## In-Situ CO2 Imaging in Laboratory EOR Research

### **Arne Graue**

Dept. of Physics and Technology University of Bergen

CO<sub>2</sub> for EOR as CCUS, Rice U., Houston, TX, USA Nov. 19th-21st, 2013

The University of Bergen





# Way Forward

**Core analysis:** 

- Micromodels
- Core plugs
- Blocks
- Numerical simulations

**Upscaling:** 

- Numerical modelling on pore scale
- Numerical modelling on field scale

**Pilot field tests:** 

- Texas (Operator: Tabula Rasa)
- Ekofisk (between close horizontal wells)

#### **Experimental setup micro model experiments**



## In-Situ Fluid Saturations by Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI)



### **Tertiary CO<sub>2</sub> Injection of Neutral-Wet Chalk**

#### Temp.: 20<sup>o</sup>C

Amott Index 0.15







































































































































#### Time: 3.74 PV



.

SCA2008-41

1





### Tertiary CO<sub>2</sub> Injection of Less Water-Wet Chalk

Temp.: 40°C

Amott Index 0.25















































#### Time: 3.93 PV







#### Time: 4.10 PV





#### Time: 4.18 PV









# Industrial CT

- Consists of a sample rotator, an x-ray source and a detector
- The detector measures the absorption of x-rays when they pass through the sample
- The sample rotates, creating a 2D image of each layer, and by moving either the sample or the detector system vertically, a 3D image is made



From www.deetee.com

- Can be moved closer to the source then a medical CT, and thus has larger resolution
- Much higher resolution then other imaging techniques
  - MRI  $\approx$  1000 microns
  - Medical CT  $\approx$  250 microns
  - Industrial CT  $\approx$  5 microns
- Runs at high voltage, meaning more energetic and penetrating x-rays, which again leads to higher resolution, but also lower contrast images
- Runs at low power
- Following images taken at 160 keV, with a resolution of 40 microns per voxel, with 1024\*1024\*1400 voxels

## Results: Rock characterization using CT

- 40 x 40 x 42 microns resolution
- 1.5" Portland chalk



## Results: Rock characterization using CT

- 40 x 40 x 42 microns resolution
- 1.5" Portland chalk


## Results: Rock characterization using CT

- 40 x 40 x 42 microns resolution
- 1.5" Portland chalk





























































![](_page_120_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_120_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_120_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_121_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_121_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_121_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_122_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_122_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_122_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_123_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_123_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_123_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_123_Figure_3.jpeg)

0.9 00 0.8

![](_page_124_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_124_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_124_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_124_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_125_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_125_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_125_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_125_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_126_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_126_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_126_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_126_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_127_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_127_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_127_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_127_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_128_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_128_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_128_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_128_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_129_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_129_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_129_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_129_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_130_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_130_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_130_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_130_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_131_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_131_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_131_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_131_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_132_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_132_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_132_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_132_Figure_3.jpeg)

# Large Volume Blocks

![](_page_134_Picture_0.jpeg)

# **Block Preparation**

![](_page_135_Picture_1.jpeg)

# High Pressure, Large Volume

![](_page_136_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_137_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_138_Figure_0.jpeg)

# Nuclear Tracer Imaging

![](_page_139_Picture_1.jpeg)

### **EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES**

- 1. Waterflood whole block
- 2. Oilflood to S<sub>wi</sub>, fracture and reassemble block
- **3. Waterflood <u>fractured</u> block**

![](_page_140_Picture_4.jpeg)

A) Strongly-water-wet
B) Moderately-water-wet
C) Nearly-neutral-wet

## **BLOCK SCALE** Strongly water-wet

![](_page_141_Figure_1.jpeg)

0.15PV ingle low Longth (cm)

#### 0.26PV

![](_page_141_Figure_4.jpeg)

0.17 PV

![](_page_141_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_141_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_141_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_141_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_141_Figure_9.jpeg)

![](_page_141_Figure_10.jpeg)

![](_page_141_Figure_11.jpeg)

![](_page_141_Figure_12.jpeg)

0.44 PV

![](_page_141_Figure_14.jpeg)

## **BLOCK SCALE** Moderately water-wet

![](_page_142_Figure_1.jpeg)

Length [cm]

Length [cm]

Length [cm]

## **BLOCK SCALE** Moderately oil-wet

![](_page_143_Figure_1.jpeg)
# Wettability effects in fractured blocks



### What happens inside the fractures during fluid flow?

#### MRI (Magnetic Resonance Imaging)

The high spatial resolution allow visualization of fluid flow patterns inside a 1mm fractures between stacked core plugs. The high resolution reveal wetting phase bridging phenomena inside the fracture.



## Recap: WF in water-wet fractured chalk

#### Wettability: I<sub>w</sub> =1.0

#### Wettability: $I_w = 0.7$





## Water Bridges with Escape Fracture



Constant differential pressure

Constant flow rate

# **Experimental setup**

## Whole view



### Cut in two



# Fracture flow in oil-wet limestone







# Waterflooding

#### Fracture filling at <u>strongly water-wet</u> conditions



#### Fracture filling at <u>moderately oil-wet</u> conditions



Start

TIME

# WF oil-wet conditions



# IEOR: Water + (Surf) + CO2 Foam

### **Pretreatment of fracture surfaces**



# IEOR: Water + (Surf) + CO2 Foam

## Injection of mobility control agent



# IEOR: Water + (Surf) + CO2 Foam Chase fluid injection



## Large Scale Collaboration Emphasizing Mobility Control and CO2 EOR in Field Pilots in Texas

#### **Collaboration: 11 universities**

- Rice University
- University of Texas at Austin
- Texas A&M U.
- Stanford U.
- Imperial College, London
- TREFLE, Bordeaux, France
- U. of Kansas
- New Mexico Tech
- TU Delft, The Netherlands
- NTNU, Trondheim, Norway
- University of Bergen, Norway

## CO<sub>2</sub> as CCUS for Integrated EOR

Arne Graue, Dept. of Physics, University of Bergen, NORWAY

Collaboration: 11 Universities in France, UK, Netherland, USA and Norway Funding: The Research Council of Norway and 3-5 oil companies

### <u>Objective:</u> Experimentally determine optimum conditions for CO<sub>2</sub> as CCUS for Integrated EOR, low S<sub>or</sub> & prod. of ROZ

#### Integration of Geology, Mathematical Modeling and Laboratory Experiments



Lab to pilot field test



MRI of CO2 injection

#### **Complementary NTI & MRI facilities**

