



From EOR to 'E²R' Sequestering CO₂ while reducing dependence on imported oil

Philip M. Marston

Attorney, Marston Law
(www.marstonlaw.com)

*Some men see things as they are
and say why? I dream things that
never were and say why not?*

– R F Kennedy (based on G B Shaw)

The world today: EOR using geologically-occurring CO₂

CO₂-based enhanced oil recovery operations (CO₂-EOR) play an important role in re-establishing oil production from “depleted” fields. Begun in the early 1970s, by 2010 CO₂-EOR production accounted for about five to six per cent of total US domestic oil production – more than five times as much as in 1988. The technique works by injecting CO₂ into an old field where the CO₂ acts as a kind of solvent, allowing the oil to flow again to a production well. The process requires vast quantities of CO₂. Current EOR operations in the US require the injection of around 50 million metric tons of additional CO₂ each year,¹ using more than 7,000 CO₂ production and injection wells.²

During EOR operations, the CO₂ diffuses through the pores of the rock and mixes with the oil, causing the oil droplets to swell. This reduces surface tension and allows the oil to detach from the rock, much as hot water works better than cold water in detaching grease from dirty dishes. The CO₂ and water flow towards the zone of lower pressure that is created by a producing well and up the wellbore to the surface where the oil is separated from the CO₂ and transported to market. The CO₂ is dehydrated, re-compressed and then re-injected into the formation to repeat the cycle. In the right formations, CO₂-based EOR allows production of an additional 10 to 20 per cent or more of the original oil in place – but still leaves about one-third to one-half of the oil in the ground, together with injected CO₂.

The annual value of the CO₂ injected for EOR operations today appears to be in excess of US\$1.25 billion and the value of the oil produced in the order of US\$8.25 billion.³ While producers endeavor to re-cycle as much of the valuable CO₂ as possible, the CO₂ gradually fills in the pore space previously occupied by the oil. Over time, the producing wells begin to produce more recycled CO₂ and less oil until eventually (after a productive period typically measured in decades), the field reaches an economic limit and is again deemed depleted. The wells are sealed, at which point the CO₂ is trapped in the same geologic formation that had contained the oil for millions of years. In effect, it has simply been moved from one geologic storage site to another, while liberating vast quantities of otherwise unrecoverable oil in the process.

About 90 per cent of the CO₂ used in EOR operations today comes from geological formations. Current geological resources of CO₂ in the US are in the order of nine billion metric tons (i.e. nine gigatons)⁴ with annual deliveries for EOR of some 45 to 50 million metric tons.⁵

However, current CO₂ supplies are fully committed and cannot meet existing demand, much less future demand for increased oil production. The CO₂ supply shortfall to the Permian Basin as of mid-2010 has been estimated to be on the order of six million metric tons per year.⁶

Enhancing EOR with emission reduction benefits: moving from EOR to “E²R”

Merely transferring CO₂ from one subsurface storage site to another does nothing to reduce atmospheric emissions of CO₂ from power plants or industrial facilities. But substituting anthropogenic CO₂ that is captured from emitting facilities – providing the “storage” component for “carbon capture and storage” – will reduce CO₂ emissions while it increases supplies of domestic oil. The economic benefit of enhanced oil recovery is thus further enhanced with the environmental benefit of reduced CO₂ emissions. The term “E²R” captures this two-fold enhancement of producing oil from previously “depleted” fields by injecting captured, anthropogenic CO₂ that is sequestered during the oil production. In short, in the world to come, EOR can become E²R: *use of captured anthropogenic CO₂ in enhanced oil recovery operations in place of geologically-occurring CO₂.*

From the standpoint of ultimate storage during oil recovery operations, the origin of the CO₂ makes no difference (so long as any impurities introduced into the CO₂ stream during the capture process are removed). There are some key differences, however, between sequestering any CO₂ stream in non-oil producing operations (such as injections in a saline formation) as compared to E²R sequestration. CO₂ injection during EOR or E²R operations presents a lower and more-controlled subsurface pressure profile than injections into a non-oil producing formation. During oil production, oil, water and CO₂ are being removed from the reservoir through the production wells throughout the productive life of the field, precluding the pressure build-up that characterizes injections in a non-oil producing sequestration project. In addition, because the oil producing wells create a zone of lower pressure into which the mix of oil, water and CO₂ will flow, the movement of the CO₂ in the subsurface from injection to production well is far more predictable than where the CO₂ has to be injected into the rock formation at pressures sufficient to continuously push the CO₂ plume away from the injection well (because there is no zone of lower pressure into which it is drawn). And of course an oil-producing formation will almost by definition have structural or stratigraphic traps that held the oil in place for millions of years and similarly provide natural bounds for CO₂ storage.

The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has already recognized that sequestration of injected CO₂ occurs during EOR operation and has recognized the lower risk profile presented by EOR operations. EPA has also recognized, however, the absence of measurement, documentation, or verification of the specific quantities of CO₂ that remain geologically sequestered during EOR operations (as well as the importance of proper site characterization and the concern over potential CO₂ migration up through old well bores).⁷

Efforts are now underway in the US to remedy that documentary gap, however, by developing protocols for measuring, documenting and verifying the quantities of anthropogenic CO₂ that remain sequestered in geological formations during EOR operations, taking into account the fact that injected CO₂ is recycled and that some of the CO₂ may be moved from one geological formation to another as EOR operations evolve. Once these protocols are implemented, it will be possible to separately account for the quantities of anthropogenic CO₂ that are permanently sequestered even when those supplies are physically commingled with supplies of CO₂ that have been produced from geological formations.

Generally accepted protocols for accounting and verifying anthropogenic CO₂ sequestered during E²R operations are an essential predicate for deploying CCS technology. They will be crucial to the success of early mover demonstration projects because the project developers will be required to show the long-term, secure sequestration of the captured CO₂. For example, about 75 per cent of the CO₂ that would be captured from the ten "first-mover" CCS demonstration projects selected by the US Department of Energy for federal support – over 12 million metric tons per year – is planned to be used in EOR projects.⁸ At an assumed price of just US\$14.30/metric ton, the output of these first mover projects could generate something on the order of US\$4.3 billion in revenue over a

twenty-five period.⁹ This is US\$4.3 billion more than would be available to emitters who develop a comparable set of otherwise identical projects to inject captured CO₂ into non-oil producing formations. The revenue from sale of the incremental barrels of domestic oil would amount to many times more. The non-E²R project developers would presumably have to pay a disposal fee in comparison.

Conversely, failure to implement such accounting and verification protocols to properly account for sequestered CO₂ captured from these anthropogenic sources could eliminate many billions of dollars that would otherwise be devoted to reducing CO₂ emissions. and thus seriously delay deployment of CCS technology.

Similarly, any increased cost or uncertainty associated with using anthropogenic CO₂ in E²R operations would make captured anthropogenic CO₂ less desirable to the oil producer than naturally-occurring CO₂ even though the two supply streams are physically interchangeable. In that case, EOR operators may avoid using captured CO₂ for enhanced oil recovery operations at all. Indeed, there might be an actual incentive to prevent *any* CO₂ supplier from introducing anthropogenic CO₂ into the supply mix if the result were higher costs or increased regulatory uncertainty for the rest of the operation. Such a result would be counterproductive from the standpoint of encouraging geologic sequestration of captured CO₂ to reduce atmosphere emissions.

In the United States, where there is significant demand for more CO₂ for oil production, the future of CCS is plainly E²R. Failure to put the necessary steps in place for transitioning from EOR to E²R will seriously stunt the deployment of CCS technology, regardless of federal research, development and deployment initiatives.

¹ *Final rule: Federal Requirements Under the Underground Injection Control (UIC) Program for Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) Geologic Sequestration (GS) Wells*, 75 Fed. Reg. 77230, at 77244. (10 December 2010) (the "EPA Class VI rule").

² *Oil and Gas Journal*, Vol 108 (19 April 2010), "Special Report: EOR/Heavy Oil Survey: 2010 worldwide EOR survey" (Table "C" showing 10,121 CO₂ producing wells and 6,955 CO₂ injection wells in US) (http://www.ogj.com/index/article-display/2122881039/articles/oil-gas-journal/volume-108/issue-14/technology/special-report__eor.html) (subscription required). See also Markus G. Puder & John A. Veil, Argonne Nat'l Lab., *Evaluation of State and Regional Resource needs to Manage Carbon Sequestration Through Injection* (2007) (<http://www.gwpc.org/e-library/documents/co2/Argonne%20Report%20CO2%20Resources.pdf>).

³ *Estimates for value of CO₂ based on price estimates in A Policy, Legal, and Regulatory Evaluation of the Feasibility of a National Pipeline Infrastructure for the Transport and Storage of Carbon Dioxide*, (31 December 2010) (report prepared for the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission and the Southern States Energy Board and funded in part by the US Department of Energy). Estimate for value of oil production based on price of \$80/bbl and oil production from CO₂-EOR of 283,000 bbl/d per the 2010 O&GJ Survey).

⁴ CO₂ reserve estimate based on R. Allis, T. Chidsey W. Gwynn, C. Morgan, S. White M. Adams, & J. Moore, *Natural CO₂ Reservoirs on the Colorado Plateau and Southern Rocky Mountains: Candidates for CO₂ Sequestration*, paper presented at the First National Conference on Carbon Sequestration (2001) (available at http://www.netl.doe.gov/publications/proceedings/01/carbon_seq/6a2.pdf) and Denbury Resources Inc., 2010 Form 10-K.

⁵ *Advanced Resources International, Inc. and Melzer Consulting, Optimization of CO₂ Storage in CO₂ Enhanced Oil Recovery Projects* (30 November 2010), report prepared for the UK Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) (Office of Carbon Capture & Storage), at 6 (Table 1).

⁶ *Id.*, at 11. See also at 10, Figure 5, "CO₂ Supply and Demand in the Permian Basin").

⁷ EPA Class VI Rule, 75 Fed. Reg. 77230, at 77244.

⁸ See Table V-2: *Planned DOE CCS Demonstration Projects, Report of the Interagency Task Force on Carbon Capture and Storage* (August 2010), at 88-89 (Obama Administration task force on barriers to deployment of CCS).

⁹ 12 million tonnes per year times \$14.30/tonne times 25 years equals \$4.29 billion.