

# GEOPHYSICAL MONITORING OF THE CO<sub>2</sub> PLUME AT SLEIPNER, NORTH SEA

*An outline review*

A. Chadwick<sup>1</sup>, R. Arts<sup>2</sup>, O. Eiken<sup>3</sup>, P. Williamson<sup>1</sup> and G. Williams<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>British Geological Survey, Kingsley Dunham Centre, Keyworth, Nottingham, NG12 5GG, United Kingdom; <sup>2</sup>Netherlands Institute of Applied Geoscience TNO - National Geological Survey, Kriekenpitplein 18, PO Box 80015, 3508 TA Utrecht, The Netherlands; <sup>3</sup>Statoil Research Centre, Rotvoll, N-7005 Trondheim, Norway.

**Abstract:** CO<sub>2</sub> produced at the Sleipner gas field is being injected into the Utsira Sand, a major saline aquifer some 1000m beneath the North Sea. The injection plume is being monitored by geophysical methods. 3D seismic data were acquired in 1994, prior to injection, and again in 1999, 2001 and 2002; seabed gravimetric data were also acquired in 2002. The CO<sub>2</sub> plume is imaged on the seismic data as a number of bright sub-horizontal reflections, growing with time, underlain by a prominent velocity pushdown. Quantitative modelling is based on plume reflectivity largely comprising tuned responses from thin layers of CO<sub>2</sub> trapped beneath thin intra-reservoir mudstones, with layer thicknesses being mapped according to an amplitude-thickness tuning relationship. Between the layers a lesser component of much lower-saturation, dispersed CO<sub>2</sub> is required to match the observed velocity pushdown. However, reservoir temperatures are subject to significant uncertainty, and inverse models of CO<sub>2</sub> distribution, based on lower and higher temperature scenarios, can produce both the observed plume reflectivity and the velocity pushdown. Higher temperature models however require that the dispersed component of CO<sub>2</sub> has a somewhat patchy rather than uniform saturation. Analysis of the datasets suggests that accumulations of CO<sub>2</sub> as small as 500 tonnes may be detectable under favourable conditions, providing a basis for setting leakage criteria. To date, there is in fact no evidence of migration from the primary storage reservoir.

**Key words:** CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration, Sleipner, geophysical methods, 4D seismic, gravity, velocity pushdown, quantitative modeling, accumulation detection

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The carbon dioxide injection at the Sleipner field in the North Sea (Baklid et al. 1996), operated by Statoil and the Sleipner partners, is the world's first industrial scale CO<sub>2</sub> injection project designed specifically as a greenhouse gas mitigation measure. CO<sub>2</sub> separated from natural gas is being injected into the Utsira Sand (Fig. 1), a major saline aquifer of late Cenozoic age (Chadwick et al., 2004a; Zweigel et al., 2004). The injection point is at a depth of about 1012 m bsl, some 200 m below the reservoir top. Injection started in 1996 and a total of more than 7 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> are presently in situ at the time of writing.




Figure 1. Location map showing Sleipner and the extent/thickness of the Utsira Sand aquifer.

Since 1998 the injection operation has been linked to a number of research projects, notably SACS, SACS2 and CO<sub>2</sub>STORE. These projects, funded by the EU, industry and national governments, aim to show that underground storage is a safe and verifiable technology. Specifically they have carried out scientific research into the geological aspects of the Sleipner injection operation by monitoring and modelling the injected CO<sub>2</sub> plume.

Key aims of the monitoring programme at Sleipner are outlined below:


1. To show that the CO<sub>2</sub> is being confined safely within the primary storage reservoir.
2. To image the distribution and migration of CO<sub>2</sub> throughout the reservoir and, should it occur, into adjacent strata.

3. To provide early warning of any potentially hazardous migration towards the seabed.

Baseline 3D seismic data were acquired in 1994, prior to injection, with repeat surveys in 1999 (2.35 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> in the reservoir), 2001 (4.26 Mt) and 2002 (4.97Mt). In addition, to complement the information available from the seismic datasets, a seabed gravimetric survey was acquired in 2002.

## 2. TIME-LAPSE SEISMIC DATASETS

This paper provides a brief outline of current interpretive work on the seismic datasets. Fuller details are given in Arts et al. (2004a, 2004b) and Chadwick et al. (2004b, 2005).



*Figure 2.* Time-lapse seismic images of the CO<sub>2</sub> plume: a) N-S inline through the 1994 dataset prior to injection and through the 1999, 2001 and 2002 datasets. b) Maps of integrated absolute reflection amplitudes from the plume showing its elliptical form in plan view and growth from 1999 to 2001. Black disc denotes injection point.

## 2.1 Time-lapse images

The CO<sub>2</sub> plume is imaged as a number of bright sub-horizontal reflections within the reservoir, growing with time (Figure 2a). The reflections are interpreted as arising from thin (< 8 m thick) layers of CO<sub>2</sub> trapped beneath thin intra-reservoir mudstones and the reservoir caprock. The plume is roughly 200 m high and elliptical in plan, with a major axis increasing from about 1500 m in 1999 to about 2000 m in 2001 (Figure 2b). The plume is underlain by a prominent velocity pushdown (Figure 3) caused by the seismic waves travelling much more slowly through CO<sub>2</sub>-saturated rock than through the virgin aquifer.




Figure 3. Velocity pushdown. a) Inline through the reservoir in 1994 and 1999 showing pushdown of the Base Utsira Sand beneath the plume. b) Cross-correlogram of a reflection window beneath the central part of the 2001 plume. Pick follows the correlation peak and defines pushdown. c) Pushdown maps in 1999 and 2001. Black disc denotes injection point.

## 2.2 Seismic modeling

Seismic modelling aimed at verifying the in situ injected mass of CO<sub>2</sub> has utilised both inverse and forward modelling techniques. Forward modelling, via history-matched reservoir simulations of the CO<sub>2</sub> plume produces a reasonable match to the observed data (Figure 4), though the detailed geometry of the plume layering remains uncertain.




Figure 4. The 2001 plume: a) observed seismic data (opacity display of the 2001 minus 1994 difference cube) b) reservoir simulation.

Inverse modelling aims to quantify amounts of CO<sub>2</sub> from layer reflectivity and velocity pushdown. Because fluid pressures are believed to have changed very little during injection, modelling is based solely on fluid saturation changes. The observed plume reflectivity most likely comprises tuned responses from thin layers of CO<sub>2</sub> whose thickness varies directly with reflection amplitude. Inverse modelling takes as a starting point, thin, high-saturation layers of CO<sub>2</sub>, mapped according to an amplitude-thickness tuning relationship. This is supported by structural analysis of the topmost CO<sub>2</sub> layer, whose thickness, estimated directly from the top reservoir topography, varies directly with reflection amplitude. In addition, in order for the modelled CO<sub>2</sub> distributions to produce the observed velocity pushdown, a minor, intra-layer component of much lower saturation CO<sub>2</sub> is required.

A measured formation temperature of 36°C is available for the Utsira reservoir, but it is poorly-constrained. Regional temperature patterns suggest

that the reservoir may be up to 10°C warmer. At the higher temperatures, CO<sub>2</sub> would have significantly different physical properties. In particular its density would be significantly lower, giving a correspondingly larger in situ volume. Inverse models of CO<sub>2</sub> distribution in the 1999 plume have been generated, based on both the measured and a possible higher temperature scenario (Figure 5). The distribution of CO<sub>2</sub> in both models is consistent with the known injected mass (allowing for parameter uncertainty) and can replicate the observed plume reflectivity and the velocity pushdown. However, the higher temperature model requires that the dispersed component of CO<sub>2</sub> has a somewhat patchy, rather than uniform, mixing of the CO<sub>2</sub> and water phases (Sengupta & Mavko 2003). This highlights a key uncertainty in verification estimates; the velocity behaviour of the CO<sub>2</sub> – water – rock system, which is heavily dependent on the (poorly constrained) nature of small-scale mixing processes between the fluid phases.

Because of these uncertainties, a modelling solution which uniquely verifies the injected volume has not yet been obtained. Work on reducing uncertainty is ongoing.




Figure 5. Inverse modelling of the 1999 plume. Observed data compared with synthetic seismograms based on inverse models for two plume scenarios: Injection point at 36°C with fine-scale mixing throughout; Injection Point at 45° C with patchy mixing in the intra-layer dispersed component of CO<sub>2</sub>.

### 2.3 Detecting migration from the storage reservoir

The seismic data indicate that no detectable leakage of CO<sub>2</sub> into the caprock has occurred so far. The potential detection capability of the Sleipner data can be illustrated by examining the 1999 plume (Figure 6). The topmost part of the plume is marked by two small CO<sub>2</sub> accumulations trapped directly beneath the caprock seal.




Figure 6. Detection limits for small amounts of CO<sub>2</sub>. a) Map of the 1999-94 difference data showing integrated reflection amplitude in a 20 ms window centred on the top Utsira Sand. Note high amplitudes (paler greys) corresponding to the two small CO<sub>2</sub> accumulations. Note also scattered amplitudes due to repeatability noise. b) Part of seismic line showing the topmost part of the plume and the two topmost CO<sub>2</sub> accumulations.

From the reflection amplitudes, the volumes of the two accumulations can be estimated at 9000 and 11500 m<sup>3</sup>, respectively. Other seismic features on the timeslice can be attributed to repeatability noise, arising from slight intrinsic mismatches between the 1999 and 1994 (baseline) surveys. It is clear that the level of repeatability noise plays a key role in determining the detectability threshold. Thus for a patch of CO<sub>2</sub> to be identified on the data it must be possible to discriminate between it and the largest noise peaks. Preliminary analysis suggests that accumulations larger than about 4000 m<sup>3</sup> should fulfill this criterion. This corresponds to about 2000 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> at the top of the reservoir (where CO<sub>2</sub> has a density of about 500 kgm<sup>-3</sup>), but less than 600 tonnes at 500 m depth where the density is considerably lower. Seismic detection depends crucially on the nature of the CO<sub>2</sub> accumulation. Small thick accumulations in porous strata would tend to be readily detectable. Conversely, distributed leakage fluxes through low permeability strata may be difficult to detect with conventional seismic techniques. Similarly, leakage along a fault within low permeability rocks would be difficult to detect. Fluxes of CO<sub>2</sub> such as these may well be associated with changes in fluid pressure, in which case shear-wave seismic data is likely to prove useful as a detection tool.

### **3. TIME-LAPSE SEABED GRAVIMETRY**

Measurements of the gravitational acceleration due to mass distributions within the earth may be used to detect variations in subsurface rock or fluid density. Although of much lower spatial resolution than the seismic method, gravimetry offers some important complementary adjuncts to time-lapse seismic monitoring. Firstly, it can provide independent verification of the change in subsurface mass during injection via Gauss's Theorem. This potentially important capability may enable estimates to be made of the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> going into dissolution, a significant source of uncertainty in efforts to quantify free CO<sub>2</sub> in the reservoir (dissolved CO<sub>2</sub> is effectively invisible on seismic data). Secondly, deployed periodically, gravimetry could be used as an 'early warning system' to detect the accumulation of CO<sub>2</sub> in shallow overburden traps where it is likely to be in the low density gaseous phase with a correspondingly strong gravity signature.

The possibility of monitoring injected CO<sub>2</sub> with repeated gravity measurements is strongly dependent on CO<sub>2</sub> density and subsurface distribution. A feasibility study of time-lapse gravimetry at Sleipner (Williamson et al., 2001) modelled plume scenarios with CO<sub>2</sub> densities ranging from over 700 kgm<sup>-3</sup> (corresponding to the lower reservoir temperature scenario) to less than 350 kgm<sup>-3</sup> (corresponding to possible



higher reservoir temperatures). The modelling indicated that future changes in the CO<sub>2</sub> plume could theoretically be detectable by seabed gravimetry. For example it was shown that the addition of 2 million tonnes to the plume would produce a change in peak gravity signal of between -8 and -33 mGal, corresponding to CO<sub>2</sub> densities of 700 kgm<sup>-3</sup> and 350 kgm<sup>-3</sup>, respectively (Figure 7). Longer-term predictions suggest that the peak gravity signature of the plume will gradually decrease as it thins by lateral migration at the reservoir top. On the other hand, if CO<sub>2</sub> leaked to shallower levels where it would have a still lower density, gravity changes could well exceed -100 mGal.




Figure 7. Peak gravity anomaly as a function of CO<sub>2</sub> density, predicted for the Sleipner CO<sub>2</sub> plume in 1999 (2.3 MT in situ). Gravity changes computed for the sea surface (solid symbols) and the seabed (open symbols).

A seabed gravity survey was acquired at Sleipner in 2002 (Eiken et al. 2003), with approximately 5 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> in the plume. The survey was based around pre-positioned concrete benchmarks on the seafloor that served as reference locations for the (repeated) gravity measurements. Relative gravity and water pressure measurements were taken at each benchmark by a customised gravimetry and pressure measurement module mounted on a Remotely Operated Vehicle (Figure 8).

Thirty concrete benchmark survey stations were deployed in two perpendicular lines, spanning an area some 7 km east-west and 3 km north-south and overlapping the subsurface footprint of the CO<sub>2</sub> plume. Each survey station was visited at least three times to better constrain instrument drift and other errors. Single station repeatability was estimated to be 4 mGal. For time-lapse measurements an additional uncertainty of 1 – 2 mGal is associated with the reference null level. The final detection threshold for Sleipner therefore is estimated at about 5 mGal.

A repeat gravity survey is planned for the summer of 2005, with a projected 8 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> in the plume. The additional 3 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> are expected to produce a gravity change of between about -10 and -43 mGal depending on density. Such a change should theoretically be detectable. In the event that acceptably accurate measurements are obtained, it will be possible to derive the average density of CO<sub>2</sub> in the plume. This will help to constrain plume temperatures, which will in turn reduce uncertainty in the seismic analysis.




Figure 8. The seabed gravimetry operation at Sleipner showing the seabed gravimetry / pressure instrumentation and the remotely operated vehicle being lowered into the sea.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

Time-lapse seismic monitoring has proved notably successful in imaging the growing CO<sub>2</sub> plume at Sleipner. Quantitative analysis of the 1999 dataset has shown that the observed seismic signature is consistent with known injected amounts, but a complete verification has not been possible due to a number of uncertainties. These are related both to reservoir properties and conditions and also to the seismic properties of the CO<sub>2</sub> - water - rock system. Gravimetry has so far been restricted to an initial survey, but it is hoped that future repeat datasets will provide additional complementary information that can be used to further reduce seismic uncertainty.

The Utsira Sand is a relatively shallow, thick reservoir with notably high porosity and permeability. In this respect it is very suitable for both seismic and gravimetric monitoring, with injected CO<sub>2</sub> giving rise to particularly pronounced geophysical signatures. Other storage scenarios are likely to prove more challenging from a monitoring standpoint. In addition to

Sleipner, industrial-scale CO<sub>2</sub> injection projects are ongoing at Weyburn in Canada (Wilson and Monea, 2004), and at In Salah in Algeria, with another planned for the Snohvit field in the Barents Sea. These will further test the efficacy of geophysical monitoring methods in a range of storage situations. Reservoir depths range from ~ 1500m to nearly 3000 m, with widely different reservoir types, including carbonates. Major research projects are linked to all of these projects and important new insights into monitoring capabilities are anticipated in the coming years.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the CO<sub>2</sub>STORE consortium for permission to publish this work. SACS/SACS2 and CO<sub>2</sub>STORE have been funded by the EU Thermie Programme, by industry partners Statoil, BP, ExxonMobil, Norsk Hydro, TotalFinaElf, Vattenfall, Schlumberger and by national governments. R&D partners are BGR (Bundesanstalt für Geowissenschaften und Rohstoffe), BGS (British Geological Survey), BRGM (Bureau de Recherches Géologiques et Minières), GEUS (Geological Survey of Denmark), IFP (Institut Français du Pétrole), TNO-NITG (Netherlands Institute of Applied Geoscience – National Geological Survey) and SINTEF Petroleum Research. Andy Chadwick publishes with permission of the Executive Director, British Geological Survey (NERC).

## REFERENCES

- Arts, R., Eiken, O., Chadwick, R.A., Zweigel, P., Van Der Meer, L., and Kirby, G.A., 2004, Seismic monitoring at the Sleipner underground CO<sub>2</sub> storage site (North Sea). in: *Geological Storage for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction*, S. Baines, J. Gale and R.J. Worden, ed., Special Publication of the Geological Society, London, 233, pp. 181 - 191.
- Arts, R., Eiken, O., Chadwick, R.A., Zweigel, P., Van Der Meer, L., and Zinszner, B., 2004b, Monitoring of CO<sub>2</sub> injected at Sleipner using time-lapse seismic data. *Energy*, **29**:1383-1393.
- Baklid, A., Korbøl, R., and Owren, G., 1996, Sleipner Vest CO<sub>2</sub> disposal, CO<sub>2</sub> injection into a shallow underground aquifer. *SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition*, Denver, Colorado, USA, SPE paper 36600, 1-9
- Chadwick, R.A., Zweigel, P., Gregersen, U., Kirby, G.A., Johannessen, P.N., and Holloway, S., 2004a, Characterisation of a CO<sub>2</sub> storage site: The Utsira Sand, Sleipner, northern North Sea. *Energy*, **29**:1371-1381.
- Chadwick, R.A., Holloway, S., Brook, M., and Kirby, G.A., 2004b, The case for underground CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in northern Europe, in: *Geological Storage for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction*, S. Baines, J. Gale and R.J. Worden, ed., Special Publication of the Geological Society, London, 233, pp. 17 - 28.

- Chadwick, R.A., Arts, R., and Eiken, O., 2005, 4D seismic quantification of a growing CO<sub>2</sub> plume at Sleipner, North Sea, in: *Petroleum Geology: North West Europe and Global Perspectives - Proceedings of the 6th Petroleum Geology Conference*. A.G. Dore and B. Vining, eds, Published by the Geological Society, London, pp. 1385 – 1399.
- Eiken, O., Stenvold, T., Zumberge, M., and Nooner, S., 2003, *Gravity monitoring at the Sleipner CO<sub>2</sub> injection site: Report on 2002 baseline survey*. Statoil Technical Report, 22pp.
- Sengupta, M., and Mavko, G., 2003, Impact of flow simulation parameters on saturation scales and seismic velocity. *Geophysics*, **68**(4):1267-1280.
- Williamson, J.P., Chadwick, R.A., Rowley, W.J., and Eiken, O., 2001, *Saline Aquifer Storage: A Demonstration Project at the Sleipner Field. Work Area 5 (Geophysics) – Gravity modelling of the CO<sub>2</sub> bubble*. BGS Commissioned report CR/01/063. 25pp.
- Wilson, M. and Monea, M., 2004, (eds.) *IEA GHG Weyburn CO<sub>2</sub> Monitoring & Storage project Summary Report 2000 – 2004*. Petroleum Technology research Centre, Regina. 273pp.
- Zweigel, P., Arts, R., Lothe, A. E., and Lindeberg, E., 2005, Reservoir geology of the Utsira Formation at the first industrial-scale underground CO<sub>2</sub> storage site (Sleipner area, North Sea) in: *Geological Storage for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction*, S. Baines, J. Gale and R.J. Worden, ed., Special Publication of the Geological Society, London, 233, pp. 165-180.