Evaluating Saline Storage Opportunities in Offshore Alabama Gabe Casanova¹, Jeremy Leierzapf¹, Mitchell Meyer¹, John W. Koster¹, David E. Riestenberg¹, George Koperna¹

Advanced Resources International, Inc 4110 Sutherland Ave, Knoxville, TN 37919 Contact: Gabe Casanova (gcasanova@adv-res.com) 337-552-3174



njection Packe

7" Tubing

Middle Perf

9.625" Casino

Figure 7: SL 534 Well #1 Well Diagram

Introduction



Southeast Regional Carbon Storage Partnership: Offshore Gulf of Mexico (SECARB Offshore) evaluates potential storage opportunities within a specifically defined GOM Study Area (Area of Interest). The evaluation focuses on active and depleted oil and gas fields, potentially associated CO2-enhanced oil recovery (CO₂-EOR) and deep saline storage resources in the state waters of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and West Florida.

This poster displays the results of an Advanced Resources International, Inc. (ARI) evaluation of saline storage opportunities in offshore Alabama, specifically Mobile Bay (Figure 1). The evaluation was done in three parts: building a geologic model of the Mobile Bay subsurface, creating a dynamic reservoir model of the highest potential storage zones, and finally constructing an injection model of existing Mobile Bay wells to investigate the feasibility of repurposing these wells as CO2 injectors.

Reservoir Model

The reservoir model was constructed using geologic model outputs and provides information on the injectivity and plume migration of supercritical CO2. This numerical modeled parameters are detailed in (Figure 4). Well log data was utilized to segregate three modeled flow units, the Tuscaloosa Massive Sand, Washita-Fredericksburg, and the Paluxy Formations. Among these three formations, the vertical column has been simplified into packages of pay and non-pay, where the numerical model is injecting into the pay units only. Work completed on the well design and existing well completions using nodal analysis indicates a maximum injection rate of 2.88 million tonnes per year of CO2, given the well's size and tubulars. Accordingly, this value has been set as the maximum injection rate in the model. Additionally, the fracture gradient is assumed to be 0.65 psi/ft, so our maximum bottomhole pressure is 90% of this gradient, or 0.585 psi/ft. Both constraints were utilized for the well control within the numerical simulations. CO2 injection is modeled for 30 years in each case. The Tuscaloosa Massive Sand, with 160 feet of net thickness and 650 feet of gross thickness, boasts the best injectivity of the three reservoirs modeled. Initially, the injection rate is slower as the brine in the system is dominating relative permeability effects. As more CO2 is injected near the wellbore, relative permeability conditions become more favorable to CO2 injection, resulting in an increasing injection rate. Within 4 years, the maximum CO2 injection rate reaches 2.88 million tonnes per year; over a 30 year period, a total 84.7 million tonnes of CO2 are injected (Figure

Massive San Wash Free Palux 7.950 8 650 11.150 Depth Net Thicknes 160 230 90 0.35 0.43 Dir 0.33 16.5 20 19 Peresity 236 Permeability 269 184 Salinity 151,000 151,000 151,000 Temperatur 0.0139 F/ft + 75 F Gradient

halo-Oliverheaveld at ...

Figure 4: Average Reservoir Properties



Figure 1: Map of oil and gas infrastructure in the Mobile Bay region



To build the geologic model, geophysical wells logs from the Geological Survey of Alabama and Enverus were used to build a geologic framework of the Mobile Bay region. Well headers, raster logs, digital logs, and shapefiles were added to the Kingdom software to facilitate the construction of the model. Formation tops were picked using references from previous work done in this region and to the north in the Mobile Graben area, and cross sections, structure maps, and gross isopach maps were generated using these extrapolated formation tops. Net reservoir was estimated by picking clean sandstone in each of the storage intervals. These inputs were then entered into volumetric calculations which we used to estimate the mass of CO₂ that can be stored per unit area.

Geologic Model

The three most promising formations for geologic storage of CO2 were the fluvial-deltaic sands of the Paluxy Formation, Washita-Fredericksburg Interval, and lower Tuscaloosa Massive Sand, which are overlain by the Tuscaloosa Marine Shale a suitable confining unit (Figure 2). The Lower Tuscaloosa Massive sand was determined to have the highest net to gross ratio and porosity across the evaluated wells. The estimated storage resource potential of these formations suggests that between 3.39 and 11.33 million metric tonnes of CO2 per square mile can be stored in the area of interest. (Figure3)

Formation	Average depth (ft)	Net thickness (ft)	Porosity	P10 (MMtonne)	P50 (MMtonne)	P90 (MMtonne)
Paluxy Formation	10610	84	15%	0.56	1.05	1.80
Washita- Fredericksburg						
Interval	8298	188	20%	1.64	3.10	5.31
Massive Sand	7640	143	21%	1.3	2.46	4.22
Total				3.49	6.61	11.33

Figure 3. Summary of Static Storage Analysis



Injection Model

The Mobile Bay injection simulations were modeled at the maximum possible rate that the wellbore can accommodate into the Tuscaloosa Massive Sand at 7,950ft. The guidelines used to create the models were as follows: Surface injection pressure cannot exceed 2500psi, erosional velocity constant of injection tubing cannot exceed 1, existing wellbore sizes (production casing size) would be used to build models, surface temperature for each model was 75F and CO2 composition was modeled to be 99.5% CO2 and .05% Nitrogen. The existing wellbore chosen for the model was Bon Secour Bay State Lease 534 Well #1(API# 01-297-20224) which has 9.625" OD casing(7" tubing was used for the model) (Figure 7). The maximum achievable rate of the wellbore is approximately 2.88 Mtpa (149.13 MMCF/Day) which was limited by the erosional velocity of the 7" injection tubing. At this rate, the wellhead pressure would be 2168psi which is below the max allowable wellhead pressure of 2500psi

(Figure 8) Mahila Ras Con 0.74 0.76 0.78 Figure 8:Erosional Velocity Ratio vs Dept 7795 ft 7800 ft 7950 ft 8000 ft

Figure 8: Pressure vs Depth