### Geological Carbon Sequestration Potential in New York State

Taury Smith, Richard Nyahay, Alexa Stolorow, Clare Dunn and Brian Slater *Reservoir Characterization Group New York State Museum*John Martin, NYSERDA Alan Belensz, NYOAG







# <u>CARBON DIOXIDE CAPTURE</u> <u>AND STORAGE (CCS)</u>

- We conclude that  $CO_2$  capture and sequestration (CCS) is the critical enabling technology that would reduce  $CO_2$ emissions significantly while also allowing coal to meet the world's pressing energy needs. (*The MIT Study- The Future of Coal, 2007*)

- For well-selected, designed and managed geological storage sites, IPCC estimates that  $CO_2$  could be trapped for millions of years, and the sites are likely to retain over 99% of the injected  $CO_2$  over 1,000 years. (IPCC CCS Report 2005)

## **Geological Carbon Sequestration**

- Geological carbon sequestration consists of CO<sub>2</sub> captured at a point source that is pumped down wells and into formations where it would remain for thousands of years
- The streams of CO<sub>2</sub> would largely come from modified coal-burning power plants
- The capture of the CO2 is another science where much work is currently underway

### Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS)





## Oil and Gas Geology in Reverse

- We are basically looking for formations that either could or do make good oil and gas reservoirs – porous and permeable strata with good overlying seals
- The oil and gas reservoirs in NY have kept the hydrocarbons in place for hundreds of millions of years and the expectation is that any carbon pumped underground would stay there for that kind of time period



#### Methods for storing CO2 in deep underground geological formations



SRCCS Figure TS-7

We are looking at options 1-3 (esp. 3) for geological sequestration in NY (from the IPCC 2006 report on CCS after Cook, 1999)

# Porosity and Permeability

- Porosity the measure of void space in a rock or sediments
- Permeability ability of a rock or sediments to transmit fluids connectedness of the pores
- Need at least some porosity and permeability to store CO<sub>2</sub>
- Also need impermeable seals to trap CO<sub>2</sub>





# **Supercritical State**



 $CO_2$  should be sequestered underground in a supercritical state that has the density of a liquid but flows like a gas – In a given space, one can store about 260 times more  $CO_2$  in a supercritical state than in a vapor or liquid state –

In order to keep  $CO_2$  in a supercritical state, it needs to be buried to a depth of <u>at least 2500 feet</u> where the pressure and temperature remain above the critical point



### Geological Work with the MRCSP

The Midwest Regional Carbon Sequestration Partnership (MRCSP) began its Phase I work in 2003 and is now well into Phase II of the NETL program. It is considering geological storage, terrestrial sequestration, and legal/regulatory issues.

New York State is in the process of joining the MRCSP and is now in the process of getting up to speed and integrating its data with that of the other member states (NYS Museum).

After correlating New York's stratigraphy with that of the other MRCSP states (Phase I), specific target formations have been identified that warrant more detailed investigation (Phase II) and scaled demo (Phase III).



# Geological Sequestration in NY

- Looking for porous and permeable strata at least 2500 feet deep with an overlying impermeable seal. Most likely targets are:
  - Onshore depleted natural gas reservoirs NY has produced gas for more than 125 years and there are many old fields that could be suitable for carbon sequestration - we know that they have good seals
  - Onshore and Offshore Saline Formations These are rock formations with porosity and permeability that are currently filled or nearly filled with very salty water (salinity up to 8 times seawater) that are isolated from shallower fresh water





Some of New York's depleted gas reservoirs could make good sequestration targets and  $CO_2$  might actually be used to enhance gas production (oil fields too shallow)





Porous dolomite from Black River Formation – our biggest gas producer today – this formation could probably accept at least one large power plant's  $CO_2$  for plant lifetime

There may be competition for this pore space as most good gas reservoirs are converted to natural gas storage fields, which can make a lot of money for their owners



### Saline Aquifers

- A saline aquifer is a rock formation that has saline brine in the pore space not potable water
- There are two main types of geological sequestration in saline aquifers:
- *Solubility Storage* –CO<sub>2</sub> goes into solution in the in situ water
- *Volumetric Storage:* displacing in situ fluid with CO2 estimates range from 0.5 to 30% of fluid might be displaced the question is where does it go? Rock type dependent

### Solubility Storage



• CO2 dissolves into in situ fluid eventually precipitate minerals that lock CO2 in place permanently

• Solubility of CO2 is strongly dependent on salinity

Measured Salinity of Formation Waters in NY State (DEC, 1988)

- Below Silurian Salt Layer
  - Silurian Bass Island 323,500 ppm (32 wt%)
  - Silurian Medina 292,121 ppm (29 wt%)
  - Ordovician Queenston 298,358 ppm (29 wt%)
  - Cambrian Potsdam/Theresa 300,763 ppm (31 wt%)
- Above Silurian Salt

– Upper Devonian Oil Zones – 156, 267 ppm (15 wt%)

### Solubility Storage Potential Very Limited



Because of the high salinity of New York's onshore saline aquifers solution storage will not supply a significant amount of storage capacity

# Volumetric Storage

- Volumetric storage means displacing *in situ* fluid with CO2
- This is controlled by the formation storage efficiency factor estimates range from 0.5 to 30% of fluid might be displaced
- The question is where does fluid go?
- Rock type dependent softer, high porosity sediments probably have higher values than harder older rocks (like we have in NY)
- Any sequestration in NY will be primarily of this type



### Volumetric storage

Critical question: What % of pore space available for volumetric storage?



Bedrock geologic map of New York – Layers dip gently to South







Layers dip or get deeper to the south - Starred layers have potential for sequestration Seals denoted with "S"



#### Preliminary assessment based on data collected and analyzed to date





One of our best opportunities is in the Rose Run Sandstone, which has produced some gas but is mainly a saline aquifer this map shows the thickness of that formation





Total feet of Rose Run Formation with porosity >5% using available density logs (5 foot contours) – thick in central NY

#### Offshore Carbon Sequestration Targets



#### Best potential probably offshore New York

## Offshore

- As many as 25 layers of sandstone below
  2500 feet, total thickness of more than
  5000 feet, up to 30% porosity and some very high permeability
- Salinity lower than onshore

Yellow beds are sandstones

			cu		<b>u</b> .		
	AGE	FORMATION	SPONTANEOUS POTENTIAL (millirotts)	LITHOLOGY	RESISTIVITY (ohms)	LITHOLOGY	DEPTH feet meters 0
ENOZOIC	PLESTOCENE PLIOCENE - MIOCENE PALEOGENE	BANQUEREAU	-ξ+		<u>(</u>	SEA LEVEL 98 ft. BELOW KB SEA FLOOR 255 ft., BELOW KB	_ 1000
sno	SANTONIAN	AN CANYON-			mum	SANDSTONE and GRAVEL unconsolidated coarse, abundant shell fragments, glauconite	500 _ _ 2000
		DAV	}	-	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	glauconite	
ACEOUS	BARREMIAN	MESEAUGA	man		J. WWW	SANDSTONE unconsolidated coarse to very coarse, in part calcareous, interbadt of red and gray gumbo-like shale, lignite, pyrite, argillaceous DOLOMITE near base	- 3000 1000-
EARLY CRET	VALANGINIAN	MISSISAUGA	MUMMM		and and an and an and an and	SHALE gray (gumbo) few beds of unconsolidated SANDSTONE, coal near top SAND very coarse, scattered pebbles, thin beds of gray SHALE (unwho) coales LIGNTE at base	- 4000
	BERRIASIAN					SHALE ignition, coal of Diskit a base SHALE and CLAY light gray, interbeds of coarse SAND, thin beds of DOLOMITE and SHALE near base SAND and learning second of SANDETONE medium is	∫ <sup>5000</sup> 1500-
LY JURASSIC	TITHONIAN- LATE HIMMERIDGIAN		MMM			SANU and loosely cemented SANUS LOVE, medium to coarse, few COAL and lignite beds, in part shaly, pyritic, micaceous SHALE orange-brown, dolomitic, abundant lignite,	6000
			MMMM			pyrite, few thin interbeds of fine to coarse SANDSTONE SANDSTONE and SHALE about 60-40 SANDSTONE	2000-
EAR	OXFORDIAN?	NOHAWK	NNNN		Manhaha	coarse to very coarse, loose; traces of pyrite, lignite SHALE red, yellow, gray, brown, in part silty, micaceous	- 7000
DDLE JURASSIC	CALLOVIAN?	MIC MAC - N	Mar MM Manufacture		a martine and and	SANDSTONE unconsolidated, coarse to very coarse, slightly arkosic, some pea-gravel, thin interbeds of brown-red and variegated SHALE	- 8000
	BATHONIAN?					SAND very coarse, unconsolidated, thick interbeds of SHALE, red-brown, gray, some COAL, pyrite	2500-
W	BAJOCIAN - AALENIAN?		NWW		When	SANDSTONE consolidated, medium, interbedded SHALE red brown, green, silty, traces of COAL, thin beds of micrite UMESTORE line to medium crystalloe pelletal	1 10000 3000-
JURASSIC ?	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	MOHICAN			AND MANUTARY AND	featilitience, microite at base     SHALE (ray-green, abundant carbonaceous flecks,     LUME STONE, Genie, fossiliarous, few thin bads of     very fine SANDOTONE     r	
	TOARCIAN -					SANUS IUNE: think, interbedoed, very time-crystalline light DOCOMITE, SHALL red-orown and gray, grading to SILTSTONE, thin LUMESTONE at base UMESTONE gray-mostlek microopytalline to fine orystalline, hard right this tracks of SHALE, gray,	- 11000
	PLIEN5BACHIAN?					g any green SANDTORE thin interbed fine to medium. PALE gay, gray-green, and brown, thin LMESTONE beds, thick SHALE grading to SANDSTONE, COAL at have DOUCOMITE light gray-belt, denie fine crystalline, part limy.	3500- 12000
EARLY		- SIOUS	}	Tent for the	hillow	SHALE and, however, graze sitty, microcours, dolomitis, interbedded SANDSTDNE, fine to medium, consolidated trace (CAL DOLOMITS light gray-buff, cryptocrystalline, in part standy, should be an	12000
	SINEMURIAN?	IRO(			ANN MANNA MANANA	sity or peteral, intribuds or ANHTUNI LS Softered Unison nodules, few thin beds of red-brown SHALE SANDSTONE light gray-pirk very fine to fine, DOLOMITE, onem-but, brown dense a little red SHALE and ANHTORITE	4000-
TO RLY JURASSIC?	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~					SHALE red-brown, streaks and inclusion of DOCOMITE and ANHYDRITE, thin interbeds of DOLOMITE, sew thin beds of tight SANDSTONE SANDSTONE fine to medium, rust-red, angillaceous, interbeds	- 14000
	HETTANGIAN - RHAETIAN?					ofSHALE.red.brown, micaceous.part.doionitic.congionerate zones with interbedded SAN05TDNE_and SNALE, few thin beds of DOLONITE_gray-dam microcrystalline QUARTZ CONGLDMERATE, red-pink, red dolonitic SHALE	-J <sup>15000</sup> 4500-
	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	BASEMENT	}		A.M. Nor	Instant, inv interbers of red SHALE, SARLD SURE and dense LIMESTORE and DOLOMITE, thick, red sardy, SHALE, pink-red, medium to coarie-grained SANDSTONE at base SERCITIC METADOLOMITE, light-gray to white, fine dense	-
IMBRIAN?			5	TD 16,071 ft.	And a	orystalliee, block SLATE partings PMDLUE with wedges and layer of metsquartake, pyrite, pyrite cubes and masses, some schistose foliation and graphite stain	- 16000
							5000- 17000

COST G-1







Generalized cross section shows that the layers are laterally extensive Could get pretty close to NYC and LI where most power is needed Far less regulatory and safety issues than the onshore saline aquifers Probably more expensive – offshore wells cost more to drill and operate Need to know the offshore NY geology better and proposed study inexplicably rejected by NYSERDA panel

### Statoil's Sleipner: Norwegian North Sea



CO<sub>2</sub> is injected

2500 meters



It probably makes sense to look at onshore sequestration for new power plants in Western NY and offshore sequestration for E. NY



Potential leakage pathways in order of likelihood in NY: well bores, flow updip, faults, fractures and through seal if highly over-pressured

# CO<sub>2</sub> as a Health Hazard

- The atmosphere is composed of roughly 0.038% CO<sub>2</sub> (slowly rising)
- Healthy adults can tolerate air with up to 1.5% CO<sub>2</sub> with no adverse effects for at least an hour that is roughly 40 times atmospheric concentration
- Above that level complications occur
- It is <u>extremely unlikely</u> that these storage projects would ever release concentrated CO<sub>2</sub> at a level that could be harmful to humans if they leak it is likely to be a slow seep but all precautions would need to be taken to ensure that this was the case





Monitoring of where the CO2 is going will be a critical part of any project – this map shows how CO2 is moving through a field in W Canada

### What We Know

- There are potential formations both onshore and offshore of New York that could possibly hold significant amounts of CO<sub>2</sub>
- Onshore these formations occur in the southern half of the western part of the State but porosity and permeability are generally low there is a chance it will not work in many of these formations
- Offshore there is potential in up to 25 formations with high porosity and permeability higher cost (?) but also a much higher probability of success



## What We Need To Know

- Prior to approving any large-scale sequestration projects, the State needs to know:
  - What onshore and offshore formations, if any, can accept the volumes of  $CO_2$  needed in a safe and cost-effective manner? This will require further mapping as well as seismic interpretation, drilling, coring, injection tests and monitoring of potential onshore and offshore sites
  - What sort of reactions will take place between the injected  $CO_2$  and the *in situ* rocks and fluids? It may be that mineralization occurs around the wells that greatly decreases permeability and storage potential. This will require testing using cores and reactive transport modeling.

