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Abstract

The pressure build-up of large scale CO₂ injection projects is one of the biggest challenges towards the development of a carbon sequestration technology. The pressure front creates stress gradients in the subsurface that can lead to dilation or slip along faults or fractures, hydrofracturing of the caprock, and potentially microseismicity. Furthermore potential compartmentalization of the storage reservoir can not only reduced the original estimated reservoir capacity, but exacerbates the pressure increase and associated hazards.

In this work we investigate the geomechanical response to the CO₂ injection in the Tubåen Fm at the Snøhvit site focusing on the potential compartmentalization of the storage reservoir. This compartmentalization has been suspected due to the unexpected pressure rise during operations in the storage reservoir that has led to a considerable decrease in the estimated total capacity and to the abandonment injection operations.

The Snøhvit gas field is located offshore in the northern Norwegian Sea (Barents Sea). CO₂ is separated from the produced gas and until 2011 it was stored underground in the Tubåen Fm. at approximately 2600 m depth. The Tubåen Fm. corresponds to a delta plain environment dominated by fluvial distributary channels and some marine-tidal influence. It is separated by the producing gas reservoir (Stø Fm.) by the Nordmela 1 and 2 Fms. that contain wide shale layers expected to act as flow barriers. The channelized nature of the Tubåen Fm. suggests the possibility of stratigraphic compartmentalization.

Structurally this area is extensively faulted, characterized by a dominant east-west-trending fault system, where the majority of the faults dip toward the basin axis and define typical horsts and graben geometry. However, it also present faults at high angles to this trend, leading to complex fault interactions and making fault compartmentalization a strong possibility as well.

Given the geometry of major faults and fractures in and above the reservoir, available estimates of the in situ stress tensor, and reservoir characteristics, we use a coupled hydromechanical approach to understand the geomechanical response of the system to the CO₂ injection,
focusing in particular on addressing the potential reservoir compartmentalization and its impacts on injection performance, CO₂ distribution and migration outside of the storage interval.
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Snøhvit CO₂ Project

- Gas fields discovered in the ‘80s with a 5 – 8% CO₂ content
- Producing natural gas with 5-8% CO₂ content, which needs to be reduced before liquefaction
- Separated CO₂ was re-injected into Tubåen Fm. at approx. 2600m depth
- Injection began in 2008, but in 2010 Statoil announced storage capacity in Tubåen was lower than expected. Have since moved to another formation

Basin at Middle Jurassic level (approx. age of producing reservoir). Blue lines outline the gas fields [from Spencer et al., 2008].

Presenter’s notes:
- Rate: 2000 t/day (In Salah 3500 t/day, Sleipner 2700 t/day)
- Total storage: 23,000 kt (In Salah 17,000 kt, Sleipner 20,000 kt)
- Basin at Middle Jurassic level (approx. age of producing reservoir). Blue lines outline the gas fields [from Spencer et al., 2008].
Storage capacity lower than expected

- Maximum reached overpressure < 10 MPa
- Control data: well pressure & 4D seismic
- Injection in 3 perforations
- Lower perforation took ~90% CO₂

Hansen et al, 2012

Presenter’s notes: Total overpressure < 10 MPa (100 bars). System was not drove to failure
Statoil pressure analysis: flow barriers at 150m & 3km from injector in agreement with 4D seismic analysis

4D difference amplitude map

Hansen et al, 2012
Stratigraphy

- Storage target: Tubåen Fm. ~2600 m depth.
  - 45-130 m clastic wedge (over ~50 km)
  - Individual channels & subordinate shales
  - Porosity 1-16%, Permeability 130-880 mD

- Caprock: Nordmela Fm.
  - Porosity ~13%, Permeability 1-23 mD

- Delta plain depositional environment, with fluvial distributary channels & some marine-tidal influence
- Highly variable sandstone facies, interbedded with siltstones & mudstones
Structural Configuration

Top of Fuglen Fm. – depth map

(Wennberg et al., 2008)
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Structural complexity of the site raises many interesting hydromechanical questions

1. What is the role of the bounding faults at the site? Are they reservoir seals or potential leakage pathways?

2. Why was storage capacity lower than expected? Is it a function of the depositional setting? What is the role of observed faults/fractures?

3. Is there a risk of contaminating the producing gas?

Presenter’s notes:
• Gaseous CO₂: $\rho = 2g/m^3 = 0.002 \text{ kg/m}^3$
• Supercritical CO₂: $\rho = 500 \text{ kg/m}^3$
• Point source sequestration at power generation facilities
• Describe elements of a successful storage scenario
  • Reservoir is ideally high permeability (accessible) and high porosity (capacity)
  • Overlying rock (caprock) is low permeability
• Tools appropriate for this specific scenario have potential for improving other techniques: shale
1.- What is the role of the bounding faults

- Fault Stability Analysis: Coulomb Criteria considering thermo poro-elasticity
- Uncertainty Analysis using PSUADE (Problem Solving environment for Uncertainty Analysis and Design Exploration)
- Data input:
  - From Statoil
    - Intersection of fault surface with top of reservoir
    - $S_{\text{hmin}}$ magnitude (from XLOT)
    - Rock mechanical properties
    - $P_p$ & $T$
  - From literature
    - $S_{\text{Hmax}}$ Azimuths
    - Tectonic Environment
    - Regional lithostatic stress ($S_v$)
Stress Uncertainty

- Up to 90 degrees variations in reported $S_{Hmax}$ Azimuths at Snøhvit
- Both Strike Slip & Reverse faulting indicators in nearby areas
- Statoil: horizontal $S_{hmin}$ (less than regional $S_v$)
- Vertical stress estimated from regional lithostatic gradients due to lack of data
Presenter’s notes: The likely magnitudes for SHmax can then be calculated by combining the equations that relate σ1 and σ3 for a critically oriented fault at the frictional limit Eq. (2) [15] with Anderson’s faulting theory which determines which principal stress (SHmax, Shmin, Sv) corresponds to S1, S2 and S3 respectively [16]. Therefore by using the corresponding equation for a SS environment, Eq. (3), the upper bound of allowable values of SHmax can be found:

* tLOT at 2400m and extrapolated to 2683 m with a grad of: 2.33 g/cm³ (= 0.0226 MPa). S3 = 42.88 [MPa] at 2683 m
Black Rectangle Shows Area of Analysis
Presenter’s notes: By comparing Pc with the reference pore pressure (Pp) in the reservoir we obtain the critical pressure perturbation (Pcp) that indicates the pore pressure change for a fault segment to slip given the stress state, fault orientation and reference Pp. When using this type of analysis to evaluate the risk of leakage, it is assumed that active faults are potential conduits for fluid migration, so that Pcp indicates the leakage potential for each portion of the fault.
Uncertainty Analysis - PSUADE

- 14 Parameters
- 1000 samples produced with Latin hypercube sampling method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$S_v$</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_{min}$</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_{max}$</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_p$</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$dP_p$</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T$</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E$</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>GPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha T$</td>
<td>$1.5e^{-5}$</td>
<td>$1e^{-6}$</td>
<td>$1.5e^{-5}$</td>
<td>1/°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fault ang</td>
<td>-85</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>-89</td>
<td>°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_{max, Az}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UQ Analysis indicates $S_{H\text{max}}$ Az as main uncertainty
Refined Uncertainty Analysis (13 variables) – Fault 10 example

NS $S_{H_{\text{max}}}$

EW $S_{H_{\text{max}}}$
Faults ~ 8-20% less stable with EW $S_{H_{\text{max}}}$

**Presenter’s notes:** Map view of faults color coded with pressure perturbation ($P_{\text{pert}}$) needed for reactivation. Color code represents pressure in MPa.
Faults ~ 8-20% less stable with E-W $S_{Hmax}$
Faults 16 to 36% more stable when considering poroelasticity (dP = 10 MPa)
2.- Why was storage capacity lower than expected
Structural vs. Stratigraphic compartmentalization

4D difference amplitude maps

Hansen et al. 2012
Structural vs. Stratigraphic compartmentalization

4D difference amplitude maps

Hansen et al., 2012
Possible Local Vertical Migration at F10

Lower Perforation  Upper Perforation

Hansen et al, 2012
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## Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>NS $S_{H_{\text{max}}}$</th>
<th>EW $S_{H_{\text{max}}}$</th>
<th>Juxtaposition Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bounding Faults (F09, 12 &amp; 14)</td>
<td>Very stable</td>
<td>Segments close to critically stressed (c.s)</td>
<td>Large offsets, contact with low permeability fms. can explain sealing capacity even if c.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fault 10</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Close to critically stressed, would explain apparent local vertical migration</td>
<td>Small offset (&lt; 10 m) could allow pressure and fluid transmission, but not cross-flow is inferred from seismic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Subseismic Fault</td>
<td>Critically stressed</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Very low offset could allow pressure or fluid migration even if not c.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary cont.

- Strong stress uncertainties difficult predictions
- Faults fairly stable under “most likely” stress state: SS & NS $S_{H_{\text{max}}}$: Caprock failure would happen before fault reactivation. Under those conditions, it is unlikely that a theoretical sub-seismic fault could act as flow barrier
- Faults are ~ 20% less stable with EW $S_{H_{\text{max}}}$ where several segments are close to critically stressed. Fault reactivation could happen before caprock failure if injection continues with risk of gas contamination.
- Snøhvit gas accumulation does not provide extra constraints to assess $S_{H_{\text{max}}}$ Azimuth (fault sealing capacity):
  - It is underfilled. It appears to have leaked in geological recent times (deglatiation?)
  - Fault juxtaposition could provide effective seal even if bounding faults are critically stressed