ambient was accounted for but not shown in the figure.



#### Figure 64

#### Small scale heat transfer analysis results


Thermal cycling for the large scale test was similar to the small scale with the exception that the interior pipe was cooled by circulating chilled water and the exterior was heated. A complete thermal cycle for the small scale testing consisted of circulating chilled water through the interior pipe for 150 minutes at approximately 50°F and then turning off and then heating the exterior of the testing fixture at 230°F for 150 minutes. The heat transfer analysis results were then mapped on to the structural model and allowed to cycle to failure or up to 50 complete cycles.

The large scale testing consisted of curing the cement in the fixture at  $190^{\circ}F$  and then subsequently starting the temperature cycling without allowing the fixture to cool back to ambient; therefore the initial temperature of the large scale model was assumed to be at a temperature of  $190^{\circ}F$ . The results from the large scale heat transfer analysis are shown in Figure 65.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 97 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010



#### Figure 65

Large scale heat transfer analysis results

# 7.2.5 Thermal properties

Thermal expansion coefficient, conductivity and specific heat values for the cement mixes were determined by CSI and are shown in Appendix A. In order to reduce computational time, average values of the cement thermal properties were used to reduce the number heat transfer analysis required.

The thermal expansion coefficient for steel was assumed to be 6.7x10-6 in/in-°F and 4.4x10-6 in/in-°F for the soil.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 98 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

## 7.2.6 Thermal boundary conditions

Surface boundary conditions were defined by giving the outer surfaces a convection coefficient and a sink temperature (water temperature or ambient air temperature). The surfaces exposed to water were applied with a film coefficient that was set to 580 W/m2K and for surfaces exposed to air a film coefficient of 15 W/m2K was used.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 99 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)




Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

### 7.3 Small Scale Lab Tests

CSI performed the small scale thermal tests on the cements previously identified in Table 5

The thermal shock test apparatus is explained below and shown diagrammatically in Figure 66.



#### Figure 66

#### Thermal shock test schematic

The test specimen comprises of an electric heater element embedded in a cylinder of cement which itself is surrounded by a metal sheath inside a metal cylinder. A brass coil supplying cooling water then surrounds the outside metal cylinder.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 100 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

A compressed air supply charges the base of the cement sample and flow is monitored through an inline flow meter. Thermocouples are embedded in the cement, just inside the outer wall and just outside the inner wall respectively.

Once cured, the test begins by heating the sample for a prescribed time until both thermal couples measure steady temperatures. Then the heating input is switched off and the cold water flow switched on to cool the sample. The rates of heating and cooling can be adjusted to accommodate different temperature ramps by adjusting the energy input and the cooling water temperature. This process is repeated to subject the sample to repeated thermal shocks until air bubbles appear at the top of the sample indicating the cement has failed through the height of the sample.

The actual test lab test setup is shown in Figure 67.




Figure 67 Thermal shock test apparatus

## 7.3.1 Small Scale Thermal Shock Testing – Results

Instant failure occurred on some of the tests where the air passed through the cement sample immediately; suggesting a failure of the curing process, see Figure 68. Test that failed immediately were attempted again and

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 101 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

successful results were achieved in all but two of the cement designs as shown in Table 6. An example of a successful test is shown in Figure 69. This sampled eventually failed through a delamination of the cement to casing bond on the outer radius of the cement.



Figure 68

Thermal shock test fail - pre-mature failure

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 102 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010





Figure 69 Thermal shock test - failure on outer radius of cement

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 103 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010





Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 104 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

The structural response for HDV09675-5-2c is shown in Figure 71. Note the magnitude has been capped to identify potential leak paths. A possible leak path is represented as the yellow line. This failure mode was observed to be similar for the other samples that failed as well.




Figure 71



Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 105 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)

Title:

Client:



Final	Report

BSEE

Project:

: Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

### Table 6 Comparison of FEA Results and Small Scale Tests

ID	Lab results		FEA Results	
	N <sub>TEST</sub>	Location	N <sub>FEA</sub>	Estimated location
HDV09675-5-4d	70 cycles	Outer pipe	50 cycles	No fail up to 50 cycles <sup>1</sup>
HDV09675-5-1b	Instant Failure	Inconclusive	1 cycle	Path goes from inner to outer
HDV09675-5-5a	No Failure	N/A	No Failure	No fail up to 50 cycles
HDV09675-5-2c	8 cycles	Outer	7 cycles	Path goes from inner to outer
HDV09675-5-3b	Instant Failure	Inconclusive	2 cycles	Path goes from inner to outer
HDV09675-5-6d	No Failure	N/A	50 cycles	No fail up to 50 cycles
^FEA was performed up to a max of 50 cycles based on the low cycles to failure on early tests performed and prior to all of the lab tests completed.				


### 7.4 Large Scale Lab Tests

Four attempts to perform the large scale tests were tried using the HDV09675-5-2c mix. However, only one was able to achieve usable data suggesting that the sealing of the test fixtures is sensitive to the curing process. The test that was successfully run failed after only a few cycles. The results of this test are discussed later on. The schematic for the large scale test fixture is shown in Figure 72.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This FEA model will be re-started and the cycle count will be increased until failure – results will be incorporated into final report.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 106 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)







Large scale test setup

The test specimen comprises of a heater on the exterior of the fixture. Chilled water is circulated through the interior pipe to cool the system.

A compressed air supply charges the base of the cement sample and flow is monitored through an inline flow meter. Thermocouples are embedded in the cement, just inside the outer wall and just outside the inner wall respectively similar to the small scale tests.

The heating and cooling can be adjusted to accommodate different temperature ramps by adjusting the energy input and the cooling water temperature. This process is repeated to subject the sample to repeated thermal shocks until air bubbles appear at the top of the sample indicating the cement has failed through the height of the sample.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 107 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

# 7.4.1 Large Scale Thermal Shock Testing – Results

As mentioned previously the test that was successfully run failed after only a few cycles in the lab testing. Lab testing confirmed that the seal failed at the inner diameter of the outer pipe. The damage observed in the FEA analysis indicates that failure of the cement occurs at about 1 to 3 cycles. Significant damage starts to initiate at the onset of the first cycle and progresses rapidly throughout the cycle. The FEA results for the large scale test are shown in Figure 73.




Figure 73

Large scale FEA at failure

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 108 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title: Final Report Client: BSEE

Project: Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

## 7.5 Large Scale Thermal Shock Testing - Conclusions

The lab testing and FEA modelling performed show that the FEA analysis can predict the failure of the cements used in the wellbore with very good accuracy.

Although some of the samples experienced immediate failure, likely as a result of the thermal cycle induced by the curing process, it was observed that the same mixes experienced early failure in the FEA as well. It was generally observed that the samples that did not fail or had a significant number of cycles to failure in the lab also performed well in the analysis. It should be noted that cement response is influenced by many different factors such as loading conditions, confinement, etc. Meaning that one mix that does poorly in a certain scenario may perform well in another.

A positive validation of the modelling techniques was provided by the HDV09675-5-2c cement sample. It showed an excellent match at small scale test as it had 8 cycles to failure in the lab and approximately 6 cycles to failure in the FEA. The large scale test had immediate failure in one attempt and failure at 2 cycles in the lab and approximately 1-3 cycles to failure in the FEA.

Therefore a high degree of confidence in the modelling methodology was gained.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 109 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)

Title:

Project:



**Final Report** Client: BSEE

Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

### 8 **PROPOSE MITIGATION TECHNIQUES**

Conventional cement systems are at times unable to maintain an effective seal under cyclic stressing conditions in the changing environment of the wellbore. These stresses are from thermal changes, and pressure changes such as stimulation activities like fracturing the wellbore. However, the industry has improved the cement systems that are used in wells.

- Computer simulations and models can help in the cementing design process for these challenges. It was found that many operators are including some type of computer simulations. The use of FEA programs to gain insight to better determine how the cements and mechanical barriers are behaving will help improve the cement systems and have the potential to provide information that can improve the software currently being used.
- Cement to casing bond is dependent on numerous mechanical properties, not just compressive strength. While one cement system may not be the best selection for all situations it was observed that the cements that exhibited more ductile behavior performed better in the lab and in the FEA simulations. These mixes generally had a lower Young's Modulus coupled with higher compression and tensile strengths.
- Excellent cement job execution is also critical to create a good bond. Mud removal, density control and other aspects of cement placement are important in creating a durable bond. The consequences of a poor cementing job are difficult to quantify. A better understanding of the effects of poor cementing on the durability of the bond can be gained by using FEA similar to the simulations performed in the lab in this project. The FEA could be used to perform sensitivity studies to investigate the wellbore response with reduced bond strengths.
- Quality control of the cement blending and mixing should be monitored to ensure that the strengths placed in the wellbore meet or exceed the intended design.

### 8.1 **Cement barrier failure modes**

Stresses induced on typical deep-water wells by stimulation operations result from increased casing pressure and thermal shock/cycling of the casing by fracturing fluids. The magnitudes of these stresses are not generally sufficient to be the primary cause of damage to the casings. However, the stresses can be sufficient to cause failure of the cement or to destroy the bond of cement to casing or cement to formation. This failure of the cement to casing bond can potentially increase the loading of the casing overstressing it and cause a failure.

Potential failure modes of cement from thermal shock during the combination of production-shut in cycles and stimulation can be attributed to tensile stress, compressive stress, and shear stress. The casing-cement-formation system integrity depends on mechanical properties of the cement such as Young's Modulus, Poisson's Ratio, and tensile strength. Cement failure in tension during stimulation is considered very common due to the

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 110 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:Final ReportClient:BSEEProject:Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

intrinsically low tensile strength of most Portland cement systems. This can be amplified if the low tensile strength system is has a higher Young's Modulus.

Additionally, the quality of cement placement and control of unwanted fluid migration in the cemented annulus after cement placement dictate the initial condition of the system and affect the potential for stress-induced seal failure. Finally, since Portland cement mechanical properties are governed by extent of chemical hydration occurring in the cement, where this hydration rate depends on time, temperature and cement design, the mechanical properties of the cement component must be measured after curing for appropriate times at simulated down-hole conditions to accurately assess performance.

In addition to time dependence, mechanical performance of Portland cement can degrade under cyclic stress that is far below failure stress for the material. This degradation is due to the porous nature of set Portland cement and localized failure of the pore walls that can result from stresses in the elastic region. Thus, stresses lower than failure strength of cement can cause plastic strains. Stress repetition from thermal shock/cycling can result in additional plastic strain thus creating channels that allow flow at lower-stresses.

In general, failure of the casing-cement-formation system as a result of thermal shock-induced stress is complex and is not accurately described by solely one or two cement mechanical property values. Primary failure points are within the cemented annulus. Failure is governed by cement composition, quality of cement placement, extent of hydration as governed by time interval between cement placement and stimulation treatment, and stimulation treatment temperatures and pressures.

## 8.2 Mechanical barrier failure modes

In general, a failure to a casing/tubular in the wellbore would occur after a failure or significant damage occurred within the cement annulus. While the design of the tubulars typically does not consider thermal shock explicitly, it is accounted for in the thermal loading applied. If a failure to a tubular is the primary cause of failure in the wellbore, the most likely cause will be due to a failed connection. This type of failure is not typically caused by thermal shock alone, but rather an additional factor such as:

- Improper design or exposure to loads exceeding rated capacity
- · Failure to comply with make-up requirements
- Failure to meet manufacturing tolerances
- Damage during storage and handling
- Damage during production operations
  - e.g., corrosion and wear

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 111 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:Final ReportClient:BSEEProject:Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

The most common failure modes of the tubulars would be characterized as:

- Ballooning
- Collapse
- Connection Failure

Existing design tools are considered adequate to design tubular barriers for thermal shock, see Section 4.2. Mitigating against the effects of temperature variation in the design of the tubulars depends upon the failure mode but design solutions are likely to be available provided the temperature loading is accounted for in the first instance.

Mechanical seal failure could be caused by high temperatures but provided the design basis for the seal components account for the temperatures and the temperature range the seals will be exposed to then the seal designs should be able to mitigate against the risk of barrier failure.

In the case of the HPHT Deepwater wells being considered in this project, thermal shock caused either by shutting in a producing well or by stimulating a well should not pose a particularly onerous design constraint for mechanical seals at or near the mudline. Seals near the mudline, for example in the well head, are likely to benefit from the temperature being higher in the bore than in the environment, provided the seal materials are rated for the highest temperatures they will be exposed to. The temperature gradient from bore temperature to environment should assist sealing, as the inside will want to expand rather than contract assisting rather than compromising sealing. For seals deeper in the well, for example the production packer, the opposite is true and cooling of the inner string, for example during stimulation, would result in a less favourable temperature gradient. But provided the temperature conditions surrounding the packer are accounted for in the packer basis of design, the risk of packer failure can be mitigated through design.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 112 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)

Title:



**Final Report** Client: BSEE Project:

Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

#### 9 **GUIDELINES AND BARRIER RISK RANKING**

The work performed in this study has highlighted that thermal shock can damage the cement barriers throughout the well bore. The magnitude of the damage to cement is governed by the amplitude of the thermal shock and design of the cement. A significant finding of the simulation work performed is the importance of designing cement sealants for durability up and down the well. Intervention or remediation can induce sufficient thermal stresses to induce cement failure in well locations not usually considered high risk (mud line or mid well). While induced stresses may not be as high as those deeper downhole, typical mechanical properties of the cement design for these locations may be much lower for those seemingly lower-risk applications. If the cements designed for these regions are not subjected to extra design evaluation the risk of seal failure increases.

The risk of cement barrier damage and hence barrier failure is also dominated by stimulation conditions rather than the production/shut-in cycles as the amplitude of the thermal shock is greatest in these circumstances. Provided appropriate consideration is given to thermal shock in the cement design, the risk of barrier failure can be mitigated. It should be noted that this project considered a maximum bottom hole temperature of 350°F. As oil and gas exploration goes even deeper and hotter, then as bottom hole temperatures exceed 350°F the risked posed by thermal shock will increase.

While the term thermal shock is not prevalent in most of the regulations surrounding the construction of a well, CFRs, [28,29,30], do capture the need to address the well design conditions throughout the life of the well and for the cement design to be certified by a licensed professional engineer that is it fit for purpose, [29]. CFR 250.415 makes reference to API RP 65 Part 2, [31], which does acknowledge that the mechanical parameters of the cement are critical to the integrity of the cement over the life of the well. The API also acknowledges that cements with high tensile strength and low Young's modulus tend to resist damage more effectively. This is supported by the findings of this study as this combination performed the best. CFR 250.415 further requires a written description of how the well designer has evaluated the best practices included in API RP 65 Part 2. Therefore there does not appear to be a need to generate a raft of new guidelines concerning well design to accommodate thermal shock, however, temperature variations within the well lifetime and how they will be accommodated by the cement design should be given greater scrutiny to ensure the intent of the existing regulations is met.

From the work performed the impact of thermal shock on the cement system appear to be dominated by the amplitude of the temperature change experienced by the well, rather than the rate of change of temperature. Design guidelines and recommended practices for HPHT well design do emphasise the need to consider the well conditions the barrier system will be exposed to over the life of the well, even if the specific term thermal shock is not used regularly.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 113 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:Final ReportClient:BSEEProject:Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

For mechanical barriers, both the amplitude and the rate of change of temperature could be a more important factor. If there is a significant temperature gradient across the barrier and that gradient changes with operating conditions, the sealing effectiveness could be impacted, albeit perhaps only temporarily. Therefore as well as taking into account the temperature amplitude the differential temperature across the barrier and how that changes with time should be accounted for in the design of the barrier. Under normal production-shut-in cycles the timescales of temperature change should limit this effect but the impact may be greater during stimulation when a sudden cooling of the well bore is much more pronounced. However good design practise and a proper understanding of the loads those barriers are exposed to should be adequate to mitigate the risk of barrier failure.

The mechanical barriers deeper in the well may be more susceptible than at the mudline. At the wellhead the environment is always colder than the bore, even during stimulation, and so the temperature gradient in the well cross-section should act in favour of the seal. The risk of this type of failure is consider low since it can be mitigated through design, provided temperature is correctly address in the design basis of the barrier elements.

Tubulars are undoubtedly affected by the temperature changes resulting from thermal shock but as with mechanical seals the design tools currently available should be sufficient to allow barriers to be designed to meet the temperature changes over the life of the well provided temperatures and temperature changes over the well life and their impact on the cement sheaths are adequately addressed at the design stage. It is also important to note that some design tools widely used for that purpose assume a competent cement sheath exists at all times. The integrity of the tubular or other aspects of the well design could be compromised if the cement fails. This emphasises the importance of getting the cement design correct. Furthermore, prudent engineering design should examine the impact of a degraded cement sheath on the tubular system.

In attempting to rank the risk to the cement barriers it would be convenient to simply use the magnitude of thermal shock as the governing metric. However an important conclusion of this study is that, while clearly the highest thermal shock occurs deeper in the well during stimulation, the damage to the barrier, if poorly designed, can extend across a significant length of the well and the vulnerability of the cement barrier to temperature change is dependent upon the design of the cement. Lower modulus high tensile strength cements tend to perform better in response to large changes of temperature but it is also apparent that one cement design that does well in one circumstance may not perform as well in another and simple designing for the maximum compressive strength may not be sufficient to produce a cement barrier that will last the lifetime of the well. Use of appropriate analysis, such as described in this study, would help ensure the cement is fit for purpose regardless of its location in the well.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 114 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:Final ReportClient:BSEEProject:Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

Overall risk ranking for the barriers within a well is primarily a task that should be carried out on a well by well basis taking the overall well integrity into account. While it may be more likely that a cement barrier is damaged during the operating life of the well, leading to barrier failure if the damage is extensive enough, the impact of that failure would be governed by the overall barrier philosophy of the well design. A risk assessment of the well's integrity should be carried out and the susceptibility of the cement designs to temperature change throughout the entire well should be included as part of that risk assessment. This study recommends that approach rather than attempting to produce a generic risk ranking for barriers in a well.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 115 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:Final ReportClient:BSEEProject:Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

## 10 ACADEMIC SCRUTINY

University of Texas at Austin has been added to the team to provide independent scrutiny of the FE and testing activities, Task 4 and 5, as well as providing input during Task 6 which will look at mitigating the effects of thermal shock.

Dr Richard Schultz was approached by the WWC project team to engage with them on this project as an Academic Partner. This engagement draws upon Dr Schulz's work in reservoir geomechanics and subsurface asset integrity as Senior Research Scientist with the Center for Petroleum and Geosystems Engineering at The University of Texas at Austin (UT), and industry-funded research programs at UT including the Fracture Research and Application (FRAC) Consortium. The Petroleum and Geosystems Engineering Department's undergraduate and graduate degree programs were consistently ranked as #1 in the nation (again through 2018) by U.S. News and World Report; the Center is the research arm of the Department. While at UT Dr Schulz was also an instructor in subsurface integrity with TopCorp, a multi-university consortium that provided technical training to state oil and gas regulators; prior to that he was Principal Geomechanicist and a key member of the company-wide subsurface containment assurance team at ConocoPhillips.

Dr Schulz's role in this project is to support and assist the Wild Wells team in three main tasks described above, from a partnering and advisory role; the intention is not to duplicate efforts but to apply his academic perspective to supplement the execution and interpretation of the technical work of these tasks.

Several meetings between U of T and WWC and CSI have taken place and U of T has reviewed the work performed by the WWC team.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 116 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:Final ReportClient:BSEEProject:Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

## II REFERENCES

- 1 Topic 1, Well Bore Thermal Shock Technology, of BSEE Broad Agency Announcement (BAA) Solicitation Number E16PS00024: Proposed Research on Safety and Technology Verification Research in the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf (OCS)
- 2 E16PC00010 Wellbore Thermal Shock Technology, Modification 001, 27 Sept 2017
- 3 AMRA 2012, Radial cracking of a borehole by pressure and thermal shock; Tarasovs, S and Ghassemi, Texas AandM University and University of Latvia.
- 4 AMRA 2013, Numerical modelling of tensile thermal stresses in rock around a cased well caused by injection of a cold fluid; Lavrov, A. and Cerasi, P, SINTEF Petroleum Research, Trondheim, Norway
- 5 SPE-117709-PA An Innovative Methodology for Designing Cement-Sheath Integrity Exposed to Steam Stimulation; Garnler, Saint-Marc, Bols and Kermanac'h, Total, 2010
- 6 SPE-182510-MS Risk-Based Analysis of Thermal Well Integrity Through Integration of Caprock Geomechanics and Cement Sheath Design, Glover, Priolo and Heinricks, 2016
- 7 BSEE Project E14PC00037 "Well Stimulation Effects on Annular Seal of Production Casing in OCS Oil and Gas Operations", CSI Technologies, 2015
- 8 SPE 106998 FE Studies of Near-Wellbore Region During Cementing Operations Part 1, Gray, Podnos, Becker, UT Austin, March 2009, SPE Drilling and Completions
- 9 ARMA-2016-246 Well Integrity Analysis 3D Numerical Modelling of Cement Interface Debonding, Feng, Podnos, Gray
- 10 SPE 168001 FE Studies of Hoop-stress Enhancement for Wellbore Strengthening, Feng, Arlanoglu, Podnos, Becker and Gray
- 11 ARMA-2014-7109 Near-well Integrity and thermal effects a computational road from laboratory to field scale, Lavrov, Torsaeter, Albawi. Todorovic, Opedal and Cerasi (SINTEF and Statoil), 2014
- 12 SPE-171430-MS Preventing String Inegrity Failure in Production and Stimulation for HPHT Wells, Aditya, Subiantoro, EMP, 2014
- 13 OTC-24852-MS Importance of Thermal Stress Loading Analysis for Tubulars in HPHT Wells, Shahreyar, Finley, Halliburton, 2014
- 14 SPE-166142-PA Environmental Risk Arising From Well-Construction Failure Barrier v Well Failure and Failure Frequency, G. King, Apache Corp and D. King WG Consulting, 2013

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 117 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title: Final Report Client: BSEE Project: Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

- 15 SPE-182460-MS Well Failure Mechanisms and Conceptualisation of Reservoir-Aquifer Failure 2016, Wu, Dodle, Turnadge and Mallants, 2016
- 16 Best Practices For Prevention And Management Of Sustained Casing Pressure, JIP for MMS, 2001
- 17 SPE169814 Assessing Wellbore Integrity in Sustained-Casing-Pressure Annulus, Rocha-Valadez, Hasan, Mannan and Kabir, 2013
- 18 API 6A Specification for Wellhead and Christmas Tree Equipment, 20th Ed, 2010 plus errata and addenda
- 19 API RP 96 Deepwater Well Design and Construction, 1st Ed, March 2013
- 20 API 17 TR8 HPHT Design Guidelines, 1st Ed, 2015
- 21 API RP 90-2 Annular Pressure Management for Offshore Wells, 1st Ed, April 2016
- 22 WellCAT Casing design software, https://www.landmark.solutions/WELLCAT
- 23 ABAQUS Finite Element Software, https://www.3ds.com/products-services/simulia/
- 24 Drillbench Dynamic Drilling Simulation Software, https://www.software.slb.com/products/drillbench
- 25 eDrilling, http://edrilling.no/products-services/wellsim/
- 26 TubeFlowPIC, http://www.btechsoft.com/TubeFlow\_PIC.aspx
- 27 DIANA FEA, <u>http://dianafea.com/content/TechDatOilGas</u>, General Purpose FE code with Oil and Gas applications
- 28 CFR 250 Oil And Gas And Sulphur Operations In The Outer Continental Shelf, Subpart D Oil and Gas Drilling Operations, Subject Group 81, General Requirements 250.400 through 250.409
- 29 CFR 250 Oil And Gas And Sulphur Operations In The Outer Continental Shelf, Subpart D Oil and Gas Drilling Operations, Subject Group 82, General Requirements 250.410 through 250.418
- 30 CFR 250 Oil And Gas And Sulphur Operations In The Outer Continental Shelf, Subpart D Oil and Gas Drilling Operations, Subject Group 83, General Requirements 250.420 through 250.428
- 31 API RP 65-2 Isolating Potential Flow Zones During Well Construction, Second Edition, December 2010 Reaffirmed, November 2016

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 118 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

# **APPENDIX A- CEMENT MATERIAL CHARACTERISTICS**

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 119 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

	UOR ENERGY		OGIE										
SUPER	IOR ENERGY	SERVICI	ES COMPAN		ratory l	Data Sumn	1ary						
ost Date: oject No:	HD	lay 19, 2017 V0965-5 - 4	2 L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L		Depth MD Repth TVD	(ft): 4,500		Job Size / Typx Well Fluid Den	sity (Ib/gal)			10.5	sing
ompany:	0	WC/BSEE			BHST (			Test Schedule	: 	(	Casing - 9	.4	
	0			Test P	rossuro (P								
Slurry De	nsity (b/gal):	16.4		Ce Slurry Yiel		lurry Desig	2 06		Total	Mixing Flui	d (gal/sk):	3	4.35
(	Cement Blend	0	Sack Weight,	% of Total		od Weight,	CSIL					25	
20	nt - Class H (Lehig	h)	94	Sack Weight 100		94.00	labst						
D	Mix Water scionized Water			entration	869	Units gal/sk	CSI Le						
Function	1	Additive APF-27	0	Concentration 0.080		Units gal/sk	CSI LA	og#					
Foamer		APF-2		0.080	Taat	Results	HOU	60					
					Test	nesuris							
leasured Da Ca	ensity. ement (Ib/gal):	16.4							Sluny Mi	Additional	Time to M	for:	10500
											at Low RP		Yes
										Max	cimum RP	M:	12,063
Desired	Thickening Time			6-10 hrs				Desired	Free Fluid		5	0.00	
	ning Time - Cem		40 B								2.0		
		Sector.						Free Fluid					
BHCT (°F		10	05:2		. 1	hromin		Free Fluid	Condition	ning Temp. (			55
						nimen		Free Fluid		Test Ar	igle:	Ver	rtical
					,	חותביור		Free Fluid	Meas		ngle: luid: 0	Ver 0.0 mL	
BHCT (°F	): 65	_			,	n min		Free Fluid	Meas	Test Ar ured Free F	ngle: luid: 0 luid:	Ver 0.0 mL 0.0	rtical / 250 mL 00%
BHCT (°F	): 65 Properties	- mp 'F	05:2		60	nramin 30	6	Free Fluid	Meas	Test Ar ured Free F	ngle: luid: 0 luid:	Vor 0.0 mL o 0.0 Gel Str	rtical / 250 mL 00%
BHCT (°F eological Fluid / M Canx	): <u>65</u> Properties lixture Te ant		05:2 300 20 76 6	2 06:44 00 100 10 44	<b>60</b> 36	<b>30</b> 32	16	3 12	Meas Calcul PV 60	Test Ar ured Free Fi ated Free F YP 21	nglo: luid: 0 luid: 10 s 15	Vor 0.0 mL 0 0.0 Gel Sta te o	rtical / 250 mL 30% singth 10 min 17
BHCT (°F eological Fluid / M Com Com	): 65 Properties facture Te ant	mp "F 80 65	05:2 300 24 76 6 100 8	2 06:44 00 100 0 44 0 60	60 36 50	30		3	Moas Calcul PV	Test Ar ured Free Fl ated Free Fl YP	nglo: luid: 0 luid: luid:	Vor 0.0 mL 0.0 Gel Str re c 5	rtical / 250 mL 30% singth 10 min 17 19
BHCT (°F he ological Fluid / M Com Com oto: Phoolo ydraulic Br	): 65 Properties facture Te ant gy measured using and	mp 1F 80 65 g R1-B1-F2	05:2 300 24 76 6 100 8	2 06:44 00 100 00 44 10 60 and reported as Pri	60 36 50 1-B1-F1.0 4 Compre	30 32 40 ssive Strengt	16 20 h Young	3 12 16	Moas Calcul PV 60 1412 cP Poisson	Test Ar ured Free F ated Free F 21 39 Ib <sub>0</sub> +100ft <sup>2</sup> <u>s Ratio</u>	ngle: luid: 0 luid: 10 s 15 0 19 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Vor 0.0 mL 1 0.0 Gel Str te c 5 3 Iby 10 tull Tes	rtical / 250 mL 00% 10 min 17 19 00tr <sup>2</sup>
BHCT (°F the ological Fluid / M Com Com Iote: Phoolo tydraulic Br	): 65 Properties facture Te ant gr measured using ond Flow Rate	mp *F 80 65 g R1-B1-F2 Splitting Test 1 2*	05:2 300 2 76 6 100 8 0 confinguration (Tensile Streng 11 psi	2 06:44 00 100 00 44 10 60 and reported as Pri	60 36 50 1-B1-F1.0	30 32 40 ssive Strengt	16 20 h Young	3 12 16	Meas Calcul PV 60 1412 oP	Test Ar ured Free F ated Free F 21 39 Ib <sub>0</sub> +100ft <sup>2</sup> <u>s Ratio</u>	ngle: luid: 0 luid: 10 s 10 s 15 <u>19</u> Coupon P Test 1 4.	Ver 0.0 mL 0.0 Gel Str e c 5 3 1by 10 sull Tes 2.5 psi	rtical / 250 mL 00% 10 min 17 19 00tr <sup>2</sup>
BHCT (°F heological Fluid / M Cam cla: Phoolo ydraulic Bo ydraulic Bo	): 65 Properties facture Te ant gy measured using and	mp *F 80 65 g R1-B1-F2 Splitting Test 1 2* Test 2 25	05:2 300 24 76 6 100 8 0 confirguration Tensile Streng 11 pei 59 pei	2 06:44 00 100 00 44 10 60 and reported as Pri	60 36 50 1-B1-F1.0 4 Compre	30 32 40 ssive Strengt	16 20 h Young	3 12 16	Moas Calcul PV 60 1412 cP Poisson	Test Ar ured Free F ated Free F 21 39 Ib <sub>0</sub> +100ft <sup>2</sup> <u>s Ratio</u>	ngle: luid: 0 luid: 10 s 15 0 19 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Ver 0.0 mL 0.0 Gel Str e c 5 3 1by 10 sull Tes 2.5 psi	rtical / 250 mL 00% 10 min 17 19 00tr <sup>2</sup>
BHCT (°F he ologisal Fluid / M Camx Camx Camx Camx Camx Camx Camx Camx	): 65 Properties facture Te ant gy measured using and Flow Rate Pipe 2 Pipe 3	mp *F 80 65 g R1-B1-F2 Splitting Test 1 2*	05:2 300 24 76 6 100 8 0 configuration <u>Tensile Streng</u> 19 psi 19 psi	2 06:44 00 100 00 44 10 60 and reported as Pri	60 36 50 1-B1-F1.0 4 Compre	30 32 40 ssive Strengt	16 20 h Young	3 12 16	Moas Calcul PV 60 1412 cP Poisson	Test Ar ured Free F ated Free F 21 39 Ib <sub>0</sub> +100ft <sup>2</sup> <u>s Ratio</u>	ngle: luid: 0 luid: 10 s 10 s 15 <u>19</u> Coupon P Test 1 4.	Ver 0.0 mL 0.0 Gel Str e c 5 3 1by 10 sull Tes 2.5 psi	rtical / 250 mL 00% 10 min 17 19 00tr <sup>2</sup>
BHCT (°F the ological Fluid / M Came C	): 65 Properties facture Te ant gy measured using ond Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	mp *F 80 65 g R1-B1-F2 Splitting Tost 1 2' Tost 2 24 Tost 3 2' Average	05:2 300 2 76 6 100 8 0 confirguration (Tensile Streng 11 pei 59 psi 243 psi	2 06:44 00 100 10 44 00 60 and reported as R th <u>Unconfines</u>	60 36 50 1-B1-F1.0 <u>6 Compre</u> 1309 p	30 32 40 ssive Strengt	16 20 # Young # 1.	3 12 16	Moas Calcul PV 60 1412 cP Poisson	Test Ar ured Free F ated Free F 21 39 Ib <sub>0</sub> +100ft <sup>2</sup> <u>s Ratio</u>	ngle: luid: 0 luid: 10 s 10 s 15 <u>19</u> Coupon P Test 1 4.	Ver 0.0 mL 0.0 Gel Str e c 5 3 1by 10 sull Tes 2.5 psi	rtical / 250 mL 00% 10 min 17 19 00tr <sup>2</sup>
BHCT (%F he clogical Fluid / M Came Ca	Properties           facture         Te           ant         gy measured using           gy measured using         mod           Flow Rate         Pipe 2           Pipe 2         Pipe 3           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0	mp *F 80 65 gR1-B1-F2 Splitting Tost 1 2' Tost 2 2' Tost 3 2' Average Thermal	05:2 300 2 76 6 100 8 10 confirguration Tensile Streng 11 psi 19 psi 243 psi Conductivity	2 06:44 00 100 0 44 0 60 and reported as R1 th <u>Unconfines</u> <u>Thermal Di</u>	60 36 50 1-B1-F1.0 4 Compre 1309 p	30 32 40 ssive Strengt si	16 20 h <u>Youns</u> # 1.	3 12 16	Moas Calcul PV 60 1412 cP Poisson	Test Ar ured Free F ated Free F 21 39 Ib <sub>0</sub> +100ft <sup>2</sup> <u>s Ratio</u>	ngle: luid: 0 luid: 10 s 10 s 15 <u>19</u> Coupon P Test 1 4.	Ver 0.0 mL 0.0 Gel Str e c 5 3 1by 10 sull Tes 2.5 psi	rtical / 250 mL 00% 10 min 17 19 00tr <sup>2</sup>
BHCT (°F the ological Fluid / M Came C	): 65 Properties facture Te ant gy measured using ond Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	mp *F 80 65 gR1-B1-F2 Splitting Tost 1 2' Tost 2 2' Tost 3 2' Average Thermal	05:2 300 2 76 6 100 8 0 confirguration (Tensile Streng 11 pei 59 psi 243 psi	2 06:44 00 100 10 44 00 60 and reported as R th <u>Unconfines</u>	60 36 50 1-B1-F1.0 4 Compre 1309 p	30 32 40 ssive Strengt si	16 20 # Young # 1.	3 12 16	Moas Calcul PV 60 1412 cP Poisson	Test Ar ured Free F ated Free F 21 39 Ib <sub>0</sub> +100ft <sup>2</sup> <u>s Ratio</u>	ngle: luid: 0 luid: 10 s 10 s 15 <u>19</u> Coupon P Test 1 4.	Ver 0.0 mL 0.0 Gel Str e c 5 3 1by 10 sull Tes 2.5 psi	rtical / 250 mL 00% 10 min 17 19 00tr <sup>2</sup>
BHCT (%F	Properties           facture         Te           ant         -           rgy measured using         -           Pips 2         Pips 3           Pips 2         Pips 3           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0	mp *F 80 65 9 R1-B1-F2 Splitting Tost 1 2' Tost 2 2' Tost 2 2' Average Ibernal 0.84 Shear B	<u>300</u> 2 <u>76 6</u> <u>100 8</u> <u>0 confirguration</u> <u>11 pei</u> <u>19 pei</u> <u>243 pei</u> <u>Conductivity</u> <u>459 W/mK</u> <u>ond</u>	2 06:44 00 100 0 44 and reported as R th <u>Unconfines</u> <u>Thermal Di</u> 0.3081	60 36 50 1-B1-F1.0 1309 p 1309 p	30 32 40 ssive Strengt si Spes 2.74 Impast Test	16 20 # 1. # 1. dic Heat 7 MJ/m <sup>3</sup> K	3 12 16 01E+06	Maas Calcul 60 1412 cP Poisson 0.21	Test Ar ured Free F ated Free F 21 39 Ib <sub>0</sub> +100ft <sup>2</sup> <u>s Ratio</u>	ngle: luid: 0 luid: 10 s 10 s 15 <u>19</u> Coupon P Test 1 4.	Ver 0.0 mL 0.0 Gel Str e c 5 3 1by 10 sull Tes 2.5 psi	rtical / 250 mL 00% 10 min 17 19 00tr <sup>2</sup>
BHCT (%F	Properties           facture         Te           ant	mp *F 80 65 9 R1-B1-F2 Splitting Tost 1 2' Tost 2 2' Tost 2 2' Average Ibernal 0.84 Shear B Tost 1 1.	300         24           76         6           100         8           0 confinguration         6           11 pei         59 pei           243 pei         243 pei           Conductivity:         459 W/mK           9955 inch plug t         6	2 06:44 00 100 00 44 00 60 and reported as R th Unconfines Thermal Di 0.3081 ravoled 7 in at 370	60 36 50 1-B1-F1.0 1309 p 1309 p flugivity mm <sup>2</sup> /s	30 32 40 serive Strengt si Spes 2.74 Moight of Bal	16 20 # <u>Young</u> # 1. dic Heat 7 MJ/m <sup>3</sup> K	3 12 16 01E+06	Maas Calcul PV 60 1412 cP Poisson 0.21	Tost Ar und Free F atad Free F YP 21 39 by100ff a Ratio C	ngle: luid: 10 e 15 19 Coupon P Tost 1 4 Tost 2 2	Ver 0.0 mL 0.0 Gel Str e c 5 3 1by 10 sull Tes 2.5 psi	rtical / 250 mL 00% 10 min 17 19 00tr <sup>2</sup>
BHCT (%F	Properties           facture         Te           ant         gr measured using           ond         Pipe 2           Pipe 2         Pipe 3           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0	mp *F 80 65 g R1-B1-F2 Splitting Tost 1 2' Tost 3 2' Average Ibernal 0.8' Shear B Tost 1 1. Tost 2 1. Tost 2 1.	300         20           76         6           100         8           0 confinguration         Tensile Streng           11 psi         39 psi           19 psi         243 psi           Conductivity:         459 W/mK           9955 inch plug to         928 inch plug to	2 06:44 00 100 0 44 0 60 and reported as R1 th <u>Unconfines</u> <u>Thermal Di</u> 0.3091 ravoled 7 in at 370 avoled 7 in at 370	60 36 50 1-B1-F1.0 1309 p 1309 p fluoivity mm²/s	30 32 40 ssive Strengt si Spc s 2.74 Impact Test Weight of Bal Test 1 4.9035	16 20 # Young # 1. dic Heat 7 MJ/m <sup>3</sup> K 166.89 gmz x 1.0035x	3 <u>12</u> <u>16</u> <u>16</u> <u>10</u> <u>16</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>11</u> <u>10</u> <u>11</u> <u>10</u> <u>11</u> <u>10</u> <u>11</u> <u>10</u> <u>11</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u>	Maas Calcul 9V 60 1412 cP Poisson 0.21 0.21	Tost Ar und Free F ated Free F 21 39 1by100ff <sup>2</sup> 4Ratio <u>C</u> 12	rgle: luid: 10 s 15 19 Coupon P Tost 1 4. Tost 2 2	Ver 0.0 mL 0.0 Gel Str e c 5 3 1by 10 sull Tes 2.5 psi	rtical / 250 mL 00% 10 min 17 19 00tr <sup>2</sup>
BHCT (%F he clogical Fluid / M Came Ca	Properties           facture         Te           ant	mp *F 80 65 g Rt-B1-F2. Soliting Tost 1 2' Tost 3 2' Avorago Ibernal 0.84 Shear B Tost 1 1. Tost 2 1. Tost 3 2.	300         20           76         6           100         8           0 confinguration         Tensile Streng           11 psi         39 psi           19 psi         243 psi           Conductivity:         459 W/mK           9955 inch plug to         928 inch plug to	2 06:44 00 100 0 44 10 60 and reported as Rt th Unconfines Thermal Di 0.3081 ravoled ? in at 370 avoled ? in at 389 p avoled ? in at 489 p	60 36 50 1-B1-F1.0 1309 p 1309 p fluoivity mm²/s	30 32 40 ssive Strengt si Spc s 2.74 Impact Test Weight of Bal Test 1 4.9035	16 20 # Young # 1. dic Heat 7 MJ/m <sup>3</sup> K 166.89 gmz x 1.0035x	3 12 16 01E+06	Maas Calcul 9V 60 1412 cP Poisson 0.21 0.21	Tost Ar und Free F ated Free F 21 39 1by100ff <sup>2</sup> 4Ratio <u>C</u> 12	rgle: luid: 10 s 15 19 Coupon P Tost 1 4. Tost 2 2	Ver 0.0 mL 0.0 Gel Str e c 5 3 1by 10 sull Tes 2.5 psi	rtical / 250 mL 00% 10 min 17 19 00tr <sup>2</sup>
BHCT (%F	Properties           facture         Te           ant         gr measured using           ond         Pipe 2           Pipe 2         Pipe 3           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0	mp *F 80 65 g R1-B1-F2 Solitting Test 1 2: Test 2 2: Test 2 2: Test 2 2: Average Ibernal 0.8 Shear B Test 1 1. Test 2 1. Test 2 1. Test 2 2. Average	05:2 300 24 76 6 100 8 10 confirguration 1 psi 243 psi 243 psi 59 W/mK 59 W/mK and 9955 inch plug tr 925 inch plug tr 925 inch plug tr	2 06:44 00 100 0 44 10 60 and reported as Rt th Unconfines Thermal Di 0.3081 ravoled ? in at 370 avoled ? in at 389 p avoled ? in at 489 p	60 36 50 1-B1-F1.0 1309 p 1309 p fluoivity mm²/s	30 32 40 ssive Strengt si Spc s 2.74 Impact Test Weight of Bal Test 1 4.9035	16 20 # Young # 1. dic Heat 7 MJ/m <sup>3</sup> K 166.89 gmz x 1.0035x	3 <u>12</u> <u>16</u> <u>16</u> <u>10</u> <u>16</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>11</u> <u>10</u> <u>11</u> <u>10</u> <u>11</u> <u>10</u> <u>11</u> <u>10</u> <u>11</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u>	Maas Calcul 9V 60 1412 cP Poisson 0.21 0.21	Tost Ar und Free F ated Free F 21 39 1by100ff <sup>2</sup> 4Ratio <u>C</u> 12	rgle: luid: 10 s 15 19 Coupon P Tost 1 4. Tost 2 2	Ver 0.0 mL 0.0 Gel Str e c 5 3 1by 10 sull Tes 2.5 psi	rtical / 250 mL 00% 10 min 17 19 00tr <sup>2</sup>
BHCT (%F he ological Fluid / M Came Ca	Properties           facture         Te           ant         gy measured using           gy measured using         0           Pipe 2         Pipe 3           0         0	mp *F 80 65 g Rt-Bt-F2 Solitting Tost 1 2' Tost 2 2' Tost 3 2' Average Ibernal 0.8' Shear B Tost 1 1. Tost 2 1. Tost 3 2. Average 2.547 pipo lo	300         2           76         6           100         8           0. configuration         1           1 psi         243 psi           243 psi         243 psi           299 W/mK         392 inch plug tr           929 inch plug tr         300 inch plug tr           921 inch plug tr         300 inch plug tr           939 inch plug tr         300 inch plug tr           945 inch plug tr         300 inch plug tr           950 inch plug tr         300 inch plug tr           300 inch plug tr         300 inch plug tr	2 06:44 00 100 00 44 00 60 and reported as R th <u>Unconfines</u> Thermal Di 0.3081 raveled ? in at 370 aveled ? in at 389 p aveled ? in at 389 p psi p to coment, 0.321*	60 36 50 1-B1-F1.0 1-309 p 1309 p 1309 p fluohity, mm <sup>2</sup> /s ssi ssi ssi	30 32 40 serive Strengt si Spec 2.74 Impact Test Voight of Bal Tost 1 4.9035 Tost 2 4.9175 Tost 2 4.9175	16 20 # Young # 1. #ic Heat 7 MJ/m <sup>3</sup> K 166.89 gms x 1.0035 x x 1.0125 x	3 12 16 01E+06 01E+06 01E+06 0.01E+06 0.01E+06 0.01E+06 0.01E+06 0.01E+06	Maass Calcul 9V 60 1412 eP Poisson 0.21 0.21	Tost Ar und Free F stad Free F YP 21 39 by 100t <sup>2</sup> a Ratio C 12 0 on 3 impace o on 4 impace	ngles: luid: 10 e 15 19 Coupon P Tost 1 4. Tost 2 2	Vor 0.0 mL 0.0 Get Ster te o 5 3 Iby/t0 Iby/t0 VII Tega 220 psi	rtical / 250 ml. 30% 10 min 17 19 3007 2017
BHCT (%F he ological Fluid / M Came Ca	Properties           facture         Te           ant         gr measured using           and         gr measured using           Pipe 2         Pipe 3           0         0 <t< td=""><td>mp *F 80 65 9 R1-81-F2 Solitting Tost 1 2' Tost 3 2' Average Thermal 0.8' Shear B Tost 1 1. Tost 3 2' Average Shear B Tost 1 1. Tost 2 1. Tost 3 2. Average 15:47 pipe le 665 Pipe len</td><td>300         20           76         6           100         8           0 confinguration         Tensile Streng           11 psi         92           243 psi         12           243 psi         12           299 W/mK         100           928 inch plug tr         100           929 inch plug tr         100           925 inch plug tr         100           925 inch plug tr         100           100         100         100           925         100         100           925         100         100           925         100         100           920         100         100           920         100         100           920         100         100         100           920         100         100         100           920         100         100         100           920         100         100         100           920         100         100         100</td><td>2 06:44 00 100 0 44 0 60 and reported as R1 th Unconfines Thermal Di 0.3091 raveled ? in at 370 aveled ? in at 338 p paveled ? in at 388 p psi p to coment, 0.3035* i</td><td>60 36 50 1-B1-F1.0 1309 p 1309 p 1309 p flueivity mm²/s ssi ssi ssi</td><td>30 32 40 saive Strengt si Space 2.74 Impact Teat Weight of Bal Test 1 4.9035 Test 2 4.9175 voorment, Test coment, Test</td><td>16 20 * Young * 1. dis Heat 7 MJ/m<sup>3</sup>K 166.89 gms × 1.0035× × 1.0125× 2 1.962* ID</td><td>3 12 16 16 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10</td><td>Maas Calcul PV 60 1412 eP Poisson 0.21 0.21 0.21</td><td>Tost Ar und Free F atod Free F YP 21 39 1by100t<sup>2</sup> a Ratio 2 2 0 on 3 impac so on 4 impa 25<sup>*</sup> top to o</td><td>rgle: luid: 0 10 s 15 19 Coupon P Tost 1 4. Tost 2 2 st act</td><td>Ver 0.0 mL 0.0 Gel Str e c 3 10/10 10/10 22.5 psi 220 psi 3285* t</td><td>rtical / 250 mL 30% singth 10 min 17 19 son* 13</td></t<>	mp *F 80 65 9 R1-81-F2 Solitting Tost 1 2' Tost 3 2' Average Thermal 0.8' Shear B Tost 1 1. Tost 3 2' Average Shear B Tost 1 1. Tost 2 1. Tost 3 2. Average 15:47 pipe le 665 Pipe len	300         20           76         6           100         8           0 confinguration         Tensile Streng           11 psi         92           243 psi         12           243 psi         12           299 W/mK         100           928 inch plug tr         100           929 inch plug tr         100           925 inch plug tr         100           925 inch plug tr         100           100         100         100           925         100         100           925         100         100           925         100         100           920         100         100           920         100         100           920         100         100         100           920         100         100         100           920         100         100         100           920         100         100         100           920         100         100         100	2 06:44 00 100 0 44 0 60 and reported as R1 th Unconfines Thermal Di 0.3091 raveled ? in at 370 aveled ? in at 338 p paveled ? in at 388 p psi p to coment, 0.3035* i	60 36 50 1-B1-F1.0 1309 p 1309 p 1309 p flueivity mm²/s ssi ssi ssi	30 32 40 saive Strengt si Space 2.74 Impact Teat Weight of Bal Test 1 4.9035 Test 2 4.9175 voorment, Test coment, Test	16 20 * Young * 1. dis Heat 7 MJ/m <sup>3</sup> K 166.89 gms × 1.0035× × 1.0125× 2 1.962* ID	3 12 16 16 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Maas Calcul PV 60 1412 eP Poisson 0.21 0.21 0.21	Tost Ar und Free F atod Free F YP 21 39 1by100t <sup>2</sup> a Ratio 2 2 0 on 3 impac so on 4 impa 25 <sup>*</sup> top to o	rgle: luid: 0 10 s 15 19 Coupon P Tost 1 4. Tost 2 2 st act	Ver 0.0 mL 0.0 Gel Str e c 3 10/10 10/10 22.5 psi 220 psi 3285* t	rtical / 250 mL 30% singth 10 min 17 19 son* 13
BHCT (%F the ological Fluid / M Come C	Properties           facture         Te           ant	mp *F 80 65 g R1-B1-F2 Solitting Test 1 2: Test 2 2: Test 2 2: Test 2 2: Average Ibernal 0.8 Shear B Test 1 1. Test 2 1. Test 1 2: Average RE: 2:547 pipo lo 8:55 Pipo lo 8:55 Pipo lo	300         20           76         6           100         8           0 confirguration         1           11 psi         59 psi           243 psi         1           Conductivity:         159 W/mK           9955 inch plug tr         3955 inch plug tr           0.07 inch plug tr         3955 inch plug tr           0.07 inch plug tr         395           shear bond 399         ngth, 0.2305" top           gth, 0.256" top 1         0.59" coupon w	2 06:44 00 100 0 44 0 60 and reported as Ri- th Unconfines Thermal Di 0.3091 raveled ? in at 370 aveled ? in at 338 p aveled ? in at 338 p psi p to coment, 0.321* to coment, 0.325* f idth, 0.0655* coupo	60 36 50 1-B1-F1.0 1309 p 1309 p 1309 p 1309 p 1309 p 1309 p 1309 p	30 32 40 soive Strengt si Spece 2.74 Moight of Bal Test 1 4.903 Test 2 4.9175 comp.nt; Test comp.nt; Test a, 2.398*pipe	16 20 * Young * 1. dic Heat 7 MJ/m <sup>3</sup> K 166.89 gms × 1.0035× × 1.0125× 2 1.962* ID length, 2.00	3 12 16 	Maas Calcul PV 60 1412 eP Poisson 0.21 0.21 0.21	Tost Ar und Free F atod Free F YP 21 39 1by100t <sup>2</sup> a Ratio 2 2 0 on 3 impac so on 4 impa 25 <sup>*</sup> top to o	rgle: luid: 0 10 s 15 19 Coupon P Tost 1 4. Tost 2 2 st act	Ver 0.0 mL 0.0 Gel Str e c 3 10/10 10/10 22.5 psi 220 psi 3285* t	rtical / 250 mL 30% singth 10 min 17 19 son* 13
BHCT (%F  the ological Fluid / M Camx Comx late: Pihoolo ydraulic Br Pipo 1 50 0 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Properties           facture         Te           ant         Te           ant         Pipa 2           Pipa 2         Pipa 3           Pipa 2         Pipa 3           0         0           0	mp *F 80 65 g R1-B1-F2 Splitting Test 1 2: Test 2 2: Test 2 2: Test 2 2: Average Ibermal 0.8 Shear B Test 1 1. Test 3 2. Average 12:547 pipe le SSS Pipe le SSS Pipe le		2 06:44 00 100 0 44 0 60 and reported as R1 th Unconfines Thermal Di 0.3091 raveled ? in at 370 aveled ? in at 338 p paveled ? in at 388 p psi p to coment, 0.3035* i	60 36 50 1-B1-F1.0 1309 p flueivity mm <sup>2</sup> /s psi ssi 'bottom to bottom to bottom to statem to set	30 32 40 serive Strengt si Spes 2.74 Impact Test Weight of Bal Test 1 4.9035 Test 2 4.9175 voemont, Test somont, Test s, 2.398 pipe n length, 0.59	16 20 * Young * 1. dic Heat 7 MJ/m <sup>3</sup> K 1 66.89 gms x 1.0035 x x 1.0125 x 2 1.962" ID longth, 2.00 95" coupon	3 12 16 16 01E+06 01E+06 0.1E+06 1.0055 inch sa 1.0055	Maass Calcul 9V 60 1412 eP Poisson 0.21 0.21 25 inches sample broke sample broke sample broke sample broke	Test Ar und Free F sted Free F YP 21 39 by 100f <sup>2</sup> a Retiro C 12 a on 3 impac so on 4 impac 25° top to o coupon to tr	sgle: luid: 10 e 15 19 Coupon P Tost 1 4 Tost 2 2 tot act ement, 0.3	Vor 0.0 mL i 0.0 Get Sta ie c 5 3 10/10 10/10 20 psi 220 psi 32285* t sont, 0.2	rtical / 250 ml. 00% ungth 10 min 17 19 0007 254*
BHCT (%F	Experies           facture         Te           ant         gg measured using           and         gg measured using           and         gg measured using           Pipe 2         Pipe 3           0         0	mp *F 80 65 g R1-B1-F2 Splitting Tost 1 2: Tost 3 2: Average Ibernal 0.8 Shear B Tost 1 1: Tost 2 1: Tost 3 2: Average 2547 pipe len 2547 pipe len 2547 pipe len	300         20           76         6           100         8           0 confinguration         Tensile Streng           11 psi         39 psi           12 psi         243 psi           Conductivity:         159 W/mK           928 inch plug tr         300 right, 0.2305" top           10, 0.2305" top         10, 595" coupon w           .916" coupon w         3.916" coupon w	2 06:44 00 100 0 44 00 60 and reported as Ri th Unconfines Thermal Di 0.3081 raveled ? in at 370 aveled ? in at 370 aveled ? in at 389 p paveled ? in at 380 p paveled ? in	60 36 50 1-B1-F1.0 1309 p 1309 p flueivity mm²/s ssi ssi ssi ssi ssi ssi ssi ssi ssi s	30 32 40 serive Strengt ei Spec 2.74 Impact Test Weight of Bal Test 1 4.9035 Test 2 4.9175 rest 2 4.9175 rest 2 4.9175 rest 1 4.9035 Test 2 4.9175 rest 1 4.9035 top of coment,	16 20 * Young * 1. dis Heat 7 MJ/m <sup>3</sup> K 166.89 gms × 1.0035 × × 1.0125 × 2 1.962* ID 2 1.962* ID 25° coupon 0.2380* bo	3 12 16 16 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Maass Calcul PV 60 1412 eP Poisson 0.21 25 inches ample broke sample broke sample broke sample broke sample broke	Tost Ar und Free F ated Free F YP 21 39 1by100ff <sup>2</sup> a Ratio <u>C</u> 12 a on 3 impace so on 4 impace co on 4 impace 25 <sup>*</sup> top to a coupon to tr of comment,	rgle: luid: 10 s 15 19 Coupon P Test 1 4. Test 2 2 ct act amont, 0.: 599 (bf ac	Vor 0.0 mL i 0.0 Get Sta ie c 5 3 10/10 10/10 20 psi 220 psi 32285* t sont, 0.2	rtical / 250 ml. 00% ungth 10 min 17 19 0007 254*
BHCT (%F he clogical Fluid / M Camx Cama Cama Camp Cama Camp Ca	Properties           facture         Te           ant         Te           ant         Te           gy measured using         Pipe 2           Pipe 2         Pipe 3           Pipe 2         Pipe 3           0         0      <	mp *F 80 65 g R1-B1-F2 Solitting Test 1 2: Test 2 2: Test 2 2: Test 2 2: Average Ihermal 0.8 Shear B Test 1 1. Test 2 1. Test 2 1. Test 2 2: Average 2:547 pipe les 6:55 Pipe les 5:50* Pipe les 5:50* Pipe les 5:50* Pipe les 5:50* Pipe les 5:50* Pipe les		2 06:44 00 100 0 44 00 60 and reported as Ri- th Unconfiner Thermal Di 0.3081 raveled ? in at 370 avoled ? in at 338 p avoled ? in at 338 p poi p to coment, 0.321° p to coment, 0.321° p to coment, 0.321° p to coment, 0.325° to coment, 0.325° to coment, 0.325° to coment, 0.321° to coment, 0.321° t	60 36 50 1-B1-F1.0 1309 p flueivity mm <sup>2</sup> /s psi si bottom to bottom to coupon to coupon to coupon to coupon to coupon to coupon to coupon to	30 32 40 esive Strengt ei Spece 2.74 Impact Test Woight of Bal Test 1 4.9035 Test 2 4.9175 voement; Test exement; Test exement; Test s, 2.398*pipe in length, 0.59 top of coment; Nameter, 865.2 iameter.	16 20 * Young * 1. dis Heat 7 MJ/m <sup>3</sup> K 166.89 gms × 1.0035 × × 1.0125 × 2 1.962* ID 2 1.962* ID 25° coupon 0.2380* bo	3 12 16 16 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Maass Calcul PV 60 1412 eP Poisson 0.21 25 inches ample broke sample broke sample broke sample broke sample broke	Tost Ar und Free F ated Free F YP 21 39 1by100ff <sup>2</sup> a Ratio <u>C</u> 12 a on 3 impace so on 4 impace co on 4 impace 25 <sup>*</sup> top to a coupon to tr of comment,	rgle: luid: 10 s 15 19 Coupon P Test 1 4. Test 2 2 ct act amont, 0.: 599 (bf ac	Vor 0.0 mL i 0.0 Get Sta ie c 5 3 10/10 10/10 20 psi 220 psi 32285* t sont, 0.2	rtical / 250 ml. 00% ungth 10 min 17 19 0007 254*
BHCT (%F http://www.seconder. Fluid / M Comm	Properties           facture         Te           ant         Te           ant         Te           gy measured using         Pipe 2           Pipe 2         Pipe 3           Pipe 2         Pipe 3           0         0      <	mp *F 80 65 g R1-B1-F2 Solitting Test 1 2: Test 2 2: Test 2 2: Test 2 2: Average Ihermal 0.8 Shear B Test 1 1. Test 2 1. Test 2 1. Test 2 2: Average 2:547 pipe les 6:55 Pipe les 5:50* Pipe les 5:50* Pipe les 5:50* Pipe les 5:50* Pipe les 5:50* Pipe les		2 06:44 00 100 0 44 00 60 and reported as Pri- th Unconfines Thermal Di 0.3091 raveled ? in at 370 aveled ? in at 338 p psi p to coment, 0.321° p to coment, 0.321° to coment, 0.325° 1 idth, 0.0655° coupo a break; Test 2: 2.9 ID, 0.6385° top of a set 2: 1.023° Length	60 36 50 1-B1-F1.0 1309 p flueivity mm <sup>2</sup> /s psi si bottom to bottom to coupon to coupon to coupon to coupon to coupon to coupon to coupon to	30 32 40 esive Strengt ei Spece 2.74 Impact Test Woight of Bal Test 1 4.9035 Test 2 4.9175 voement; Test exement; Test exement; Test s, 2.398*pipe in length, 0.59 top of coment; Nameter, 865.2 iameter.	16 20 * Young * 1. dis Heat 7 MJ/m <sup>3</sup> K 166.89 gms × 1.0035 × × 1.0125 × 2 1.962* ID 2 1.962* ID 25° coupon 0.2380* bo	3 12 16 16 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Maass Calcul PV 60 1412 eP Poisson 0.21 25 inches ample broke sample broke sample broke sample broke sample broke	Tost Ar und Free F ated Free F YP 21 39 1by100ff <sup>2</sup> a Ratio <u>C</u> 12 a on 3 impace so on 4 impace co on 4 impace 25 <sup>*</sup> top to a coupon to tr of comment,	rgle: luid: 10 s 15 19 Coupon P Test 1 4. Test 2 2 ct act amont, 0.: 599 (bf ac	Vor 0.0 mL i 0.0 Get Sta ie c 5 3 10/10 10/10 20 psi 220 psi 32285* t sont, 0.2	rtical / 250 ml. 00% ungth 10 min 17 19 0007 254*

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 120 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

		LOGI									
SUPERIOR ENERG	IV SERVIC	ES COMP	ANY	Laborati	ory Data Sun	nmarv					
est Date:	March 13, 20	7		10000		1997 - 1997	Size / Type		14 (in)		Casing
oject No:	HDV0965-5-	tB	2	Depth	h TVD (ft): 4,2	200 Wol	I Fluid Don	sity (lb/gal)		9.	
impany:	WWC/BSEE		•			22 Tes D1	t Schedule			Casing - 9.4	
				Temp. Grad. Test Press	A	1					
	_			Ceme	ent Slurry Des	ion					
Slurry Density (b/gal):	12.0	0	-	Skurry Yield (ft		2.24		Tota	Mixing Flui	d (gal/sk):	12.81
Cement Blend		Sack Weigh		of Total Weight	Prod Weight, Ib/sk	CSI Log					
Cement - Class H (Le	high)	94	1000	65	61.10	L4560	33				
POZMIX (74)		74		35	25.90	L3627					
Mix Water Deionized Water		c	12.808	۱ <mark>۰</mark>	Units gal/sk	CSI Log : 0	•				
Function	Additive		Conce	ntration	Units	CSI Log					
Defeamer	Defeamer 7 Gel (Bentor	011	0.	300	%bwoc (DB) %bwoc (DB)	L4878 P2272					
Light Weight	Get (Bentor	109/	8.		%DWOC (L/H)		2.4				
					Test Results						
Comont (b/gal): Desired Thickening Ti tal Thickening Time - Ca			0 Ba 4:17	2 70 Bc	hranin				Additional Vontex a		0 sec. Yes 12,016 122 hrzmin hrzmin hrzmin
Desired Thickening Ti tal Thickening Time - Ce BHCT (%F): 101 Desired Free Fluid se Fluid Conditioning Measured	me vment		0 Bc 4:17	70 Bc Shear Bond Test 1 2.02 in Test 2 1.96 in Test 3 1.98 in	hranin Inch pilog traveled () Inch pilog traveled () Inch pilog traveled () Inch pilog traveled () In bond 170 pil	).17 in at 52 psi	Test 1 4.	Compres Tes 50 500 54 6 Ball 66.9 99 x 1.013	Additional Vontex : Max serve Streng t Temperatu psi at psi at psi at gms, Distan x .991 inch	at Low RPM: cimum RPM: the (°F): 10:51 N/A	Yes 12,016 122 hrzmin hrzmin hrzmin ss on 1 impact
Cement (b/gal): Desired Thickening Time - Ce BHCT (PF): 101 Desired Free Fluid se Fluid Conditioning Measured Calculated	Temp. (%F): Test Angle: Free Fluid:	<2% 101 Vertica 4.0 mL/ 25	0 Bc 4:17	70 Bc Shear Bond Test 1 2.02 in Test 2 1.96 in Test 3 1.98 in	ich plug travolod ( ich plug travolod ( ich plug travolod (	).17 in at 52 psi	Weight o Test 1 4.	Compres Tes 50 500 54 6 Ball 66.9 99 x 1.013	Additional Vontex : Max serve Streng t Temperatu psi at psi at psi at gms, Distan x .991 inch	at Low PPM: cimum RPM: ath re (*F): 1051 NA 12:00 ce 11.25 inch sampb broke h sampb broke	Yes 12,016 122 hcmin hromin hromin hromin or 1 impact or 1 impact
Comont (b/gal): Desired Thickening Time - Co BHCT (%F): 101 Desired Free Fluid te Fluid Conditioning Measured Calculated sellogical Properties Fluid / Maxture	Temp. (°F):_ Test Angle: Free Fluid:_ Temp *F	<u>≪2%</u> 101 Vortica 4.0 mL/ 25 1.60% 300	0 Bc 4:17 0 mL 200	70 Bc Shear Bond Test 1 2.02 in Test 2 1.96 in Test 3 1.99 in Average shea 100	nch pilog travelied 0 ich pilog travelied 0 ich pilog travelied 0 ar bond 170 psi 60 30	).17 in at 52 psi ).21 in at 43 psi 6	Weight o Test 1 4. Test 2 4.	Compress Tes 50 500 54 i Bal 66.9 99 x 1.013 99 x 1.001	Additional Vortex a Max asive Streng Temperatu psi at psi at psi at grns, Distan x .991 inch x 0.984 incl	at Low RPM: cimum RPM: ath re (°F): 10:51 NA 12:00 co 11:25 inche sampb broke n sampb broke Get 10 soc	Yes 12,016 122 hcmin hrmin hrmin hrmin ss on 1 impact s on 1 impact Strength 10 min
Comont (b/gal): Desired Thickening Ti tal Thickening Time - Ce BHCT (%F): 101 Desired Free Fluid e Fluid Conditioning Measured Calculated eological Properties Fluid / Maxture Cement	Tomp. (%F): Tost Angle: Free Fluid: Free Fluid: Tomp *F 80 101	<2%           101           Vortica           4.0 mL/ 25           1.60%           300           52           66	0 Bc 4:17 0 mL 200 50 62	70 Bc <u>Shear Bond</u> Test 1 2.02 in Test 1 2.02 in Test 2 1.96 in Test 2 1.96 in Test 3 1.99 in Average sheat 100 48 58	ch plag travolied 0 ch plag travolied 0 ch plag travolied 0 ar bond 170 psi 60 30 46 44 54 50	).17 in at 52 psi ).21 in at 43 psi	Weight o Test 1 4. Test 2 4.	Compress Tes 50 500 54 feast # Ball 66.9 99 x 1.013 99 x 1.001	Additional Vortex x Max saive Strong t Tomperatu pei at pei at pei at pei at saive sai saive saive saive sai sai sai sai sai s	at Low RPM: cimum RPM: ath re (*F): 1051 NA 12:00 ce 11.25 inche sample broke sample broke Getti	Yes 12,016 122 hcmin hrzmin hrzmin hrzmin on t impact s on t impact Strength
Comont (b/gal): Desired Thickening Ti tal Thickening Time - Ce BHCT (%F): 101 Desired Free Fluid e Fluid Conditioning Measured Calculated eological Properties Fluid / Maxture Cement	Tomp. (%F): Tost Angle: Free Fluid: Free Fluid: Tomp *F 80 101	<2%           101           Vortica           4.0 mL/ 25           1.60%           300           52           66	0 Bc 4:17 0 mL 200 50 62	70 Bc <u>Shear Bond</u> Test 1 2.02 in Test 1 2.02 in Test 2 1.96 in Test 2 1.96 in Test 3 1.99 in Average sheat 100 48 58	ch plag travolied 0 ch plag travolied 0 ch plag travolied 0 ar bond 170 psi 60 30 46 44 54 50	0.17 in at 52 psi 0.21 in at 43 psi 6 27	Weight c Test 1 4. Test 2 4. 3 20	Compres Tos 500 540 6 Ball 66:9 99 x 1.013 99 x 1.001	Additional Vontex : Max estive Streng removeratu poi at poi at poi at gms, Distan x .991 inch x 0.984 incl YP 35	at Low PPM: cimum RPM: 10.51 NA 12:00 ce 11.25 incht sampb broke h sampb broke 10.50 Get 10.50 19	Yos 12,016 122 hr.min hr.min hr.min hr.min so on 1 impact o on 1 impact strength 10 min 19
Cement (b/gal): Desired Thickening Tit tal Thickening Time - Ce BHCT (PF): 101 Desired Free Fluid se Fluid Conditioning Measured Calculated seological Properties Fluid / Macture Cement Cement Cement te: Pheology measured un draulic Bond	Temp. (%F): Test Angle: Free Fluid: Free Fluid: Free Fluid: Temp *F 80 101 sing Rt-B1-F2 Splittin	 	0 Bc 4:17	70 Bc Shear Bond Test 1 2.02 in Test 2 1.92 in Test 2 1.92 in Test 3 1.99 in Average sheat 100 48 58 Test 8 H.Bl. nconfined Co	nch plag traveled 0 sch plag traveled 0 sch plag traveled 0 ar bond 170 psi 60 30 46 44 54 50 F1.0 compressive Strem	6 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	Weight of Test 1 4. Test 2 4. 3 20 21 21 	Compres Tes 50 500 54 6 Bal 66.9 99 x 1.013 99 x 1.013	Additional Vortex : Max estive Streng t Temperatu psi at psi at gms, Distan x .991 inch x .0.984 incl YP 35 38 ibyr000* <sup>2</sup>	at Low RPM: cimum RPM: ath re (*F): 1051 NA 12:00 ce 11.25 inche sample broke b sample broke 10 sec 19 19 bo	Yes           12,016           122           hcmin           hcmin           hcmin           hcmin           so on 1 impact           o on 1 impact           10 min           19           26           /100m <sup>2</sup>
Cement (b/gal): Desired Thickening Time - Ce BHCT (%F): 101 Desired Free Fluid te Fluid Conditioning Measured Calculated cological Properties Fluid / Maxture Cement	Temp. (°F):_ Temp. (°F):_ Temp ?F Free Fluid: Temp ?F 80 101 101 Tent 1 3 Tent 1 3 Tent 2		0 Bc 4:17	70 Bc Shear Bond Test 1 2.02 in Test 2 1.92 in Test 2 1.92 in Test 3 1.99 in Average sheat 100 48 58 Test 8 H.Bl. nconfined Co	nch pilog traveled 0 ch pilog traveled 0 ch pilog traveled 0 ar bond 170 psi 60 30 46 44 54 50 F1.0	6 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	Weight of Test 1 4. Test 2 4. 3 20 21 21 	Compress Tes 50 500 54 # Ball 66.9 99 x 1.013 99 x 1.001 PV 24 37 cP	Additional Vortex : Max estive Streng t Temperatu psi at psi at gms, Distan x .991 inch x .0.984 incl YP 35 38 ibyr000* <sup>2</sup>	at Low RPM: cimum RPM: ath re (*F): 10:51 12:00 co 11:25 inche sampb broke is sampb broke 10 sec 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	Yes           12,016           122           hranin           hranin           hranin           ss           on 1 impact           s on 1 impact           10 min           19           26           /100#*
Comont (b/gal): Desired Thickening Ti tal Thickening Time - Ce BHCT (°F): 101 Desired Free Fluid te Fluid Conditioning Measured Calculated te Fluid / Macture Coment	Temp. (°F):_ Test Angle: Free Fluid:_ Free Fluid:_ 101 101 3 Test 1 3 Test 2 7 Test 3		0 Bc 4:17	70 Bc Shear Bond Test 1 2.02 in Test 2 1.92 in Test 2 1.92 in Test 3 1.99 in Average sheat 100 48 58 Test 8 H.Bl. nconfined Co	nch plag traveled 0 sch plag traveled 0 sch plag traveled 0 ar bond 170 psi 60 30 46 44 54 50 F1.0 compressive Strem	6 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	Weight of Test 1 4. Test 2 4. 3 20 21 21 	Compres Tes 50 500 54 6 Bal 66.9 99 x 1.013 99 x 1.013	Additional Vortex : Max estive Streng t Temperatu psi at psi at gms, Distan x .991 inch x .0.984 incl YP 35 38 ibyr000* <sup>2</sup>	at Low RPM: cimum RPM: ath re (*F): 10:51 NA 12:00 co 11:25 inche sampb broke th sampb broke 10 soc 19 19 By Coupon Pulli T Toot 152 pr	Yes           12,016           122           hranin           hranin           hranin           ss           on 1 impact           s on 1 impact           10 min           19           26           /100#*
Comont (b/gal): Desired Thickening Time - Co BHCT (%F): 101 Desired Free Fluid E-Fluid Conditioning Measured Calculated Calculated Comont Comont Comont Comont and Comont and Comot and Com	Temp. (°F): Test Angle: Temp 1F 80 101 Solitim Solitim Test 1 Test 1 Test 3 Test 3 Averag	101           Vertica           4.0 mL/25           1.60%           300           52           .0 configurat           a Tensile Str           38 pai           35 pai           35 pai           207 psi           al Conductivit	0 Bc 4:17 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL	70 Bc Shear Bond Tost 1 2.02 in Tost 2 1.96 in Tost 3 1.99 in Avorago shea 100 48 58 58 tod as R1-B1- nconfined Co	ch plug traveled 0 ch plug traveled 0 ch plug traveled 0 ar bond 170 psi 60 30 46 44 54 50 F1.0 cmpressive Street 448 psi circlar, Sp	6 27 6 27 27 27 27 3.191 south Young's. # 3.191 socilic Heat	Weight of Test 1 4. Test 2 4. 3 20 21 21 	Compres Tes 50 500 54 6 Bal 66.9 99 x 1.013 99 x 1.013	Additional Vortex : Max estive Streng t Temperatu psi at psi at gms, Distan x .991 inch x .0.984 incl YP 35 38 ibyr000* <sup>2</sup>	at Low RPM: cimum RPM: ath re (*F): 10:51 12:00 co 11:25 inche sampb broke is sampb broke 10 sec 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	Yes           12,016           122           hranin           hranin           hranin           ss           on 1 impact           s on 1 impact           10 min           19           26           /100#*
Comont (b/gal): Desired Thickening Tit tal Thickening Time - Ce BHCT (°F): 101 Desired Free Fluid seluid Conditioning Measured Calculated selogical Properties Fluid / Maxture Comont Comment	Temp. (°F): Test Angle: Temp 1F 80 101 Solitim Solitim Test 1 Test 1 Test 3 Test 3 Averag		0 Bc 4:17 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL	70 Bc Shear Bond Test 1 2.02 in Test 2 1.96 in Test 3 1.99 in Average shea 100 48 58 Ted as R1.81 nconfined Cc	ch plug traveled 0 ch plug traveled 0 ch plug traveled 0 ar bond 170 psi 60 30 46 44 54 50 F1.0 cmpressive Street 448 psi circlar, Sp	6 27 in at 52 psi 27 in at 43 psi 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 3.18/	Weight of Test 1 4. Test 2 4. 3 20 21 21 	Compres Tes 50 500 54 6 Bal 66.9 99 x 1.013 99 x 1.013	Additional Vortex : Max estive Streng t Temperatu psi at psi at gms, Distan x .991 inch x .0.984 incl YP 35 38 ibyr000* <sup>2</sup>	at Low RPM: cimum RPM: ath re (*F): 10:51 12:00 co 11:25 inche sampb broke is sampb broke 10 sec 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	Yes           12,016           122           hranin           hranin           hranin           ss           on 1 impact           s on 1 impact           10 min           19           26           /100#*
Camont (b/gal): Desired Thickening Tit tal Thickening Time - Ce BHCT (%F): 101 Desired Free Fluid se Fluid Conditioning Measured Calculated calculated selegical Properties Fluid / Maxture Cement Cement Cement Cement Tement Neasured und drautic Bond Flow Rate si Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Temp. (°F): Test Angle: Temp 1F 80 101 Solitim Solitim Test 1 Test 1 Test 3 Test 3 Averag	101           Vertica           4.0 mL/25           1.60%           300           52           .0 configurat           a Tensile Str           38 pai           35 pai           35 pai           207 psi           al Conductivit	0 Bc 4:17 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL	70 Bc Shear Bond Test 1 2.02 in Test 2 1.96 in Test 3 1.99 in Average shea 100 48 58 58 test as R1-B1- nconfined Co	ch plug traveled 0 ch plug traveled 0 ch plug traveled 0 ar bond 170 psi 60 30 46 44 54 50 F1.0 cmpressive Street 448 psi circlar, Sp	6 27 6 27 27 27 27 3.191 south Young's. # 3.191 socilic Heat	Weight of Test 1 4. Test 2 4. 3 20 21 21 	Compres Tes 50 500 54 6 Bal 66.9 99 x 1.013 99 x 1.013	Additional Vortex : Max estive Streng t Temperatu psi at psi at gms, Distan x .991 inch x .0.984 incl YP 35 38 ibyr000* <sup>2</sup>	at Low RPM: cimum RPM: ath re (*F): 10:51 12:00 co 11:25 inche sampb broke is sampb broke 10 sec 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	Yes           12,016           122           hranin           hranin           hranin           ss           on 1 impact           s on 1 impact           10 min           19           26           /100#*
Cement (b/gal): Desired Thickening Tit tal Thickening Time - Ce BHCT (%): 101 Desired Free Fluid te Fluid Conditioning Measured Calculated te fluid / Macture Cement Cement Cement Cement Cement Cement Cement Cement Coment	Temp. (°F): Test Angle: Temp 1F 80 101 Solitim Solitim Test 1 Test 1 Test 3 Test 3 Averag	101           Vertica           4.0 mL/25           1.60%           300           52           .0 configurat           a Tensile Str           38 pai           35 pai           35 pai           207 psi           al Conductivit	0 Bc 4:17 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL	70 Bc Shear Bond Test 1 2.02 in Test 2 1.96 in Test 3 1.99 in Average shea 100 48 58 58 test as R1-B1- nconfined Co	ch plug traveled 0 ch plug traveled 0 ch plug traveled 0 ar bond 170 psi 60 30 46 44 54 50 F1.0 cmpressive Street 448 psi circlar, Sp	6 27 6 27 27 27 27 3.191 south Young's. # 3.191 socilic Heat	Weight of Test 1 4. Test 2 4. 3 20 21 21 	Compres Tes 50 500 54 6 Bal 66.9 99 x 1.013 99 x 1.013	Additional Vortex : Max estive Streng t Temperatu psi at psi at gms, Distan x .991 inch x .0.984 incl YP 35 38 ibyr000* <sup>2</sup>	at Low RPM: cimum RPM: ath re (*F): 10:51 12:00 co 11:25 inche sampb broke is sampb broke 10 sec 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	Yes           12,016           122           hranin           hranin           hranin           ss           on 1 impact           s on 1 impact           10 min           19           26           /100#*
Cement (b/gal):	Temp. (°F): Test Angle: Temp 1F 80 101 Solitim Solitim Test 1 Test 1 Test 3 Test 3 Averag	101           Vertica           4.0 mL/25           1.60%           300           52           .0 configurat           a Tensile Str           38 psi           35 psi           3207 psi           3207 psi	0 Bc 4:17 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL 0 mL	70 Bc Shear Bond Test 1 2.02 in Test 2 1.96 in Test 3 1.99 in Average shea 100 48 58 58 test as R1-B1- nconfined Co	ch plug traveled 0 ch plug traveled 0 ch plug traveled 0 ar bond 170 psi 60 30 46 44 54 50 F1.0 cmpressive Street 448 psi circlar, Sp	6 27 6 27 27 27 27 3.191 south Young's. # 3.191 socilic Heat	Weight of Test 1 4. Test 2 4. 3 20 21 21 	Compres Tes 50 500 54 6 Bal 66.9 99 x 1.013 99 x 1.013	Additional Vortex : Max estive Streng t Temperatu psi at psi at gms, Distan x .991 inch x .0.984 incl YP 35 38 ibyr000* <sup>2</sup>	at Low RPM: cimum RPM: ath re (*F): 10:51 12:00 co 11:25 inche sampb broke is sampb broke 10 sec 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	Yes           12,016           122           hranin           hranin           hranin           ss           on 1 impact           s on 1 impact           10 min           19           26           /100#*

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 121 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

avrenivn enenut	SERVICES COMP				25			
		Labo	ratory Data Summe	<u>Y</u>				
ojact No: HD	pril 04, 2017 2V0965 5 - 2c WWC/BSEE	-	Depth MD (ft): 12,702 Mepth TVD (ft): 12,100 BHST (%F): 245 BHCT (%F): 190 rad. (%F/100ft): 1.36	Job Size / Tys Wall Fluid De Test Schedul	nstly (tb/gal):	9 5/8 (m) Lin	16. er - 9.20	Uner 4
		100000000000000000000000000000000000000	hassume (PSI): 11,230	51				
Siuny Density (b/gal):	17.0	Sluny Yiek	ment Surry Design 1 (tî'sk): 1.4		Total 8	Alking Filuid (p	jal/38):	5.08
Comere Bland	Sack Weigt	ht, % of Total Sack Weight	Prod Weight, Ib/sk	CSI Log #			1	
Comort - Class H (Lohig		100	94.00	L4560				
Mix Water	c	Concentration	Units	CSI Log #				
Doioniz od Water		5.077	gaist	Tabstock				
Function	Addieve	Concentration	Units	CSI Log #				
sighting Agent Silica	Hematilis Silica Flour	8.000	%bwoc (DB) %bwoc (DB)	P0481B L4372				
	Deloamer 7011	0.100	%bwoc (DB)	L4878				
Fluid Loss	FL-17	0.900	%bwoc (DB)	P2274				
Disportant	NC-S-1	0.800	%bwoc (DB)	C4170				
	Sand-100 Mash	25.000	(BB) powd/P	L4373				
Retarder	FR-1	0.100	%bwoc (DB)	L4869				
			Test Results					
asured Density					Slurry Mixin			
Comant (Ib/gal):	17.0					Additional Tir		10 sec
						Vortex at L	UT RPM:	Yes 12,174
						Webuilt	1200 PUP 00.	12,179
Desired Thickening Time	8	6-10 hrs			Compress	ve Strength		
al Thickening Time - Cerm	-	40 Bc 70 Bc			Test T	emperature i	(平):	245
BHCT (%F): 190	2.0							
	<u>0</u> . ( <u>)</u>	09:41 09:58	bermin		50	psi at	03:28	hramin
	<u>_</u>	09:41 09:56	brania		50 500	psi at	03:28	hromin hromin
	<u></u>	09:58	brain		500 3,224	psi at psi at	03:51	hromin hromin
		09:56	branin		500	psi at psi at psi at	03:51	hromin hromin hromin
		00/31 00/58	tranin		500 3,224	psi at psi at	03:51	hromin hromin
		09:58	termin	Desize	500 3,224 3,921	psi at psi at psi at	03:51 12:00 24:00	hromin hromin hromin
Desired Fluid Loss	<u>&lt; 100mis</u>	00:31 00:58	termin	Do sino France Fauld	500 3,224 3,921	psi at psi at psi at	03:51	hromin hromin hromin
Desired Fluid Loss		00/41 00:58	tranin		500 3,224 3,921	psi at psi at psi at	03:51 12:00 24:00 0.00	hromin hromin hromin
Desired Fluid Loss	<u>&lt; 100mis</u> amp (۴۴): 190		tr.min		500 3,224 3,921	psi at psi at psi at psi at	03.51 12:00 24:00 0.00	hronin hronin hronin hours 190 ertical
Desked Fluid Loss nic Fluid Loss Test T Collected Collected Th	< <u>100mls</u> amp (4F): 190 uid (ml.): 26 me (mln.): 30		trank		500 3,224 3,921 d Free Fluid Conditioni	psi at psi at psi at psi at ng Temp. (°F Test Angk ted Free Fluk	03.51 12:00 24:00 	hrmin hrmin hrmin hours 190 ortical L/ 250 mL
Desired Fluid Loss ac Fluid Loss Test T Collected F	< <u>100mls</u> amp (4F): 190 uid (ml.): 26 me (mln.): 30		branin		500 3,224 3,921 d Free Fluid Conditioni	psi at psi at psi at psi at ng Temp. (% Test Angk	03.51 12:00 24:00 	hronin hronin hronin hours 190 ertical
Dasted Fluid Loss an Fluid Loss Collected F Collected F API Fluid Loss (m	< <u>100mls</u> amp (4F): 190 uid (ml.): 26 me (mln.): 30		branin		500 3,224 3,921 d Free Fluid Conditioni	psi at psi at psi at psi at ng Temp. (°F Test Angk ted Free Fluk	0351 1230 2430 0.00 1: 2: W 2: W 2: 0.0 mi 2: 0	httmin httmin httmin hours 190 erfical L/ 250 mL 1.00%
Desined Fluid Loss no Fluid Loss Test T Collacted F Collacted F API Fluid Loss (m scientical Progeness	<100mls emp (%): 190 uid (ml.): 26 ne (min.): 30 L/30min): 52		- "	Free Fluid	500 3,224 3,921 d Free Fluid Canditioni Measu Calcula	psi at psi at psi at psi at ng Temp. (% Test Angk ad Free Fluk ad Free Fluk	03.51 12.00 24.00 	httmin httmin httmin hours 190 arfical L/ 250 mL 100%
Desited Fluid Loss no Fluid Loss Test T Collected F Collected F API Fluid Loss (m extendical Progeness	< <u>100mls</u> amp (4F): 190 uid (ml.): 26 ne (mln.): 30	200 100 200 100 200 118			500 3,224 3,921 d Free Fluid Conditioni	psi at psi at psi at psi at ng Temp. (°F Test Angk ted Free Fluk	0351 1230 2430 0.00 1: 2: W 2: W 2: 0.0 mi 2: 0	httmin httmin httmin hours 190 erfical L/ 250 mL 1.00%
Desired Fluid Loss to: Fluid Loss Test T Collection Th API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid Loss (m Centert Centert	≤ 100mls emp (*F): 190 uic (mL): 25 as (min.): 30 L30min(: 52 L30min(: 52 80 254 190 150	206 100 205 118 107 63	60 30 76 42 43 25 5	Free Fuld	500 3,224 3,921 d Free Fluid Conditioni Measu Calcular PV 282 145	psi at psi at psi at psi at ng Tomp, (*F Tost Angk ad Froe Fluk bd Froe Fluk YP 14 10	03.51 1230 2430 0.00	hranin hranin hranin hours 190 orfical L/ 250 mL L00% Seength 10 min 15 35
Desired Fluid Loss ac Fluid Loss Test T Collector Tr API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid Loss (m Comant Coma	<100mls amp (%): 190 uid (ml.): 26 ne (mln.): 30 Li30mln): 52 amp -F 300 80 284 190 150 81-13-F2.0 configuration 190 150 81-13-F2.0 configuration	200 100 205 118 107 63 50 and sported as R1-8	60 30 76 42 43 25 -	6 3 11 6 8 5	500 3.224 3.921 3.921 Canditioni Maasu Calcular PV 282 145 cP	pol at pol at pol at pol at pol at pol at rest Angle and Free Fluk bid Free Fluk YP 14 10 avroom <sup>2</sup>	03.51 12:00 24:30 24:30 : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	hranin hranin hranin hours 190 orfcol L/ 250 mL 1,09% 200% 10 min 15 366 100f <sup>2</sup>
Dasing Fluid Loss an Fluid Loss Collected F Collected F Collection Th API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid Loss (m Cemant Cemant Cemant Cemant Struct Bood of the same using daulic Bood	<100mls amp (*F): 190 ud (mL): 26 me (min): 30 L30min): 52 mp rF 300 80 254 190 150 gR1 BF:F20 configuration Splitching Tensile San Splitching Tensile San	200 100 205 118 107 63 50 and sported as R1-8	60 30 76 42 43 25 1-F1.0 Compressive Suttingth	Free Fault	500 3,224 3,921 d Free Fluid Condition Calcular Calcular 252 145 6P P	psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at Test Angle res f Free Fluk Pree Fluk YP 14 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	03.51 12:00 24:00	htzmin htzmin htzmin htzmin htzuns 190 4rdical 1/ 250 mL 1/ 250 mL 10 min 15 36 36 36 36
Desired Fluid Loss ac Fluid Loss Test T Collector Tr API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid / Mosure Fluid / Mosure Camart Camart Echolog measured using desuld Book Flow Rate	≤ 100mls emp (*F): 190 uic (mL): 25 as (min.): 30 L30mini: 52 L30mini: 52 80 254 190 150 pH-B+F2.0 configures in Soliwing Tonsis Sin Tast 160cpt	200 100 205 118 107 63 50 and sported as R1-8	60 30 76 42 43 25 -	6 3 11 6 8 5	500 3.224 3.921 3.921 Canditioni Maasu Calcular PV 282 145 cP	psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at ng Tomp, (*F Tost Angle ad Free Fluk bd Free Fluk YP 14 10 may roome Comp 5 T	03.51 12:00 24:00	hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hours 190 orfical L/ 250 mL L00% 36 36 36 36 36 36
Desired Fluid Loss to Fluid Loss Test T Collector Tr Collector Tr API Pluid Loss (m API Pluid Pluid API	<100mls amp (*F): 190 ud (mL): 26 me (min): 30 L30min): 52 mp rF 300 80 254 190 150 gR1 BF:F20 configuration Splitching Tensile San Splitching Tensile San	200 100 205 118 107 63 50 and sported as R1-8	60 30 76 42 43 25 1-F1.0 Compressive Suttingth	Free Fault	500 3,224 3,921 d Free Fluid Condition Calcular Calcular 252 145 6P P	psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at ng Tomp, (*F Tost Angle ad Free Fluk bd Free Fluk YP 14 10 may roome Comp 5 T	03.51 12:00 24:00	hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hours 190 orfical L/ 250 mL L00% 36 36 36 36 36 36
Desited Fluid Loss ter Fluid Loss Test T Collaction Th API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid Loss (m actinginal Properties Fluid / Missuin Carmant Carmant Carmant Elson Rati Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0	<100mls amp (%): 190 uid (mL): 26 as (min.): 30 L30min): 52 amp -F 300 80 284 190 150 Fit-19-12.0 configuration Soluting Tensile Sin Test 1 606ps Test 2 602ps	200 100 205 118 107 63 50 and sported as R1-8	60 30 76 42 43 25 1-F1.0 Compressive Suttingth	Free Fault	500 3,224 3,921 d Free Fluid Condition Calcular Calcular 252 145 6P P	psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at ng Tomp, (*F Tost Angle ad Free Fluk bd Free Fluk YP 14 10 may roome Comp 5 T	03.51 12:00 24:00	hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hours 190 orfical L/ 250 mL L00% 36 36 36 36 36 36
Desired Fluid Loss to Fluid Loss Test T Collector Tr Collector Tr API Pluid Loss (m API Pluid Loss (m API Pluid Loss (m Coment Coment Coment Coment Coment Coment Plow Rate 4 Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 max	<100mls <tr>         &lt;100mls</tr>	200 100 205 118 107 63 on and reported as R1-8 ength Unconfined	60 30 75 42 43 25 1-F1.0 Compressive Steingth 6310 psl	5 3 11 5 8 5 <u>Young's Modulus</u> • 2206406	500 3,224 3,921 d Free Fluid Condition Calcular Calcular 252 145 6P P	psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at ng Tomp, (*F Tost Angle ad Free Fluk bd Free Fluk YP 14 10 may roome Comp 5 T	03.51 12:00 24:00	hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hours 190 orfical L/ 250 mL L00% 36 36 36 36 36 36
Desited Fluid Loss tex Fluid Loss Test T Collection Th API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid L	< 100mls	200 100 205 118 107 63 107 63 en and seported as R1-8 engeh Unconfined	60 30 76 42 43 25 5 5-F1.0 Compressive Seeingth 6-310 pal	Free Fuld 6 3 11 6 8 5 Young's Modulus • 220E+06	500 3,224 3,921 d Free Fluid Condition Calcular Calcular 252 145 6P P	psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at ng Tomp, (*F Tost Angle ad Free Fluk bd Free Fluk YP 14 10 may roome Comp 5 T	03.51 12:00 24:00	hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hours 190 orfical L/ 250 mL L00% 36 36 36 36 36 36
Desired Fluid Loss Inc Fluid Loss Test T Collection Th API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid Loss (m Cormant Cormant Example Constant Fluid / Micruito The Fluid (m Fluid / Micruito Cormant Fluid / Micruito The Fluid Loss Pluid (m API Fluid Loss API Fluid API Fluid Loss API Fluid Loss API Fluid Loss API Fluid API Fluid Loss API Fluid API Fluid Loss API Fluid API Fluid Loss API Fluid API Fluid	<100mls amp (*F): 190 uid (mL): 25 as (min.): 30 L30min): 52 amp *F 300 80 284 190 150 51-191-F2.0 configuration Soluting Tonate Sin Tast 1 686ps Tast 251 psl Tast 272 psl Average 705 psl	200 100 209 118 107 63 on and sported as R1-8 ungeh Unconfined	60 30 76 42 43 25 5 5-F1.0 Compressive Sittingth 6310 psl	Free Fuld 6 3 11 6 8 5 Young's Modulus • 220E+06	500 3,224 3,921 d Free Fluid Condition Calcular Calcular 252 145 6P P	psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at ng Tomp, (*F Tost Angle ad Free Fluk bd Free Fluk YP 14 10 may roome Comp 5 T	03.51 12:00 24:00	hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hours 190 orfical L/ 250 mL L00% 36 36 36 36 36 36
District Fluid Loss tic Fluid Loss Test T Collacted F Collacted F Collacted F Collacted F Collacted F Collacted F Collacted F Carmant Carmant E Rhoology Instaured using thuid: Bong Box Fabs 9 Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 9 Pipe	<100mts amp (*F): 190 (udi (mL): 26 ac (min.): 30 L30mtni: 52 amp +F 300 80 284 190 150 51-131-F2.0 contiguration Soluting Tensite San Test 1 606ps Test 2 631 psi Test 2 742 psi Average 705 psi Thermal Conducery 1.3027 WimK	200 100 205 118 107 63 107 63 en and seported as R1-8 engeh Unconfined	60         30           76         42           43         25           1-F1.0	Free Fuld 6 3 11 6 8 5 Young's Modulus • 220E+06	500 3,224 3,921 d Free Fluid Condition Calcular Calcular 252 145 6P P	psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at ng Tomp, (*F Tost Angle ad Free Fluk bd Free Fluk YP 14 10 may roome Comp 5 T	03.51 12:00 24:00	hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hours 190 orfical L/ 250 mL L00% 36 36 36 36 36 36
Desired Fluid Loss tec Fluid Loss Test T Collection Tr API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid L	≤ 100mls emp (47): 190 uic (m1): 25 as (min): 30 L30mld: 52 30 190 150 pR1-81-52.6 configurate Soliving Tonsis 254 190 150 pR1-81-52.6 configurate Soliving Tonsis 254 193 150 rest 2 631 psi Test 2 631 psi 1.9027 W mK Shear Bond	200 100 205 118 107 63 nor and reported as R1-8 engeth Unconfined wy Teermal D4 0.30085	60         30           75         42           43         25           5-F1:0	6         3           11         6           8         5           Young's Modulus         220E-06           Litest         Murrhk.	500 3.224 3.921 d Free Fuld Canditorit Measu Calcular 282 745 eP <u>PV</u> 282 145 eP	psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at ng Tomp, (*F Tost Angle ad Free Fluk bd Free Fluk YP 14 10 may roome Comp 5 T	03.51 12:00 24:00	hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hours 190 orfical L/ 250 mL L00% 36 36 36 36 36 36
Desired Fluid Loss Test T Celiseba F Celiseba F Celiseba F Celiseba F Celiseba F Celiseba F Celiseba F Celiseba F Ruid / Masura Too Carmant Carmant Carmant Exc. Rhoology masurad using draubé cons Fluid / Masura Carmant Plose Fabr 4 Pips 1 Pips 2 Pips 3 0 0 0 0 max 0 0 max 0 0 max 0 0 max	≤100mts amp (*F): 190 uid (m1): 25 be (m1n): 30 L30mth): 52 amp *F 300 80 284 190 150 g R1-B1-F2.0 configurate Soluting Tenetic Star Test 2 631 pal Test 3 792 pal Average 706 pal Thermal Conduction 1.3027 WimK Shoar Bond Test 1,2,1135 inch pal	200 100 209 118 107 63 on and is portiad as R1-B engeh Unconfined ug Thermal Dil 0.2008	60         30           76         42           43         25           1-F1.0         25           Compressive Settingth         5310 pal           Musiking:         Specifi           6310 pal         3.3168           Musiking:         Specifi           831 pal         Weight of Ball 6	5         3           11         6           8         5           Young's Modulus           * 220E406           SHOULUS           MU/m <sup>2</sup> X           Litom           MU/m <sup>2</sup> X           Litom           MU/m <sup>2</sup> X	500 3.224 3.921 d Free Flaid Candiloni Measu Calculu PV 282 145 cP Roleson's 0.264 25 inches	pol at pol at pol at pol at pol at pol at rest Angle as d Pree Fluk bed Free Fluk bed Free Fluk 10 10 avroom? Te Te	03.51 12:00 24:00	hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hours 190 orfical L/ 250 mL L00% 36 36 36 36 36 36
Destrud Fluid Loss tex Fluid Loss Test T Collection Th API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid L	< 100mls	200 100 205 118 107 63 on and sports d as R1-S senach Unconfined up traveled 0.1965 in at 25 g traveled 0.1965 in at 25	60         30           76         42           43         25           1-F1.0         Compressive Swingth 6310 pd           6310 pd         Smooth 3310 pd           Immediation         3.3166           Immediation         Total for Salid 2 pd           331 pd         Waight of Eall G           2 pd         Total f A.913 x 3	5         3           11         6           8         5           Young's Modulus 9           2.20E+06           Elicat MJ/m <sup>2</sup> K           CERATE           Status	500 3.224 3.224 3.221 d Free Flaid Conditional Molasta Calcular PW 252 145 CP 0.2645 0.2645 25 inches pib troke on 65	pol at po	03.51 12:00 24:00	hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hours 190 orfical L/ 250 mL L00% 36 36 36 36 36 36
Desired Fluid Loss Inc Fluid Loss Test T Collection Th API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid Loss (m Comart Cernart Carnart Carnart Ex Rhodogy measured using draube Bordy Fluid / Manue The Rate I Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0 0 0	< 100mls	200 100 209 118 107 63 en and spools as RT-B enoch Unconfined www. Thermal Del 0.20389 up traveled 0.1965 in at 25 g traveled 0.296 in at 25	60         30           76         42           43         25           1-F1.0         25           Compressive Settingth         5310 pal           Musiking:         Specifi           6310 pal         3.3168           Musiking:         Specifi           831 pal         Weight of Ball 6	5         3           11         6           8         5           Young's Modulus 9           2.20E+06           Elicat MJ/m <sup>2</sup> K           CERATE           Status	500 3.224 3.224 3.221 d Free Flaid Conditional Molasta Calcular PW 252 145 CP 0.2645 0.2645 25 inches pib troke on 65	pol at po	03.51 12:00 24:00	hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hours 190 orfical L/ 250 mL L00% 36 36 36 36 36 36
Desired Fluid Loss Inter Fluid Loss Test T Collection The API Fluid Loss (m API Flui	≤ 100mls           emp (*F):         190           uid (mL):         26           ne (min):         30           L80mini:         52           Strip: F         300           190         150           191         150           Schisting Transite Sim         Schisting Transite Sim           Tast 1 606psi         Tast 2 631 pai           Tast 2 631 pai         Tast 2 92 pai           Average 705 pai         Thermal Conductive           Tast 1 2.1135 inch pi         Tast 1 2.1135 inch pi           Tast 1 2.1135 inch pi         Tast 1 2.1135 inch pi           Tast 1 2.1135 inch pi         Tast 1 2.1135 inch pi	200 100 205 118 107 63 61 and sported as R1-8 <b>sneeth Unconfined</b> 0.30389 ug traveled 0.1965 in at 35 19 traveled 0.1979 in at 35 313 pd	60         30           76         42           43         25           1-F1.0         Stringth           6310 pcl         5310 pcl           Intel 2 4           Intel 2 4           Mage: Test           Weight of Ball 6           Test 2 4           Test 2 4           Test 2 4	Free Fuld           6         3           11         6           8         5           Young's Modulus           *         2.20E+06           *         2.20E+06           *         2.20E+06           *         2.20E+06           CHIGAL         MU/m*X           6.89 gms, Distances 11         1           0.5475 x 1.0815 inch 1         1	500 3.224 3.921 3.921 d Free Flaid Conditional Measure Calcular PW 282 145 cP 255 inches pic broke on 65 sample broke on 65	pol at po	0351 12300 24300 	hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin kours 190 effical L/ 250 mL 10 min 15 36 9006 <sup>7</sup> 31 31 31
Desired Fluid Loss Inter Fluid Loss Test T Collection The Collection The API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid Loss (m Commant Commant Explosed Properties Fluid / Manune Test Theorem Commanded Test Fluid Properties Test Theorem Commanded Test Theorem Commanded Test Test Test Test Test Test Test Test	<100mts	200 100 209 118 107 63 on and spontod as RT-8 on a	60         30           76         42           43         25           1-F3.0	Free Fuld           6         3           11         6           8         5           Young's Modulus           *         2.20E+06           *         2.20E+06           *         2.20E+06           *         2.20E+06           CHIGAL         MU/m*X           6.89 gms, Distances 11         1           0.5475 x 1.0815 inch 1         1	500 3.224 3.921 3.921 d Free Flaid Conditional Measure Calcular PW 282 145 cP 255 inches pic broke on 65 sample broke on 65	pol at po	0351 12300 24300 	hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin kours 190 effical L/ 250 mL 10 min 15 36 9006 <sup>7</sup> 31 31 31
District Fluid Loss Test T Collected Fluid Loss Test T Collected Fl Collected Fl	< 100mls	200 100 209 118 107 63 In and sportbud as R1-B senach Unconfined up traveled 0.1965 in at 35 313 pd 10 p to cament, 0.250° to	60         30           76         42           43         25           1-F1.0         25           Compressive Sterngth 6310 psl         50010           Starting         33016           Tost 1 4.913 x.1         55 psl           Tost 2 4.8115 x         bottom to cament.	6         3           11         6           8         5           Young's Modulus 6           2.20E+06         2.20E+06           Litical Mum*X           Litical Mum*X           Colspan="2">Sign colspan="2"Sign colspan="2">Sign colspan="2"Sign colspan="	500 3.224 3.921 3.921 d Free Fluid Conditionit Molastu Calcular PW 252 145 6P 0.264 0.264 25 inches pib troke on 65 sample broke on 65 sample broke on 65	pol at po	0351 12300 24300 	hrznin hrznin hrznin hrznin hrznin sefical (/ 250 mL (/ 250 mL () 00% anone 10 min 15 <u>36</u> 36 si si si
Desired Fuld Loss Inter Fuld Loss Test T Collection Te API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid Loss (m Comart Cernart Cernart Entri (Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0 max 1 Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0 max 1 Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0 max 1 Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0 max 1 Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0 max 1 Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0 max 1 Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0 max 1 Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0 max 1 Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0 max 1 Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0 max 1 Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0 0 max 1 Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0 0 max 1 Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	≤ 100mls           emp (*F):         190           uid (mL):         25           ne (min):         30           L30mini:         52           mp *F         300           80         284           190         150           191         150           52         150           51         150           51         150           52         150           51         150           52         150           51         150           52         150           51         152           52         150           51         152           52         150           53         150           54         150           54         150           54         150           54         150           54         150           54         150           54         150           54         150           54         150           54         155           50         155           50         155	200 100 205 118 107 63 on and reported as R1-8 engeth Uniconfined up traveled 0.229 in at 25 up traveled 0.229 in at 25 up traveled 0.229 in at 25 sis pel traveled 0.229 in at 25 up traveled 0.250 in at 25 up travel	60         30           76         42           43         25           5-F1.0         5           Compressive Strangth         6310 psl           6310 psl         5310 psl           Status         Santia           Part Test 1 + 0.913 x 1         55 psl           Test 2 + 8.915 x         Dottom to commant, Test 2 1           Stomm to commant, Stommand, Sto	Free Fuld           6         3           11         6           8         5           Young's Modulus         6           220E-06         220E-06           Elicat         M/m*X           689 gmo, Distances 11         10           05+75 x 1.0815 Inch sam         10           99° ID, 2.647° Pipe Is         1,0.625           1,2007° Pipe D, 0.625         1,0.625	500 3.224 3.921 3.921 d Free Fluid Conditionit Molastu Calcular PW 252 145 6P 0.264 0.264 25 inches pib troke on 65 sample broke on 65 sample broke on 65	pol at po	0351 12300 24300 	hrznin hrznin hrznin hrznin hrznin sefical (/ 250 mL (/ 250 mL () 00% anone 10 min 15 <u>36</u> 36 si si si
Desired Fluid Loss Test T Celiseled F Celiseled F Celiseled F Celiseled F Celiseled F Celiseled F Celiseled T Cernart Carnart Carnart Fluid / Masun Tow Rate Rev Rate Rev Rate Pos T Plop 2 Plop 3 0	<100mts     amp (*F): 190     uid (m1): 25     ac (min): 30     Li30min): 52     ac (min): 53     ac (min): 54     ac (	200 100 205 118 107 63 on and sported as RT-8 ongh Unconfined ug traveled 0.225 h at 2 g traveled 0.225 h at 25 ug traveled 0.225 h at 25 313 pd * bp to coment, 0.250* b po to coment, 0.250* b po to coment, 0.250* b twidth, 0.57* coupon bit width, 0.57* coupon bit	60         30           76         42           43         25           1-F1:0	6         3           11         6           8         5           Young's Medulus 5           2206-06         2206-06           Bition Mum*X           Status 108-75 x 1.0615 inch sam 0.8475 x 1.0615 inch sam 0.8475 x 1.0615 inch sam 0.8475 x 1.0615 inch sam	500 3.224 3.921 d Free Flaid Candiloni Measu Calcular PV 282 145 6P Beleson's 0.264 25 inches pis broke on 65 campis broke on 65 c	pol at po	0351 12300 24300 	hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hours 190 erfcal 1/250 mL 10 min 35 35 3000 <sup>4</sup> 31 35 35 31 35 35 31 35 35 31 35 35 35 35 35 35
Desired Fuld Loss Inter Field Loss Test T Collection Tir API Field Loss (m API Field	<100mts     amp (*F): 190     uid (m1): 25     ac (min): 30     L00mtol: 52     continguints     ac (min): 52     continguints     ac (min): 52     continguints     soluting Tenetic Sim     fait 160pci     Test 200pci     Test 200pci     test 2135 inch pi     test 3133 int achieve     ment, 57338 int achieve	200 100 205 118 107 63 on and sported as RT-8 ongh Unconfined ug traveled 0.225 h at 2 g traveled 0.225 h at 25 ug traveled 0.225 h at 25 313 pd * bp to coment, 0.250* b po to coment, 0.250* b po to coment, 0.250* b twidth, 0.57* coupon bit width, 0.57* coupon bit	60         30           76         42           43         25           1-F1:0	6         3           11         6           8         5           Young's Medulus 5           2206-06         2206-06           Bition Mum*X           Status 108-75 x 1.0615 inch sam 0.8475 x 1.0615 inch sam 0.8475 x 1.0615 inch sam 0.8475 x 1.0615 inch sam	500 3.224 3.921 d Free Flaid Candiloni Measu Calcular PV 282 145 6P Beleson's 0.264 25 inches pis broke on 65 campis broke on 65 c	pol at po	0351 12300 24300 	hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hours 190 erfcal 1/250 mL 10 min 35 35 3000 <sup>4</sup> 31 35 35 31 35 35 31 35 35 31 35 35 35 35 35 35
Desired Fuld Loss Into Flatd Loss Test T Calacted F Calacted F Calacted F Calacted F Calacted T API Flatd Loss (m API Flatd Loss (m Cernart Cernart Cernart Cernart Flatd / Manuer F Poor 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0 0 max 1 Pipe 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0 0 max 0 0 0 max 0 0 0 0 max 0	≤ 100mls           emp (*F):         190           uid (m1):         25           ae (min):         30           L30mini:         52           mp 1F         300           80         254           190         150           191         150           192         150           193         150           194         254           305         150           194         150           195         160           198         2631 pid           198         2705 pid           Thermal Conductive         1.3027 Wink           Shear Bond         1.3027 Wink           Shear Bond         1.3027 Wink           27 080 pipe length, 0.364         70 Pipe length, 0.364           27 080 pipe length, 0.364 Pipe length         0.364           27 080 pipe length, 0.364         259.38 lbf achieve           10 mingth, 2.008 Pipe length         1.3027 Pipe length	200 100 205 118 107 63 en and sporthol as R1-8 enceth Unconfined w Dates of the sporthol of the sporthol g traveled 0.252 in at 253 ug traveled 0.252 in at 253 ug traveled 0.2557 to pt to cement, 0.2537 to pt to cement, 0.2557 to pt to	60         30           76         42           43         25           5-F1.0	6         3           11         6           8         5           Young's Modulus         5           2206-06         2206-06           Litest         MJ/m*K           6.89 gms, Distance 11         1           0.6475 x 1.0815 inch sam         0.9475 x 1.0815 inch sam           0.9475 x 1.0815 inch sam         0.9475 x 1.0815 inch sam           95° EL 2.647° Pipe lie         2.007° Pipe 0.0.521           yzonnewith,         7' bottom of coupon to	500 3.224 3.921 3.921 d Free Fuld Candilorit Measu Calcular PV 282 145 eP 282 145 eP 282 251 145 eP 282 252 145 eP 282 252 255 145 eP 282 255 255 145 eP 285 255 145 eP 285 255 145 eP 285 255 145 eP 285 255 145 eP 285 255 145 eP 285 255 145 eP 285 255 145 eP 285 255 145 eP 285 255 145 eP 285 255 145 eP 285 255 255 255 255 255 255 255	pol at po	0351 12300 24300 0.00 12 10 22 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 10	hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hours 190 erfcal 1/250 mL 10 min 35 35 3000 <sup>4</sup> 31 35 35 31 35 35 31 35 35 31 35 35 35 35 35 35
Desired Fluid Loss Test T Collection Th Collection Th API Fluid Loss (m Collection Th API Fluid Loss (m Commant Carmant Carmant Fluid / Maxium Too Flat Brookingy measured using draule Coord Fluid / Maxium Too Flat Pope T Pipe 2 Pipe 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	≤ 100mts           amp (*F):         190           uid (m1):         25           ne (min):         30           L00mts):         52           semp *F         300           80         284           100         150           gR1-B1-F2.0 configurate         52           Stelling Totalls Stell         Total 12,000 pail           Test 16 (60c)         13027 Wink           Stelling Totals Stell         1.327 Wink           Stelling Total 2,1355 inch pil         Test 3,2327 Wink           Stelling Total 2,1355 inch pil         1.327 Wink           Stelling Totall 2,1355 inch pil         Test 3,327 Wink           Stelling Totall 2,1355 inch pil         Test 12,135 inch pil           Test 12,2135 inch pil         Stelling Total 2,338 (b) pail           Test 2,338 (b) pail         0.354 (b) pail           Tige Bangth, 2,308 (b) pail         1* Pipe length, 2,008* Pipe           2018* Diameta, 2,134* Diameta, 2,164 (b)         1* Pipe length, 2,008* Pipe	200 100 209 118 107 63 on and reported as RT-8 enget Unconfined up traveled 0.291 in at 25 10, 1965 in at 2 g traveled 0.291 in at 25 21, 2015 10, 1975 color to a width, 0.575 color to a the to ask, Tad 22, 2555 e D, 0.7955 to p of coup st; Test 2: 1.0475' Langth	60         30           76         42           43         25           1-F1.0	6         3           11         6           8         5           Young's Modulus         5           2206-06         2206-06           Litest         MJ/m*K           6.89 gms, Distance 11         1           0.6475 x 1.0815 inch sam         0.9475 x 1.0815 inch sam           0.9475 x 1.0815 inch sam         0.9475 x 1.0815 inch sam           95° EL 2.647° Pipe lie         2.007° Pipe 0.0.521           yzonnewith,         7' bottom of coupon to	500 3.224 3.921 3.921 d Free Fuld Candilorit Measu Calcular PV 282 145 eP 282 145 eP 282 251 145 eP 282 252 145 eP 282 252 255 145 eP 282 255 255 145 eP 285 255 145 eP 285 255 145 eP 285 255 145 eP 285 255 145 eP 285 255 145 eP 285 255 145 eP 285 255 145 eP 285 255 145 eP 285 255 145 eP 285 255 145 eP 285 255 255 255 255 255 255 255	pol at po	0351 12300 24300 0.00 12 10 22 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 10	hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hours 190 erfcal 1/250 mL 10 min 35 35 3000 <sup>4</sup> 31 35 35 31 35 35 31 35 35 31 35 35 35 35 35 35
Dasterd Fluid Loss Inter Fluid Loss Test T Collected F Collected F Comment Com	≤ 100mts           amp (*F):         190           uid (m1):         25           ne (min):         30           L00mts):         52           semp *F         300           80         284           100         150           gR1-B1-F2.0 configurate         52           Stelling Totalls Stell         Total 12,000 pail           Test 16 (60c)         13027 Wink           Stelling Totals Stell         1.327 Wink           Stelling Total 2,1355 inch pil         Test 3,2327 Wink           Stelling Total 2,1355 inch pil         1.327 Wink           Stelling Totall 2,1355 inch pil         Test 3,327 Wink           Stelling Totall 2,1355 inch pil         Test 12,135 inch pil           Test 12,2135 inch pil         Stelling Total 2,338 (b) pail           Test 2,338 (b) pail         0.354 (b) pail           Tige Bangth, 2,308 (b) pail         1* Pipe length, 2,008* Pipe           2018* Diameta, 2,134* Diameta, 2,164 (b)         1* Pipe length, 2,008* Pipe	200 100 205 118 107 63 on and sported as RV-8 smath Unconfined up traveled 0.1965 in at 25 0.30689 Up traveled 0.1965 in at 25 up traveled 0.170 in at 38 313 pd ** bp to cement, 0.2507* op to sement, 0.2507* to sement,	60         30           76         42           43         25           1-F1.0	6         3           11         6           8         5           Young's Modulus         5           2206-06         2206-06           Litest         MJ/m*K           6.89 gms, Distance 11         1           0.6475 x 1.0815 inch sam         0.9475 x 1.0815 inch sam           0.9475 x 1.0815 inch sam         0.9475 x 1.0815 inch sam           95° EL 2.647° Pipe lie         2.007° Pipe 0.0.521           yzonnewith,         7' bottom of coupon to	500 3.224 3.921 3.921 d Free Fuld Candiloni Measu Calcular PV 282 745 eP Polesonis 0.2645 25 inches pie broke on 60 sample broke o	pol at po	0351 12300 24300 0.00 12 10 22 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 6 4 10 sec 10	hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hours 190 erfcal 1/250 mL 10 min 35 35 3000 <sup>2</sup> 31 35 35 31 35 35 31 35 35 31 35 35 35 35 35 35 35 35 35 35 35 35 35

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 122 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

	INOLOGI	ES				HDV	965-5 - 3b	
SUPERIOR ENERGY	Y SERVICES COMP	ANY			_			
		Labor	atory Data Summ	nar <u>y</u>				
est Date: A	April 04, 2017	I	Oepth MD (ft): 17,000	Job Stze	/ Type:	5 (n)	Liner	ř.
-	DV 0965 5 - 3b	D	opth TVD (ft): 16,50		id Density (b/gal)		17.8	-
ompany:	WW C/BSEE	-	BHST ("F): 350 BHCT ("F): 284	Test Sch	edule:	S.E.	iner - 9.22	
			sd. ("F/100tt): 1.64					
		201021	essure (PSI): 16,51					
Sturry Density (Ib/gal):	18.5	2000	ment Slurry Desig	<u>n</u> 75	Total	Mixing Fluid	Amellely !-	6.32
24 12 10 14 1 1 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Sack Weigh	Sluny Yiek	Prod Weight,	and the second	1000	awing russ	(garant).	
Cement Blend	Ib	Sack Weight	Ib/sk	CSI Log#				
Cement - Class H (Lehi	igh) 94	100	94.00	L4560				
Mb: Water	0	oncentration	Units	CSI Log #				
Delonized Water		6.318	gařsk	labstock				
Function	Additive	Concentration	Units	CSI Log#				
Arighting Agent Silica	Hernatile Silica Flour	40.000	%bwoc (DB) %bwoc (DB)	C2730 C3196				
Defoamer	Defoamer 7011	0.100	96bwod (DB)	C4174				
FW/Susp Aid	LTBA-1	0.200	%bwoc (DB)	P3587				
Fluid Loss Dispersant	FL-17 NC-8-1	1.000	%bwoc (DB) %bwoc (DB)	P2274 C4170				
	Sand-100 Mesh	25.000	%bwoc (DB)	L4373				
Retarder	PCR-3 MicroMax	1.000	%bwoc (DB) %bwoc (DB)	C1989 Z2051				
	MEROMA	24.000	The Wood (LDB)	22061				
			Test Results				-	
Desired Thickening Tim	•	6-10 hrs			Compres	sive Strengt	h	
otal Thickening Time - Can	nent 4	KO BC 70 BC			Test	Temperature	("F):	350
BHCT ("F): 284	0	6:25 06:29	homin		50	psi at		nimen
					500	psi at		romin
					3,044	psi at	12:00 h	rimin
							12:00 h 24:00 h	
					3,044 4,292	psi at psi at	12:00 h 24:00 h	rimin rimin
Destred Fluid Loss	s50mia				3,044 4,292 Islined Free Fluid	psi at psi at	12:00 h 24:00 h	rimin rimin
limed Fluid Loss Test 3	emp (*F): 284			Da Fina F	3,044 4,292 Indexed Free Fluid	psi at psi at psi at ing Temp. (*	12:00 h 24:00 h <u>- h</u> <u>0.00</u> F): 190	romin romin nours
lined Fiuld Loss Test T Collected F	amp (*F): 284 Tuld (mL): 14	1			3,044 4,292 select Free Fluid Condition	psi at psi at psi at ing Temp. (* Test Ang	12:00 h 24:00 h <u>0.00</u> F): 190 jb: Vertici	romin romin nours al
timed Fluid Loss Test 3 Collected F Collection Tit	amp (*F): 284 Auld (mL): 14 me (min.): 30	1			3,044 4,292 add Condition Meas	psi at psi at psi at ing Temp. (* Test Ang ured Free Fit	12:00 h 24:00 h <u>0.00</u> F): 190 jb: Vertic id: 0.0 mL/2	romin romin nours al 50 mL
lined Fiuld Loss Test T Collected F	amp (*F): 284 Auld (mL): 14 me (min.): 30	-			3,044 4,292 add Condition Meas	psi at psi at psi at ing Temp. (* Test Ang	12:00 h 24:00 h <u>0.00</u> F): 190 jb: Vertic id: 0.0 mL/2	romin romin nours al 50 mL
Ined Fluid Loss Test T Collected F Collecton Tir API Fluid Loss (m teological Properties	kimp (*F): 284 Nuld (mL): 14 ne (min.): 30 NJ 30min): 28			Free F	3,044 4,292 Suid Condition Meas Calcul	psi at psi at psi at ing Temp. (* Test Ang ured Free Flu ated Free Flu	12:00 h 24:00 h - h 0.00 F): 190 pb: Vento id: 0.0 mL/2: kd: 0.009 Cal Seon	romin romin tours al 50 mL K gen
Imad Fluid Loss Test T Collected F Collected F Collected F Collector T API Fluid Loss (m Heological Properties Fluid / Micture T	kimp (*F): 284 luid (mL): 14 ne (min.): 30 Lui/30min): 28 kimp *F 300	200 100 305 234	60 30 154 104	<u>Free 1</u> 6 3	3,044 4,292 estinad Free Fluid Said Condition Meas Calcul	psi at psi at psi at ing Temp. (* Test Ang und Free Fit ated Free Fit YP	12:00 h 24:00 h - h 9.00 F): 190 bb: Vertic 190: Vertic 4d: 0.001/2: 4d: 0.009 Cell Seon 10 sec	romin romin tours al <u>50 mL</u> K <b>geh</b> 10 min
Intel Fluid Loss Test 3 Collected F Collected F Collected F API Fluid Loss (m heological Properties Fluid / Michure T Cement Cament	bimp (*F): 254 tud (mL): 14 nc (min): 30 tu' 30min): 28 bimp *F 300 50 552 190 292	396 224 214 129	154 104 89 54	Free F	2,044 4,292 edited Free Fluid Condulor Meas Calcul PV 509 280	psi at psi at psi at ing Temp. (* Test Ang urad Free Fit ated Free Fit 54 24	12:00 h 24:00 h 5.000 F): 190 pb: Verific 4: 0.0 mL / 2 At: 0.009 Cal Seon 10 sec 4:0 15	romin romin nours al 50 mL 6 90 mL 6 10 min 94 32
Itmad Fluid Loss Test T Collector Tr API Fluid Loss (m heelogical Properties Fluid / Micture T Coment Cament Cament Coment Coment Coment	bimp (*F): 284 tutd (mL): 14 me (mls.): 30 tut30min): 28 bimp *F 300 80 552 190 202 190 202	395         224           214         129           tion and reported as R1	154 104 89 54 -B1-F1.0	6 3 57 49 18 12	2,044 4,292 estimal Free Fluid Condition Meas Calcul PV 505 280 cP	psi at psi at psi at ing Temp. (* Test Ang ured Free Fit ated Free Fit 54 24 Ib/1004*	12:00 h 24:00 h 0.000 h 5): 190 b): Vento id: 0.0 mL / 2 id: 0.004 Call Seon 10 sec 49 15 12,1004	romin romin nours al 50 mL 6 90 mL 6 10 min 94 32
timed Fluid Loss Test 1 Collected Collected The Collected The Collected The Collected Properties Fluid / Michane Cement	bimp (*F): 254 tud (mL): 14 nc (min): 30 tu' 30min): 28 bimp *F 300 50 552 190 292	395         224           214         129           tion and reported as R1	154 104 89 54	6 3 57 49 18 12	2,044 4,292 estination Free Field Condition Meas Catcul 250 250 cP Ulus Protection	psi at psi at psi at psi at rest Ang ured Free Fit ated Free Fit <b>YP</b> 54 24 <b>by100R<sup>2</sup></b> 5 <b>Fallo</b> 22	12:00 h 24:00 h 5.000 F): 190 pb: Verific 4: 0.0 mL / 2 At: 0.009 Cal Seon 10 sec 4:0 15	romin romin nours al 50 mL 6 90 mL 6 10 min 94 32
Internal Fluid Loss Test T Collector Tr Collector Tr API Fluid Loss (m heological Properties Fluid / Mixture T Coment Com	bimp (*F):         284           tuld (mL):         14           ne (min.):         30           ul/ 30min):         28           samp *F         300           80         552           190         202           190         202           Total 1 533pt         1 533pt           Text 2 590 psi         1 530 psi	395         224           214         129           tion and reported as R1	154 104 89 54 -B1-F1.0 I Compressive Strang	6 3 57 49 18 12 h Young's Mod	2,044 4,292 estination Free Field Condition Meas Catcul 250 250 cP Ulus Protection	psi at psi at psi at psi at rest Ang ured Free Fit ated Free Fit <b>YP</b> 54 24 <b>by100R<sup>2</sup></b> 5 <b>Fallo</b> 22	12:00 h 24:00 h 	romin romin nours al 50 mL 6 90 mL 6 10 min 94 32
Itend Fluid Loss Test 1 Collector Tr API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid Loss (m API Fluid Loss (m Coment Coment Coment Coment Coment Coment Fluid Altiture T Coment Fluid Altiture Fluid Altiture Fluid Altiture Fluid Altiture Fluid Pho 1 Pho 2 Pho 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	bitmp (*F):         284           uid (mL):         14           ne (min.):         30           ui/ 30min):         28           semp *F         300           80         552           190         292           rg R+: 65+F>0 comfiguration           Settining Tensile: Str           Teat 1 533psi           Teat 3 500 psi	395         224           214         129           tion and reported as R1	154 104 89 54 -B1-F1.0 I Compressive Strang	6 3 57 49 18 12 h Young's Mod	2,044 4,292 estination Free Field Condition Meas Catcul 250 250 cP Ulus Protection	psi at psi at psi at psi at rest Ang ured Free Fit ated Free Fit <b>YP</b> 54 24 <b>by100R<sup>2</sup></b> 5 <b>Fallo</b> 22	12:00 h 24:00 h - h 9:00 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 000 Cal Sten 10 sec 49 15 By 1906 Futon Pull Test	romin romin nours al 50 mL 6 90 mL 6 10 min 94 32
Iterad Fluid Loss Test T Collector T Collector T AFI Fluid Loss (m <u>Fluid / Micture</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u> <u>Coment</u>	bimp (*F):         284           tuld (mL):         14           ne (min.):         30           ul/ 30min):         28           samp *F         300           80         552           190         202           190         202           Total 1 533pt         1 533pt           Text 2 590 psi         1 530 psi	395         224           214         129           tion and reported as R1	154 104 89 54 -B1-F1.0 I Compressive Strang	6 3 57 49 18 12 h Young's Mod	2,044 4,292 estination Free Field Condition Meas Catcul 250 250 cP Ulus Protection	psi at psi at psi at psi at rest Ang ured Free Fit ated Free Fit <b>YP</b> 54 24 <b>by100R<sup>2</sup></b> 5 <b>Fallo</b> 22	12:00 h 24:00 h - h 9:00 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 000 Cal Sten 10 sec 49 15 By 1906 Futon Pull Test	romin romin nours al 50 mL 6 90 mL 6 10 min 94 32
Itemat Fluid Loss         Test 1           Colector F         Colector F           Colector Tr         API Fluid Loss (m           API Fluid Loss (m         To           Coment         Coment           Coment         Coment      Coment         Coment      <	bitmp (*F):         284           tuid (mL):         14           en (mln):         30           ti/ 30mm):         28           samp *F         300           80         552           590         292           mg R-5-52.0 confligural         582           Text 1 533csi         Text 2 580 psi           Text 2 580 psi         Text 3 500 psi           Average 571 psi         Thermal Conductivity	396 224 214 129 Ion and reported as R1 sength Unconfined	154         104           80         54	6 3 57 40 18 12 h Young's Mod # 1.57E+06	2,044 4,292 estination Free Field Condition Meas Catcul 250 250 cP Ulus Protection	psi at psi at psi at psi at rest Ang ured Free Fit ated Free Fit <b>YP</b> 54 24 <b>by100R<sup>2</sup></b> 5 <b>Fallo</b> 22	12:00 h 24:00 h - h 9:00 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 000 Cal Sten 10 sec 49 15 By 1906 Futon Pull Test	romin romin nours al 50 mL 6 90 mL 6 10 min 94 32
Itemad Fluida Lossa         Test T           Collectora F         Collectora F           Collectora F         Collectora F           API Fluida Loss (m         T           Build / Michare         T           Comment         Comment           Comment         Comment           Comment         Comment           Comment         Comment           Comment         Comment           Collectora Pipe 1         Pipe 2           Dial         Pipe 1           Dial         0           Dial         0           Dial         0           Dial         0	bittip (*F):         284           utip (dmL):         14           ne (min.):         30           util 30min):         28           samp *F         300           80         552           190         202           Total 1533psi         590 psi           Test 2580 psi         Test 2590 psi           Average 571 psi	396 224 214 129 tion and reported as R1 sangth Unconfine of	154         104           80         54	6 3 57 49 18 12 h Young's Med # 1.57E+06	2,044 4,292 estination Free Field Condition Meas Catcul 250 250 cP Ulus Protection	psi at psi at psi at psi at rest Ang ured Free Fit ated Free Fit <b>YP</b> 54 24 <b>by100R<sup>2</sup></b> 5 <b>Fallo</b> 22	12:00 h 24:00 h - h 9:00 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 000 Cal Sten 10 sec 49 15 By 1906 Futon Pull Test	romin romin nours al 50 mL 6 90 mL 6 10 min 94 32
Internal Fluid Loss         Test 1           Colector Tr         Colector Tr           API Fluid Loss (m         Test 3           Fluid / Mixture         Test 3           Fluid / Mixture         Test 3           Coment         Coment           Coment         Flow Rate           State Proor Pate         Flow Rate           State Proor Pate         Flow Rate           State Proor Pate         O           State Pate         Flow Rate           State Pate         Flow Rate           State Pate         O	bitmp (*F):         284           tuid (mL):         14           en (mln):         30           ti/ 30mm):         28           samp *F         300           80         552           590         292           mg R-5-52.0 confligural         582           Text 1 533csi         Text 2 580 psi           Text 2 580 psi         Text 3 500 psi           Average 571 psi         Thermal Conductivity	396 224 214 129 Ion and reported as R1 sength Unconfined	154         104           80         54	6 3 57 40 18 12 h Young's Mod # 1.57E+06	2,044 4,292 estination Free Field Condition Meas Catcul 250 250 cP Ulus Protection	psi at psi at psi at psi at rest Ang ured Free Fit ated Free Fit <b>YP</b> 54 24 <b>by100R<sup>2</sup></b> 5 <b>Fallo</b> 22	12:00 h 24:00 h - h 9:00 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 000 Cal Sten 10 sec 49 15 By 1906 Futon Pull Test	romin romin nours al 50 mL 6 90 mL 6 10 min 94 32
Itemat Fluid Losa         Test T           Collector Tr         Collector Tr           API Fluid Loss (m         Collector Tr           API Fluid Loss (m         T           Coment         Collector Tr           Collector Tr         Trow Rate           Flow Rate         Tr           Collector Tr         Trow Rate           Collector Tr          Collector Tr         Trow Rate           Collector Tr          Collector Tr          Collector Tr          Collector Tr          Collector Tr          Collector         Tr	amp (*F):         284           tutd (mL):         14           ne (mls,1:         30           ut/30min):         28           amp *F         300           80         552           190         202           190         202           190         202           190         202           17 Tenzis Sir         500           17 Tenzis Sir         500           17 Tenzis Conductivii         1.5523 Wink           Shear Bond         Teat 12.050 Inch play	396     224       214     129       Ibin and reported as R1       sangth     Unconfined       Str     Thermal St       0.4905 r     0.4905 r       g traveled 0.1645 in at 3	154         104           80         54           81.F5.0         504           I Compressive Strong         5044 pal           S044 pal         504           S073         3.17           Import Test         Weight of Bal	6         3           57         49           18         12           h         Young's Mod #           16.7E+06           MUm*K           16.689 gms, Distar	2,044 4,292 4,292 Condition Meas Calcul PV 505 280 280 29 0,21 0,21	ysi at psi at psi at psi at rost Ang ured Frae Fil atod Frae Fil atod Frae Fil 24 24 <b>E</b> y1008 <sup>2</sup> <b>S Ratio</b>	12:00 h 24:00 h - h 9:00 F): 190 F): 190 F): 190 F): 00 mL/2 Ad: 0.004/2 Cal Seb Ad: 0.004 Cal Seb Ad: 0.004 Cal Seb Ad: 0.004 To Sec 49 TS TS TS Tast 1 0 psi Tast 2 80 psi	romin romin nours al 50 mL 6 90 mL 6 10 min 94 32
Intel Fluid Loss         Test 1           Colector Tr         Colector Tr           API Fluid Loss (m         To           Balance         To           API Fluid Loss (m         To           Connent         Connent           Connent         Connent           Connent         Fluid / Mixture         To           Sement         Connent         Connent           Sement         Connent         Connent           Sement         Connent         Connent           Connent         Connent         Conne           Connent	amp (*F):         284           uti (mL):         14           ne (min.):         30           uti 30mmin;         28           100         552           100         202           100         202           100         202           101         284           102         202           103         202           104         530 bit           Text 1 533pit         Text 3 500 pai           Average 571 psi         1.5523 W/mK           State 1 2.050 pich play         1.6523 W/mK           State 1 2.050 pich play         Text 1 2.050 pich play	396     224       214     129       ion and reported as R1       singth     Unconfined       transition     Unconfined       transition     0.4005 m       ug transided 0.1645 m at 13       ug transided 0.1915 in at	154         104           80         54           B1F5.0         50           I Compressive Strang 5044 psi         50           tusk/thr         Special 3.17           Impact Test 967 psi         Weight of Bal 377 pal	6         3           57         49           18         12           h         Young's Mod #           1.67E+06           IB: Heat \$ Maim <sup>2</sup> K           166.89 gms, Distar x 1.0175 x 1.0015	2,044 4,292 estrad Free Fluid Conditor Meas Cated 280 280 280 280 0,25 90 280 0,25 0,25 0,25 0,25 0,25 0,25 0,25 0,2	ypsi at psi at psi at psi at rest Ang und Pros Fit atod Pros Fit by 1008 <sup>2</sup> <u>54</u> <u>24</u> <u>24</u> <u>24</u> <u>24</u> <u>24</u> <u>24</u> <u>24</u> <u>2</u>	12:00 h 24:00 h - h 0.00 F): 1900 kb: Vertio Vertio Cat Seon / 2: Ad: 0.00 Cat Seon / 2: Ad: 0.00 Ag 15 By 100 By 100 By 100 For 1 pai Test 1 0 pai Test 2 80 pai	romin romin nours al 50 mL 6 90 mL 6 10 min 94 32
Intel Fluid Loss         Test T           Colector Tr         Colector Tr           API Fluid Loss (m         T           Beological Properties         T           Fluid / Mixture         T           Coment         Coment           Coment         Coment           Coment         Coment           Coment         Coment           Flow Fate         Flow Fate           Flow Rate         0           00         0         0           00         0         0           00         max         0           00         max         0           00         -         0           00         -         0           00         -         0           00         -         0           00         -         -           00         -         -           00         -         -           00         -         -           00         -         -           00         -         -           00         -         -	amp (*F):         284           uti (mL):         14           ne (min.):         30           uti 30mmin;         28           100         552           100         202           100         202           100         202           101         284           102         202           103         202           104         530 bit           Text 1 533pit         Text 3 500 pai           Average 571 psi         1.5523 W/mK           State 1 2.050 pich play         1.6523 W/mK           State 1 2.050 pich play         Text 1 2.050 pich play	396     224       214     139       tion and reported as R1       sength     Unconflued       transfer     Unconflued <tr< td=""><td>154         104           89         54           B1F5.0         50           I Compressive Strang 5044 psl         50           tusk/thr         Special 3.17           Impact Test 967 psl         Weight of Bal 377 psl</td><td>6         3           57         49           18         12           h         Young's Mod #           1.67E+06           IB: Heat \$ Maim<sup>2</sup>K           166.89 gms, Distar x 1.0175 x 1.0015</td><td>2,044 4,292 estrad Free Fluid Conditor Meas Cated 280 280 280 280 0,25 90 280 0,25 0,25 0,25 0,25 0,25 0,25 0,25 0,2</td><td>ypsi at psi at psi at psi at rest Ang und Pros Fit atod Pros Fit by 1008<sup>2</sup> <u>54</u> <u>24</u> <u>24</u> <u>24</u> <u>24</u> <u>24</u> <u>24</u> <u>24</u> <u>2</u></td><td>12:00 h 24:00 h - h 0.00 F): 1900 kb: Vertio Vertio Cat Seon / 2: Ad: 0.00 Cat Seon / 2: Ad: 0.00 Ag 15 By 100 By 100 By 100 For 1 pai Test 1 0 pai Test 2 80 pai</td><td>romin romin nours al 50 mL 6 90 mL 6 10 min 94 32</td></tr<>	154         104           89         54           B1F5.0         50           I Compressive Strang 5044 psl         50           tusk/thr         Special 3.17           Impact Test 967 psl         Weight of Bal 377 psl	6         3           57         49           18         12           h         Young's Mod #           1.67E+06           IB: Heat \$ Maim <sup>2</sup> K           166.89 gms, Distar x 1.0175 x 1.0015	2,044 4,292 estrad Free Fluid Conditor Meas Cated 280 280 280 280 0,25 90 280 0,25 0,25 0,25 0,25 0,25 0,25 0,25 0,2	ypsi at psi at psi at psi at rest Ang und Pros Fit atod Pros Fit by 1008 <sup>2</sup> <u>54</u> <u>24</u> <u>24</u> <u>24</u> <u>24</u> <u>24</u> <u>24</u> <u>24</u> <u>2</u>	12:00 h 24:00 h - h 0.00 F): 1900 kb: Vertio Vertio Cat Seon / 2: Ad: 0.00 Cat Seon / 2: Ad: 0.00 Ag 15 By 100 By 100 By 100 For 1 pai Test 1 0 pai Test 2 80 pai	romin romin nours al 50 mL 6 90 mL 6 10 min 94 32
Inter Fluid Loss         Test T           Colector Tr         Colector Tr           API Fluid Loss (m         T           API Fluid Loss (m         T           Coment         Coment	binp (*F):         284           tutid (mL):         14           na (min.):         30           J/30min1:         28           amp *F         300           80         552           150         292           ng RF- 85-92.0 confligural         Setting També 300           Teat 1 538psi         Teat 2 580 psi           Teat 2 580 psi         Teat 2 590 psi           Morage 571 psi         Thermal Conductivity           State 300 psi         1.5523 W /mK           Shar Bond         Teat 1 2.059 inch pli           Teat 2 1.8815 inch pli         Avorage shar bord 300	396     224       214     129       10n and reported as R1       singth     Uncontined       type     0.4005 r       g traveled 0.1645 in at:       ug traveled 0.1915 in at       313 psi	154         104           89         54           B1F5.0         504           ICompressive Stange         5044 psl           Itasivity         Scace           100         3.17           Weight of Bal         Weight of Bal           857 psl         Weight of Bal           957 psl         Test 14.8875           378 psl         Test 2.4.8810	6         3           57         40           18         12           1         157           4         1.57E+06           #         1.57E+06           Ific. Heat         5           5.59.0 JB         5           4.075 x 1.075 x 1.0015         1.075 x 1.0050 l	2,044 4,292 added Frae Field add Constlor Meas Calcul PV 505 280 cP 280 cP 0,22 0,22 0,22 0,22 0,22	psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at for Amp, (* Tost Amp, und Frae Filt atod Frae Filt atod Frae Filt 24 24 but 004* 5 5 5 5 7	12:00 h 24:00 h - h 9:00 F): 1900 pb: Veritic id: 0.0 mL / 2 at: 0.004 Cell Seen 10 sec 49 15 By 1006 Supon Pull Test 10 pel Test 1 0 pel Test 2 80 pel	rmin rmin 100rs 50 mL 50 mL 50 mL 50 mL 32 32 32
Itemad Fluid Loss         Test T           Collector Tr         Collector Tr           API Fluid Loss (m         T           API Fluid Loss (m         T           Build / Mixture         T           Coment         Coment	bimp (*F):         284           tutid (mL):         14           ne (min,):         30           u/30min):         28           amp *F         300           80         552           190         292           ng RS-B1-F2.0 confligura         Text 1532sil           Text 2580 pai         Text 2580 pai           Nvorage 571 pai         1.5522W/mK           Shear Bond         Text 1 2.059 inch play           Text 2 1.3056 inch play         Text 2 1.3056 inch play           Text 2 1.2056 inch play         Text 3 1.516 ph n           Average shear bond         Setter State (1, 0, 176)	396     224       214     129       216 mand reported as R1       sength     Unconfined       100     1000       100     0.4005 m       100     0.4005 m       100     1645 m at:       100     1645 m at:       100     1645 m at:       100     1645 m at:       100     1765 m at:       110     1765 m at:       110     1765 m at:       110     1765 m at:	154         104           80         54           -B1-F1.0         504           Compressive Stange         504           5044 pal         504           fmpact         504           soft pal         100           soft pal         100	6         3           57         49           18         12           1         157           4         1.57E+06           #         1.57E+06           Ific. Heat         5           5.59.0 JB         5           4.075 x 1.075 x 1.0015         1.075 x 1.0050 l	2,044 4,292 added Frae Field add Constlor Meas Calcul PV 505 280 cP 280 cP 0,22 0,22 0,22 0,22 0,22	psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at for Amp, (* Tost Amp, und Frae Filt atod Frae Filt atod Frae Filt 24 24 but 004* 5 5 5 5 7	12:00 h 24:00 h - h 9:00 F): 1900 pb: Veritic id: 0.0 mL / 2 at: 0.004 Cell Seen 10 sec 49 15 By 1006 Supon Pull Test 10 pel Test 1 0 pel Test 2 80 pel	rmin rmin 100rs 50 mL 50 mL 50 mL 50 mL 32 32 32
Itemad Fluida Losse         Test T           Collectora F         Collectora F           Collectora T         Collectora T           API Fluida Loss (m         T           Ballo All Michare         T           Comment         Comment           Comment         Comment           Comment         Comment           Comment         Comment           Comment         Comment           Collectora Price Sand         Comment           Collectora Price Sand         Collectora Price Sand           Collectora Collectora Collectora Price Sand         Collectora Price Sand           Collectora Collectora Collectora Collectora Price Sand         Collectora Price Sand           Collectora Collectora Collectora Collectora Collectora Collectora Collectora Price Sand         Collectora Collectora Price Sand           Collectora Collecto	amp (*F):         284           truid (mL):         14           ne (mln,1:         30           u/J 30min):         28           amp *F         300           80         552           190         292           190         292           Text 1 533pti         560 psi           Average 571 psi         1.5523 Wimk           Statt Bond         1.5523 Wimk           Statt 2 1.505 Inch plu         Text 2 1.505 Inch plu           Text 2 1.505 Inch plu         Text 3 1.8815 Inch plu           25345 pipe length; 0.175         2.5245 pipe length; 0.27	396         224           214         125           150 and reported as R1         150           150 and reported as R1         150           151 and reported as R1         0.4005 r           152 and reported 0.1645 in at 1         0.4005 r           153 pt         151 state           154 and reported 0.1915 in at 313 pt         313 pt           155* top to comment, 0.298*         0.4000 r	154         104           89         54           B1.F5.0         54           I.Compressive Strong 5044 psi         504           flusivity         Sees nm7/s           S7 psi         3.17           S7 psi         Test 1 4.8875           375 psi         Test 1 4.8875           S7 psi         Test 1 4.8875           S7 psi         Test 1 4.8875           S7 bottom to coment, Te S7 bottom to coment, Te         57	6         3           57         49           18         12           h         Young's Mod #           16.57         49           57         49           18         12           h         Young's Mod #           16.589 gms, Distar x 1.0175 x 1.0015           x 1.0175 x 1.0015           x 1.011 x 0.9050 l           xst 2 1.9845" ID, 2.	2,044 4,292 4,292 Condition Meas Calcul 280 280 280 280 0,21 0,21 0,21 0,21 0,21 0,21 0,21 0,2	ypi at psi at the	12:00 h 24:00 h - h 9.00 F): 1900 F): 1900 F]: 1900 F]: 1900 F]: 1	romin romin tours al 50 mL K 90 90 90 90 91 91 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92
Itemad Fluida Losa         Test T           Colectora F         Colectora F           Colectora T         Colectora F           API Fluida Losa (m         T           Bando Matchine         T           Comment         Comment           Comment com         Recommendate	bimp (*F):         284           tutid (mL):         14           me (min.):         30           ut/30min):         28           wmp *F         300           80         552           190         292           mg RS-B1-F2.0 confligura         Settiting Tensis: Site           Test 2 580 psi         Test 2 580 psi           Test 3 500 psi         Norage 571 psi           Thermal Conductivit         1.5523 WimK           Shear Bond         Test 1 2.059 inch plug           Test 2 1.3056 inch plug         Test 3 1.305 inch plug           Average shear bond         Test 3 1.305 inch plug           Test 3 2.305 inch plug         Test 3 1.305 inch plug           Compon konght, 0.2525 your         Company           Josephangth, 0.2525 wims         Jack 2000 psi	396         224           214         129           121         129           121         129           121         129           121         129           121         129           121         129           123         129           124         129           125         120           126         124           127         129           128         129           129	154         104           80         54           B1.F5.0         54           I Compressive Strong 5044 pai         504           I Compressive Strong 504 pai         502           I Make I Angel 507 pai         502           S77 pai         100           507 bottom to coment; T 507 bottom to coment; on 506 bottom to coment; on 506 bottom to coment.	6         3           57         49           18         12           h         Young's Mod #           15.7E+06           MUCHood           15.7E+06           MUCHood           166.89 gms, Distar x 1.0775 x 1.0015 x 1.011 x 0.9950 l           est 2 1.9845* ID, 2.           es length, 1.925* Pi, uppon widh,	2,044 4,292 4,292 Condition Meas Calcul PV 505 6P 100 6P 100 02 02 02 02 02 02 02 02 02 02 02 02 0	psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at test Ang ured Free Fit atod Fit atod Free Fit atod Free Fit atod Free Fit atod Fit Atod Fit Atod Fit Atod Fi	12:00 h 24:00 h - 1 0.00 F): 190 b: Went / 2: dd: 0.0 mL / 2:	rmin rmin 10urs 30 mL 50 mL 50 mL 50 mL 50 mL 32 32 32 5° botto
Flow Fluid Loss         Test T           Colector Tr         Colector Tr           API Fluid Loss (m         T           Beological Properties         T           Fluid / Micture         T           Comment         Comment           Colo 0         0           D0         0	bimp (*F):         284           tutid (mL):         14           me (min.):         30           ut/30min):         28           wmp *F         300           80         552           190         292           mg RS-B1-F2.0 confligura         Settiting Tensis: Site           Test 2 580 psi         Test 2 580 psi           Test 3 500 psi         Norage 571 psi           Thermal Conductivit         1.5523 WimK           Shear Bond         Test 1 2.059 inch plug           Test 2 1.3056 inch plug         Test 3 1.305 inch plug           Average shear bond         Test 3 1.305 inch plug           Test 3 2.305 inch plug         Test 3 1.305 inch plug           Compon konght, 0.2525 your         Company           Josephangth, 0.2525 wims         Jack 2000 psi	396         224           214         129           121         129           121         129           121         129           121         129           121         129           121         129           123         129           124         129           125         120           126         124           127         129           128         129           129	154         104           80         54           B1.F5.0         54           I Compressive Strong 5044 pai         504           I Compressive Strong 504 pai         502           I Make I Angel 507 pai         502           S77 pai         100           507 bottom to coment; T 507 bottom to coment; on 506 bottom to coment; on 506 bottom to coment.	6         3           57         49           18         12           h         Young's Mod #           15.7E+06           MUCHood           15.7E+06           MUCHood           166.89 gms, Distar x 1.0775 x 1.0015 x 1.011 x 0.9950 l           est 2 1.9845* ID, 2.           es length, 1.925* Pi, uppon widh,	2,044 4,292 4,292 Condition Meas Calcul PV 505 6P 100 6P 100 02 02 02 02 02 02 02 02 02 02 02 02 0	psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at test Ang ured Free Fit atod Fit atod Free Fit atod Free Fit atod Free Fit atod Fit Atod Fit Atod Fit Atod Fi	12:00 h 24:00 h - 1 0.00 F): 190 b: Went / 2: dd: 0.0 mL / 2:	rmin rmin 10urs 30 mL 50 mL 50 mL 50 mL 50 mL 32 32 32 5° botto
Intel Fluid Losa         Test 1           Colector Tr         Colector Tr           Colector Tr         Colector Tr           API Fluid Loss (m         Tr           Band Mitchine         Tr           Coment         Coment           Coment         Pho 1           Coment         Coment           Coment         Coment           Coment         Coment           Coment         Coment           Coment         Flow Rate           Coment         Coment           Coment         Flow Rate           Coment         Flow Rate           Coment         Coment           Coment         Coment           Coment         Coment </td <td>bing (*F):         284           truid (mL):         14           ne (min.):         30           u/30mmin:         28           isage (****)         30           100         552           190         292           ng R5-85-92.0 confligural         562           190         292           ng R5-85-92.0 confligural         560 ppil           Average 571 ppil         15623 WimK           Stear Bond         15523 WimK           Stear Bond         Text 1 2.050 inch pil           Text 2 1.9305 inch pil         Text 3 15.1 inch pil           Text 2 1.9305 inch pil         Text 3 1.0525 incu           25845 pipe length, 0.175         2.9305 inch pil           25845 pipe length, 0.9525 incu         2.9305 inch pil           2597 Pipe length, 1.9527 incu         2.9305 inch pil</td> <td>396     224       214     129       10m and reported as R1       singth     Unconfine d       singth     Unconfine d       by     Thermal Di       0.4805 r       g traveled 0.1645 in at: 0       ug traveled 0.1645 in at: 0       ug traveled 0.1765 in at       313 psi       D5* top to comment, 0.256* to       15* top to comment, 0.257* coupreak, Test 2: 2.9565* to       150 out 0.057* coupreak, Test 2: 2.9555* top of c</td> <td>154         104           89         54           815 F3.0         54           I Compressive Staring 5044 psl         504           I Compressive Staring 507         504           I Majoriti Staring 57         503           S77 psl         Weight of Bal 777 psl           S77 psl         Test 14.8875           S77 psl         Test 24.8810           S0° bottom to cornerit, on thokness, 2.5105*/ps uppon length, 0.5905* or coupon to top of cornerit,</td> <td>6         3           57         49           18         12           1         157           40         157           18         1.57E+06           Inc. Hoat         5           55.2         1.57E+06           10.175 x 1.0015         1.0015           x 1.0175 x 1.0015         x 1.0175 x 1.0015           x 1.0171 x 0.9455 10         2.           e length, 1.065" PI         puppon weth, 1.055" PO           10.3760" bottom of         10.3760" bottom of</td> <td>2,044 4,292 addited Free Fluid add Constier Meas Calcul PV 505 280 cP 11,25 inches inch sample brek ch sample brek ch sample brek ch sample brek</td> <td>psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at for Anny (* Tot Anny ured Free Fit ated Fit</td> <td>12:00 h 24:00 h - h 9:00 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 00 h 10 sec 49 15 15 10 sec 49 15 15 10 sec 49 15 15 10 sec 49 15 15 10 sec 49 15 15 10 sec 49 15 10 sec 49 10 sec 49 15 15 10 sec 49 10 sec 49 10 sec 49 15 10 sec 49 10 sec 40 10 sec 40 10 10 sec 40 10 sec 40 10 sec 10 10 sec 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10</td> <td>rmin rmin 10urs 30 mL 50 mL 50 mL 50 mL 50 mL 32 32 32 5° botto</td>	bing (*F):         284           truid (mL):         14           ne (min.):         30           u/30mmin:         28           isage (****)         30           100         552           190         292           ng R5-85-92.0 confligural         562           190         292           ng R5-85-92.0 confligural         560 ppil           Average 571 ppil         15623 WimK           Stear Bond         15523 WimK           Stear Bond         Text 1 2.050 inch pil           Text 2 1.9305 inch pil         Text 3 15.1 inch pil           Text 2 1.9305 inch pil         Text 3 1.0525 incu           25845 pipe length, 0.175         2.9305 inch pil           25845 pipe length, 0.9525 incu         2.9305 inch pil           2597 Pipe length, 1.9527 incu         2.9305 inch pil	396     224       214     129       10m and reported as R1       singth     Unconfine d       singth     Unconfine d       by     Thermal Di       0.4805 r       g traveled 0.1645 in at: 0       ug traveled 0.1645 in at: 0       ug traveled 0.1765 in at       313 psi       D5* top to comment, 0.256* to       15* top to comment, 0.257* coupreak, Test 2: 2.9565* to       150 out 0.057* coupreak, Test 2: 2.9555* top of c	154         104           89         54           815 F3.0         54           I Compressive Staring 5044 psl         504           I Compressive Staring 507         504           I Majoriti Staring 57         503           S77 psl         Weight of Bal 777 psl           S77 psl         Test 14.8875           S77 psl         Test 24.8810           S0° bottom to cornerit, on thokness, 2.5105*/ps uppon length, 0.5905* or coupon to top of cornerit,	6         3           57         49           18         12           1         157           40         157           18         1.57E+06           Inc. Hoat         5           55.2         1.57E+06           10.175 x 1.0015         1.0015           x 1.0175 x 1.0015         x 1.0175 x 1.0015           x 1.0171 x 0.9455 10         2.           e length, 1.065" PI         puppon weth, 1.055" PO           10.3760" bottom of         10.3760" bottom of	2,044 4,292 addited Free Fluid add Constier Meas Calcul PV 505 280 cP 11,25 inches inch sample brek ch sample brek ch sample brek ch sample brek	psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at for Anny (* Tot Anny ured Free Fit ated Fit	12:00 h 24:00 h - h 9:00 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 00 h 10 sec 49 15 15 10 sec 49 15 15 10 sec 49 15 15 10 sec 49 15 15 10 sec 49 15 15 10 sec 49 15 10 sec 49 10 sec 49 15 15 10 sec 49 10 sec 49 10 sec 49 15 10 sec 49 10 sec 40 10 sec 40 10 10 sec 40 10 sec 40 10 sec 10 10 sec 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	rmin rmin 10urs 30 mL 50 mL 50 mL 50 mL 50 mL 32 32 32 5° botto
Intel Fluid Losa         Test T           Colector T         Colector T           API Fluid Losa (m         T           API Fluid Losa (m         T           Beological Properties         T           Fluid / Micture         T           Cament         Commont           Commont         Commont           Cament         Commont           Cament         Commont           Commont         Commont	bimp (*F):         284           tutu (imt.):         14           me (min.):         30           ut/30min):         28           amp *F         300           80         552           190         292           mg RS-B1-F2.0 confligural         Settining Tensis: 53 million           Test 2 580 psi         Test 2 580 psi           Test 3 500 psi         Average 571 psi           Thermal Conductivity         1.5523 Wimk           Shear Bond         Test 1 2.050 inch plug           Test 2 1.3056 inch plug         Test 3 1.3056 inch plug           Test 2 1.3056 inch plug         Test 3 1.3056 inch plug           Test 3 1.3056 inch plug         Test 3 1.3056 inch plug           Test 3 1.3056 inch plug         Test 3 1.3056 inch plug           Test 3 1.3056 inch plug         Test 3 1.3056 inch plug           Test 3 1.3056 inch plug         Test 3 1.3056 inch plug           2.3040 Pipe bength, 0.227         Test 3 1.3056 inch plug           Test 3 1.3057 incours         Test 3 1.3056 inch plug           Test 3 1.3056 inch plug         Test 3 1.3056 inch plug           Test 3 1.3057 incours         Test 3 1.3056 inch plug           Test 3 1.3057 incours         Test 3 1.30576 incours           Test 3 1.3050	396         224           214         129           121         129           120         129           121         129           121         129           121         129           121         129           123         129           124         129           125         126           126         145           127         140           128         128           129         129           129         129           129         129           129         129           129         129           129         129           129         129           129         129           129         129           129         129           129         129           120         1295           120         1295           120         1295           120         1295           120         1295           120         1295	154         104           80         54           B1.F5.0         54           I Compressive Strong 5044 pail         Seec           I Musivity         Seec           strong         Magazi Testi           strong         Impact Testi           strong         Test 1 4.8875           375 pail         Test 1 4.8875           375 pail         Test 1 4.8875           50° bottom to coment; T         Test 5005° rci cupon tength; 50505° rci cupon to top of comment; 9th, 2.014° Diameter, 19	6         3           57         49           18         12           1         157           40         157           18         1.57E+06           Inc. Hoat         5           55.2         1.57E+06           10.175 x 1.0015         1.0015           x 1.0175 x 1.0015         x 1.0175 x 1.0015           x 1.0171 x 0.9455 10         2.           e length, 1.065" PI         puppon weth, 1.055" PO           10.3760" bottom of         10.3760" bottom of	2,044 4,292 addited Free Fluid add Constier Meas Calcul PV 505 280 cP 11,25 inches inch sample brek ch sample brek ch sample brek ch sample brek	psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at for Anny (* Tot Anny ured Free Fit ated Fit	12:00 h 24:00 h - h 9:00 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 1900 F): 00 h 10 sec 49 15 15 10 sec 49 15 15 10 sec 49 15 15 10 sec 49 15 15 10 sec 49 15 15 10 sec 49 15 10 sec 49 10 sec 49 15 15 10 sec 49 10 sec 49 10 sec 49 15 10 sec 49 10 sec 40 10 sec 40 10 10 sec 40 10 sec 40 10 sec 10 10 sec 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	rmin rmin 10urs 30 mL 50 mL 50 mL 50 mL 50 mL 32 32 32 5° botto

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 123 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

alo-			Labora	tory Data Summ	ary			
t No: any:	March 2 HOV096 WW09	5.5 - 5a	Da Dep Temp. Grad	pth MD (ft): 6,700 th TVD (ft): 6,700 BHST (*F): 91 BHCT (*F): 80	Job Stae / 1	kensity (b/gal):	(in) Liner - 9.17	Liner .9
				ient Slurry Design			-	
- 22 <sub>1000</sub> 0	y (Ib/gal):	13.5 Sack Weight,	Sluny Yield   % of Total	H7sk): 1.7 Prod Weight, ID/Sk	2 CSI Log #	Total Ma	ing Fluid (gal/sk):	9.27
	Class H (Lehigh)	94	Sack Weight 100	94.00	L4561			
	lx Water Sea Water	Cor	B, B24	Units ga7sk	CSI Log # Labstock			
inction Susp Aid	LT	ditive SA-1	Concentration 0.200	Units %bwcc (DB)	CSI Log# C3074			
t Weight Id Loss		llicate Liquid 7 Liquid	0.150	gai/sk gai/sk	C8173 C3963			
				Test Results				
Como	nt (b/gal): 13.5	23					ditional Time to Mix: Vortex at Low RPM: Maximum RPM:	0 sec. Yes 12,025
Thickanin CT (*F):	ickening Time ig Time - Coment 80	09	Bo 70 Bo 12 11-53	hr.min		50 500 109 353	nperature ("F): psi at 00:01 psi at 34:42 psi at 12:00 psi at 24:00 psi at -	91 hranin hranin hranin hranin hours
sired Flu	Test Temp (*	L): 15			Ense Flui	Conditioning	Test Angle:	80 Vertical
Fluid Los	Collected Fluid (m	n.): 30						nil. / 250 mil. 0.00%
	Collected Fluid (m Collection Time (mir Fluid Loss (mi/ 30m)							
API	Collection Time (mir Fluid Loss (mL/30ml openties	in): <u>30</u>	200 100	60 30	6 3	PV	Cel YP 10 sec	Seongeh 10 min
ogical Pro uid / Mixtr Comont Comont	Collection Time (mil Fluid Loss (mil/30mi operfiles une Temp *F 80 80	n): 30 F 300 <u>172</u> 164	132 82 130 82	60 <u>38</u> 60 40	6 3 14 10 12 8	162	YP         10 sec           20         11           20         13	10 min 25 23
API add / Mixta Coment Coment Theology Unic Bond Fio	Collection Time (mir Pluid Loss (mL/30mi agenties ure Teamp * 6 80 measured using R1-1 1 50 w Rate Te pa 2 Pipes 7 1 6 max Te	n): 30 F 300 <u>172</u> 164	132 82 130 82 an and reported as R1-8	60 <u>38</u> 60 40	14 10 12 8	162 156 cP lb	YP         10 soc           20         11           20         13           /1008**         Ib	10 min 25 23 100H <sup>2</sup> [62] psi
API add / Mixto Coment Coment Coment Coment Pipe 1 Pipe 1 Pipe 1 0 0 0 0 0	Collection Time (mil/ Fluid Loss (mU/30mil/ apperties)           operties/ ure         Temp * F           80         80           measured using R1-1         50           1         50           10         70           0         max           0         0	n): 30 72 164 Bh F20 configuratik Bh F20 configuratik Sitting Tensile Siter at 1 266 pai et 2 216 pai et 2 216 pai et 3 277 pai	132 82 130 82 an and reported as R3-B	60 38 60 40 31-F1.0 Compressive Strength 1858 psi usivity Speci	14 10 12 B Young's Module	162 156 CP Ib s Poisson's R	YP         10 sec           20         11           20         13           /100H <sup>3</sup> Ib           Billo         Coupon Pull           Test 1 +260	10 min 25 23 100H <sup>2</sup> [62] psi

Pipe ID, 0.797" top of coupon to top of cement, 0.2845" bottom of coupon to bottom of cement, 602.59 bit achieved a break. Tensile Test 1: 1.05" Length, 2.008" Diameter, 880 bit, Test 2: 1.075" Length, 2.007" Diameter, 733.5 bit, Test 3: 1.031" Length, 1.993" Diameter, 895.5 bit, UCS sample 3.561" Length, 2.003" Diameter, 1.993" Diameter, 895.5 bit, UCS sample 3.561" Length, 2.003" Diameter, 1.993" Diameter, 895.5 bit, UCS sample 3.561" Length, 2.003" Diameter, 1.993" Diameter, 1.993" Diameter, 1.993" Diameter, 895.5 bit, UCS sample 3.561" Length, 2.003" Diameter, 1.993" Diameter, 895.5 bit, UCS sample 3.561" Length, 2.003" Diameter, 1.993" Diameter, 895.5 bit, UCS sample 3.561" Length, 2.003" Diameter, 1.993" Diameter, 895.5 bit, UCS sample 3.561" Length, 2.003" Diameter, 1.993" D

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 124 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

CSI TEC	HNOL	DGIES	5						0965-5	
SUPERIOR ENER	GY SERVICES	COMPANY		cotony Date	a Summary					
			Labo	atory bai	2 Junning 1					
C	March 31, 2017			Depth MD (ft):	Contraction of the second s	Job Size / Typ		9 5/8 (In)		Casing
	HDV0965-5 - 6d		E	Sopth TVID (ft):		Well Fluid De				15.2
mpany:	WW C/BSEE	13		BHST (*F): BHCT (*F):	201	Test Schedult	8 × <u>-</u>		Casing - 9.10	
				rad. ("F/100H): Ressure (PSI):	.72 14,330					
ana ana ana amin'ny sara-a	- testetr		Ce	ement Siurr	y Design			58719555	anoosoes	1445
Sluny Density (b/gal):			Sluny Ye	ld (ft <sup>a</sup> /sk):	1.06		Total	Mixing Flui	d (gal/sk):	4.36
Coment Blend	Sa	ck Weight,	% of Total Sack Weight	Prod V Ib/		CSI Log#				
Coment - Class H (La	(high)	94	100	94.		L4905				
42233		8	210		3 000	22433363				
Mix Water Delonized Water		10000000	ntration 029	Un		CSI Log# labstock				
State of the state of FT label	ter and the second s	~	Allen Marine		12.0					
Function	Additive		Concentration	Un		CSI Log #				
Detoamer Fluid Loss	FL-17 Liquid	L	0.010	gal gal		C4174 C3963				
Retarder	Kalig 32L		0.020	ga		L4850				
				Test Res	uits					
					10		-	1012		
Coment (b/gal):	16.4						Slurry M		Timp to Mix:	10 590
Contractor (an Sec).	10.4								t Low RPM:	
	13								imum RPM:	
Desired Thickening Ti			6-10 hrs					Max ssive Strene	imum RPM: <u>ath</u>	12,167
tai Thickening Time - G		40 Bc	70 Bc				Test	Max <u>ssive Strens</u> t Temperatu	imum RPM: th re (°F):	12,167
		40 Bc 05-22	70 Bc	hermi	n		Test 50	Max silve Strend t Temperatu psi at	imum RPM: <u>ath</u> re (°F): 02:04	12,167 201 hr:min
ai Thickening Time - G		40.000	70 Bc	hr.mi	n		Terst 50 500	Max <u>ssive Strens</u> t Temperatu	imum RPM: th re (°F): 02:04 02:45	12,167
ai Thickening Time - G		40.000	70 Bc	br.ml	D.		Test 50	Max <u>solve Strens</u> t Temperatu psi at psi at	imum RPM: <u>ath</u> re (°F): 02:04	12,167 201 hronin hronin
tal Thickening Time - G		40.000	70 Bc	hr.ml	n.		Test 50 500 3,097	Max solve Streng t Temperatu psi at psi at psi at	imum RPM: ath no (°F): 02:04 02:49 12:00	12,167 201 hrmin hrmin hrmin
tal Thickening Time - C BHCT (°F): 162	ement	06-22	70 Bc	hr.mi	n		Test 50 500 3,097 4,081	Max solve Streng psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at	Imum RPM: ath 02:04 02:49 12:00 24:00 -	12,167 201 hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hours
tal Thickening Time - O BHCT (*F): 162 Desired Fluid Loss		06-22	70 Bc	hr.ml	n		Test 50 500 3,097	Max solve Streng psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at	imum RPM: ath no (°F): 02:04 02:49 12:00	12,167 201 hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hours
tal Thickening Time - G BHCT (*F): 162 Desired Fluid Loss atic Fluid Loss	ement	06-22	70 Bc	hr.mi	n	Dealtes Fisio Fluid	Test 50 500 3,097 4,081	Max solve Streng psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at	imum RPM: 10 (°F): 02:04 02:49 12:00 24:00 - 0.4	12,167 201 hrmin hrmin hrmin hrmin hours
tal Thickening Time - G BHOT ("F): 162 Desired Fluid Loss Nic Fluid Loss Test Collected	<u>&lt;50 m</u> . Tomp (*F): : Fluid (mL):	06.22 06.22	70 Bc	br.mi	n		Test 50 500 3,097 4,081 1 Free Fluid Condition	Max solve Strong Temperatu psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at si at si at psi at si at psi at psi at psi at si at psi	Imum RPM: 02:04 02:04 12:00 24:00 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	201 hranin hranin hranin hranin hours 10 162 Vertical
tal Thickening Time - G BHCT ("F): 162 Desired Fluid Loss atic Fluid Loss Test Collected Collected	<u>&lt;50 m</u> 1 Temp (*F): 1 Fluid (mL): Time (min.):	162 10 30	70 Bc	brani	n		Test 50 500 3,097 4,081 1 Free Fluid Condition Meas	Max To-mporatu poi at poi at	Imum RPM: 02:04 02:04 12:00 24:00 - (°F): 00 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01	12,167 201 hrmin hrmin hrmin hours 162 Veritaal mi. / 250 mi.
tal Thickening Time - G BHOT ("F): 162 Desired Fluid Loss Nic Fluid Loss Test Collected	<u>&lt;50 m</u> 1 Temp (*F): 1 Fluid (mL): Time (min.):	06.22 06.22	70 Bc	brami	n		Test 50 500 3,097 4,081 1 Free Fluid Condition Meas	Max solve Strong Temperatu psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at si at si at psi at si at psi at psi at psi at si at psi	Imum RPM: 02:04 02:04 12:00 24:00 - (°F): 00 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01	201 hranin hranin hranin hranin hours 10 162 Vertical
tal Thickening Time - G BHOT ("F): 162 Desired Fluid Loss hit: Fluid Loss Test Collected Collected API Fluid Loss (	<u>&lt;50 m</u> 1 Temp (*F): 1 Fluid (mL): Time (min.):	162 10 30	70 Bc	hrani	n		Test 50 500 3,097 4,081 1 Free Fluid Condition Meas	Max To-mporatu poi at poi at	Imum RPM: (*F): 02:04 02:45 12:00 24:00 	12,167 201 hronin hronin hronin hronin hours 162 Veritaal mi. / 250 mi. 0,00%
tal Thickening Time - 0 BHOT (*F): 162 Desired Fluid Loss til: Fluid Loss Collected Collected API Fluid Loss API Fluid Loss sological Properties	<u>50 m</u> 1 Temp (*F): 1 Fluid (mL): Time (min.): (mL/30min):	162 10 30	70 Bc 06:29	hr.mi	n 30 e	Fise Fluid	Test 50 500 3,097 4,081 1 Free Fluid Condition Meas	Max Temperatu pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at ning Temp. TeatAn uned Free F	Imum RPM: (*F): 02:04 02:45 12:00 24:00 	12,167 201 hrzmin hrzmin hrzmin hrumin hours 20 162 Veritaal mi. / 250 mL 0,00%
tal Thickening Time - G BHCT (*F): 162 Desired Fluid Loss file Fluid Loss Test Collected Collected Collected AFI Fluid Loss Fluid / Michae Cement	<u>= 50 m</u> : Temp (*F): : Fluid (mL): : The (mL): (mL/30min): : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	162 162 10 30 20 300 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	70 Bc 06:29	<b>60</b> 138	30 G 73 2	Free Fluid	Test 50 500 4,081 3 Free Fluid Condition Meas Calcul PV 463	Max solve Strong Temperatu psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at stat restAr testAr testAr yp 80	Imum RPM: 02:04 02:45 12:00 24:00 - 19:00 - 10:00 13	12,167 201 hranin hranin hranin hranin hours 162 Verital mit / 250 mL 0,00% 1 Sarongé 1 Sarongé 1 Sarongé
tal Thickening Time - 0 BHCT (*F): 162 Desired Fluid Loss It: Fluid Loss Test Collected Collected Collected Collected Collected Collected Fluid Loss ( API Fluid Loss ( Sfluid / Mixture Camert Comert Comert	<u>50 m</u> Tomp (*F): Fluid (mL): Time (mL): (mL/30min): 30 152	0622 0622 162 10 20 20 300 20 470 365 460 365	70 Bc 06:29 0 100 0 207 6 221	60 138 154	30 6	Free Fluid	Test 50 500 3,007 4,081 Condition Meas Calcul PV 453 448	Max salve Strong Temporatu psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at psi at salve salve salve salve salve psi at psi a	Imum RPM: 02:04 02:04 02:45 12:00 24:00 24:00 0.0 (*F): 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	12,167 201 htmln htmln htmln htmln htmln htmln html 162 Verital 162 0,00% 162 162 162 162 162 162 162 162
tal Thickening Time - G BHCT (*F): 162 Destred Fluid Loss tit: Fluid Loss Collection API Fluid Loss / Collection API Fluid Loss / collection API Fluid Loss / collection Collect	<u>&lt;50 m</u> 1 Tomp (*F): 1 Fluid (mL): 1 Time (min.): 1 Time (	0622 0622 162 162 10 20 20 300 20 470 36 470 36 470 36 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	70 Bc 06:29 0 100 0 207 6 221 and sponded as R	60 138 154 1-81-F1.0	30 6 75 2 90 2	Fine Fluid 3 3 0 10 5 13	Test 50 50 3,097 4,081 Condition Meas Calout PV 463 448 CP	Max serve Strong I Temporatu pel at pel at	Imum RPM: 100 102:04 102:04 102:04 102:04 102:04 102:04 102:04 102:04 102:04 103:05	201 branin brani
tal Thickening Time - G BHOT (°F): 162 Destred Floid Loss til: Fluid Loss Test Collection API Fluid Loss / Collection API Fluid Loss / Collection	<u>&lt;50 m</u> 1 Tomp (*F): 1 Fluid (mL): 1 Time (min.): 1 Time (	0622 0622 162 10 30 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30	70 Bc 06:29 0 100 0 207 6 221 and sponded as R	60 138 154 1-81-F1.0	30 6 75 2 90 2	Free Fluid	Test 50 50 3,097 4,081 Condition Meas Calout PV 463 448 CP	Max serve Stream Te-mperatu pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at serve serve reaction reaction pel at pel a	Imum RPM: 02:04 02:04 02:45 12:00 24:00 24:00 0.0 (*F): 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	201 branin brani
tal Thickening Time - 0 BHCT (°F): 162 De sired Fluid Loss site Fluid Loss Test Collected Collected Collected API Fluid Loss   Study Mixture Comert C	<u>50 m</u> Tomp (*F): Fluid (mL): Thus (mL)2 (mL/30min): 30 152 152 152 152 152 152 152 152	0622 0622 162 10 30 20 300 200 470 355 460 356 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	70 Bc 06:29 0 100 0 207 6 221 and sponded as R	60 138 154 181.F1.0 d Compression	30 6 73 2 90 2 s.Stongth 1	Fine Fluid 3 3 10 5 13 Young's Modulus	Test 50 500 3,097 4,081 Condition Meas Calcul PV 453 448 cP Folsson	Max serve Stream Te-mperatu pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at serve serve reaction teacher teacher serve teacher tea	Imum RPM: 110 02:04 02:04 12:00 24:00 	12,167 201 htmln ht
tal Thickening Time - G BHCT (°F): 162 BHCT (°F): 162 Collected Co	≤50 m           I Temp (*F):           I Fluid (mL):           Time (min.):           Immu (min.):           mu/30min):           152           soling R1:B1:F2:0           soling R1:B1:F2:0           Text 1:100           Text 1:100           Text 2:901           Text 3:1241	162     10     300     20     300     20     300     300     30	70 Bc 06:29 0 100 0 207 6 221 and sponded as R	60 138 154 181.F1.0 d Compression	30 6 73 2 90 2 s.Stongth 1	Fine Fluid 3 3 10 5 13 Young's Modulus	Test 50 500 3,097 4,081 Condition Meas Calcul PV 453 448 cP Folsson	Max serve Stream Te-mperatu pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at serve serve reaction teacher teacher serve teacher tea	Imum RPM: 10 10 12:00 12:00 12:00 24:00 	12,167 201 htmln ht
tal Thickening Time - 0 BHCT (*F): 162 Desired Fluid Loss til: Fluid Loss Test Collector API Fluid Loss   Collector API Fluid Loss   Collector API Fluid Loss   Collector API Fluid Loss   Collector Collector API Fluid Loss   Collector Co	smant	162     10     300     20     300     20     300     300     30	70 Bc 06:29 0 100 0 207 6 221 and sponded as R	60 138 154 181.F1.0 d Compression	30 6 73 2 90 2 s.Stongth 1	Fine Fluid 3 3 10 5 13 Young's Modulus	Test 50 500 3,097 4,081 Condition Meas Calcul PV 453 448 cP Folsson	Max serve Stream Te-mperatu pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at serve serve reaction teacher teacher serve teacher tea	Imum RPM: 10 10 12:00 12:00 12:00 24:00 	12,167 201 htmln htm
tal Thickening Time - 0 BHOT (°F): 162 BHOT (°F): 162 Collection API Fuld Loss Collection API Fuld Loss Fluid / Mixture Cement Coment Enhology measured u draulic Bond Flow Rate E Flow Rate Flow Rate Place 1 Pipe 2 Pipe 0 0 0 0 0	<u>≤50 m</u> Tomp (*F): Fluid (mL): Time (min.): mL30min): Temp *F 80 162 sting R1.81-F2.0 Selifting 1 110 Tost 1 110 Tost 2 901 Tost 3 1341 Average 11	06 22 06 22 162 162 10 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 20 10 20 20 20 10 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	70 Bc 06:29 0 100 0 207 6 221 and reported as R b Uncentine	60 138 154 187.F1.0 d Compete Selv 10732 psi	30 6 79 2 90 2 9 Strangth 3	Fine Fluid 0 10 5 13 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Test 50 500 3,097 4,081 Condition Meas Calcul PV 453 448 cP Folsson	Max serve Stream Te-mperatu pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at serve serve reaction teacher teacher serve teacher tea	Imum RPM: 10 10 12:00 12:00 12:00 24:00 	12,167 201 htmln htm
La Thickening Time - 0 BHCT (°F): 162 Desired Fluid Loss Itic Fluid Loss Total Collected Colle	<u>50 m</u> : Temp (*F): : Fluid (mL): : The (mL): : The (mL): : The (mL): : Temp *F : 80 : 152 : 152	10 cc     0622     10     10     30     20     300     20     300     20     300	70 Bc 06:29 0 100 2 207 6 221 ind sponda as R b Unconfine Thermal D	60 138 154 154 157-71.0 d Compressive 10732 psi fftusivelty	30 6 79 2 90 2 s Strangth 1 # Specific H	Fine Fluid 5 3 0 10 5 13 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Test 50 500 3,097 4,081 Condition Meas Calcul PV 453 448 cP Folsson	Max serve Stream Te-mperatu pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at serve serve reaction teacher teacher serve teacher tea	Imum RPM: 10 10 12:00 12:00 12:00 24:00 	12,167 201 htmln htm
tal Thickening Time - 0 BHOT (°F): 162 Desired Fluid Loss til: Fluid Loss Test Collector API Fluid Loss   Collector API Fluid Loss   Collector API Fluid Loss   Collector API Fluid Loss   Collector	<u>50 m</u> : Temp (*F): : Fluid (mL): : The (mL): : The (mL): : The (mL): : Temp *F : 80 : 152 : 152	06 22 06 22 162 162 10 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 20 10 20 20 20 10 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	70 Bc 06:29 0 100 0 207 6 221 and reported as R b Uncentine	60 138 154 154 157-71.0 d Compressive 10732 psi fftusivelty	30 6 79 2 90 2 9 Strangth 3	Fine Fluid 5 3 0 10 5 13 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Test 50 500 3,097 4,081 Condition Meas Calcul PV 453 448 cP Folsson	Max serve Stream Te-mperatu pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at serve serve reaction reaction pel at pel a	Imum RPM: 10 10 12:00 12:00 12:00 24:00 	12,167 201 htmln htm
tal Thickening Time - 0 BHOT (°F): 162 Destred Fluid Loss Test Collector API Fluid Loss Collector API Fluid Loss Collector Col	<u>50 m</u> : Temp (*F): : Fluid (mL): : The (mL): : The (mL): : The (mL): : Temp *F : 80 : 152 : 152	06 22 06 22 162 10 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 300 20 30 300 20 30 30 20 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30	70 Bc 06:29 0 100 2 207 6 221 ind sponda as R b Unconfine Thermal D	60 138 154 154 161-71.0 10732 psi 10732 psi 10732 psi 10732 psi	30 6 79 2 90 2 s Strangth 1 # Specific H	Fine Fluid 5 3 0 10 5 13 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Test 50 500 3,097 4,081 Condition Meas Calcul PV 453 448 cP Folsson	Max serve Stream Te-mperatu pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at pel at serve serve reaction reaction pel at pel a	Imum RPM: 10 10 12:00 12:00 12:00 24:00 	12,167 201 htmln htm
Ital Thickening Time - 0           BHOT (*F):         162           Desired Fluid Loss         Test           BHOT (*F):         162           Desired Fluid Loss         Test           Colection         Desired Fluid Loss           Example         Test           Colection         API Fluid Loss           Event         Concerts           Coment         Coment           Coment         Test           Fluid Mixture         Coment           Coment         0           I Flow Rate         Flow Rate           I Flow Rate         0           I Flow Rate         0           I O         0           I O         0           I O         0           I O         0           I O         0           I O         0           I O         0		0622 0622 15 162 10 300 200 470 300 200 470 300 200 470 300 200 470 300 200 470 300 200 470 300 200 470 300 200 470 300 200 470 300 200 470 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 48 47 47 48 48 48 48 48 48 48 48 48 48 48 48 48	70 Bc 06:29 0 100 0 207 4 221 ind spondal as R b Unconfine Thermai D 0.446 /r sold 0.160 in at 3	60 138 154 161-F1.0 10732 psi Husivily mm <sup>2</sup> s Imp 197 psi We	90 6 73 2 90 2 9. Strangth 9 # <u>Specific H</u> 2.368 MJ sect Test ght of Ball 66.8	Free Fluid           0         10           5         13           foang's Modulus         1.63E+07           eat m <sup>2</sup> X	Test 50 500 3,007 4,081 Condition Meas Calcul PV 453 448 cP Follsson 0.1	Mix serve Strong Temperatu pel at pel	Imum RPM: 10 10 12:00 12:00 12:00 12:00 14:00 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	12,167 201 htmln htm
Initial Thickening Time - 0           BHOT (*F):         162           Destred Fluid Loss         Test           Distred Fluid Loss         Test           Colection         Test           API Fluid Loss         Test           Colection         API Fluid Loss           Coment         Coment           Coment         Coment           Fluid / Mixture         Coment           Coment         0           Fluid Schid         Pipe 1           Fluid Robid         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0           0         0		06 22 06 22 06 22 162 162 10 300 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2	70 Bc 06:29 0 100 0 207 6 221 ind tepofied as R b Unconflice <u>The mail D</u> 0.449 / solid 0.180 in at 8	60 138 134 134 134 10732 psi 10732 psi	30         6           70         2           90         2	Free Fluid           3         3           0         10           5         13           foung's Modulus         1.53E+07           eat         m <sup>2</sup> X.           8 gms, Distance 1         5505 lindh s	PV 463 448 CP Poisson 0.1 25 inches ample broke	Mix serve Strong Temporatu pol at pol at	Imum RPM: 110 re (*F): 02:04 02:04 12:00 24:00  10:00	12,167 201 htmln
tai Thickening Time - 0           BHCT ("F):         162           BHCT ("F):         162           Dissingd Fluid Loss         162           stic Fluid Loss         162           Dissingd Fluid Loss         162           Stic Fluid Loss         162           Collected         Collected           Collected         Collected           API Fluid Loss         162           State State         Collected           Coment         162           State State         Flow Rate           Flow Rate         Flow Rate           Pipe 1         Pipe 2         Pipe           00         0         0         0           00         0         0         0         0           00         0         0         0         0           00         0         0         0         0           00         0         0         0         0           00         0         0         0         0		06 22 06 22 06 22 162 162 10 300 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 30 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2	70 Be 06:29 0 100 0 207 6 221 ind reported as R b Unconfilee Unconfilee 0.449 r 0.449 r	60 138 134 134 134 10732 psi 10732 psi	30         6           70         2           90         2	Free Fluid           0         10           5         13           foang's Modulus         1.63E+07           eat m <sup>2</sup> X	PV 463 448 CP Poisson 0.1 25 inches ample broke	Mix serve Strong Temporatu pol at pol at	Imum RPM: 110 re (*F): 02:04 02:04 12:00 24:00  10:00	12,167 201 htmln

Shear Bond Test 1 1.9995" ID, 2.5635 pipe length, 4285" top to cement, 3380" bottom to cement; Test 2 1.984" ID, 2.5095" Pipe length, 4655" top to cement, 2570" bottom to cement; Test 3 1.9795" ID, 2.585 Pipe length, 5165" top to cement, 2996" bottom to cement.

Coupon Pull least 1: 2,9535° coupon length, 0,5545° coupon width, ,0535° coupon thickness, 2,555° pipe length, 2,005° Pipe ID, 0,856° top of coupon to top of cement, 0,3115° bottom of coupon to bottom of cement, 600bit maximum did not break, pushed with GCTS and obtained 719 lbt; Test 2: 2,9555° coupon length, 0,5895° coupon width, 0,0860° coupon thickness, 2,5245° Pipe length, 2,005° Pipe ID, 0,9555° top of coupon to top of cement, 0,2915° bottom of coupon to bottom of cement, 5,41,521bit achieved a break.

Tensile Test 1: 1.067\* Length, 2.027: Diameter, 3747 bt; Test 2: 1.079\* Length, 2.01\* Diameter, 3375 bt; Test 3: 1.0785\* Length, 2.0055\* Diameter, 4240 bt. UCS sample 3.389\* Length, 2.012\* Diameter, YMPR sample 3.4225\* Length, 2.0115\* Diameter.

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 125 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

# **APPENDIX B – TASK 2 DEFINITION**

## **Definitions, Assumptions and Search Parameters**

The following will be applied to help focus Task 2 and provide some boundary conditions/limits for search parameters.

### **Thermal Shock Definition:**

- Wells with a bottom hole temperature of 350°F or above combined with a minimum ambient temperature as low as 40°F.
- Thermal shock could be initiated by shutting in a producing well and allowing it to cool to ambient or by stimulating a well, although these thermal shocks are less severe than stimulation and damage mainly caused by the cyclical nature.
- Thermal shock not only depends on the temperature range but also the rate at which temperature changes. The rate of cooling of the well would depend on the operations considered, e.g. natural cooling post shut-in or cooling during well stimulation for example.
- While the expectation is that further refinement of the definition of thermal shock may be made in Task 3, the public domain search effort for task 2 will use the above definition to determine if research has been done into well thermal shock caused either by shut-in or stimulation.

## Initial Well Configuration:

- Wells in the Lower Tertiary<sup>2</sup> associated with Deepwater operations will be used to define the target operating conditions for the search parameters. Task 2 will define and use a representative well configuration to assist in the search but should not rule out any other information the search uncovers.
- It was acknowledged at the project kick-off meeting that BSEE's focus is on OCS Gulf of Mexico but that relevant knowledge from other regions, if readily uncovered by the public domain search, would be considered.<sup>3</sup>
- Sensitivities to well parameters such as true vertical depth, measured depth, casing schedule, deviation, top of cement and hole size do not need to be explored in Task 2. Task 2 will catalogue all of the variables that could have some impact on the thermal shock response of the well and the impact of these will then be explored in Task 4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> This could include Arctic conditions for example, which could also prove to be worst-case?

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 126 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Wells in the Cascade and Chinook fields are considered typical of the target wells



Title:	Final Report
Client:	BSEE
Project:	Thermal Shock Technology / E16PC00010

- Task 2 will catalogue all of the variables that could have some impact on the thermal shock response of the well and the impact of these will then be explored in Task 4, however;
- Task 2 excludes attempts and efforts by research team members to conduct a sensitivity analysis on the relative impact of the variables, and
- Task 2 includes acquisition of any previously conducted sensitivity studies or related research, if any exists.

# Materials:

- It is acknowledged that there are multiple variants of all of the primary well materials with steel, cement and elastomers each having subtly different mechanical and thermal properties that may have some bearing on thermal shock response. Indeed a range of steel grades will likely be used through a typical casing program and these may also have slight differences in thermal properties. However, Task 2 should not attempt to use all possible permutations of the materials as parameters for public domain information searches but rather identify whether typical well construction materials have been the subject of research into thermal shock as defined above. The following boundary definitions apply:
  - To be considered, steel used in all casing strings that extend to the mudline. (Liners re excluded unless tied-back to the mudline.);
  - To be considered, steels (and any elastomers) in the wellhead and below, likely to be 4-6 different alloys that exhibit variations in hardness, brittleness an thermal-induced properties
  - The tree does not need to be considered within the scope of this project

Document ID	Document Owner	Page	Template ID / Revision No.
TM-PM-17	Alistair Gill	Page 127 of 127	TM-PM-17 (01)