# Violet Grove CO<sub>2</sub> Injection Pilot: The Time-lapsed inefield

Marcia Couëslan & Don Lawton, University of Calgary Mike Jones, Schlumberger Canada

## Outline

- Introduction
- Field Background
- Time-lapse Surveys
  - Importance of Repeatability
  - Time-lapse Results
  - Supporting Evidence
  - Conclusions
- Recommendations
  - Acknowledgements

#### Introduction

The Penn West Project is

• A pilot project that injects CO<sub>2</sub> into the reservoir for EOR and sequestration purposes.

 Uses an innovative surface and borehole seismic program that has been designed to monitor injected CO<sub>2</sub>.



- CO<sub>2</sub> injection for EOR and sequestration
- CO<sub>2</sub> is delivered by tanker truck from a gas plant 50 km away
- Supercritical CO<sub>2</sub> is injected

- At a rate of ~ 70 tonnes/day at ~ 20 MPa
- The average Canadian produces ~5 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> per year



- Monitor well equipment was installed in February 2005
  - 8 geophone arrays
  - 6 pressure/temperature sensors
  - 2 fluid sampling ports
- Baseline seismic survey was acquired in March 2005

• CO<sub>2</sub> injection commenced the next week



#### Advantages of Fixed VSP Array

- Higher frequency bandwidth than surface seismic data
  - Results in higher vertical and horizontal resolution near the monitor well
- Provides a correlation between the time indexed surface seismic and the depth indexed well logs
- Information gained from the VSP can be used to improve surface seismic processing Velocities, Q Estimation, anisotropy analysis
  Allows for passive seismic monitoring

# Processing Flow



| 0.00         | Line   | e 3: | PP S                                   | urfa | ce Se | eism | nic 8       | γV     | SP     |      |
|--------------|--------|------|--|------|-------|------|-------------|--------|--------|------|
| Offse<br>(m) | t 1000 | -800 | -400                                   | -200 | 200   | 600  | 1000<br>800 | 1200   | 1400   | 1600 |
|              |        |      |  |      |       |      |             |        |        |      |
| 1.0 s        |        |      |  |      |       |      | Cardium     | Form   | ation  |      |
| 1.2          |        |      |  |      |       |      | Viking ]    | Format | tion   |      |
| 1.4          |        |      |  |      |       |      |             |        |        |      |
| 16           |        |      |  |      |       |      |             |        | Line 1 |      |
| 1.0          |        |      | ······································ |      |       |      | Line 2      |        |        |      |
| 1.8          |        |      | ************************************** |      |       | 2    | Line 3      |        |        |      |
| 2.0          |        |      |  |      |       |      |             |        |        |      |

| Li<br>Offse<br>(m) | ne 3: | Surfa | lsm<br>e | ic &<br>800 | S-V<br>1200 | <b>SP</b><br>1600 |
|--------------------|-------|-------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| 1.0 s              |       |       |          | Cardium     | Formatio    |                   |
| 1.2                |       |       |          | Viking F    | ormation    |                   |
| 1.6                |       |       |          |             |             |                   |
| 1.8                |       |       |          |             |             |                   |

- Andrea

k

### **Time-lapse Surveys**

• Time-lapse surveys are required

- To monitor the  $CO_2$  flood in the reservoir
- To look for leakage pathways in the overburden
- First monitor survey was acquired in December 2005
  - Expect to acquire a second monitor survey in early 2007

#### Time-lapse Surveys

- Properties expected to change:
  - P-wave velocity at the reservoir
  - Fluid composition as the CO<sub>2</sub> is injected
- Expected seismic response:
  - Increased travel times
  - Change in reservoir amplitudes
  - Geophone array is fixed

- Can be used to calibrate source variability and overburden travel times between the surveys

## Why Is Repeatability Important?

- Repeatability is affected by source-receiver geometries, consistency of the source signature, and shot-generated noise
- Seismic noise is often caused by subsurface heterogeneities

• Repeating source-receiver geometries allows the noise to the replicated and differenced away

## Line 2 All Shots: Baseline



## Line 2 All Shots: Monitor



## Line 2 All Shots: Difference



#### Line 2 Repeated Shots: Difference



#### Finite Difference Modelling: Baseline



#### Finite Difference Modelling: Monitor



## Finite Difference Modelling: Difference



- -

#### P-wave Results Line 2: Baseline



## P-wave Results Line 2: Monitor



## P-wave Results Line 2: Difference



## The Supporting Evidence

- Amplitude increases correlate directly to the Cardium event
- Excellent data repeatability

- Seismic traces, amplitude & phase spectra
- Small time shifts in the crosscorrelations
  - Travel times at base of the reservoir show a systematic increase of 0.2 ms

#### Conclusions

- Shot repeatability is extremely important
- P-wave amplitudes at the Cardium on Line 2 have increased since the baseline survey
- Comparison of the datasets, amplitude & phase spectra, and crosscorrelations indicate an excellent tie between surveys
- Expect to see increased time-lapse effects on the next survey as the volume of CO<sub>2</sub> in the reservoir increases

## Recommendations

- Instrument entire well with geophones

   Will provide high resolution images of the reservoir and overburden around the well
- May want geophone arrays in several wells in the field
  - Merge the volumes for laterally extensive coverage
- Potentially instrument production or injection wells

#### Acknowledgements

- Scott Leaney and Schlumberger Canada
- Alberta Energy Research Institute (AERI)
- Western Economic Diversification (WED)
- Natural Resources Canada (NRCan)
- CREWES sponsors for financial support
- Penn West Petroleum



#### S-wave Results Line 2: Monitor



Time (s)

#### S-wave Results Line 2: Baseline



## S-wave Results Line 2: Difference



## **Comparison of Amplitude Spectra**



# **Comparison of Phase Spectra**

