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Abstract

This study numerically simulated the injection of supercritical phase CO₂ into the South Georgia Rift (SGR) basin to evaluate the feasibility and efficacy of long term geologic storage. The injection simulation modeling was divided into two phases. During phase one of the modeling, very little geologic and reservoir dynamics data was known about the SGR basin. Due to lack of basin data, an equilibrium model was used to estimate the initial hydrostatic pressure, temperature and salinity gradients that represent our study area. For the equilibrium model, the USGS SEAWAT program was used and for the CO₂ injection simulation, TOUGH2-ECO2N was used. A stochastic approach was used to populate the permeability in the injection horizon within the model domain. The statistical method to address permeability uncertainty and heterogeneity was Sequential Gaussian Simulation. The target injection depths are well below the 1 km depth required to maintain CO₂ as a supercritical fluid. This study simulated 30 million tons of CO₂ injected at a rate of 1 million tons per year for 30 years. This is USDOE’s stated minimum capacity requirement for a viable CO₂ storage reservoir. In addition to this requirement, a 970 year shut-in time (no injection) was also simulated to better determine the long term fate and migration of the injected CO₂ and to ensure that the SGR basin could effectively contain 30 million tonnes of CO₂. The preliminary modeling of CO₂ injection indicated that the SGR basin is suitable for geologic storage of this DOE stated minimum capacity.
During phase two, newly acquired seismic and well data were used to build a 3-D geologic model that included structure for the injection simulation model. Phase two of the injection simulation modeling looks at the effects of faulting on the numerical simulation of CO$_2$ injection into the South Georgia Rift basin. For this study, two software packages were employed to build the injection simulation model. Petrel™ was used to construct geo-cellular grid based on the 3-D geologic model. CO$_2$ injection simulation was achieved using the compositional reservoir simulator CMG-GEM. The total simulation time was 100 years during which a total of 30 million tonnes of CO$_2$ was injected at a rate of 1 million tonnes per year for 30 years followed by a 70 year shut-in period. Multiple experiments were run to find the effects of fault permeability on the resultant fate of the injected CO$_2$. Fault permeabilities were: 0 mD representing a sealing fault, 1 mD representing a low permeability fault, and 100 mD representing a conduit fault. The results from this research illustrate that with a permeability of 1 mD, significant leakage of CO$_2$ occurs up the faults. This is evidence that fault analysis is a critical factor in injection simulation modeling and ultimately in determining the efficacy of long term geologic storage of CO$_2$ and that even low permeability faults make the geology potentially unsuitable.

Conclusion of this research are: 1) the SGR basin is composed of numerous sub-basins, 2) this study only looked at portions of one sub-basin, 3) in SC, 30 million tonnes of CO$_2$ can be injected into the diabase units if the fracture network is continuous through the units, 4) due to the severity of the faulting there is no way of assuring the injected CO$_2$ will not migrate upward into the overlying Coastal
Plain aquifers, and 5) the SGR basin covers area in three states and this project only studied two small areas so there is enormous potential for CO$_2$ sequestration in other portions the basin and further research needs to be done to find these areas.
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Chapter 1

Introduction and Motivation for this Research

1.1 Introduction

This research aligns with the newest carbon management legislation and initiatives on the basis of the assumption that increased carbon dioxide (CO₂) levels are a major cause of climate change. Increasingly scientists are connecting rising temperatures with increasing amounts of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. These gases absorb part of the long-wave heat radiation emitted from the surface of the earth and can therefore cause atmospheric temperatures to increase (Houghton, 1997; Boden, 1994; Neftel, 1994; Keeling, 2004; Canadell, 2007; Solomon, 2009). Carbon dioxide is the most important because of the evidence that links increased atmospheric CO₂ concentrations with increased atmospheric temperature. In a global effort to mitigate the anthropogenic release of CO₂ into the atmosphere, carbon capture, utilization and storage (CCUS) technology has become a major area of research in the climate change arena. (Goldberg et al., 2008; Zoback and Gorelick, 2012; Pires et al., 2011; Brantley et al. 2015; Nasvi et al., 2013; Leung et al., 2014; Cinar and Riaz, 2014; Riaz and Cinar, 2014; Park et al., 2006). In particular, deep saline formations provide a large storage area worldwide (Mohammed et al., 2012; Bachu, 2000; Behtham and Kirby, 2005; Ghomian et al., 2008; Micheal et al., 2010; Zhuo et al., 2007). Of all emissions...
reduction mechanisms, including upgrading existing power plants for improved efficiency in power generation, building higher efficiency new plants, relying more on renewable energy and nuclear power, carbon capture and storage (CCS) is projected to provide the largest contribution to emissions reduction in the near/mid-term.

The U.S. Department of Energy National Technology and Energy Laboratory (U.S. DOE NETL) has acknowledged that the Mesozoic basins along the eastern seaboard of the United States contain sequences of sandstone layers bound by diabase and shale layers that may serve respectively as reservoir and seal layers ideal for CO₂ injection and long term storage. The South Georgia Rift (SGR) basin, one of the aforementioned Mesozoic basins, is classified by the U.S. DOE NETL as a “high potential” basin that represents a significant storage opportunity that could be commercially developed in the future (U.S. DOE-NETL, 2008).

This study investigates the feasibility of injection and long-term CO₂ storage in the northern portion of the SGR basin. The SGR basin lies near the southern end of the Eastern North American Rift System and is presupposed to be the southernmost and the largest of the eastern North American Triassic rift basins [(Figure 1.1) (Daniels and Zeitz, 1983; Klitgord et al., 1984; Olsen, 1997; Withjack et al., 1998; Schlische, 2003)]. In sharp contrast to other basins being evaluated for carbon storage, the northern portion of the SGR basin has never been extensively studied and has only one boring (the Norris Lightsey # 1) that penetrates the depth of interest. The N.L. # 1 is a petroleum exploration well that
was drilled to a depth of 4,115 m and is the only well that goes through the 3000+ m of the Jurassic/Triassic J/Tr section of the basin (Shafer and Brantley, 2011). The Norris Lightsey #1 (N.L. #1) boring log indicates sequences of sandstone, diabase, and shale that could equate to a vertically stacked series of CO₂ reservoirs and seals, which would provide multiple reservoir CO₂ storage capability within the same injection well. The vertically stacked reservoir/seal combinations are ideal because they potentially reduce the CO₂ footprint for large volumes of CO₂ injection by using the same well to inject CO₂ into a series of vertically stacked reservoir horizons (Shafer and Brantley, 2011). With conservative porosity and permeability estimates, the U.S. DOE capacity equations (U.S. DOE, 2006) indicate the SGR basin has massive potential (> 100 million tonnes) for CO₂ storage. The large CO₂ storage volume estimates, combined with the vertically stacked storage potential and lack of deep wells that could serve as potential leakage pathways, make the SGR basin unique and potentially very attractive for long term CO₂ storage.

The southeastern U.S. contributes a large portion of our nation's total CO₂ (Figure 1.2). More than half of all (stationary and non-stationary) CO₂ emissions in South Carolina are from electric power plants and industrial manufacturing facilities. Permanently storing CO₂ in close proximity to the sources will provide economic efficiencies and reduce risks associated with transporting CO₂ long distances from source to sink. This research will ultimately aid in the determination of the extent to which the SGR is a suitable basin for long-term storage of supercritical CO₂.
The University of South Carolina has led a SGR basin characterization study to determine the feasibility of long-term geologic storage of CO2. The basin characterization study was divided into three stages. The first stage evaluated all existing (legacy) data pertaining to the SGR basin using well logs and statistics (Brantley et al., 2015, Nelson and Kibler, 2003). During the second stage, approximately 386 kilometers (km) [~240 miles (mi)] of new seismic data were acquired and evaluated for optimum location of a deep characterization borehole. During the third and final stage a characterization borehole (i.e., Rizer # 1) was drilled. Petrophysical and geochemical testing within the borehole were performed and core and cuttings samples were examined for petrology.

The SGR basin is of particular importance for several reasons: 1) The large areal extent of the SGR basin (Figure 1.1) could prove to have large CO2 storage capacity; 2) The “high potential” basin classification that represents a significant storage opportunity in a region with adequate seals that could be commercially developed in the future; and 3) The proximity of the SGR basin to major sources of CO2 in the southeastern United States. The SGR basin provides a unique opportunity for geologic carbon storage because the basin is not perforated with wells and boreholes, which could be potential leakage pathways that must be considered for long-term geologic storage of CO2.

Due to the lack of information on the SGR basin at the onset of the CO2 injection simulation modeling, this effort was divided into two phases. Phase One of CO2 injection simulation into the SGR basin was a preliminary assessment using a simplified geocellular model and pre-specified basin parameters - porosity and
permeability (Brantley et al., 2015). Due to lack of basin data, an equilibrium model was used to estimate the initial hydrostatic pressure, temperature and salinity gradients that represent our study area. For the equilibrium model, the USGS SEAWAT program was used and for the CO₂ injection simulation, TOUGH2-ECO2N was used. A stochastic approach was used to populate the permeability in the injection horizon within the model domain. The target injection depths are well below the 1 km depth required to maintain CO₂ as a supercritical fluid. This study simulated 30 million tons of CO₂ injected at a rate of 1 million tons per year for 30 years. This is U.S. Department of Energy stated minimum capacity requirement for a viable CO₂ storage reservoir. In addition to this requirement, a 970 year shut-in time (no injection) was also simulated to better determine the long term fate and migration of the injected CO₂ and to ensure that the SGR basin could effectively contain 30 million tonnes of CO₂.

The focus of the second phase of the injection simulation is to use the model to study the impact of the geologic structure, particularly faults, on the fate of the buoyancy driven CO₂ plume. The SGR basin characterization study has revealed that the basin is highly fractured and faulted; therefore, the effect of the faulting on CO₂ migration must be considered when determining the efficacy of geologic storage of CO₂. The second phase of CO₂ injection simulation into the SGR basin used newly acquired data and a 3-dimensional (3-D) geologic model built in Schlumberger's Petrel™. Petrel™ is a state-of-the-art industry grade reservoir engineering software platform that enables collaboration of scientists and engineers to develop and contribute to a single dynamic earth model.
The 3-D geologic model grid was then imported into CMG-GEM™ compositional reservoir simulator for CO₂ injection simulation. Total simulation time was 100 years during which a total of 30 million tonnes of CO₂ was injected at a rate of 1 million tonnes per year for 30 years followed by a 70 year shut-in period. Multiple experiments were run to find the effects of fault permeability on the resultant fate of the injected CO₂. The results illustrate that with a permeability of 1 mD, significant leakage of CO₂ occurs up the faults. This is evidence that fault analysis is a critical factor in injection simulation modeling and that even low permeability faults make the geology potentially unsuitable for long term geologic storage of CO₂.

1.2 Site Description

During Triassic and Early Jurassic time, a series of rift basins formed along a wide zone extending from the future Gulf of Mexico through Nova Scotia, Morocco, the Tethyan margin, Western Europe, and Greenland to form the Central Atlantic Margin (CAM). The Eastern North American Rift System (ENARS) portion of the CAM is comprised of a northeast trending series of Triassic-age rift basins that record the tectonic history just prior to the breakup of Pangea and the opening of the Atlantic (Olsen, 1997; Schlische et al., 2003). These basins are filled by continent-derived fluvial and lacustrine redbeds, referred to as the Newark Supergroup, and Jurassic-age diabase and basalt of the Central Atlantic Magmatic Province (Olsen, 1997). As the SGR basin formed, it filled with sediment from the adjoining area and from rivers flowing along the axis of the rift. The basin is very deep in places, with sediments accumulating on the order of 5-6 kilometers (km).
[~3-4 miles (mi)] thick and comprised of mostly fine to coarse grained sandstone, mudstone and siltstone red beds with intercalated layers of basalt and/or diabase. While the SGR basin was forming, there was also episodic but significant igneous activity. Mafic igneous rock intrusions known as dikes and sills entered the sedimentary layers, and lava flowed on the top of the sedimentary material in some locales. Unlike many other Mesozoic basins that crop out along the eastern edge of North America, the SGR basin is completely buried, making characterization much more difficult.

The breakup of Pangaea, including the formation of the Mesozoic basins of eastern North America, has been extensively researched with the exception of the SGR basin. Due to (1) the depth of the SGR basin combined with (2) the lack of interest from the exploration industry, only sparse drilling and geophysical research has been conducted. Previous to this study, the structure of the SGR basin had only been speculated from scattered drilling and potential field (gravity and magnetics) interpretation, leaving the internal boundary and the deep structure unknown (McBride, 1991). Chowns and Williams (1983) completed a comprehensive study of deep wells in Georgia, Florida, and Alabama to assess the extent of the SGR basin and relied on interpretations of gravity and magnetic surveys for determining the boundaries where little to no well control was available (Hefner, 2013). There are less than ten boreholes that were drilled into the Triassic-age sediments and only one wildcat well, the N.L. #1 drilled in the 1984, that penetrated a significant portion [~4,000 meters (m) (~13,123 feet)] of the SGR basin in our South Carolina study area. Lack of data makes the SGR basin unique
in that unlike other U.S. DOE sponsored carbon capture and storage projects, the basin has yet to be studied. Further, there is so little currently known about the geology of the SGR basin that the formations have yet to be named. Nevertheless, the Carbon Sequestration Atlas of the United States and Canada (U.S. DOE NETL, 2008) identifies the Triassic basin in southern South Carolina as a saline formation suitable for CO₂ storage.
Figure 1.1: CO$_2$ Sources in South Carolina and Georgia proximal to the study area.
Figure 1.2: Eastern North American Rift System Mesozoic Basins and the South Georgia Rift Basin.
Chapter 2:

CO₂ Injection Simulation into the South Georgia Rift Basin for Geologic Storage: A Preliminary Assessment

2.1 Objectives

The objectives of phase one of the injection simulation modeling were to simulate CO₂ injection, plume migration, and long-term fate of supercritical CO₂ in the SGR basin. The injection simulation will be assist in determining the suitability of the SGR basin for long-term geologic carbon sequestration. For this study, long-term is defined as 1000 years and over pressured is defined as pressure that would cause upward leakage of CO₂ through the igneous seal or pressure that exceeds lithostatic pressure, which is ~65 megapascals (MPa) [9,427 pound force per square inch (psi)].

Criteria for suitability are:

1. Meet U.S. DOE’s minimum required injection rate and capacity of 1 million tonnes annually over 30 years.

2. The process of CO₂ injection does not over-pressurize the system.

3. The CO₂ does not migrate unexpectedly, particularly through the seal.
The CO₂ injection simulation will:

1. Forecast the reservoir conditions and the system’s response to the stress of CO₂ injection.
2. Forecast the fate and transport of the CO₂ during injection as well as a prescribed time post-injection.
3. Aid as a decision support tool in determining if the SGR basin is suitable for long-term geologic storage of supercritical CO₂.
4. Aid as a decision support tool in the design of CO₂ injection field studies and full scale implementation.

2.2 CO₂ Injection Simulation

CO₂ injection feasibility and CO₂ migration within (and out of) the target storage formations are key concerns of deep geologic sequestration. Safe and permanent underground storage of CO₂ must be certain before commercial development of a particular site can be undertaken. Numeric injection simulation models aid in addressing these concerns. The first step of the numeric modeling process is to create a Conceptual Site Model (CSM). A CSM is a three-dimensional (3-D) geological model of the study site that is based on existing data and helps to better understand the physical conditions and behavior of the system being studied (Mercer and Faust, 1981). Using C-Tech Development Corporation's MVS software, a 3-D conceptual model was built to visualize the basic basin geology as indicated by the N.L. # 1 litho-stratigraphic log. MVS is state-of-the-art visualization software designed to aid engineers and environmental modelers in subsurface analysis, visualization, and animation (Copsey, 2014). For the MVS
conceptual model, we used a simplified lithology of three different materials: unconsolidated coastal plain, igneous rock, and sandstone. Figure 2.1 illustrates the CSM and displays basic basin stratigraphy as well the stacked storage concept of injecting into the multiple horizons. Armed with a better understanding of the subsurface conditions, the next step was to construct a numerical model of the study area.

Due to the deficiency of data in our study area, a two-pronged approach was taken to numerically simulate CO$_2$ injection and plume behavior in a target reservoir interval in the SGR basin's stacked reservoir stratigraphy. The SGR basin is a deep, variable-density groundwater flow, heat, and salinity transport system. However, hydrostatic pressure and brine concentration gradient are unknown. For this reason, the first step of the CO$_2$ injection simulation modeling was to establish pressure, temperature, and salinity regimes that are representative of the in-situ environment of the deep saline SGR basin using an equilibrium model. The results of the equilibrium model were then used as the initial conditions for the CO$_2$ injection simulation. Table 2.1 is a flowchart explaining the workflow for this two-pronged modeling approach to CO$_2$ injection simulation.

The initial conditions necessary for the injection simulation modeling using the TOUGH2 code require a hydrostatic pressure gradient, which is not known in the SGR basin. For this reason, we used USGS' SEAWAT to establish pressure, temperature, and salinity equilibrium conditions and thus, the initial hydrostatic pressure gradient. SEAWAT is an extension of the USGS-MODFLOW for numerical simulation of 3-D, variable density, transient groundwater flow...
integrated with MT3DMS solute transport code. The advantages of using SEAWAT over traditional analytical methods are that it's readily available, easy to use, and considers density effects in the flow calculation. For the SEAWAT equilibrium model, a 100 x 100 x 100 grid was created that represents a 10 km (~6.2 mi) x 10 km (~6.2 mi) x 3 km (~1.9 mi) (x,y,z) spatial extent of the model domain. This grid size was selected to balance the size of the domain with the desired resolution. To the extent of what is known about the subsurface of the study area and in accordance with the conceptual site model, the layers are one of three materials: unconsolidated Coastal Plain sediment, Triassic lithified sediments, or J/T mafic material. The model domain vertical discretization is variable to coincide with the litho-stratigraphy of the N.L. #1 well (Figure 2.2).

The thermal gradient was derived from the bottom-hole temperature of the N.L. #1 well log. The salinity gradient was presupposed from the Department of Energy’s National Energy Technology Lab’s identification of the SGR basin as being a hyper-saline system. Storativity and porosity parameters were derived from relevant literature and the N.L. #1 well log (Nelson and Kibler, 2003; Ryan et al., 2002). The elevation of the water table in the study area is approximately -10 m (~32.8 ft.), therefore an initial head of -10 m (32.8 ft.) was assigned to the entire domain. The surface layer of the domain was assigned -10 m (32.8 ft.) as a fixed boundary head, for every cell below a continuously saturated system was assumed. The equilibrium model was run to steady state with only fixed top (i.e., water table) boundary hydraulic heads.
The model output is a steady-state equilibrium volume that represents the hydrostatic pressure as a function of depth, temperature, and salinity in the SGR basin. Table 2.2 shows the hydrostatic pressure vs. depth considering temperature and salinity for every 10 horizons within the full vertical dimension of the domain. As expected, the pressure gradient increases with depth, as the salinity increases. As the basin becomes hyper-saline near its modeled base, the hydrostatic pressure non-linearly increases with depth. The results of the SEAWAT equilibrium model were then used as the initial conditions for the CO₂ injection simulation modeling.

TOUGH2-ECO2N, as implemented in PetraSim® is the software platform that was used for CO₂ injection simulation. ECO2N is the fluid property module for the TOUGH2 simulator that is designed for applications to geologic sequestration of CO₂ in saline formations. It addresses the thermodynamics and thermophysical properties of H₂O – NaCl – CO₂ mixtures, reproducing fluid properties largely within experimental error for the temperature, pressure, and salinity conditions of interest (Pruess, 2005; Pruess and Spycher, 2006). For this study, it was assumed that the CO₂ being injected is in supercritical phase. Due to the depth of the injection horizon, the pressure and temperature of the geologic strata far exceeds what is necessary to maintain this phase (i.e., T_{crit} = 31.04 °C (87.9 °F), P_{crit} = 7.382 MPa [(1,071 psi); (Vargaftik, 1975)]. For the TOUGH2 injection simulation model, a variable grid was created that represents a 10 km (~6.2 mi) x 15 km (~9.3 mi) x 3 km (~1.9 mi) (x,y,z) domain (Figure 2.3). Variable grids are used to allow incorporation of more spatial information in a computationally efficient way. This
approach creates a hierarchal concept of space that creates a grid with much smaller cells (Voronoi cells) centered on and around the injection well, with the smallest cell being approximately the size of the injection well for a realistic injection representation. The variable grid is capable of simulating regional as well as local dynamics simultaneously (Vleit et al., 2009).

As with the SEAWAT model, the TOUGH2 model domain vertical discretization is variable to agree with the lithostratigraphy of the N.L. # 1 well and each cell was assigned a material and populated with that materials postulated hydrogeologic properties determined from N.L. # 1 geophysical log and relevant literature. The largest database of siliciclastic porosity and permeability data found was an assimilation done by the U.S. Geologic Survey (USGS) in Open-file Report 03-420. This report consists of over 70 datasets taken from published data and all measurements were taken from core samples. From this report, all of the data on Triassic-aged sediments were filtered out and the porosity and permeability data were plotted. Each dataset contained (1) a minimum of 20 porosity and permeability values, (2) a description of the depositional setting, (3) method of measurement, (4) referenceable source, and (5) the formation name, again, depth, and location of each sample taken (Nelson and Kibler, 2003). Figure 2.4 is a scatterplot of all datasets from the USGS that contain porosity and permeability data for cored samples of Mesozoic sandstone throughout the world. The porosity dataset is normally distributed and permeability dataset ranges over six orders of magnitude and log normally distributed. The dissolution of CO$_2$ in the formation water, also known as solubility trapping, is an important CO$_2$ migration and
trapping mechanism in the post-injection period of geologic storage in deep saline formations. Capillary pressure \( (P_c) \) and relative permeability are two major driving forces of fluid migration in CCUS; therefore, an accurate representation of the each is crucial for modeling solubility trapping, and hence long term CCUS (Boxiao et al., 2012; Bachu and Bennion, 2008). To address capillary pressure and relative permeability, the van Genuchten Function (Pruess, 2005) and Corey's curves (Pruess, 2005) were used respectively in accordance with the ECO2N user manual's default values.

For both the equilibrium and the injection simulation, it was assumed that the permeability of the mostly unconsolidated material of the South Carolina coastal plain of (SGR basin overburden) was anisotropic and that the sandstone and mafic material within the SGR basin was isotropic. Table 2.3 is a summary of the parameters used for SGR basin CO\(_2\) injection simulation.

Material property information (i.e., porosity and permeability) for CO\(_2\) injection simulation in data-deficient geologic environments is sparse. Therefore, the material properties between and among data points must be determined through interpolation if the assumption of a homogeneous environment is unrealistic, which is usually the case. For this reason, stochastic simulation techniques have become the method of choice for generating numerical models that represent subsurface heterogeneities (Doyen, 2007). A commonly applied technique is Sequential Gaussian Simulation (SGS), which is a method for simulating spatially continuous properties (e.g., permeability) requiring knowledge of a variogram and histogram. In SGS, numerous equally probable and spatially
correlated realizations are created to incorporate uncertainty in the model parameter. Throughout the history of spatial stochastic modeling, Gaussian random fields are probably the oldest and the most commonly used models to represent spatial distributions of continuous variables (Damsleth, 1994). To demonstrate the effect of uncertainty in permeability heterogeneity in the injection reservoir on simulated CO\textsubscript{2} plume migration, a spatially correlated random field of permeabilities ranging from 10 milliDarcy (mD) to 100 mD was created using the Stanford Geostatistical Modeling Software (SGeMs) (Remy \textit{et al.}, 2007) for SGS. The mean permeability of eight realizations was 23.4 mD, and the mean of the standard deviation of the eight realizations was 5.02 mD.

For this study, we used the sedimentary section between igneous seals E and F for the CO\textsubscript{2} injection simulation reservoir and the basalt horizon E as the top seal. The depth range of the target injection sedimentary section is between 2,476 m (8,123 ft.) – 2,588 m (8,491 ft.) below land surface, or well below the 1km (~0.62 mi) critical depth to maintain CO\textsubscript{2} as a supercritical fluid. Using the TOUGH2 preconditioned bi-conjugate gradient solver, multiple iterations of injection simulation were performed. The simulations began with a simple layer cake geologic representation of the basin and progressed into a more complex geology as confidence in the simulation approach was gained. For example, a 45\textdegree{} azimuth was applied to the permeability field to better represent the postulated SGR reservoir conditions. Also, to illustrate the significance of adding noncomplex, yet realistic geologic structure to the CO\textsubscript{2} injection simulation process, a 2\% dip, trending in a southerly direction, was added to the entire model domain. This is the
approximate dip of the base of the Coastal Plain. For the CO$_2$ injection simulation an injection rate of 1 million tonnes per year for 30 years was established. In addition to this requirement, a 970 year shut-in time (no injection) was also simulated to better determine the long-term fate and migration of the injected CO$_2$ and to ensure that the SGR basin could effectively contain the 30 million tonnes of supercritical CO$_2$.

2.3 Results and Discussion

Many numerical experiments were conducted using the TOUGH2-ECO2N simulation code. Reservoir parameters were varied along with injection zone, injection time and shut-in time. Table 2.4 is a summary of the parameters that were adjusted for various simulation scenarios. The simulations were conducted to evaluate model robustness and the effects of different modeling scenarios and assumptions on the injection and resulting supercritical CO$_2$ plume dynamics. For example, experiments were run with reservoir porosity ranging from 1% to 25%. Due to uncertainty of the rock properties and hydrodynamics, an average of 6% porosity was used for the input of the modeling results discussed in this paper. This was an intentionally conservative approach as the USGS assimilated database suggest the average porosity for analog basin sandstone is ~ 15%. Throughout the preliminary injection simulation, many experiments were conducted using the range of input parameters discussed above, however, the results discussed in this paper are the results of the final and most progressed experiments of the preliminary modeling process.
Figure 2.5 shows the maximum pressure build-up at the injection wellhead as compared to the lithostatic pressure and demonstrates that the maximum injection pressure stays well below the injection zone lithostatic pressure, therefore insuring that the system does not become over-pressured due to CO$_2$ injection. Figure 2.6 shows the dissipation of the pressure back towards basin equilibrium during the subsequent 970 year shut-in period. Figure 2.6 suggests that the pressure recovery takes significantly more time than build-up due to injections. Note that the basalt seal horizon tightly holds the injection pressure and only during the shut-in period does it slightly increase in response to the pressure increase due to CO$_2$ injection. This slight increase in pressure in the basalt seal indicates that the simulation is working correctly and that the seal easily keeps the increased system pressure from propagating upwards. In other words, the seal adequately contains not only the supercritical CO$_2$, it also contains the pressure increase resulting from the injection. Figure 2.7 shows the effect of uncertainty in permeability ($k$) heterogeneity in the injection reservoir after a 1,000 year simulation. The image on the left assumes homogenous conditions with a constant $k$ (10 mD), while the image on the right show the results of the same simulation with $k$ ranging from 10 mD to 100 mD. In comparing the two Figure 2.7 images, the addition of a heterogeneous permeability distribution to the injection reservoir did not significantly change the radial extent of the injected CO$_2$, however a permeability modifier did provide a reasonable way to address in-situ permeability heterogeneity and therefore this approach should be used in all future CO$_2$ injection simulation of the SGR basin.
In contrast to the results illustrated in Figure 2.7 pertaining to heterogeneity, Figure 2.8 illustrates the importance of adding structural geology to the CO$_2$ injection simulation process. As in Figure 2.7, both Figure 2.8 images are the result of simulating the injection of CO$_2$ into the SGR reservoir at a rate of 1 million tonnes per year for 30 years with a 970 year shut-in. The left image in Figure 2.8 is the result of using the previous 10 mD to 100 mD heterogeneous permeability field for the injection reservoir. To illustrate the significance of adding simple, yet realistic, geologic structure to the CO$_2$ injection simulation process, a 2% dip was added to the entire model domain. As can be seen on the right side of Figure 2.8, a 2% dip has a dramatic effect on the resultant morphology of the injected CO$_2$ plume. Being buoyant, the injected supercritical CO$_2$ rises until it hits the seal, and then slowly migrates up-dip along the bottom of the seal for the entire 1,000 year simulation. This simulation demonstrates that adding structural geology to the simulation can have a dramatic (and realistic) effect on the simulation outcome, resulting in a much larger areal footprint of the injected CO$_2$, particularly up-dip of the injection well. However, even with the geological structure added, the CO$_2$ still did not migrate more than 5 km (~3.2 mi) away from the injection well. Figures 2.7 and 2.8 are both from a top view looking straight down on the simulated injection site. The CO$_2$ plume seen in the both figures is in the injection reservoir, and none of the CO$_2$ penetrated the seal for the entire simulation period (Figure 2.8). Figure 2.9 is a slice plane of saturated CO$_2$ directly through the center of the injection well at the end of a 1,000 year simulation.
All CO₂ injection simulation experiments we conducted indicate that the SGR basin is suitable for long term CO₂ injection and storage. This conclusion was determined by meeting the three suitability criteria. Using the parameters discussed above the SGR basin could easily handle the U.S. DOE minimum requirement of 30 million tonnes of CO₂. The plume footprint is minimal even with conservative estimates for porosity (6%) and permeability (10 - 100 mD) (Figure 2.8). At the end of the 30 year injection, the areal extent of the CO₂ footprint was <20 square km (~7.7 square mi) and the maximum migration of CO₂ away from the injection well was < 5 km (~3.2 mi) (up-dip). Further, the pressure build-up at the well-head is much less than half of the calculated lithostatic pressure, which at the injection depth is approximately 65 MPa (9,427 psi) (Table 2.5). In the suitability criteria, over pressured is defined at (1) pressure that causes upward leakage of CO₂ through the caprock, and (2) injection pressure staying below the lithostatic pressure. When compared to numerical simulations of investigations from other saline basins, the plume size, pressures, and CO₂ saturation results of this SGR basin study are in range with their results (Zhuo et al., 2007; Yamamoto et al., 2009; Bacon et al., 2009; Sasaki et al., 2008; Omambia and Li, 2010).
2.4 Tables and Figures

Table 2.1 Flow chart of the modeling steps taken in this study.
Table 2.2 Results of the equilibrium model showing hydrostatic pressure vs. depth considering temperature and salinity for every 10 horizons within the full vertical dimension of the domain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Top</th>
<th>Bottom</th>
<th>Pressure, Pa</th>
<th>Temperature Degrees C</th>
<th>Salt Mass Fraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>97981</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>5.20E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-360</td>
<td>-400</td>
<td>3618651</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>1.07E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-760</td>
<td>-800</td>
<td>7508566</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>2.38E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-1160</td>
<td>-1200</td>
<td>11366485</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>5.29E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>-1560</td>
<td>-1600</td>
<td>15185285</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>1.18E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>-1960</td>
<td>-2000</td>
<td>18960265</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>2.62E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2339.95</td>
<td>-2400</td>
<td>22598440</td>
<td>74.25</td>
<td>5.69E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>-2760</td>
<td>-2800</td>
<td>26391763</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>1.28E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>-3160</td>
<td>-3200</td>
<td>30112647</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>2.81E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>-3534</td>
<td>-3582</td>
<td>33769369</td>
<td>103.95</td>
<td>5.80E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3944.66</td>
<td>-4000</td>
<td>38539006</td>
<td>114.31</td>
<td>1.24E-01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3 Material Properties of the three major rock types used in the injection simulation. Sources include Norris Lightsey #1 well log, relevant literature and TOUGH2 Manual default data for material type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Coastal Plain</th>
<th>Reservoir</th>
<th>Seal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XY Permeability</td>
<td>m²/mD</td>
<td>3.60e-12/3650</td>
<td>9.87e-15/10</td>
<td>1.00e-20/1.00e-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z Permeability</td>
<td>m²/mD</td>
<td>3.60e-13/365</td>
<td>9.87e-15/10</td>
<td>1.00e-20/1.00e-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porosity</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Density</td>
<td>kg/m³</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corey S&lt;sub&gt;gr&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corey S&lt;sub&gt;lr&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Genuchten P&lt;sub&gt;o&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>kPa</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>337.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Genuchten λ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Genuchten S&lt;sub&gt;lr&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.4 Parameters that varied to experiment with different modeling scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters that were varied</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Porosity Range (%)</th>
<th>XY Permeability (mD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reservoir</td>
<td>0.01 - 0.25</td>
<td>1 mD - 1000 mD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sill</td>
<td>0.001 - 0.25</td>
<td>0.00001 mD - 1000 mD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td>Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shut-in Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 9,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End time</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.5 Maximum pressure at the well head as a result of CO$_2$ injection at a rate of 1 million tonnes per year for 30 years. Lithostatic pressure at the injection depth is ~ 65 MPa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Step (yrs)</th>
<th>Maximum Pressure (MPa)</th>
<th>Injection Horizon Litho-Static Pressure (MPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1688E-08</td>
<td>32.49</td>
<td>~65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.49023</td>
<td>~65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>32.49545322</td>
<td>~65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.499372</td>
<td>~65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.5013673</td>
<td>~65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.61847671</td>
<td>~65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>33.8951342</td>
<td>~65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>34.9798193</td>
<td>~65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.21795855</td>
<td>~65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>34.25720533</td>
<td>~65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>34.18094097</td>
<td>~65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>34.11525042</td>
<td>~65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>34.05397069</td>
<td>~65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>34.04202138</td>
<td>~65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>33.98237462</td>
<td>~65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>33.08928793</td>
<td>~65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>32.60085565</td>
<td>~65.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.1: Conceptual solid earth model for the South Georgia Rift Basin. The light brown represents the unconsolidated coastal plain sediments, the red represent the sandstone reservoir material, and the dark gray represents the diabase seals. The green represents the base of the injection well and the stacked series of injection zones.
Figure 2.2: Norris Lightsey #1 litho-stratigraphic well log with Gamma. Injection simulation took place in the reservoir between Diabase E and Diabase F.
Figure 2.3: CO₂ injection simulation model domain based on Norris Lightsey #1 well lithology. The simulated injection well is located coincidently with the Norris Lightsey #1 well location and injection simulation will take place in red horizon. (between Diabase E and Diabase F in Figure 2.2).
Figure 2.4: Scatterplot of USGS international database of porosity and permeability of Triassic Sediments. The mean porosity and permeability was used to postulate the reservoir data. Source: USGS Open-file Report 03-420.
Figure 2.5: Pressure buildup adjacent to the injection well during injection compared to the lithostatic pressure (black line). Injection rate is 1 million tonnes of CO$_2$ per year for 30 years.
Figure 2.6: Pressure buildup adjacent to the injection well during injection. Injection rate is 1 million tonnes of CO$_2$ per year for 30 years.
Figure 2.7: Effect of uncertainty in permeability heterogeneity in the injection reservoir on CO₂ plume footprint after 1,000 year simulation with 30 years injection of 1 million tonnes CO₂ and 970 years of shut-in. Left image assumes homogeneous conditions with a constant k (10 mD) while the right image shows the results of the same simulation with a k modifier ranging from 10 mD to 100 mD.
Figure 2.8: Effect of geologic structure (2% northward oriented dip) on CO$_2$ plume footprint after 1,000 year simulation with 30 years injection of 1 million tonnes CO$_2$ and 970 years of shut-in. Left image shows the results of the simulation with a spatially $k$ in the range 10 mD to 100 mD but no dip. The right image shows the up-dip migration of the CO$_2$ plume as a result of the 2% dip in the reservoir strata.
Figure 2.9: Results of simulation of 1 million tonnes CO\textsubscript{2} injection per year for 30 years after 1000 years (i.e., 970 years of no injection).
Chapter 3

Inclusion of Faults in 3-D Numerical Simulation of CO₂ Injection into the South Georgia Rift Basin

3.1 South Georgia Rift Geology - Newly Acquired Data

The previously described SGR basin characterization study catalogued numerous geological, geophysical and petrophysical research (Akintunde et al., 2012; Akintude et al., 2013; Brantley et al., 2015; Clendenin et al., 2011; Clendenin, 2013; Heffner et al., 2011; Heffner, 2013; Hollon et al., 2014; Rine et al., 2014; Shafer and Brantley, 2011; Waddell et al., 2011; Waddell et al., 2014). During the second phase of the characterization study, approximately 386 km (~240 mi) of seismic data were collected, processed and interpreted. During the third phase of the project, the characterization borehole Rizer # 1 was drilled to a depth of approximately 1,889 m (~6,200 ft.) Cores from this borehole were sent to Weatherford® Laboratories for petrophysical analyses. The results from the Weatherford® Laboratories analyses indicate that the SGR basin was once buried up to 5 km (3.1 mi) deeper than previously believed. At that depth, the target reservoir (Diabase C) would have been buried up 7,750 m (25,427 ft.) deep (Rine et al. 2014). Due to the depth of the burial of the sandstone, there was significantly more compression of the material than was previously thought before the characterization study. For this reason, the postulated porosity and
permeability (6% and 10 – 100 mD respectively) data used in phase one of the injection simulation modeling were significantly over estimated. Newly analyzed data suggest average ambient porosities for rotary and conventional core samples are 3.4% and 3.1%, respectively, and average permeability of rotary air and conventional core samples are between 0.065 millidarcy (mD) and 0.0049 mD, respectively. These values of porosity and permeability values are markedly different than this used in the phase one study.

Using the newly acquired petrophysical data, along with the newly acquired seismic data, a 3-D geologic model of the study was created using Petrel™ (Figure 3.1). The results of the SGR basin characterization study have drastically changed what was once thought about the SGR basin, in particular, about the efficacy of using the Triassic sandstone horizons for permanent geologic storage of supercritical CO₂.

3.2 Research Objectives

Using newly acquired seismic and borehole geophysics data, phase two of the injection simulation modeling created a more realistic CO₂ injection simulation model for the SGR basin as compared to our previous study, phase one. For phase two, an entirely new domain (compared to that in phase one of the modeling) was created using: 1) The 3-D grid from Petrel™ that includes interpreted basin structure and 2) Parameterization using SGR basin material data derived from petrophysical analyses and the newly acquired Rizer #1 characterization borehole geophysical logs. Rizer # 1 is a characterization borehole drilled to validate the
newly acquired seismic data as well as to correlate to horizons evident in the N.L. # 1 well. The 3-D geologic model created in Petrel™ provides a refined stratigraphic, volumetric and structural domain that includes faults. This geologic model along with the empirically derived material data provided by Weatherford® Laboratories, allowed us to create an injection simulation model realistic to SGR basin conditions than the phase one modeling effort, which was mostly parameterized using basin data based on literature and the N.L. # 1 well log. Research done by Rutqvust et al. (2007) suggests faults, fractures and deteriorated abandoned drill holes or wells comprise primary risk factors for leakage in engineered CO$_2$ injection systems. Corroborating this finding, Deng et al. (2012) concluded that risk assessments of potential sequestration site leakage should consider faults and fracture zones to evaluate the potential for premature failure of a designed system. Faults can either serve as high permeability by-pass conduits that allow CO$_2$ to escape out of the target reservoir or they can act as low permeability seals that can aid in the compartmentalization of CO$_2$ in the target reservoir. In this work, we estimated a permeability range within the faults based on the Rizer # 1 borehole geophysical logs and used this range to investigate the impact of faults on the flow of supercritical CO$_2$ into the fractured and faulted diabase injection zone. The goal of these simulations were to: 1) Create a new dynamic model of the SGR basin for CO$_2$ injection simulation; 2) Analyze the effects of fractures and faulting in the injection reservoir and seal geology, and 3) Test the feasibility of the SGR basin for the long term storage of 30 million tonnes of supercritical CO$_2$. 
The long term fate of injected CO\textsubscript{2} for geologic storage is divided into four different storage modes: 1) Free gas; 2) Trapped gas; 3) Dissolved in the formation brine; and 4) Gas sequestered as solid minerals or mineralization trapping. Modes 1, 2 and 3 can be simulated with multiphase flow simulators such as TOUGH2-ECO2N (Pruess 2005, Hou, 2012, Brantley et al., 2015, Zhang et al., 2011; Omambia and Li, 2010) and CMG-GEM (Basbug and Gumrah, 2005, Frangeul et al., 2004). However, the mineralization trapping can only be simulated using a reactive transport model (Shu et al., 2012; Thibeau and Nghiem, 2007). In this study, we focused on the first, second and third modes using the multiphase simulator CMG-GEM. GEM is the Computer Modeling Group’s (CMG) Generalized equation-of-state Model (GEM) compositional simulator which includes options such as CO\textsubscript{2}, miscible gases, volatile oil, gas condensate, horizontal wells, well management, complex phase behavior among others (http://www.cmgl.ca/software/gem2014, GEM2014.10, 2014.).

3.3 Injection Simulation Modeling

The complexity of the SGR basin structure presented a challenge in developing the 3-D geologic model in Petrel™. The only units that could be mapped between the Rizer #1 borehole and the N.L. # 1 borehole are the diabase intrusive units. The N.L. # 1 boring log indicates sequences of sandstone, diabase, and shale and was used to correlate with the newly acquired seismic and borehole data to help produce the 3-D geologic model. The complexity of the structure made correlation between sandstone units almost impossible. The following horizons were mapped:
base of the Coastal Plain, the top and base of diabase units C, E, and F (Figure 3.2). The results from the petrographic and core analyses ruled out using the sandstone as possible injection zones due to its aforementioned low porosity and permeability (3.1\% and 0.065 mD). The only possible porous zones that could be used for CO$_2$ storage and injection simulation are along the diabase units. These diabase units are highly fractured and the Rizer #1 geophysical log indicates the average porosity to be approximately 10\% and the average permeability to be approximately 10 mD. During the drilling of Rizer #1, water flowed into the borehole from one of the diabase horizons and this empirically supports the log data that the diabase is highly fractured.

For phase two of the injection simulation modeling, two software packages were employed to build the injection simulation model. Petrel™ was used to construct a geo-cellular grid based on the 3-D geologic model. CO$_2$ injection simulation was achieved using the compositional reservoir simulator CMG-GEM (Delshad et al., 2010; Saadatpoor et al., 2009). The geologic horizons were created in Petrel™. These horizons were then imported into CMG-GEM as isopachs.

The model volume used in all of the phase two simulations is 178 x 142 x 50 (i, j, k) for a total of 1,167,563 active cells. The typical cell size is 100m x 100m x 200m. However, there was grid refinement of the injection horizon surrounding the injection well and k values varied by the thickness of the horizon. Adjacent to the well, an area of 5 (x direction) x 6 (y direction) cells (500 m x 600 m) was refined into 3 (i) x 3 (j) x 1 (k) for a total of 2,700 refined cells for each layer in the model.
Grid refinement is used to allow for the incorporation of greater spatial information in a computationally efficient way, thus creating a hierarchical concept of space around the injection well (Brantley et al., 2015). The k (vertical) cells varied in thickness along with the horizon surfaces were divided into 50 layers as follows (Figure 3.3; Table 3.1):

- Layers 1 to 10: Diabase C
- Layers 11 to 20: Sandstone 1
- Layers 21 to 30: Diabase E
- Layers 31 to 40: Sandstone 2
- Layers 41 to 50: Diabase F

In order to optimize the computation efficiency of the model, only the horizons below the coastal plain were used in the simulation modeling. These include Diabase C, Sandstone1, Diabase E, Sandstone 2, and Diabase F. CO₂ was injected into Diabase E and Sandstone 1 is assumed the caprock seal.

Material properties were assigned based on the Weatherford® Laboratories results and the Rizer # 1 petrophysical ELAN logs. All of the diabase horizons were assigned a porosity of 10% and a heterogeneous permeability distribution as shown in Figure 3.4. The permeability heterogeneity was generated by specifying a random permeability between 1 and 100 mD. The scale is logarithmic so the actual data is a random number between >0 and 2. This range was estimated based on the fractured nature of the diabase evidenced by the Rizer #1
petrophysical ELAN logs. All sedimentary horizons in the model serve as caprock due to their low permeability and porosity. They are given a vertical and horizontal permeability of 0.065 mD and porosity of 3.4%. The simulation model parameters along with the horizon surfaces minimum and maximum depths are shown in Table 3.1. As with the preliminary model (phase one), 30 million tonnes of CO$_2$ were injected at a rate of 1 million tonnes per year (1.38E7 m$^3$ per year), which is the DOE’s stated minimum capacity to be considered a viable basin for geologic storage. Model complexity resulted in a significant amount of computer time to reach convergence. For this reason, we chose 100-year simulations for Phase two of the modeling. As with Phase one, the first 30 years were injection of supercritical CO$_2$. However, instead of a 970 year shut-in as with phase one, there was only a 70-year shut-in with Phase two because of simulation time requirements. The first year of the simulation (1/1/2014 – 12/31/2014) was used as time for model equilibration. Injection of supercritical CO$_2$ started on 1/1/2015 and continued until year 2045 and shut-in spanned 2045 – 2115. The maximum time step was set to 30 days although this was rarely reached due to the complexity of the geology.

3.4 CO$_2$ Injection Results

To examine the impact of potential fault leakage, numerical simulations were conducted using a progressively higher permeability in the faults zones identified in the 3-D geologic model. For the first experiment, a permeability of 0 mD was assigned to the faults. In this scenario, the faults serve as seals. As expected, the CO$_2$ was contained in the injection zone Diabase E and there was no CO$_2$ leakage
or migration out of the target reservoir for the entire 100-year numerical experiment. Figure 3.5 is a 2-D image of the CO$_2$ saturation of the top layer of Diabase E (layer 21 in the model) and shows the areal extent of the CO$_2$ plume. Figure 3.6 plots the dissolved phase CO$_2$ against the supercritical CO$_2$. The CO$_2$ is dissolving the fastest during the 30-year injection phase and this slows as soon as the injection stops. However, CO$_2$ continues to dissolve for the entire 100-year experiment - this is important because dissolution into the host brine is the third trapping mechanism of CO$_2$ in geologic storage. This is corroborated by the supercritical CO$_2$ plot peaking at the end of the injection period and then trending in a steady decline as more CO$_2$ dissolves into the brine.

For the second numerical experiment, a permeability of 1 mD was assigned to the faults. This scenario represents a leaky fault with small interconnected fractures. This scenario is significant because a low permeability like 1 mD may not be viewed as a significant source of leakage. Figure 3.7 shows the top of Diabase E (layer 21 of the model) and the 2-D areal extent of the CO$_2$ plume migration at the top of the injection horizon. It closely resembles the plume extent in Figure 3.5. These plumes resemble each other in the 2-D view because the amount of leakage up the 1 mD fault was 47% of the total volume of injected CO$_2$ (Table 3.2), therefore 53% of the CO$_2$ is trapped by the caprock and pooled in the top of the injection horizon. However as is shown in Figure 3.8, even at permeability as low as 1 mD causes significant leakage (~ 47% of the total injected CO$_2$) and upward migration of CO$_2$ out of the target reservoir. Figure 3.8 is a 3-D image of the CO$_2$ migration over the 100-year simulation. As can be seen in Figure
3.8, the CO$_2$ migrates up the faults and pools in Diabase C, which is the top boundary of the model. Given the injection depth of [~1710 m – 2953 m; 5610 ft. – 9688 ft. (Table 3.1)] and the 100 year time scale, the CO$_2$ transport is mainly due to buoyancy and dispersion, not advection. The injected CO$_2$ has a specific gravity at the injection depth of approximately 0.7 (Mammoli and Brebbia, 2011). Therefore, due to buoyancy, the CO$_2$ will rise in the more dense brine occupying the pore space. This can be seen in Figure 3.8 as the CO$_2$ follows the contours up dip in the formation and pools up against the bottom of the caprock as well as traveling up the permeable faults and pooling at the top boundary of the model.

For the final numerical experiment, a permeability of 100 mD was assigned to the faults. This experiment represents a highly fractured fault zone with a high leakage rate. Figure 3.9 is a 2-D image of the areal extent of the plume at the top of the model in Diabase C. This image shows that much of the CO$_2$ has migrated up the fault and pooling in high concentrations in the top layer of the model. Figure 3.10 is a 3-D image of CO$_2$ saturation after 100 year simulation with the fault permeability set to 100 mD. This image better displays the amount of CO$_2$ that has traveled up the fault out of the target reservoir of Diabase E and into Diabase C. This is significant because it illustrates that a fault with 100 mD permeability is a large conduit and CO$_2$ will escape at a very rapid rate on a human time scale. In the 100 year simulation, ~85% of the CO$_2$ injected migrated up to the top of the model (Table 3.2; Figure 3.11).

It was determined that at injection depth, the lithostatic pressure ranges from ~60 – 65 MPa. The maximum injection pressure is ~31 MPa, which is
approximately half of the lithostatic pressure in the injection zone (Figure 3.12) thus indicating injecting activity would not induce seismicity and further fracturing.

The results from this research illustrate that even with a permeability of 1 mD significant leakage and migration of CO₂ occurs up faults (Table 3.2). Figure 3.12 graphically compares the volume (m³) of CO₂ that remained in the target reservoir with the fault permeabilities set to 1 mD and 100 mD. This graph makes it easier to visualize, conceptualize and compare the amount of CO₂ that was injected versus the amount of CO₂ that remained in the target reservoir. This is evidence that fault analysis can be a critical factor in injection simulation modeling and ultimately in determining the efficacy of long term geologic storage of CO₂ and that even low permeability faults make the geology potentially unsuitable.
### 3.5 Tables and Figures:

Table 3.1. Injection simulation model domain information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>50 Layers Total in the Model</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Porosity (%)</th>
<th>Permeability (mD)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diabase C</td>
<td>Surface Top Layer 1</td>
<td>Minimum 1283 m</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10 mD</td>
<td>Top of the Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Bottom Layer 10</td>
<td>Maximum 1916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone 1</td>
<td>Surface Top Layer 11</td>
<td>Minimum 1387 m</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.065 mD</td>
<td>Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Bottom Layer 20</td>
<td>Maximum 2848 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabase E</td>
<td>Surface Top Layer 21</td>
<td>Minimum 1710 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Bottom Layer 30</td>
<td>Maximum 2953 m</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1-200 mD</td>
<td>Injection Horizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone 2</td>
<td>Surface Top Layer 31</td>
<td>Minimum 1710 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Bottom Layer 40</td>
<td>Maximum 3453 m</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.065 mD</td>
<td>Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabase F</td>
<td>Surface Top Layer 41</td>
<td>Minimum 1710 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Bottom Layer 50</td>
<td>Maximum 3517 m</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10 mD</td>
<td>Base of the Model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2. CO$_2$ volume injected vs leakage analysis for 1 mD and 100 mD faults.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fault Permeability</th>
<th>1 mD</th>
<th>100 mD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total CO$_2$ Injected (m$^3$)</td>
<td>1.6432E+10</td>
<td>1.6432E+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation Time (years)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ Remaining in Diabase E (m$^3$)</td>
<td>7.0634E+09</td>
<td>2.4183E+09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ Leakage out of Diabase E (m$^3$)</td>
<td>9.3682E+09</td>
<td>1.4013E+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of CO$_2$ Remaining in Diabase E</td>
<td>57.01%</td>
<td>14.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of CO$_2$ Leakage out of Diabase E</td>
<td>42.99%</td>
<td>85.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leakage Rate (m$^3$ / day)</td>
<td>1.2898E+05</td>
<td>1.9293E+05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leakage Rate (m$^3$ / year)</td>
<td>7.8857E+06</td>
<td>1.1796E+07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection Rate (m$^3$ / day)</td>
<td>2.2622E+05</td>
<td>2.2622E+05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection Rate (m$^3$ / year)</td>
<td>1.3831E+07</td>
<td>1.3831E+07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.1. Location maps showing the study area and the injection simulation domain boundaries. Map (A) shows the South Georgia Rift basin in relation to the ENARS. Map (B) shows the location of the study area within the SGR basin and map (C) is the top surface, Diabase C, of the 3-D geologic map produced using Petrel™. Color variation indicates the surface depth and various faults.
Figure 3.2. Petrel™ produced 3-D geologic model surfaces with the faults. This image illustrates the complexity of the geology and the amount of faulting in the study area. The various colors of each plane represents each individual fault.
Figure 3.3. 3-D Cross section of the injection simulation model. This image shows the layers and complexity of the geology of the injection simulation model. The top of the model (blue) is Diabase C and is located beneath the Coastal Plain of South Carolina at a depth of ~600 m below land surface. The bottom of the model (red) is Diabase C and has a maximum depth of ~3517 m below land surface.
Figure 3.4. Layer 1 (top of the model) permeability distribution. This distribution was used for all of the Diabase layers and ranges in value between 1 and 200 mD. The left side of the permeability map is stretched as a result of the final simulation model grid extending slightly further than the permeability map that was exported from Petrel™. The white diagonal feature is a fault that extends through the top of the model.
Figure 3.5. 2-D image of CO₂ saturation of the top layer of Diabase E showing the areal extent of the CO₂ plume as a result of 30 millions tonnes of CO₂ injected for 30 years with a 70 year shut-in. In this experiment, the faults permeability was 0 mD and all of the injected CO₂ remained in the target reservoir, Diabase E. This image displays the more buoyant CO₂ rising up the top surface Diabase E and being laterally sealed by the fault and horizontally sealed by Sandstone 1.
Figure 3.6. Plot of dissolved phase CO$_2$ vs supercritical CO$_2$. In this experiment, the faults permeability was 0 mD and all of the injected CO$_2$ remained in Diabase E. The injection stopped and shut-in started 1/1/2045. Solubility is a trapping mechanism that begins with injection and can continue until the all of the mechanically or chemically untrapped CO$_2$ is in solution.
Figure 3.7. 2-D image of the CO$_2$ saturation of the top layer of Diabase E (layer 21) showing the areal extent of the CO$_2$ plume as a result of 30 millions tonnes of CO$_2$ injected for 30 years with a 70 year shut-in with a fault permeability of 1 mD. Leakage out of the target reservoir has happened but it is hard to see in 2-D surface view.
Figure 3.8. 3-D image of \( \text{CO}_2 \) saturation after 100 year simulation with the fault permeability set to 1 mD. This 3-D image illustrates that: 1) Even with a permeability of 1 mD, there is significant leakage out of the target reservoir up the faults into Diabase C, which is the top of horizon of the model; and 2) The complexity of the geology. Note the topography of the Diabase C surface.
Figure 3.9. Surface image of the CO$_2$ saturation of the top layer of Diabase C (layer 1) showing the areal extent of the CO$_2$ plume as a result of 30 millions tonnes of CO$_2$ injected for 30 years with a 70 year shut-in with a fault permeability of 100 mD. A large portion of the CO$_2$ has migrated up through the faults into Diabase C, which is the top of the model, and pooled in high concentration.
Figure 3.10. 3-D image of CO$_2$ saturation after 100 year simulation with the fault permeability set to 100 mD. This 3-D image displays (1) significant leakage up the faults into Diabase C, which is the top of horizon of the model; and (2) the complexity of the geology. In the 100 year simulation, most of the CO$_2$ injected migrated up to the top of the model pooling in high concentrations.
Figure 3.11. Graph of the CO$_2$ remaining in Diabase E (target reservoir) after the 100 year simulation. The difference between the remaining and total injected is the amount of CO$_2$ leakage.
Figure 3.12. Plot of the basin pressure response of each horizon at the injection well. Diabase E (blue dashed line), the injection horizon, has the largest response. Most of the pressure was contained by the Sandstone seal (pink line) above the target reservoir. In this experiment, the faults permeability was 0 and all of the injected CO$_2$ remained in Diabase E. Note that the maximum injected pressure is below half of the reservoir lithostatic pressure (~63 MPa). HC POVO SCTR is the CMG-GEM software terminology for hydrocarbon pore volume pressure in a particular sector, or in this case CO$_2$ pore volume pressure in a particular horizon.
Chapter 4
Conclusions and Discussion

4.1 Conclusions

Conclusion of this research are: 1) the SGR basin is composed of numerous sub-basins, 2) this study only looked at portions of one sub-basin, 3) in SC, 30 million tonnes of CO$_2$ can be injected into the diabase units if the fracture network is continuous through the units, 4) due to the severity of the faulting there is no way of assuring the injected CO$_2$ will not migrate upward into the overlying Coastal Plain aquifers, and 5) the SGR basin covers area in three states and this project only studied two small areas so there is enormous potential for CO$_2$ sequestration in other portions of the basin and further research needs to be done to find these areas.

The results from Phase 1 of the injection simulation modeling suggest that the SGR basin is suitable for long term geologic storage of CO$_2$. However, the results from the more detailed phase two modeling shows the suitability of the SGR basin for long term storage of CO$_2$ remains inconclusive due to lack accurate data on the fault properties and juxtaposition, given the influence faults may have on CO$_2$ migration. If the faults act as seals, this portion of the SGR basin is suitable for CO$_2$ injection using the highly fractured diabase layers as the reservoir horizons and the low porosity and permeability sedimentary sandstone layers as the seals.
However, if the faults have as little as 1 mD of permeability, the seal is compromised and CO$_2$ will migrate upwards out of the intended reservoir at a rate of 7.8857E+06 m$^3$ per year, thus deeming this portion of the SGR basin unsuitable for long term geologic storage of CO$_2$. The results of this study show the importance of:

1) Including accurate geologic structure (particularly faults) into CO$_2$ injection simulation modeling
2) Knowledge of whether the faults act as leaky conduits or seals
3) Accurate fault permeability data for the containment of CO$_2$
4) Having correct reservoir data, in particular porosity and permeability for injection simulation modeling.

The results from this research illustrate that even with low permeability faults, significant leakage and migration of CO$_2$ occurs. This is evidence that fault analysis is a critical factor in injection simulation modeling and ultimately in determining the efficacy of long term geologic storage of CO$_2$ and that even low permeability faults make the geology potentially unsuitable.

4.2 Discussion
In summary, in the South Carolina (SC) portion of the SGR basin, 30 million tons of CO$_2$ can be injected into the diabase units if the fracture network is continuous through the units, however, due to the severity of the faulting there is no way of assuring the injected CO$_2$ will not migrate upward into the overlying Coastal Plain aquifers. In SC, the seismic data suggest the faulting extends upward into the
Coastal Plain making that area not suitable for CO$_2$ storage. The complex faulting observed at the study areas appear to be associated with transfer fault zones (Heffner 2013). Newly acquired seismic data in the Georgia portion of the SGR basin suggest there are porous zones in the J/T sandstones that could be used for geologic storage of CO$_2$ here. These porous zones will need to be far away from the transfer fault zones identified by Hefner (2013) to ensure containment of injected CO$_2$. It also needs to be stressed that the SGR basin covers area in four states (South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama and Florida). The injection simulations conducted in this study were limited to one small area. Consequently, there is enormous potential for CO$_2$ storage in other portions the basin and further research needs to be done to locate these suitable areas.

The suggested next step of the research are to:

1) Continue with the fault permeability analysis on a logarithmic scale approach. 0 mD, 1 mD and 100 mD are a good foundation for future fault leakage analyses adding 10 mD, 1000 mD and 10,000 mD and use these results to create fault leakage coefficients and a permeability vs leakage graph one could use to estimate the leakage in their fault system.

2) Use available software such as the Computer Modelling Group Ltd. WinProp module to simulate the CO$_2$/basalt mineralization to calculate the mineralization rate as well the volume of mineral trapping after a 100 year simulation.
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