



SPE 115929

Modeling Leakage Through Faults of CO₂ Stored in an Aquifer

Kyung Won Chang, The University of Texas at Austin; Susan E. Minkoff, The University of Maryland, Baltimore County; and Steven L. Bryant, SPE, The University of Texas at Austin

Copyright 2008, Society of Petroleum Engineers

This paper was prepared for presentation at the 2008 SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition held in Denver, Colorado, USA, 21–24 September 2008.

This paper was selected for presentation by an SPE program committee following review of information contained in an abstract submitted by the author(s). Contents of the paper have not been reviewed by the Society of Petroleum Engineers and are subject to correction by the author(s). The material does not necessarily reflect any position of the Society of Petroleum Engineers, its officers, or members. Electronic reproduction, distribution, or storage of any part of this paper without the written consent of the Society of Petroleum Engineers is prohibited. Permission to reproduce in print is restricted to an abstract of not more than 300 words; illustrations may not be copied. The abstract must contain conspicuous acknowledgment of SPE copyright.

Abstract

For secure storage of CO₂ within geologic formations, the integrity of caps – overlying strata that are impervious to CO₂ – is an important factor. Geologic structures, notably faults and the damage zones surrounding them may provide a conduit for CO₂ to escape through a cap. If the fault encounters shallower permeable formations, the CO₂ rising along the fault can enter them. This lateral migration would attenuate the rate at which CO₂ enters sensitive formations such as aquifers used for drinking water. Thus, CO₂ leakage along faults will have three behaviors: upward migration from the storage formation along a fault, lateral movement from the fault into permeable layers, and a continued but attenuated CO₂ flux along the fault above the layers.

Here we develop a quasi-1D single-phase flow model for these three behaviors. The model is highly simplified and intended to be suitable for inclusion in a certification framework for geologic storage projects. The model accounts for flow from the fault into a permeable formation using a leakoff coefficient. The coefficient can vary spatially and depends on the geometry and petrophysical properties of the formation. We apply a commercial simulator to verify the quasi-1D model. A series of examples illustrates the controlling mechanisms for leakage rate from the reservoir and its attenuation by flux into shallower layers.

Nonlinearities arise even in this simple model. For example, leakage flux and the degree of attenuation vary nonlinearly with the permeability of the fault and the permeability of the shallower layer(s) intersected by the fault. Layers nearest the CO₂ storage formation produce the most attenuation. But the percentage of CO₂ entering overlying formations from the fault varies linearly with the ratio of fault permeability to leakoff coefficient. A simple estimate of the leak-off coefficient compares favorably with 2D, full-physics simulations. If the permeable layer is dipping, CO₂ enters it asymmetrically and estimating the leakoff coefficient is less straightforward. The difference arises because of preferential flow within the layer (CO₂ in the upper part, water below).

Introduction

If society elects to reduce anthropogenic emissions of CO₂, geologic storage will be one of the key technologies for achieving this goal. In the standard approach to storage, CO₂ is captured from fixed sources such as coal-fired power plants, compressed and injected at supercritical conditions into a suitable target formation. For typical geothermal gradients, suitable formations are found at depths of 800 m (2600 ft) or more, as their temperatures and pressures will be above the critical point of CO₂. Trapping the injected CO₂ involves one or more mechanisms (Bachu *et al.* 1994; IPCC 2006): (1) permeability trapping by an impervious confining layer or cap rock; (2) solubility trapping by CO₂ dissolution into the aqueous phase in the pore space; (3) mineralogic trapping by chemical reaction of cations with dissolved CO₂ to precipitate carbonate minerals; (4) residual phase trapping as the nonwetting CO₂ phase becomes disconnected in pores or small clusters of pores; (5) stratigraphic trapping below a formation whose capillary entry pressure is greater than the capillary pressure of the CO₂ phase. An intact confining layer is necessary for several trapping mechanisms. However, sedimentary basins often contain geological discontinuities which are potential pathways for leakage through the confining layer. Faults are one such discontinuity and are prevalent in many regions where CO₂ storage is likely to be implemented. Wells are a man-made discontinuity, likewise prevalent in likely storage regions. We do not treat them here, but the conceptual model for faults provides a foundation for assessing leakage along wells (Huerta *et al.* 2008).

It is therefore important to examine the consequences if injected CO₂ encounters a fault. Figure 1 illustrates the situation of interest. A conductive fault can be a major pathway for the CO₂ plume due to its large transfer capacity. However CO₂ leaking