Non-Isothermal Flow of CO₂ in Injection Wells: Evaluation of Different Injection Modes
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Abstract: Injection conditions of CO₂ at the wellhead may play a major role on the flow behavior through the wellbore. The density and the injection rate reached at the bottomhole are key factors affecting the performance and efficiency of CO₂ geological storage. In this work a model of non-isothermal flow of CO₂ in injection wells is developed in Comsol and used to assess different injection strategies.
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1. Introduction

During the injection of carbon dioxide (CO₂), the fluid density within the injection pipe could vary significantly along the well in response to pressure and temperature variations, thus affecting the CO₂ injection rate at the reservoir depth (Figure 1). Among other reasons, understanding the behavior of CO₂ flow through injection and monitoring wells is crucial because: (i) CO₂ flow through the injection wells is the linking step between transport and storage (Nimtz et al., 2010; Pan and Oldenburg, 2014); (ii) the adopted injection strategy may affect significantly the energy consumption and efficiency of CO₂ geological storage (Vilarrasa et al., 2013); (iii) design and control of the operation both at pilot and industrial scale.

Flow of CO₂ in non-isothermal wells involves solving the partial differential equations (PDE) that express energy, mass and momentum conservation. These PDEs are coupled through equations of state (EOS) governing fluid and thermodynamic properties (Lu and Connell, 2008; Han et al., 2010; Pan et al., 2011; Sponagle et al., 2011).

In the present work, a one-dimensional (1D) model for non-isothermal single-phase flow of CO₂ through injection wells is developed in Comsol Multiphysics and applied to evaluate different injection modes and hypothetical CO₂ injection scenarios.

2. Methodology

The methodology used to implement in Comsol the present 1D non-isothermal single-phase flow of CO₂ in injection wells, follows the approach of Lu and Connell (2014), in which the flow equations are based on the averaged-flow model (Hasan and Kabir, 2002).

2.1 Governing Equations

Flow of CO₂, or any fluid, and its mixtures in non-isothermal wells involves solving the PDE that express energy, mass and momentum conservation. The governing equations are derived from a general form for two-phase flow, here applied to the specific case of single-phase flow (e.g., pure gas or liquid). With the transient terms included, the governing equations describing non-isothermal one-dimensional flow in wells can be expressed as follows:

\[
\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho \dot{v}}{\partial z} + \dot{v} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial z} = 0 \tag{1}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \dot{v}}{\partial t} + \dot{v} \frac{\partial \dot{v}}{\partial z} + \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial z} = -f \frac{\dot{v}^2}{2d} + g \sin \theta \tag{2}
\]
\[ \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} + \frac{v}{\partial z} - \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial t} + \frac{v}{\partial t} + v^2 = -v \sin \theta - \frac{\pi d q(z,t)}{\rho A} \] (3)

In equations (1-3), \( t \) is time and \( z \) denotes the one-dimensional coordinate along the length of the wellbore. Length is used instead of depth in terms of the \( z \)-coordinate, because the injection tubing may include horizontal or inclined sections. \( v \) is the average velocity, \( p \) is the pressure, \( h \) is the specific enthalpy of CO\(_2\), \( g \) is the gravity, \( \theta \) is the inclination angle of the wellbore, \( d \) is the internal diameter of the injection tubing, \( A = \pi d^2/4 \) is the cross section area, \( f \) denotes the Moody friction factor and \( q \) is the heat exchange flux between the fluid and its surroundings (wellbore and formation), which here is described by \( q(z) = -\pi d U \cdot (T - T^\infty(z)) \), where \( U \) is the overall-heat-transfer coefficient for wellbores, \( T \) is the CO\(_2\) temperature and \( T^\infty(z) \) describes the distribution of the formation temperature along the injection well. On the other hand, \( h \) is expressed as a function of \( p \) and \( T \) using thermodynamics (Lu and Connell, 2014)

\[ dh = C_p (dT - \eta dP) \] (4)

where \( C_p \) is the specific heat of CO\(_2\) at constant pressure, and \( \eta = T \left( \frac{\partial V}{\partial T} \right) \) is the Joule-Thompson coefficient (\( V \) denotes the molar volume of CO\(_2\)). Eq. (4) is used to express Eq. (3) in terms of \( T \) as state variable instead of \( h \).

### 2.2 Boundary and initial conditions

Two typical operating conditions at the wellhead are flowrate-controlled and pressure-controlled injection, respectively. For flowrate-controlled injection, a Dirichlet boundary condition is set at the inlet specifying \( p, T \) and \( v \), while at the bottomhole no boundary is considered. For pressure-controlled injection a boundary condition relating the flowrate and the reservoir pressure at the bottom of the well can be specified as

\[ v = PI(p - p_R)A \quad z = L \] (5)

where \( L \) is the well length, \( PI \) stands for the local well productivity index and \( p_R \) is the local reservoir pressure.

It is assumed that the CO\(_2\) is initially static in the well at a uniform injection temperature and a pressure distribution given by hydrostatic and the pressure injection at the wellhead.

### 2.3 Constitutive relationships

As far as fluid properties are concerned, density and heat capacity of CO\(_2\) were calculated according to the Redlich-Kwong EOS (Redlich and Kwong, 1949) using the parameters proposed by Spycher et al. (2003). Viscosity was calculated according to the correlation of Altunin and Sakhabetdinov (1972). The friction factor was computed considering both laminar and turbulent flow. The last was calculated according to the Zigrang and Sylvester (1985) correlation, assuming a rugosity of the injection pipe equal to 0.36 mm.

### 2.4 Implementation in Comsol

The model equations were implemented in Comsol through the coefficient’s form of the PDE module with multiple dependent variables

\[ e_s \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} + d_s \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot (c \nabla u + \alpha u - \gamma) + \beta \cdot \nabla u + au = f \] (6)

where \( u = (p, v, T)^T \), \( e_s = c = \alpha = 0 \), \( \gamma = 0 \) and

\[ d_s = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial p}{\partial p} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1/\rho_0 - \eta & v & C_p \end{pmatrix} \] (7a)

\[ \beta = \begin{pmatrix} v \frac{\partial p}{\partial p} & \rho & 0 \\ 1/\rho & v & 0 \\ -v \eta & v^2 & v C_p \end{pmatrix} \] (7b)

\[ a = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -f_p v/2 d & 0 \\ 0 & -g \sin \theta & 4 U_\infty/p d \end{pmatrix} \] (7c)
All constitutive relationships were implemented as local equations by using Comsol variables. The domain was discretized considering a uniform mesh of 1000 elements. Stationary and time-dependent studies were defined to solve the problem in steady state and transient. In both cases the system of equations (6) was solved with a fully coupled Newton-Raphson iteration scheme.

3. Injection modes

Seven simulations were run to study different CO₂ injection conditions at the wellhead: gas, gas and liquid near the critical point (CP), supercritical (SC) (8 and 10 MPa), liquid at high \( p \) and \( T \), liquid at low \( p \) and \( T \) (Table 1 and Figure 2). The energy consumption due to surface conditioning operations varies for each injection mode and can be roughly estimated by the difference of specific enthalpy between wellhead and storage vessel conditions (Vilarrasa et al., 2013). Table 1 shows the energy consumption for each injection mode (storage vessel at 2.0 MPa and -20 ºC; injection flowrate of 1.0 kg/s). It is higher when injecting CO₂ in gas-phase, near critical and SC conditions at the wellhead. On the contrary, injecting CO₂ in liquid-phase reduces substantially the energy consumption because pumping/compression is easier and heating is minor.

![Figure 2. CO₂ phase diagram: pipeline transportation is done in liquid conditions and geological storage stays in supercritical conditions. Color dots and numbers represent 7 injection conditions at the top of the well (Table 1) (VC stands for vessel conditions).](image)

![Figure 3. Fluctuating CO₂ injection regime.](image)

Two additional simulations were run to study the effect of injecting SC CO₂ at 8.0 MPa and 40 ºC (Table 1): (i) with variable flowrate and (ii) under pressure-controlled injection. In (i) a fluctuating injection regime is defined by a piecewise function in Comsol (Figure 3), such that the total mass of injected CO₂ during 100
days is equal to the mass injected at a constant rate of 1.0 kg/s in the same period (8640 ton of CO₂). In (ii), the well productivity index is set at 6x10⁻⁷ m s⁻¹ N⁻¹ and the reservoir pressure in the near-field of the well is assumed to increase in time due to CO₂ injection according to the evolution depicted in Figure 4. This \( p_R \) increase was defined in Comsol by using a piecewise cubic interpolation function.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Different wellhead conditions

Figure 5 shows the temperature, pressure, velocity and density profiles obtained in steady state for each injection mode. Injecting gaseous CO₂ causes very low densities through the wellbore. CO₂ injection in gaseous near the CP and SC (8 MPa) conditions increase density but at the bottom this is still lower than 600 kg/m³. By contrast, injecting liquid near the CP and SC (10 MPa) conditions lead to higher bottomhole densities, comparable to those reached by injecting liquid CO₂. Higher CO₂ densities are advantageous because they are closer to the density of the resident brine, which reduce buoyancy effects in the reservoir and the potential risks of caprock failure and subsequent CO₂ leakages.

Secondly, transient simulations reveal that steady state is reached faster by injecting at higher pressures. In particular, steady state flow conditions are obtained after 1 hour when injecting SC CO₂ at the wellhead (Figure 6). On the contrary, operational equilibrium is reached only after 100 days by injecting gaseous or liquid CO₂ at low pressure (Figure 7).
4.2 Fluctuating CO₂ injection

Injecting CO₂ at variable flowrate can help to increase considerably the density of CO₂ at the bottomhole. Figure 8 shows that an average density increase of about 18% is obtained at the bottomhole (compare Figure 8b and d), despite there are periods in which CO₂ heating due to the friction within the injection pipe can induce a notorious density reduction (Figure 8c and d). Nevertheless, it has been demonstrated that a fluctuating injection regime can enhance CO₂ dissolution into the resident brine of the storage.
aquifer (Hidalgo and Carrera, 2009). Therefore, the present simulation shows that this injection mode has the double advantage of reducing the pressure within the reservoir and improving the efficiency of CO$_2$ storage.

Figure 8. Temperature and density evolution under constant (a, b) and fluctuating (c, d) injection regime.

4.3 Pressure-controlled injection

Pressure-controlled injection may be more realistic operating conditions. Even more, it provides a way for coupling models for CO$_2$ flow through the well and multiphase flow and transport of CO$_2$ through the geological formations (reservoir and caprock). Nevertheless, pressure-controlled injection causes variable mass injection flowrates, which can reduce substantially the efficiency of storage. A comparison between the steady state $p$, $v$, $T$, and $\rho$ profiles obtained under flowrate-controlled injection and pressure-controlled injection with a constant reservoir pressure of 10 MPa is presented in Figure 9. Due to the lower heating (Figure 9a) and the higher pressures (Figure 9b) developed through the injection string, the CO$_2$ density increases significantly under pressure-controlled injection (Figure 9d). However, the higher density is compensated by a reduction of the injected mass of CO$_2$. The velocities decrease in more than one order of magnitude (Figure 9c), which results in a total injected mass of CO$_2$ of about 1322 ton in 100 days.

The situation is even worse when considering the effect of a dynamic reservoir pressure. The increase of the reservoir pressure due to the evolution of a CO$_2$–rich phase within the storage formation reduces the injection rate (Eq. 5).

Figure 9. Flowrate-controlled versus pressure-controlled ($p_R = 10$ MPa) injection: temperature (a), pressure (b), velocity (c), and density (d) profiles in steady state. CO$_2$ is injected SC at 40 ºC and 8 MPa.

For the assumed $p_R$ increase (Figure 4), the total mass of CO$_2$ injected in 100 days is now about 980 ton. In contrast, the CO$_2$ densities through the injection well are substantially increased (Figure 10d), as a consequence of the stronger cooling of the well (Figure 10a). This is due to the lower velocities (Figure 10c) that allow CO$_2$ to exchange heat with the surrounding for longer times. In fact, the CO$_2$ temperature approaches the geothermal gradient quickly, such that after 10 days there is a temperature difference of only 1 ºC between them in most of the wellbore (Figure 10a).

Figure 10. Flowrate-controlled (dashed line) versus pressure-controlled injection with variable $p_R$ (solid line). Evolution of temperature (a), pressure (b), velocity (c), and density (d) profiles. CO$_2$ is injected SC at 40 ºC and 8 MPa.
5. Conclusions

A 1D model for non-isothermal single-phase flow of CO\textsubscript{2} through injection wells has been implemented in Comsol. This implementation can be used for the assessment of several injection modes. In particular, the simulations performed in this work allowed to compare different operating conditions at the wellhead, which can represent hypothetical scenarios of CO\textsubscript{2} pre-conditioning at surface.

The results show that wellhead conditions of CO\textsubscript{2} below the critical point cause low fluid densities through the injection pipe. Conversely, injecting liquid CO\textsubscript{2} or CO\textsubscript{2} at high pressure helps to increase the density at the bottomhole, which has added benefits for the efficiency and security of the geological storage. Moreover, steady state is reached faster by injecting at higher pressures. Higher densities at the bottomhole can also be achieved by a fluctuating injection regime, which also has the advantage of enhancing the CO\textsubscript{2} storage efficiency. Pressure-controlled injection may also induce high densities as well, although at a reduced injected mass of CO\textsubscript{2}.

It is concluded that CO\textsubscript{2} injection conditions should be tuned considering a balance between optimal storage densities and the stability of the operation. The present model could also be used to determine operating conditions leading to undesired blowout episodes.
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