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# Project Overview

- Funding Profile
- Project Performance Dates: 07/01/2021– 06/30/2024

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BP1 07/01/21 - 06/30/22</th>
<th>BP2 07/01/22 - 06/30/23</th>
<th>BP3 07/01/23 - 06/30/24</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOE Funds</strong></td>
<td>NMIMT 332,640</td>
<td>University of Utah 54,419</td>
<td>Silixa LLC 246,970</td>
<td>LANL 79,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Share %</strong></td>
<td>32.389</td>
<td>13.608</td>
<td>140,315</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>169,139</td>
<td>26,449</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43,195</td>
<td>6,612</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>156,146</td>
<td>14,132</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td>39,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28,481</td>
<td>3,530</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>657,924</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>246,970</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104,064</td>
<td>23,750</td>
<td>187,915</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total ($)</strong></td>
<td>714,025</td>
<td>275,596</td>
<td>210,274</td>
<td>1,199,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost Share %</strong></td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DOE Funds
- **NMIMT**: 332,640
- **University of Utah**: 54,419
- **Silixa LLC**: 246,970
- **LANL**: 79,996

## Cost Share
- **BP1**: 20.7%
- **BP2**: 21.1%
- **BP3**: 21.0%
- **Total**: 20.8%
Project Overview: Objectives

• The main objective is to carry out field deployment of an integrated suite of cost-effective and novel geophysical, geochemical, and geomechanical technologies for detection and characterization of faults and fractures.

• The project will deploy these technologies at the San Juan Basin (SJB) CarbonSAFE Phase III site.

• To permanently deploy an integrated behind casing fiber optic sensing system, including Distributed Strain Sensing (DSS), Distributed Temperature Sensing (DTS), and a high sensitivity Distributed Acoustic Sensing (DAS) system.

• To employ Rock Volatile Stratigraphy (RVStrat), a novel geochemical technology that uses drill cuttings and core, to locate faults (including aseismic faults) and estimate their sizes and orientations.
Project Overview: Objectives

- To detect faults near and more distant from the well bore, including faults in the crystalline basement rock, using a novel multi-scale U-Net machine learning method to evaluate 3D surface seismic and 3D VSP images.

- To integrate proposed technologies to develop advanced rock physics and coupled thermo-hydrodynamic-mechanical models in combination with the Monte Carlo method, to determine state of stress on each mapped fault and estimate long-term slip potential and/or maximum fault slip potential resulting from large-scale CO$_2$ injection.
Our Approach

Field Deployment and Data collection: DAS, DSS, DTS
Existing Data: Seismic data, BARS, well Logs, Drilling cuttings, Core, DFIT,

Machine Learning Seismic Fault Detection

Geochemical Analysis for fault detection and characterization

Wellbore Analysis for fault detection and Characterization

Fault Failure/Slip Analysis

Modeling
Advanced Rock Physics Modeling
Static/ 3D Mechanical Earth Model (MEM)
Fault/Fracture Property Assignment
Hydrodynamic Model

Integrated Modeling for Hazard Assessment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Subtask</th>
<th>Milestone Title &amp; Description</th>
<th>Planned Completion Date</th>
<th>Verification method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Project Kick-off meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attend Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Deployment of DAS/DSS/DTS behind casing in the SJB CarbonSAFE stratigraphic well</td>
<td>12/31/2022</td>
<td>Report to DOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Drilling cuttings, core and legacy core cuttings assembled</td>
<td>10/31/2021</td>
<td>Report to DOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Seismic analysis detecting aseismic and basement faults</td>
<td>9/30/2022</td>
<td>Report to DOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RVstrat approach detecting and characterizing faults</td>
<td>7/31/2022</td>
<td>Report to DOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1/5.2</td>
<td>Wellbore analysis detecting and characterizing geological features such as faults</td>
<td>3/31/2022</td>
<td>Report to DOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Determination of principal stress, pore pressure within storage complex</td>
<td>1/31/2023</td>
<td>Report to DOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1/6.2</td>
<td>Compilation of fault information and baseline seismicity within storage complex and basement</td>
<td>9/30/2023</td>
<td>Report to DOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Fault slip analysis</td>
<td>11/30/2023</td>
<td>Report to DOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Completion of static model for numerical simulation</td>
<td>2/28/2023</td>
<td>Report to DOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Numerical modeling for hazard assessment</td>
<td>4/30/2024</td>
<td>Report to DOE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Storage Complex @ San Juan Basin
SJB CarbonSAFE Project Facts

Key Project Facts

• Retrofit the San Juan Generating Station with 6-7 MMT/yr CO₂ capture technology, locally store within San Juan Basin.

• Characterization target located ~17 miles from SJGS

Characterization Plan

• Drill characterization well, perform injectivity tests on Private land

• Perform suites of laboratory experiments and numerical models

• Purchased 3D seismic, acquire 3D VSP
Key Notes

• Completion to Class VI Standard
  The strat well even though permitted as class II, we plan to complete it to a class VI standard for potential future use.

• Fiber Optic Line
  Fiber optic line will be attached, along with downhole gauges, to the outside of the 5-1/2” casing to monitor the stress, pressure and temperature profiles along the wellbore.
Silixa Distributed Optical Fiber Technology

Fiber Optics Installation ➔ Monitoring Solutions ➔ Data Interpretation ➔ Assess Risks

- Faults/Fractures Detection and Characterization
- Matrix/Fractures/Faults Geomechanical Properties Evaluation
- Micro-seismicity Monitoring
Downhole Fiber Optic Cable – A825 Outer Sheath

* Drawing not to scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optical Details</th>
<th>Multimode</th>
<th>Singlemode</th>
<th>Constellation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiber Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Diameter</td>
<td>60 μm</td>
<td>9 μm</td>
<td>8 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cladding Diameter</td>
<td>125 μm</td>
<td>125 μm</td>
<td>125 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wavelength</td>
<td>850 nm</td>
<td>1300 nm</td>
<td>1310 nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Attenuation</td>
<td>3.2 dB/Km</td>
<td>1.4 dB/Km</td>
<td>0.72 dB/Km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scheduled Data Acquisition - Fiber Optic

The DTS, DSS, and DAS data acquisition plan includes:

- Mobilization 1 – Fiber optic cable deployment
  - Measurements during fiber optic cable deployment to assess integrity of optical fibers using a portable optical time-domain reflectometer (OTDR).

- DSS and DTS surveys after the cable reaches total depth and before the cementation process to assess the hole temperature profile, which can be used to inform the cement mixture.

- DSS and DTS surveys during and after the cementation process to assess the cementation progress, final cement level, and cement curation process, which can be informative about the thermal and hydraulic properties of the formation.
Scheduled Data Acquisition- Fiber Optic

The DTS, DSS, and DAS data acquisition plan includes:

• Mobilization 2 – Baseline
  ➢ Strain (DSS) baseline
  ➢ Temperature (DTS) baseline
  ➢ Acoustic (DAS) baseline (ambient noise log)
  ➢ Seismicity baseline
  ➢ Continuous monitoring during DFIT using DTS, DSS, DAS
LANL Multiscale Connection-fusion U-shaped Convolutional Neural Network (MCFU)

Architecture of multiscale connection-fusion convolutional neural network method (MCFU).

Fault Segmentation from Seismic Image via MCFU

Technology Advantages
- Improved in Faults Detection
- Reliable Large-scale Fault Mapping
- Enhanced Cost Efficiency
Machine learning fault detection on a depth-converted 3D volume of a 3D prestack time migration image showing that there is no major fault at the project site.
3D Surface Seismic, Before and after Reprocessing

Greenhorn Mbr.
Entrada
Honaker Trail
Precambrian
AHS Rock Volatiles CCS Well Site Evaluation

Analyze Rock Volatiles ➔ Analyze Nearby Well ➔ Assess Risks

- Faults/Fractures
- Fault Activating
- Fluid Conduits
- CO₂ Seals
- CO₂ Permeability
- Past CO₂ Loss
- Future CO₂ Loss

Humble Oil - Kirtland 1
San Juan Co. NM (1961)

Kirtland 1; 14 miles SSW of CarbonSAFE Site
Cuttings Sampling for AHS Analysis

4 Legacy Wells’ Cuttings Analyzed
SJB Fluid Migration from Legacy Cuttings Volatiles

- Gentle Cryo-Trap Volatiles Analyses, Maps Fluid Migration From Legacy Drill Cuttings.
- Migrated Oil and Condensate Occur as Data Spikes
- No Relationship to Stratigraphy or Lithology,
- Potential Fracture Migration.
San Juan Basin Geological Modeling

• More than 2200 well tops so far
SJB CarbonSafe Geomodel

- Grid cells \((nI \times nJ \times nK)\): 322 x 321 x 29
- Total number of grid cells: 2,886,660
- X (ft.): 235356.12 ~ 555976.40 -> 320620.28 ft. (60.72 miles)
- Y (ft.): 1957320.33 ~ 2278308.71 -> 320988.38 ft. (60.79 miles)
- CRS: NM-W:NAD27 New Mexico State Planes, Western Zone, US Foot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer No.</th>
<th>Formation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Brushy Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Salt Wash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bluff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Summerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Todilto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Entered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Camel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A) SSTVD structure map of the topo of the Honaker Trail Formation with locations of structural sections X, Y, and Z

B) Cross sections X, Y, Z (10x vertical exaggeration) with key formation grids visible
In previous work, we identified the seismic risk using a single planar model.
We are improving our understanding of risk through discretization

The search radius is placed at many locations

A planar regression elucidates the discrete fault patch
We ran the analysis for three faults in the case of both discretization and a single planar model.

Median values for each point in the fault model

All the realizations for each point in each model
We are formulating the problem in a Bayesian framework.

We want to understand the Impact discretization (r) has on Coulomb Failure Function (CFF).
• The project management team completed the technology maturation plan and received the approval from the DOE.
• The downhole Fiber Optic cable was successfully manufactured and the clamps utilized during the cable installation was secured.
• Over 1,161 well cuttings from four legacy wells close to the proposed SJB CarbonSAFE III site has been identified and analyzed geochemically through the RVStrat technology.
• The concepts and mathematics involved in viscoplastic stress relaxation theory was constructed to interpret the log data for fault detection and characterization.
• The preliminary analysis using machine learning techniques did not identity any major fault within the current 3D seismic volume.
• The faults orthogonal to the Hogback Fault had been interpreted by the Monte Carlo Mohr-Coulomb simulations.
• The fault polygons for the hogback fault system as well as other basement faulting system in the area has been identified and the static geological and hydrodynamic flow model was completed.
• The training on advanced modeling tools, including dfnWorks, Hoss, and Amanzi, for the hazard assessment have been completed.
Next Steps- DfnWorks

dfnGen → dfnFlow → dfnTrans

1) PFLOTRAN
2) FEHM
3) AMANZI

1) Advection-Dispersion
2) Particles
3) Pipe-Network
Next Step- Coupled Modeling Workflow

AMANZI-ATS

Pressure
Temperature
Saturation
...

Inyan
Control Center

Call
Mapping

HOSS

Call

Porosity
Permeability
Aperture
...

Simulation Output
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Appendix

- These slides will not be discussed during the presentation but are mandatory.
Organization Chart

Project Management
G. El-Kaseeh (PM) - (Tasks 1,2,3,5)

Principal Investigator (PI)
Dr. William Ampomah

New Mexico Tech
W. Ampomah - Lead - Tasks 1,2,5,6,7
G. El-Kaseeh - Tasks 1,2,3,5
S. Wang - Tasks 1,2,4
J. Tu - Task 7
L. Martin - Task 5,6
A. Rinehart - Task 5,6
Geoscientist - Task 3,7.
Students - Task 7

University of Utah
B. McPherson - Lead (Tasks 5,6)
K. McCormack (Task 5,6)

Los Alamos National Laboratory
L. Huang - Lead - Tasks 3
R. Pawar - Tasks 7
J. Hyman - Task 7
Z. Lei - Task 7

Consultants
T. Bratton (Task 5)

AHS
M. Smith (Task 4)
C. Smith (Task 4)
P. Gordon (Task 4)
T. Smith (Task 4)

Silixa LLC
T. Coleman (Tasks 2)
D. Podrasky (Task 2)
## Proposed Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 1.0</th>
<th>Project Management and Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtask 1.2</td>
<td>Technology Maturation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2.0</td>
<td>Deployment of Field Technology/Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtask 2.1</td>
<td>Review of Well Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtask 2.2</td>
<td>Deployment of the DSS/DAS/DTS Fiber Optic Cable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtask 2.3</td>
<td>Data Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtask 2.4</td>
<td>Cutting Sample Collection and Pretreatment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task 3.0 Seismic Analysis for Fault Detection
- Subtask 3.1 Machine Learning Fault Detection of Surface Seismic Image
- Subtask 3.2 Machine Learning Fault Detection of VSP Images and VSP-DAS Images
- Subtask 3.3 Comparison with Industry Standard Seismic Fault Detection

### Task 4.0 Geochemical Analysis for Fault Detection and Characterization
- Subtask 4.1 Historical Sample Analysis
- Subtask 4.2 Volatiles Identification and Quantification
- Subtask 4.3 Bulk Mechanical Strength Measurements
- Subtask 4.4 Integration of well log and RVstrat Analysis

### Task 5.0 Wellbore Analysis for Fault Detection and Characterization
- Subtask 5.1 Fault and Fracture Detection using Wellbore Images
- Subtask 5.2 Fault and Fracture Detection using BARS
- Subtask 5.3 DFIT Analysis to Quantify Minimum Horizontal Stress, Pore Pressure, and Matrix Permeability
- Subtask 5.4 Viscoplastic Minimum Principal Stress Estimation
- Subtask 5.5 Strain Modeling with Finite Element Analysis

### Task 6.0 Fault Slip/Activation Analysis
- Subtask 6.1 Compile Stress Information
- Subtask 6.2 Compile Fault Information
- Subtask 6.3 Compute Coulomb Failure Function

### Task 7.0 Integrated Modeling for Hazard Assessment
- Subtask 7.1 Geological/Static Modeling
- Subtask 7.1.1 Geologic Structural and Stratigraphic Framework
- Subtask 7.1.2 3D Hydrodynamic and Mechanical Model
- Subtask 7.1.3 Fracture Modeling
- Subtask 7.1.4 Fault Transmissibility Modeling
- Subtask 7.2 Advanced Rock Physics Modeling
- Subtask 7.2.1 Verify the presence of fractures in caprocks
- Subtask 7.2.2 Develop combined rock physics model
- Subtask 7.3 Advanced Numerical Modeling
- Subtask 7.3.1 Hydrodynamic Modeling
- Subtask 7.3.2 Coupled Thermo-hydrodynamic-Mechanical Modeling
Outer Sheath: A825 Alloy Performance in Comparison to 316SS

- Primary protection of fibers provided by outer sheath, 0.25” OD, 0.035” thick A825 Alloy continuous tube (sometimes called Incoloy).

- Developed for **high corrosion resistance** at high T, particularly low/high pH solutions & chloride stress corrosion (*significantly higher performance than 316SS*).

- High performance in high T environment, less than a 5% tensile strength reduction at 500 C. Considerably stronger than 316 SS.