

## **Southwest Regional Partnership on Carbon Sequestration**

### Quarterly Progress Report

Reporting Period: October 1, 2013–December 31, 2013

Reid Grigg, PI, Brian McPherson, PI, and Robert Lee, Project Manager

**DE- FC26-05NT42591**

Recipient: New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology  
801 Leroy Place  
Socorro, New Mexico 87801

## Table of Contents

<b>Table of Contents .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>List of Figures and Tables.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>TASK 1 Regional Characterization .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>TASK 2 Public Outreach and Education .....</b>	<b>8</b>
Subtask 2.2 Project Website .....	8
<b>Task 4 Site Characterization and Planning.....</b>	<b>8</b>
Subtask 4.1 Existing Data Gathering and Interpretation .....	8
Subtask 4.3 Initial Reservoir Model Development.....	10
STOMP-EOR.....	10
Base Pre-CO <sub>2</sub> Injection Multiphase Flow Model .....	11
Development of Methodology for Permeability Parameterization at FWU .....	13
Literature Review of the Ensemble Kalman Filter .....	17
Generalized 2-D Basin-Wide Model Focused on Field-Scale Relative Permeability .....	18
Mesh Conversion Effort.....	20
Evaluation of Response Surface Method for Risk Assessment of CCS .....	21
Subtask 4.4 Initial Risk Assessment.....	22
Subtask 4.5 Site Work Plans.....	30
<b>Task 5 Well Drilling and Completion .....</b>	<b>30</b>
Subtask 5.1 Characterization Wells .....	31
Logging and Coring .....	37
Core Collection and Preservation .....	41
<b>Task 6.0 Operational Monitoring and Modeling .....</b>	<b>43</b>
Subtask 6.1 Surface and Near-Surface Monitoring .....	43
CO <sub>2</sub> Surface Flux Monitoring .....	44
Eddy Covariance Tower Development and Calibration .....	52
Subtask 6.2 Subsurface Monitoring.....	60
Accounting and Verification of Injected CO <sub>2</sub> Storage .....	60
Groundwater Geomechanical Modeling.....	61
Water Sample Analysis.....	67
Subtask 6.3 Seismic Activities.....	71
Seismic Reflection Data.....	71
Subtask 6.4 Reservoir Modeling.....	74
Velocity Model Generation and Testing.....	74
<b>Task 8 Project Management and Oversight.....</b>	<b>75</b>
Coordination of Project Activities .....	75
Drilling and Wells.....	77
Site Visits.....	78
Work Plans.....	78
Logging and Coring.....	79
<b>Cost Status .....</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>Summary of Significant Accomplishments.....</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>Anticipated Delays .....</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>Technology Transfer.....</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>86</b>

## List of Figures and Tables

Figure 1. Grid cells showing distribution of porosity (left) and permeability (right).....	11
Figure 2. Field pressure versus time (1955-2010) profile from simulation.....	12
Figure 3. Field versus time (1955-2010) profile from simulation. ....	12
Figure 4. Field gas versus time (1955-2010) production from simulation. ....	13
Figure 5. Model grid, locations of injection well and observation points, and facies distribution (White: F1; Purple: F2) for the initial forward permeability-estimation model. ....	17
Figure 6. Permeability distribution produced by the initial forward permeability-estimation model.....	15
Figure 7. Initial pressure condition in the initial forward permeability-estimation model.....	15
Figure 8. Simulated pressure field at the end of 100 days for the initial forward permeability-estimation model.....	16
Figure 9. Noted pressure data at five locations in the initial forward permeability-estimation model.....	16
Figure 10. Vertical slice through the well path showing the supercritical CO <sub>2</sub> saturation profile at the end of injection. Cell number 12 is the bottom of the primary seal.....	19
Figure 11. Vertical slice 2 km up-dip from the well path showing the supercritical CO <sub>2</sub> saturation profile at the end of injection. Cell number 12 is the bottom of the primary seal. ....	20
Figure 12. Morrow B section of FWU Well 1316 baseline log.....	34
Figure 13. Damaged casing joint. ....	35
Figure 14. 3D Image of the damage at 7508 ft. in Well 1310A. ....	36
Figure 15. Photographs from the core preservation activities in the quarter October 1–December 31, 2013. Clockwise: a core sample within a helium-tight canister showing the copper gasket; a canister connected to the purge-and-pump-down vacuum line; Well 13-10A with the drill rig; and an approximately 3-inch tall section of the aluminum core barrel that was cut to provide a sample for a canister. ....	41
Figure 16. Tentative directory structure for MVA workgroup data on the SWP Velo data-sharing site.....	43
Figure 17. A map view of the CO <sub>2</sub> surface flux measurements locations.....	44

Figure 18. CO <sub>2</sub> surface flux at different locations (October 6, 2013).....	49
Figure 19. Map showing representations of CO <sub>2</sub> soil flux measurements from October, 2013 visit to Farnsworth, Texas. ....	49
Figure 20a. Locations of subsidiary anemometers and existing weather stations. ....	54
Figure 20b. Subsidiary Anemometer #1.....	54
Figure 20c. Subsidiary Anemometer #2.....	55
Figure 21. MH4 calculated flux values.....	58
Figure 22. MH3 calculated flux values.....	58
Figure 23. Afternoon session of MH3 calculated flux values. ....	59
Figure 24. Evening session of MH3 calculated flux values.....	59
Figure 25. MH3 calculated flux values.....	60
Figure 26. MH3 coinciding time fluxes.....	60
Figure 27. Average concentrations of detected elements and total dissolved solids (TDS) content of produced water sampled from wells AWT3 and AWT4 from the Morrow Sandstone in the Farnsworth Unit. ....	63
Figure 28. Mineral saturation indices (SI) for Morrow groundwater predicted from speciation calculations. ....	64
Figure 29. Reaction path modeling results of titration of 50 g of CO <sub>2</sub> into 1 kg Morrow formation water under reducing conditions. ....	65
Figure 30. Reaction path modeling results of titration of 50 g of CO <sub>2</sub> into 1 kg of Morrow formation water under oxidizing conditions.....	66
Figure 31. Predicted mineral abundances as a function of reaction progress due to reaction of CO <sub>2</sub> -charged groundwater with Morrow host rock under oxidizing conditions.....	67
Figure 32. Predicted mineral abundances as a function of reaction progress due to reaction of CO <sub>2</sub> -charged groundwater with Morrow host rock under reducing conditions.....	67
Figure 33. Elevation-time surfaces created in Petrel. Different colors denote different times in milliseconds. The TWT seismic data intersects these surfaces. ....	71
Figure 34. Seismic reflection data in TWT (left) and in TD (right) after a depth-conversion. ....	71

Figure 35. Color shaded relief map of Arizona, New Mexico, and West Texas. The track of the topographic signature of the Socorro Fracture Zone is indicated with arrows in the margins of the figure. Other arrows indicate the eastern and western ends of the Jemez lineament (Sanford and Lin, 1998). The black square represents Ochiltree County, Texas. The Canadian River, which follows the topography of the Socorro Fracture Zone, is indicated by the blue line just south of black square and following the red arrow to the east.....74

Figure 36. Time slice from Morrow B sandstone of an ant-track volume. The dark linear features on the right line up with a preliminary fault interpretation modeled from reflection offset in the 3D seismic cube. ....74

Figure 37. Schematic of the seismic survey for the VSP, cross well tomography, and the passive seismic wells. The current study focuses on the west side of the field. The passive array will be going into Well 13-10 well. ....75

Table 1. Importance of Core Analyses Relative to Major Project Objectives.....	9
Table 2. Top 10 Ranked Risks Based on Risk Priority Number .....	23
Table 3. Project (Programmatic Risks).....	24
Table 4. Programmatic Risks to the Environment or Public .....	25
Table 5. Scientific Risks .....	29
Table 6. List of Logs for Well 1310-A .....	38
Table 7. Depths of Core Preservation in Helium-Tight Canisters for Farnsworth Unit Well 13-10A .....	42
Table 8. CO <sub>2</sub> Surface Flux Collected on October 6, 2013.....	45
Table 9. CO <sub>2</sub> Surface Flux Collected on November 21, 2013.....	50
Table 10. R2 Values.....	57
Table 11. Analysis of Water Samples Taken October 23, 2013.....	69
Table 12. Analysis of Water Samples Taken November 21, 2013.....	70
Table 13. Budget and Expenditures for the Quarter October 1–December 31, 2013.....	81
Table 14. Milestone Plan/Status .....	82

## Executive Summary

Tasks addressed in this quarter were Tasks 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 8.

*Task 1–Regional Characterization:* By the end of the quarter, work on the updated information for NATCARB was completed determining a range for oil and gas reservoir storage in the SWP states.

*Task 2–Public Outreach and Education:* MediaWiki and the Semantic MediaWiki extension were updated for SWP-Velo and maintenance work on SWP-Velo was performed.

*Task 4–Site Characterization and Planning:* An updated Core Analysis Plan was produced and a map depicting the structure of the top of the Arbuckle Group was updated. Work continued on the development of STOMP-EOR, focusing on realizing an executing version of the simulator. Modeling work focused on construction of the base pre-CO<sub>2</sub> injection multi-phase flow model in the Morrow B sandstone formation and development of methodology for permeability parameterization at FWU. The SWP simulation workgroup began evaluating whether to adopt the widely-used Ensemble Kalman filter (EnKF) approach. Work on relative permeability, and in particular, field-scale relative permeability, continued this quarter and researchers began designing an efficacy-testing approach. Researchers continued to work with CO<sub>2</sub>-PENS + PSUADE to quantify uncertainty for capacity, injectivity, pressure, migration, and integrating CO<sub>2</sub>-PENS + PSUADE with STOMP/Velo/GS3 products. Work also continued on developing response surfaces for selected risk FEPs. Work plan revisions were completed and resubmitted.

*Task 5–Well Drilling and Completion:* Well 1310A was drilled, cored, logged, cased, and cemented, after some delays caused by problems in drilling. Researchers preserved samples of core in the field immediately after it arrived at Earth's surface, with helium-containing cannisters.

*Task 6–Operational Monitoring and Modeling:* Work progressed on a number of fronts in this quarter. SWP researchers began laying out a directory structure for data related to the MVA workgroup/program. CO<sub>2</sub> surface flux monitoring continued, with samples being gathered and analyzed twice in the quarter and Eddy covariance tower development and calibration continued. SWP accounting and verification of injected CO<sub>2</sub> storage into the Morrow Formation at the Farnsworth Unit began on October 1. Geochemical modeling of groundwater in the Morrow Sandstone refined and extended work that had begun in the last quarter; the next phase will consist of building a reactive transport model for the Morrow Sandstone using a simplified geologic model. Water samples were taken at the project site and analyzed. Researchers interpreted a 3D seismic cube using velocity and stratigraphic models in anticipation of generating facies models and a velocity model was generated and tested.

*Task 8–Project Management:* Chaparral, Schlumberger, and SWP worked on coordination of site activities and timing to optimize data for site characterization and MVA with cost. A venue and program for the annual review meeting November 19–20 were determined, and the meeting was held in Liberal, KS, with visits to the project site and the Ethanol plant in Liberal, the primary FWU CO<sub>2</sub> source. On November 13, Principal Investigators for the SWP attended the IEA Expert Review for the SWP Phase III project on November 13 in Washington DC.