Proof-of-Feasibility of Using Wellbore Deformation as a Diagnostic Tool to Improve CO2 Sequestration

DE FE0004542

Larry Murdoch, Clemson University

Stephen Moysey, Clemson University
Leonid Germanovich, Georgia Tech
Cem Ozan, Baker Hughes
Sihyun Kim, Georgia Tech
Glenn Skawski, Clemson University
Johnathan Ebenhack, Clemson University
Josh Smith, Clemson University

U.S. Department of Energy
National Energy Technology Laboratory
Carbon Storage R&D Project Review Meeting
Developing the Technologies and Building the Infrastructure for CO_2 Storage
August 21-23, 2012

Presentation Outline

- Preliminaries
- Current project status
- Plans









Improve characterization

Anticipate problems

Benefit to the Program

Measuring and interpreting casing deformation should improve the ability to characterize flow and geomechanical properties of injection zones and confining units, as well as help identify problems with wellbore integrity that could lead to leakage.

Program Goal:

- ✓ Develop technologies that will support industries' ability to predict CO_2 storage capacity in geologic formations to within ±30 percent
- ✓ Develop technologies to demonstrate that 99 percent of injected CO_2 remains in the injection zones

Project Overview:
Goals and Objectives

Evaluate feasibility of using wellbore deformation as a diagnostic tool.

1. What deformation should be expected?
   - FEM analyses, Task 2
2. Can that deformation be measured?
   - Instrument development and testing, Task 4
3. Can the measurements be interpreted?
   - Inverse analyses, Task 3

What can be measured?

Task 4

Goal: Assess capabilities to measure deformation of wellbores under field conditions.

Downhole Tools

- Axial displacement/strain
- XZ, YZ shear (tilt)
- Radial displacement

Sensors

- Displacement
  - LVDT, DVRT
  - Optical Fiber Bragg Grating (FBG)
- Acceleration
  - MEMS accelerometer
- Tilt
  - Electrolytic bubble



3D Borehole Displacements

Optical Fiber Sensor



Fiber Bragg Grating Strain Gauge

+ Immune to EM interference
+ Immune to supercrit CO2
+ No downhole electronics
+ Many gauges per fiber
- Fragile



Field Testing in Newark Basin, July 2012

Radial Displacement

Newest Development



+ EM or optical gauges
+ Simpler than axial
+ More compact than axial
- Only 1 component of deformation

Prototype testing

Field Testing

Ambient Response w/ FBG



Strain rate: ~10^{-7}/12hrs = $2x10^{-12}$ s^{-1}

Pumping test w/DVRT and tiltmeter



Noise and Resolution

1 Hz, RMS residual



Status

- ✓ Axial, radial, 3D
- ✓ Field testing at shallow depths
- ✓ Mobilization

Resolution

- Axial displacement: 0.01 μm
- Axial strain: 0.01 με
- Radial displacement: <0.1 μm
- Tilt: 0.03 μrad
- Shear strain: 0.2 με
- Strain Rate: $<10^{-12}\ s^{-1}$

What deformation is expected?
Task 2

Goal: characterize deformation in the vicinity of wellbores used for sequestration.

- Benchmark simulations
  - FLAC, Abaqus, Comsol, GMI Wellcheck…
- Response Scenarios
  - Reservoir types
  - Heterogeneities
  - Wellbore completion

Basic Principles





Example: Regional-to-Wellbore-Scale

Geometry

Constant *Q* injection, 6 lps ~100gpm, Axial symmetry

Aquifer: *k*: $10^{-13}m^2$, *b*: 100m, *E*: 15GPa , *R* = 30km

Confining : *k*: $10^{-16}m^2$, *b*: 1000 m; *E*: 15GPa

Casing: *k*: 1nd; 8-inch, 8mm wall, *E*: 200GPa

Screen: *k*: $10^{-13}m^2$; 8-inch, 8mm wall, *E*: 200GPa





Regional-to-Wellbore-Scale Simulation

Discretization

Telescoping mesh to resolve casing in regional-scale simulation



Response in Injection Well



Vertical Profiles on Wellbore



Hydromechanical type curves





Response in Monitoring Well

r = 1000m



Monitoring well location



Vertical Profiles *r* = 1000m



Effect of Confining Unit Permeability

Radial displacement

Constant *P* injection, 1 MPa
Aquifer: *k*: 0.1d, *b*: 1m, *E*: 1GPa
Confining : *k*: *1md*, *2md*, *0.5 md*
b: 10 m; *E*: 1GPa
Casing: *k*: 1nd; 8-inch, 8mm wall, *E*: 200GPa
Screen: *k*: 0.1d; 8-inch, 8mm wall, *E*: 200GPa
Measurement: 0.2 and 2 m above contact







How can measurements be interpreted? Task 3:

Goals: a.) Quantify ability of data to constrain model parameters, b.) assess how uncertainty in parameters translates into risks; c.) optimize methods for efficient large-scale reservoir characterization

Gradient-Based Optimization

Objective: Find model parameters that provide minimum data misfit

- Provides local assessment of parameter uncertainty and correlation
- Efficient search of parameter space (i.e., few model runs = *fast*)
- Finds **local** minimum



Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC)

Objective: Find probability distribution of model parameters consistent with observed data and uncertainties

- Allows assessment of full joint probability model for parameters (i.e., needed for *prediction uncertainty*)
- Random search of parameter space (i.e., many model runs = *slow*)
- Finds **global** minimum

Example: Effect of Data on Estimation Uncertainty

Pressure + Displacement Data (10% noise)

Constant rate injection using line source.

Pressure and displacement from poroelastic analytical solution. *Wang* [2000, eq. 8.105, 8.106]

<u>Parameters:</u>

- Hydraulic Conductivity
- Hydraulic Diffusivity
- Loading Efficiency



Typical Well Test
Pressure Data Only (10% noise)





- Pressure data fit as well as for fully constrained case
- Similar constraint of hydraulic conductivity and diffusivity as fully constrained case
- Poor constraint of the loading efficiency

Accomplishments to Date

- FEM benchmark analyses
- Basic patterns of deformation; axial, radial, tilt
- Magnitudes: ~ 1μm, strain: ~1με
- Sensitivity to confining unit, casing leakage
- Axial displacement in monitoring well
- Instruments to measure axial, radial, 3D
- Field Resolution: ~0.01 μm, ~0.01 με
- Demonstrated in the field at shallow depths
- Interpretation using MCMC and HPC

Summary

- Key Findings
  - Expect μm/με-scale displacements
  - Possible to measure 0.01 μm/με-scale
  - Interpretation appears feasible
- Future Plans
  - Forward analyses; reservoir structure, properties, casing-cement-formation, thermal
  - Instrument evaluation; Harden FBG system, deep deployment, radial extensometer
  - MCMC; apply to numerical analyses, assess uncertainties, real field data

Effects of Annular Leakage

Constant *P* injection, 1MPa
Confining: *k*: 10μD









Pressure Data Only (10% noise)

Color scale shows objective function,
Points show accepted models





Loading efficiency cannot be constrained.

Pressure + Displacement Data (10% noise)



Color scale shows objective function,
Points show accepted models



Well defined minimum in objective function.

Gradient Descent:



Take successive steps in gradient descent direction.

Choose steps so that error always decreases in moves toward the minimum.

Problematic when local minima occur or problem is poorly conditioned.

MCMC:



Propose step based on current position (e.g. random walk).

Accept step if error decreases.

Repeat.

If error increases in a step, accept/reject with a probability related to the increase in error.

➔ Allows steps to move "uphill" out of local minima.

➔ After running chain, the samples can be used to infer joint statistics for parameters.

3D Borehole Displacements

Electrical Sensors



+ Proven technology
  - Electrolytic tilt
  - EM displacement
+ High resolution
- Downhole electronics
- Vulnerable to EM interference



Appendix

– These slides will not be discussed during the presentation, but are mandatory

Organization Chart

- Describe project team, organization, and participants.
  - Link organizations, if more than one, to general project efforts (i.e. materials development, pilot unit operation, management, cost analysis, etc.).

- Please limit company specific information to that relevant to achieving project goals and objectives.

Gantt Chart

- Provide a simple Gantt chart showing project lifetime in years on the horizontal axis and major tasks along the vertical axis. Use symbols to indicate major and minor milestones. Use shaded lines or the like to indicate duration of each task and the amount of that work completed to date.

Bibliography

List peer reviewed publications generated from project per the format of the examples below

- Journal, one author:
  - Gaus, I., 2010, Role and impact of CO2-rock interactions during CO2 storage in sedimentary rocks: International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control, v. 4, p. 73-89, available at: XXXXXXX.com.
- Journal, multiple authors:
  - MacQuarrie, K., and Mayer, K.U., 2005, Reactive transport modeling in fractured rock: A state-of-the-science review. Earth Science Reviews, v. 72, p. 189-227, available at: XXXXXXX.com.
- Publication:
  - Bethke, C.M., 1996, Geochemical reaction modeling, concepts and applications: New York, Oxford University Press, 397 p.

Pressure + Displacement Data (10% noise)

Convergence of chain achieved for all three model parameters



Radial displacement

steady line source





Near-well radial displacement
Line Source







Near-well radial displacement
Open Hole







Near-well radial displacement

Screened hole, bonded to formation







Near-well radial displacement

Screened hole, soft layer, no pre-stress







Transient injection test



Constant Q=3x10^{-4} m^3/s
Screened
Confining stress: 10MPa
Casing compressed 10MPa
during completion

Since start of injection



Pressure response



Relative to unloaded radius




×10^-5
15
10
5
0
-5
Axial strain
0
2
4
6
8
10
z (m)
1 minute
10 minutes
1 hr
2 hr

Effects of Annular Leakage

Constant *P* injection, 1MPa
Confining: *k*: 10μD









Technical Status

- Focus the remaining slides, logically walking through the project. Focus on telling the story of your project and highlighting the key points as described in the Presentation Guidelines
- When providing graphs or a table of results from testing or systems analyses, also indicate the baseline or targets that need to be met in order to achieve the project and program goals.

Steady injection into well

- Axial symmetry, 1-D radial
- CH boundary at *r*=1000m
- Plane strain
- Properties, sand and water



k: 100mD, *b*=1m, *E*=1GPa, α=1; ν=0.25
β=4.4x10^{-10} Pa-1, μ: 0.001 Pa s



Cases

1. Line source
2. Open hole
   - *r*: 0.1m
   - Pressurized, w/ flow
   - Pressurized, no flow
3. Casing/Screen
   - *r:* 0.1m; *w*: 8mm; *E*: 200GPa
   - Pressurized, w/ flow (screen)
   - Pressurized, no flow (casing)



What can be measured?