

11–13 MARCH 2024 Houston, Texas

Carbonated Brine Injection as a Low-Risk CO₂ Storage Strategy: A Case Study for Inyan Kara Sandstone Reservoir

Wei Xiong, PhD NETL Support Contractor

March 11, 2024



11-13 MARCH 2024 Houston, Texas

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.

0.4



11-13 MARCH 2024 Houston, Texas

Authors and Contact Information

Wei Xiong^{1,2*}; Zineb Belarbi^{3,4}; Randal Thomas³; Dustin Crandall⁵; Merry Tesfu⁶; Meghan Taunton⁶; Ryan Klapperich⁶; Marc Kurz⁶

¹National Energy Technology Laboratory, 626 Cochran Mill Road, Pittsburgh, PA 15236, USA
 ²NETL Support Contractor, 626 Cochran Mill Road, Pittsburgh, PA 15236, USA
 ³National Energy Technology Laboratory, 1450 SW Queen Avenue, Albany, OR 97321, USA
 ⁴NETL Support Contractor, 1450 SW Queen Avenue, Albany, OR 97321, USA
 ⁵National Energy Technology Laboratory, 3610 Collins Ferry Road, Morgantown, WV 26505, USA
 ⁶University of North Dakota, Energy & Environmental Research Center (EERC), 15 North 23rd Street, Stop 9018, Grand Forks, ND 58202, USA

wei.xiong@netl.doe.gov



11-13 MARCH 2024 Houston, Texas

Overview



Carbonated brine injection (CBI) has the potential for large-scale carbon sequestration throughout the oil and gas industry through its network of already existing Class II saltwater disposal (SWD) wells. For CBI, CO_2 is first dissolved into produced waters being injected. Since the CO_2 is mixed with the produced water prior to injection, the benefits are predicted to include no migration of free-phase CO_2 and negligible pressure increase when compared to standard SWD injection.

The objective of this study was to evaluate the feasibility and long-term safety associated with combined produced water and CO_2 storage in the North Dakota portion of the Williston Basin.



Methods



Study

1



Reservoir Model Parameters

- Reservoir thickness: 300 ft
- Simulation block widths in the I and J direction: 101*101
- Simulation cell size: 10*10-ft (I*J) with a cell thickness of 10 ft (K)
- Number of layers: 40
 - Mowry Formation, 5 layers
 - Inyan Kara Formation, 30 layers
 - Swift Formation, 5 layers
- The reservoir was assumed to be 100% brine saturated
- Porosity and permeability data extracted from a larger geological model
 - Porosity 0.23
 - Permeability in I and J direction is 284 md; permeability in K direction is 10% of the horizontal permeability

Constant Parameters	Value
Injection Rate, bbl/day	8,000
Years of Injection	20
Pre-injection	1
Post-injection	100
Reservoir Pressure, psi	2,255 or 1,500
Reservoir Depth, ft	4,700
Reservoir Temperature, °F	165
Wellhead Temperature, °F	60

Preliminary simulation findings revealed that within the molality range of 0.75 to 0.65 mol/kg, approximately 99.99% of CO_2 would be successfully dissolved into the reservoir fluid with 10,000 ppm injection fluid salinity and reservoir fluid salinity. To minimize the leakage risk, 0.2, 0.4, and 0.6 mol/kg CO_2 molality were chosen to study salinity scenarios.



Reservoir Injection Scenarios and Results

Lower injection salinity allows more CO_2 to be safely stored through dissolution. Among all the tested scenarios, 0.2 mol/kg dissolved CO_2 presents minimal leakage risk.

Sc.	Injection Fluid Salinity (ppm)	Reservoir Fluid Salinity (ppm)	Molality (mole/kg)	CO ₂ Dissolved, %	CO₂ Gas Phase, %
1	100,000	10,000	0.2	99.99%	0.01%
2	200,000	10,000	0.2	99.99%	0.01%
3	300,000	10,000	0.2	99.97%	0.02%
4	400,000	10,000	0.2	99.94%	0.04%
5	100,000	20,000	0.4	99.99%	0.01%
6	200,000	20,000	0.4	99.98%	0.02%
7	300,000	20,000	0.4	93.06%	6.93%
8	400,000	20,000	0.4	63.92%	36.07%
9	100,000	30,000	0.6	99.99%	0.01%
10	200,000	30,000	0.6	92.19%	7.80%
11	300,000	30,000	0.6	65.35%	34.64%
12	400,000	30,000	0.6	53.19%	46.79%



11-13 MARCH 2024 Houston, Texas

Bottomhole Pressure

Bottomhole pressure (BHP) built steadily throughout the simulation period while still remaining well below the maximum BHP for a typical SWD well in the Williston Basin (~3,000-3,300 psi). The highest BHP observed in these tests came from Scenario 12 which reached 3,010 psi at the end of the injection phase. Scenario 12 represents the case with the highest tested salinity and dissolved CO₂ molality of 0.6. A rise in BHP was observed in Scenarios 8, 11, 12 due to excessive gas phase CO₂.



8



11-13 MARCH 2024 Houston, Texas

Dissolved CO₂ Migration

Dissolved CO₂ migrates downwards over long-term storage, further lowering the leakage risk.





11-13 MARCH 2024 Houston, Texas

Reactive Transport Model Setup

Sandstone is mostly composed of quartz, with a porosity of 23%. There was 0.2 molal dissolved CO_2 in the injected produced water. The injection period was set at 20 years with the injection fluid rate (1,280 m³/day). After 20 years, the injection fluid rate was set at 0 for 100 years as the shut-in period. All kinetic rates for primary and secondary minerals are from literature.

Formation	Concentration	Injection Water	Concentration
Quartz	70.5 volume %	SiO ₂ (aq)	
Muscovite	2.7 volume %	Al+++	a New York
Siderite	3.8 volume %	Fe ⁺⁺	124.71 mg/L
Mg ⁺⁺	57 mg/L	Mg ⁺⁺	1,091.15 mg/L
рН	6.1	pH-	5.94
Ca++	259 mg/L	Ca++	16,674.76 mg/L
Na⁺	7,114 mg/L	Na⁺ –	75,341.45 mg/L
K+	408 mg/L	K+	4,483.17 mg/L
CI-	10,600 mg/L	Cŀ	152,006.21 mg/L
SO4	1,000 mg/L	SO4	613.46 mg/L
HCO3-	1,086 mg/L	HCO ₃ ⁻ as C	0.2 molal
Ba++		Ba++	34.40 mg/L
NO ₃ -		NO ₃ -	151.96 mg/L



11-13 MARCH 2024 Houston, Texas

Dissolved CO₂ Species



CO₂(aq) remains the predominant form. Total C decreases slightly over time. Carbonate and bicarbonate participates in rock-fluid interactions.



11-13 MARCH 2024 Houston, Texas

pН

pH decreases from 6.1 before injection to 5 over long-term storage.





11-13 MARCH 2024 Houston, Texas

Porosity Change

Porosity decreases from 23% to 21% due to carbonate mineral precipitation close to the injection point.



13



Summary

- Carbonated brine storage is a low-risk geologic CO₂ sequestration strategy. Simulations of CBI at small CO₂ molality (0.2 mol/kg) were found to show no perceivable increases in reservoir pressure or impacts to brine viscosity or density due to the dissolved CO₂.
- Dissolving CO₂ into produced water disposal streams creates a cash incentive through IRS Section 45Q tax credits. For permanent storage, the tax credit is currently \$85/ton of CO₂ sequestered.
- CBI may be applied relatively quickly because no new wells need to be drilled. Regulatory
 considerations for CBI include the regulations surrounding above ground storage of the produced
 water on location and creating a path to approval under Class II injection wells.



Acknowledgments

This work was performed in support of the National Energy Technology Laboratory's (NETL) ongoing research under Carbon Storage Advanced R&D Field Work Proposal by NETL's Research and Innovation Center.

The authors wish to acknowledge Ryan Hall from NGL Energy Partners for valuable discussions for site-related information. Thanks to James Gardiner for working on early lab and field work prior to this simulation project.

For more information, please see the published report:

Xiong, W.; Belarbi, Z.; Thomas, R.; Crandall, D.; Tesfu, M.; Taunton, M.; Klapperich, R.; Kurz, M. Assessment of Carbonated Brine Injection as Low-risk Strategy for Geologic Carbon Storage; DOE.NETL-2023.4328; NETL Technical Report Series; U.S. Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory: Pittsburgh, PA, 2023; p 56.



NETL Resources

VISIT US AT: www.NETL.DOE.gov





@NationalEnergyTechnologyLaboratory

Corresponding author – wei.xiong@netl.doe.gov





Appendix - Kinetic Rates

Minerals	k (mol/cm²·s)	E (J/mol)	Reference
Quartz	1.00E-16	87,500	(Rimstidt and Barnes, 1980)
Muscovite	2.00E-16	64,000	(Nagy, 1995)
Siderite	2.00E-11	55,000	Set to dolomite
Barite	1.26E-12	30,800	(Palandri and Kharaka, 2004)
Calcite	1.58E-10	63,000	(Plummer et al., 1978)
Dolomite	2.00E-11	55,000	(Busenberg and Plummer, 1982)
Witherite	4.47E-12	41,900	Set to strontianite (Sonderegger et al., 1976)
Kaolinite	3.98E-16	64,000	(Sverdrup, 1990)
Dawsonite	1.00E-11	62,800	(Palandri and Kharaka, 2004)
Magnesite	4.57E-14	23,500	(Palandri and Kharaka, 2004)
Aragonite	1.58E-10	63,000	Set to calcite
Huntite	2.00E-11	55,000	Set to dolomite
Monohydrocalcite	1.58E-10	63,000	Set to calcite
Maximum Microcline	1.26E-15	58,000	Set to K-feldspar
K-feldspar	1.26E-15	58,000	(Helgeson et al., 1984)