

# Distributed Strain Sensing based Reservoir Monitoring for Carbon Sequestration Reservoirs

Presenter: Dr. Ge Jin, Colorado School of Mines

**Coauthors**: Yanrui Daisy Ning & Peiyao Li, Colorado School of Mines

Richard Hammack, National Energy Technology Laboratory

Kan Wu, Texas A&M

## Disclaimer

This project was funded by the United States Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory, in part, through a site support contract. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, nor the support contractor, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.





## Outline



- Introduction
- Aseismic Deformation and Distributed Strain Sensing
- Geomechanical Inversion and Uncertainty
- Discussion and Future Works
- Conclusion

#### Risk of Cap Rock Integrity and Induced Seismicity for CCS Projects



Unwanted mechanical changes



Rutqvist, 2012

- Cap rocks are typically low-permeability shales.
- Deformation in shale formations can occur without causing seismic activity due to the presence of ductile rocks.
- Monitoring for microseismic activity may not be effective for assessing the integrity of caprocks in CO<sub>2</sub> storage (CSS) reservoirs.
- Overburden pressure and chemical monitoring can only detect CO<sub>2</sub> leakage after it has already occurred.

# Is there a monitoring method to detect cap rock and reservoir fracture deformation before overburden leakage?

## **Distributed Fiber-Optic Sensing**





Distributed Temperature Sensing (DTS) Distributed Acoustic Sensing (DAS) **Distributed Strain Sensing (DSS)** 

- Distance: up to 8 km
- Spatial resolution: 0.2 m
- Sampling interval: 30 s
- Sensitivity: 0.1  $\mu \varepsilon$

## **Borehole Cable Deployment**







#### 3D Fracture Growth







#### 3D Fracture Growth







#### Srinivasan et al., SPE-214690-PA

- Single fracture
- Fracture upper tip location grows continuously

#### Vertical Well DSS Signal vs. Simulation



#### Aseismic Deformation Observed in Shale





Deformation in shale formation can be aseismic due to ductile rocks  $\rightarrow$ Microseismic monitoring may be inefficient for caprock integrity monitoring for CSS reservoirs!

## **Problem Statement**

- Can we observe aseismic deformation induced strain change using DSS?
- Using strain change observed along monitor well(s), how well can we constrain the fracture location, geometry, and deformation?
- 10 degrees of freedom:
  - Location: x, y, z
  - Geometry: L, H, Strike, Dip
  - Deformation: W, S1, S2



## DSS Detection Threshold (0.1 $\mu\epsilon$ sensitivity)





Rutqvist, 2012

Monitor well in the overburden can detect fracture aseismic deformation in caprocks, allowing early warnings and mitigations.

An inversion algorithm is required to interpret the strain measurements.



#### Non-linear and Non-uniqueness Inversion Problem: Single Vertical Well



Generated 1 million random initial models, followed by gradient decent inversion.

52,116 final models with errors smaller than 5% were found using 1050 CPU hours.

Non-uniqueness due to the following trade-offs:

- Single component measurements (azimuth)
- Distance/fracture size/deformation value





Error < 5% - 52,116 fractures

### Two Vertical Wells



Uncertainty of azimuth is improved. Trade-off between distance and fracture size still exists.





Error < 5% - 367 fractures

## L-shape Monitor well

- Azimuth uncertainty is reduced.
- Symmetric distribution on both sides of the monitor well.
- Distance/fracture size trade-off.







Error < 5% - 541 fractures

#### L-shape + Vertical wells:

- Fracture location can be accurately estimated.
- Trade-off between slippage value and fracture size.





Error < 5% ~ 47 fractures



#### Monitor well with complex geometry

- Similar results as two monitor wells.
- It can be more cost-effective for monitoring purposes.





Error < 5% ~ 89 fractures



#### Field Data Example: HFTS2





19

## **Future Works**



- Improving calculation efficiency for the inversion algorithm.
- Adding geological constraints to improve accuracy.
- Apply the inversion algorithm for the field measurements.
- Optimize monitor well designs for maximum detectability on fractures in cap rocks and CCS reservoirs.

## Conclusion



- CO<sub>2</sub> injection can cause natural fractures and faults to deform, compromising the integrity of the cap rock in CCS reservoirs, leading to overburden leakage and increasing the risk of induced seismicity.
- Cap rocks are typically composed of shale, which can undergo aseismic deformation that is not easily detectable using seismic methods.
- By deploying fiber-optic-based distributed strain sensing in monitor wells, it is possible to characterize aseismic and seismic deformation before CO<sub>2</sub> leaks into overlying formations, offering earlier warning opportunities compared to other monitoring methods.
- Optimal positioning and design of monitor wells can enhance detection accuracy.