Energy 139 (2017) 1094-1110

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Energy

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/energy

CO₂ injection-induced fracturing in naturally fractured shale rocks

Lei Wang ^{a, *, 1}, Bowen Yao ^{a, 1}, Haojun Xie ^{a, b}, Philip H. Winterfeld ^a, Timothy J. Kneafsey ^c, Xiaolong Yin ^a, Yu-Shu Wu ^a

^a Petroleum Engineering Department, Colorado School of Mines, USA

^b College of Petroleum Engineering, China University of Petroleum (East China), China

^c Energy Geosciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 20 March 2017 Received in revised form 11 July 2017 Accepted 8 August 2017 Available online 9 August 2017

Keywords: Supercritical CO₂ Injection-induced fracturing Shale Natural fracture True tri-axial stress Breakdown pressure

ABSTRACT

Niobrara shale cubes of 20 cm from Colorado were employed to investigate gas and supercritical CO_2 injection-induced fracturing in naturally fractured caprocks of deep aquifers/depleted reservoirs and fractured shale reservoirs. Under tri-axial stresses, gas or supercritical CO_2 was injected into the center of the cubes to induce fracturing. Real-time pressure and temperature, acoustic wave, pressure decay, fracture coloring, and gas fracturing were used to characterize the fracturing process and fracture morphology. Without pore pressure, CO_2 injection-induced fracturing occurred and completed instantly, accompanied by an evident temperature drop. Strongly bonded fractures barely affected transverse fracture propagation, whereas weakly bonded or open fractures arrested the injected fluid first and then allowed it to generate new fractures using gas and supercritical CO_2 are much lower than both poroelastic predictions and slick-water fracturing pressure, and some are even lower than the minimum horizontal stress. This is attributed to unconformable preexisting fractures and the low viscosity of CO_2 . Moreover, decreasing tri-axial stress levels and increasing stress differences tend to lower the breakdown pressure. This study is instructive for understanding and tackling geomechanical issues related to CO_2 geological storage and fracturing of shale reservoirs.

© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

In reducing anthropologic CO₂ emission from power plants and other industrial applications, a series of technologies for carbon capture, utilization, and storage (CCUS) have been developed and implemented during the past half century [1]. CO₂ capture can be carried out during different stages of the fuel combustion as precombustion, oxy-fuel combustion, and post-combustion processes [2]. And several capture techniques have been successfully applied in coal-fired power plants, such as the solvent adsorption process for capturing CO₂ from flue gas using amine compounds [48]. Lately, more high-efficiency CO₂ capture sorbents have been found and systematically investigated, for example, the K_2CO_3/Al_2O_3 sorbent possessing fast reaction and high carbonation conversion rate with respect to CO₂ in flue gas [3,4]. After capture, CO₂ is generally separated and sorbents are regenerated. Then, utilization

E-mail address: lwang@mines.edu (L. Wang).

¹ The first two authors contributed equally to this study.

and storage are two different destinations for the captured CO₂, the former treats CO₂ as a feed stock for synthesizing new chemicals and producing fuels, or an environmentally friendly vehicle for enhanced oil/gas recovery [5], while the latter compresses, transports, and injects CO₂ into a proper geological site for long-term sequestration [6]. It is obvious that utilization provides beneficial options of turning CO₂ into high-demand products or entering life cycles of different industrial applications, whereas storage is only an unprofitable fate for captured CO₂ requiring additional pipeline construction, well drilling, and energy consumption [7,8]. Nonetheless, most utilization options do not have sufficient capacity to mitigate CO₂ emission and are temporary regarding the life cycles of the products. Geological sequestration and storage in deep saline aquifers and oil and gas reservoirs, on the other hand, is a permanent solution with enormous capacity and worldwide availability, though accompanied by leakage risk [9–11]. On sites overlapping with oil and gas fields, abundant surface/subsurface facilities and geological features can be exploited, and the whole process could even be more practical and economical provided the CO₂ enhanced oil recovery benefit. For safe and permanent CO₂ geological storage,





^{*} Corresponding author.

the caprock overlying the storage formation should be intact and integrated so that CO_2 can be effectively trapped without escape. In addition, the subsurface plumes of sequestrated CO_2 should be continuously monitored to ensure that containment is provided. These are not only technological prerequisites but also required by federal laws and regulations, e.g. in the United States.

1.1. Exemplary CO₂ geological storage projects

In recent years, several field-scale CO₂ storage projects have been implemented around the world, for example, the injection in the Sleipner offshore field in the North Sea of Norway [12] and the injection in In Salah field in Algeria [13,14]. Both of these projects inject CO₂ separated from the produced natural gas stream; the difference is that the Sleipner project injects CO₂ into a ~250 m thick sandstone aquifer (Utsira formation) above the gas reservoir [12], while the In Salah project injects CO_2 into the ~20 m thick brine-saturated flank of the gas reservoir [15]. The Sleipner project started in September 1996 and until June 2016, about 16.2 million tons of CO₂ had been sequestered. The caprock of the Utsira formation is considered effective in sealing so that the injection is still ongoing [16]. The In Salah project started in 2004, in total, over 3.8 million tons of CO₂ had been sequestered until its suspension in June 2011, out of concern over the integrity of the ~150 m sublayer right above the storage formation. But the sealing integrity of the other ~800 m caprock above this sublayer is not thought to be impaired [17]. The permeability ranges of Sleipner and In Salah injection zones are 1–3 Darcy [18] and 1–100 milli-Darcy [13], respectively. Together with the big difference in thickness, the In Salah storage formation is more geomechanically susceptible given the reported amount of injected CO₂, which has been verified by rate- and pressure-correlated microseismic events [19], surface lifts from satellite-based geodetic measurements [20], coupled geomechanics and fluid flow simulation [14], etc. Note that the injection pressure in In Salah storage formation is around 300 bar and the bottom hole temperature is about 40 °C lower than the formation temperature of 93 °C [21], both above the supercritical point (1070.4 psi and 31.0 °C) of CO₂ [22]. Though lacking field data with high confidence renders the interpretations difficult, it is generally believed that fracturing was induced in the ~150 m caprock sublayer containing preexisting fractures by high-pressure CO₂ injection [13,15].

By means of numerical simulation, several studies tried to evaluate the fracturing processes induced during CO₂ injection into storage formations (e.g. [23-25]). Huang et al. [26] set preexisting fractures in storage reservoirs to simulate supercritical (sc) CO₂ injection pressure responses for monitoring purposes by coupling thermal, hydraulic, and mechanical processes. They suggested that installing downhole pressure gauges should be useful to quantify scCO₂ leakage pathways and rates, and that increasing the injection rate slowly would reduce the caprock rock failure risks. In laboratory, studies on scCO₂ induced fracturing processes are limited. Ishida et al. [27,28] and Chen et al. [29] injected scCO₂ into 17 cm granite cubes under tri-axial stresses and observed that scCO₂ created more tortuous and branched fractures with lower breakdown pressures than oil and water of higher viscosity. Under simple tri-axial stress conditions, Li et al. [30] fractured cylindrical Green River shale samples and obtained marginally more complex fracture patterns with CO₂ than water. Zhang et al. [31] recently conducted water, liquid CO₂, and scCO₂ fracturing on 20 cm shale cubes obtained from the outcrop of the Lower Silurian Longmaxi Formation in Sichuan Basin, China. Their experiments demonstrated that the breakdown pressure of the shale samples decreased significantly with the decreasing fluid viscosity, and specifically that of scCO₂ fracturing was about half of that of water fracturing. In addition, the scCO₂ induced fractures are more irregular and have more small cracks than hydraulic fractures. In consideration of shale or mudstone caprocks with preexisting faults and fractures, there are quite a few discussions regarding fault reactivation and seismicity triggering [32,33]. However, scCO₂ injection-induced fracturing processes and mechanisms are still not very clear, particularly direct experimental observations on real caprocks are very rare.

1.2. Hydraulic fracture initiation

Hydraulic fracturing processes have been widely investigated with conventional reservoir rocks or analogs. In general, the factors that affect fracture initiation in homogeneous reservoir rocks mainly include *in-situ* (confining) stress, fracturing fluid pressure [34], fluid leak off, tensile strength, and other rock properties [35], which can be correlated to the fracture initiation pressure by the following equations at different conditions.

When no fluid leak off is assumed, the fracture initiation or breakdown pressure can be calculated by Hubbert and Willis [34].

$$P_b = 3\sigma_h - \sigma_H + \sigma_t - P_p \tag{1}$$

where σ_h and σ_H are the minimum and maximum horizontal stresses, respectively; σ_t is the tensile strength of the reservoir rock, and P_p is the pore pressure.

If the reservoir rock is permeable, then the fracture initiation pressure can be obtained from Haimson and Fairhurst [35] and Detournay and Cheng [36].

$$P_{b} = \frac{3\sigma_{h} - \sigma_{H} + \sigma_{t} - \alpha(1 - 2\nu)/(1 - \nu) \cdot P_{p}}{2 - \alpha(1 - 2\nu)/(1 - \nu)}$$
(2)

where α is Biot's constant and v is Poisson's ratio.

Ideally within homogeneous reservoirs, hydraulic fracturing is dominated by *in-situ* stress and fractures typically initiate perpendicular to the minimum horizontal stress direction. Nonetheless, actual reservoir heterogeneity, wellbore perforations, well orientation relative to principal stresses, and so on can all alter the local stress distribution, and the direction of fracture initiation.

1.3. Hydraulic fracture propagation

Compared to fracture initiation, propagation is less susceptible to the restrained local stress alternation. During fracture propagation, the fracture planes should be perpendicular to the minimum horizontal stress, as has been verified by many theoretical and experimental investigations ([34]; Hanson et al., 1980). Given a sensible difference between the maximum and minimum horizontal stresses, the fracture plane always turns to be perpendicular to the minimum horizontal stress as it propagates into the reservoir, even though the initiation direction might be different [37].

Hydraulic fracture propagation pressure is generally lower than the initiation pressure, depending on the stress states near the fracture tip and the fluid pressure inside it. Linear elasticity shows that there exists a critical stress intensity factor K_{lc} for Mode I fracturing of a material [38].

$$K_{lc} = \sqrt{\frac{2E\gamma}{1-v^2}}$$
(3)

where *E* is Young's modulus and γ is the specific surface energy.

 K_{lc} , as a material constant, can either be measured experimentally or calculated theoretically [49]. When the actual stress intensity factor exceeds K_{lc} , fracture is expected to propagate. For a fracture in 2D geometries, the intensity factor is

$$\mathbf{K}_{I} = \left(P_{f} - \sigma_{\mathrm{h}}\right) \sqrt{\pi L_{f}} \tag{4}$$

where P_f is the fluid pressure in the fracture tip and L_f is the fracture half length.

And for a circular fracture in 3D geometries, the intensity factor is

$$K_I = \frac{2}{\pi} \left(P_f - \sigma_h \right) \sqrt{\pi R_f}$$
(5)

where R_f is the fracture radius [39].

Combining Eqs. (3) and (5), one can easily obtain the fracturing fluid pressure needed for propagating a fracture in homogeneous reservoir rocks. Obviously, the required pressure is a function of σ_h , fracture mode and size, and rock properties. Specifically, it increases with increasing σ_h and decreasing fracture size. Note that fluid leak off that reduces the intensity factor is not considered in Eqs. (4) and (5). Eqs. (3)–(5) are only applicable for intact and homogeneous reservoir rocks, but as a matter of fact, reservoir rocks are mostly heterogeneous and contain numerous fractures.

1.4. Effect of preexisting fractures on hydraulic fracturing

Naturally, most geological formations experienced complex sedimentary processes, tectonic activities, diagenetic evolution, reservoir pressure changes, and so on. Thus, rock properties of sublayers are generally different from each other, and faults and fractures are ubiquitous in geological formations at different scales [50,51]. In addition, considering CO₂ storage in oil and gas reservoirs, pressure depletion due to production generally results in subsidence of the overburden formations, which could result in disintegration or fracturing of the caprocks over conventional reservoirs. In unconventional reservoirs, besides the natural fractures, hydraulic fractures are often created for improving hydrocarbon recovery by injecting fracturing fluids.

The preexisting faults, fractures, and weak layer interfaces could have a strong influence on the hydraulic fracture propagation in real situations such that the propagating fractures could either be inhibited, promoted, arrested, or reoriented in terms of the bonding strength and orientation of the fractures or interfaces. Strong bonding interfaces not parallel to the fracture propagation will increase the fracturing pressure, and eventually allow the fractures to propagate through them [52]. Weakly bonded fractures, if in coincidence with the orientation of fracture extension, will facilitate the hydraulic fracture propagation. Weakly bonded fractures not parallel to the fracture extension will probably arrest the fracture propagation [53]. Nonetheless, given increasing hydraulic pressure, fractures reoriented along the weakly bonded interface could again return to the original orientation dominated by the *insitu* stresses.

Therefore, to optimize the practical operations in the field, discussing the presence of preexisting fractures during scCO₂ injection is inevitable and meaningful. At present, there are very few investigations that target the effect of preexisting fractures on scCO₂ injection-induced fracturing of caprocks, i.e. shale or mudstone.

In this study, we acquired shale rock chunks from the CEMEX Lyons cement plant, where the Niobrara shale outcrop is excavated as a raw material to manufacture Portland cement. From the submeter scale chunks, we have cut five 20 cm shale cubes, within which natural or preexisting fractures were observed. For some of the shale cubes, visible natural fractures or interfaces were bonded with epoxy. In total, three types of shale cubes with preexisting fractures of different bonding strength were prepared: a) Natural calcite-filled or strongly bonded fractures, b) Preexisting open/ unbonded fractures, c) Weakly epoxy bonded fractures. By varying the tri-axial stresses, we injected CO₂ into four shale samples and slick-water into one sample to investigate the initiation, propagation, patterns, and morphology of injection-induced fractures.

2. Shale sample preparation

All shale samples were cut nearly perpendicular to the bedding planes, and boreholes were drilled 11.43 cm deep with the diameter of 1.78 cm vertically into the bedding architecture in the z-stress direction from the center of the top face (Fig. 1). Afterwards, an L-shape casing with outer diameter of 1.27 cm was bonded into the borehole using high-strength cold weld 2-part epoxy, leaving a 5.08 cm long uncased/open hole bottom section in the center of the cubic shale samples.

Shale sample 1, shown in Fig. 1, has distinguishable laminations with two major horizontal interfaces appearing on faces 1–4. Also, there are two white calcite-filled/strongly bonded vertical fractures which can be seen on faces 1, 3, 5, and 6.

Shale sample 2 has one major horizontal interface, which connects with a nearly vertical fracture on face 2, as shown in Fig. 2 (left). Combining faces 1, 2, and 6, it can be seen that the interface-fracture structure severs a pentahedral corner from the block.

On shale sample 3 in Fig. 2 (right), both high permeability horizontal interfaces and vertical fractures cross through the cube. The white traces and braids on the block faces are foraminifera or Inoceramid shell fragments of relatively large size and small oyster and pelecypod shell fragments deformed during sedimentation [40]. Samples 4 and 5 in Fig. 3 exhibit high permeability according to pressure decay curves. To better imitate varied bonding strength of preexisting fractures and interfaces, we injected epoxy through the borehole to seal these preexisting fractures in shale samples 3-5; epoxy was seen seeping out of several points on the block faces and then injection was stopped. Residual epoxy in the borehole was washed out by rinsing the borehole with acetone 5 times. The epoxy formula has a nominal tensile strength of 1500 psi after setting for 12 h. After injecting the epoxy, we left these three shale samples at room conditions to cure for more than 3 days before any further treatments.



Fig. 1. Unfolded faces of sample 1 before CO_2 injection-induced fracturing. Slightly inclined and horizontal dark lines are preexisting bedding interfaces (black arrows), vertical white stripes are calcite-filled fractures (white arrows), and dark areas are residual stains of water used for color contrast during photographing faces. A thin piece lost from face 6, uneven stress loading was mitigated by using Teflon plate shims during the experiments. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)



Fig. 2. Faces of samples 2 (left) and 3 (right) before CO₂ injection-induced fracturing. Note: the block number (e.g. #2) is on face 1 of each block. Dark lines are preexisting fractures. The loose triangular piece on the upper corners of faces 2, 3, and 5 was attached by high-strength cold weld 2-part epoxy (left). White clusters on sample 3 are deformed shell fragments (right).



Fig. 3. Faces of samples 4 (left) and 5 (right) before injection-induced fracturing. Note: the block number (e.g. #4) is on face 1 of each block. Dark lines are preexisting fractures, dark areas are residual stains of water used for color contrast during photographing faces. White clusters on sample faces are deformed shell fragments (right). (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

3. Experimental procedures

On each of the first four shale samples, we conducted preinjection characterization, CO₂ injection, post-injection characterization, and gas fracturing. Photography, acoustic wave, and pressure decay tests were employed to characterize the shale samples before and after CO₂ injection-induced fracturing. Details of acoustic wave measurements and pressure decay tests can be found in Cha et al. [41] and Wang et al. [42]. Before CO₂ injection, we first pre-heated the shale sample in an oven to 60 °C, which is above the supercritical temperature, then we set up the sample in the tri-axial loading frame [43] with injection pipelines connected. Afterwards, scCO₂ was pumped into the borehole until the sample was fractured. According to the borehole pressure when the samples were fractured, CO₂ in the borehole could be either in supercritical or gas state. After post-injection characterization, dye solution was injected at low pressure to color the induced fractures [44] and finally the samples were broken down by gas fracturing under triaxial stresses to disclose the induced fracture planes [45]. For each shale sample, the experimental procedures slightly varied but generally followed:

- 1. Photograph sample faces,
- 2. Pre-injection acoustic wave measurements,
- 3. Pressure decay under no stress loading using 100 psig nitrogen gas,
- 4. CO₂ injection until the sample is fractured,
- 5. Photograph if induced fractures appear on sample faces,
- 6. Post-injection acoustic wave measurements,
- 7. Pressure decay under no stress loading using 100 psig nitrogen gas,

- 8. Fracture coloring by pressurizing dye solution into the borehole,
- 9. Nitrogen gas fracturing under tri-axial stresses,
- 10. Photograph sample faces and disclosed fracture planes.

4. Results and discussion

Supercritical CO₂ was injected to induce fracturing on four shale samples (#1–4) with borehole temperature above the supercritical temperature, and slick-water was injected to fracture one sample (#5) as a control experiment. The actual borehole pressure, depending on the breakdown point of the samples, was either above or below the supercritical pressure. Thus, these four samples were fractured by either gas CO₂ or scCO₂. Injection rate was adjusted in practical needs for each sample using an ISCO 500D syringe pump. Tri-axial stress loading levels and differences were varied to investigate the effect of *in-situ* stress on the breakdown pressure of CO₂ injection. The preexisting fracture types and the experimental conditions for five shale samples are listed in Table 1.

4.1. Pressure and temperature during scCO₂ injection

Under tri-axial stresses, $scCO_2$ was injected into the borehole and the borehole pressure and temperature were detected by a pressure transducer and a thermocouple in real-time. Tri-axial stresses were maintained at quasi-steady state by occasionally pressurizing air hydraulic pumps. The accuracy of the pressure transducer and thermocouple are $\pm 0.25\%$ and ± 0.5 °C in the experimental measurement range, respectively. The accuracy of pressure readings from the air hydraulic pumps used for tri-axial

Table 1

Experimental conditions of CO₂/slick-water injection for five shale samples.

Shale #	Injected fluid	Tri-axial stresses x:y:z psi	Stress difference psi	Injection rate ml/min	Preexisting fracture types
1	scCO ₂	1600:2100:2600	500	40	calcite-filled, strongly bonded
2	gas CO ₂	1100:1600:2100	500	80	weakly bonded/open fractures
3	scCO ₂	1100:1600:2100	500	80	weakly epoxy bonded
4	gas CO ₂	1200:2100:3000	900	open valve	weakly epoxy bonded
5	slick-water	1100:1600:2100	500	1	weakly epoxy bonded



Fig. 4. Tri-axial stresses for CO₂ injection into shale sample 1.

stress loading is $\pm 0.5\%$. All these experimental parameters were recorded by a data acquisition unit operating at a frequency of two data points per second.

Shale sample 1 was fractured using scCO₂ under tri-axial

stresses of x:y:z = 1600:2100:2600 psi, as shown in Fig. 4. The injection rate was set at a constant rate of 40 ml/min. Fig. 5 presents the pressure and temperature profiles during CO_2 injection into shale sample 1. The breakdown pressure of CO_2 injection is 1300.1



Fig. 5. Borehole pressure (black) and temperature (red) during CO₂ injection into shale sample 1. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)



Fig. 6. Tri-axial stresses for CO₂ injection into sample 2.

psig at 1135.6 s, corresponding to an obvious bump on the x-stress and slight drops on y- and z-stress in Fig. 4, indicating that new fractures were induced against the minimum horizontal stress. The temperature when the sample was fractured was 37.4 °C, then it sharply dropped to 29.4 °C due to scCO₂ leakage through generated fractures and subsequent expansion and vaporization.

Shale sample 2 was treated by injecting CO₂ into borehole under tri-axial stresses of x:y:z = 1100:1600:2100 psi (Fig. 6). The borehole pressure and temperature profiles are shown in Fig. 7. The first peak pressure is 953.6 psig at 191.1 s, achieved by opening the valve to allow scCO₂ to flow and expand from pump to borehole. At this point, the temperature was 46.2 °C. Then the pump was started at 10 ml/min while the borehole pressure kept decreasing rapidly. The pump rate was later increased to 40 ml/min, but the pressure decline rate only slowed down very slightly. Hence, we increased the pump rate to 80 ml/min, which increased the borehole pressure and reached a second peak of 727.2 psig at 907.6 s when the pump ran out of CO₂. The pump was then refilled and heated, during which borehole pressure decreased to 220.4 psig at 1608.6 s. In view of the high pressure decline rate, conductive fractures were present or likely generated and leakage occurred through these fractures. Then, pumping restarted at 80 ml/min, the third peak pressure is 769.3 psig at 1687.6 s. After finishing injecting the second pump of CO₂, the borehole pressure was allowed to decrease until 3000 s. During the whole injection process, there are no obvious responses on tri-axial stress curves in Fig. 6, suggesting that fractures were created along the preexisting fractures or interfaces. At the moments when the first and the third pressure



Fig. 7. Borehole pressure and temperature during CO₂ injection into sample 2.



Fig. 8. Tri-axial stresses for scCO₂ injection into sample 3.

peaks were achieved, borehole temperature showed obvious decreases due to CO_2 leakage and resultant expansion. Since the pressure peaks are below the supercritical pressure of 1070.4 psi, shale sample 2 was fractured by gas CO_2 .

Sample 3 was fractured by injecting $scCO_2$ under a tri-axial loading of x:y:z = 1100:1600:2100 psi (Fig. 8). We injected two cycles of CO₂ to fracture sample 3, corresponding to two pressure peaks in Fig. 9. At the beginning, after opening valve at 608.2 s, the borehole pressure rose to 766.4 psig. The initial injection rate was set at 40 ml/min and the pressure tended to level out. Thereafter the injection rate was increased to 80 ml/min, as $scCO_2$ ran out, the first pressure peak of 1392.5 psig was achieved at 1138.5 s with borehole temperature of 39.7 °C. The pump was refilled and heated, and then injection continued at 80 ml/min. Borehole pressure

reached the second peak of 1109.7 psig at 1722.5 s with borehole temperature of 35.4 °C. On the temperature profile, there are two relatively small drops corresponding to these two injection cycles. However, on the stress profiles no obvious responses showed up, indicating that no big new fractures were created or scCO₂ just leaked off through the preexisting fractures sealed by epoxy.

Sample 4 was treated by injecting CO₂ into borehole under triaxial stresses of x:y:z = 1200:2100:3000 psi, as shown in Fig. 10. The injection pressure and borehole temperature profiles are shown in Fig. 11. After completely opening the valve at 114.6 s, sample 4 was fractured at 804.3 psig with borehole temperature of 54.0 °C. This peak pressure corresponds to a very slight bump on xstress loading in Fig. 10, indicating that the gas CO₂ fracturing primarily occurred along preexisting fracture planes with possible



Fig. 9. Borehole pressure and temperature during CO₂ injection into sample 3.



Fig. 10. Tri-axial stresses for CO₂ injection into sample 4.

new fractures created against x-stress. In addition, the temperature drastically dropped about 7 $^{\circ}$ C right after the fracturing, due to CO₂ leakage, expansion, and vaporization.

Under tri-axial loading of x:y:z = 1100:1600:2100 psi (Fig. 12), shale sample 5 was fractured by injecting a synthetic slick-water which consisted of 0.1 wt% hydrolyzed polyacrylamide, 2.0 wt% KCl, and red dye. At 20 °C, the viscosity of this synthetic slick-water, measured with a rotating cylinder viscometer, is 1.8 mPa s. Fig. 13 shows the borehole pressure profile during the slick-water injection. Injection started at 1 ml/min, and pressure reached the first peak of 521.3 psig at 1281.1 s. Ten seconds later, the pump was stopped to allow pressure drawdown. Seeing that borehole pressure leveled out near 100 psig, we restarted the pump at 1 ml/min, and the pressure reached the highest peak of 1602.5 psig at 2352.6 s. After 10 s, the pump was again stopped. Unexpectedly, file corrupted around 2500 s and the data acquisition system was restarted. This caused the data gaps in both Figs. 12 and 13. As pressure leveled out near 180 psig, the pump was restarted at 1 ml/ min, and a small peak of 309.7 psig was achieved at 3562.2 s, then pressure slowly decreased, suggesting the fracture propagation stage. Later, we increased the injection rate to 10 ml/min, and a pressure peak of 434.7 psig was reached at 4256.2 s. In tens of seconds, fluid leak off was observed on the sample faces and pump was turned off. On the tri-axial stress curves, there are slight responses on x-, y-, and z-stress corresponding to the last pressure peak, while all earlier pressure peaks including the highest one did not bring about any obvious responses. This suggests that probably only the last peak created new fractures or extended preexisting fractures, whereas all other peaks only broke through the weakly bonded preexisting fractures.

In comparison with shale samples 1–4 fractured by CO₂, slickwater fracturing needs extra hundreds of psi to break down the sample, even though originally shale sample 5 has more permeable fractures than others.

4.2. Active acoustic wave measurements

Active acoustic wave measurement is a nondestructive method to detect the internal structure changes of an object. Before and after CO₂ injection-induced fracturing, acoustic wave measurements were conducted on each pair of opposite faces of the shale sample to examine whether there are new fractures induced across the acoustic wave pathways. New fractures or gas gaps generated inside rock blocks generally dissipate acoustic energy density by means of retarding the acoustic wave velocity and reducing the wave amplitude, whereas tri-axial stress loading without sensible internal damage would only slightly change the wave velocity [46]. Fig. 14 sketches the acoustic wave measurement locations for placing the acoustic transmitter on faces 1 and 5, and face 2 has the same numbering as face 1. The acoustic receiver was placed on corresponding locations on the opposite faces. In each acoustic measurement, 5000 data points were acquired for plotting the waveform.

P and S wave signatures measured from faces 1 and 3 for sample 1 before (black) and after (red) $scCO_2$ injection-induced fracturing are shown in Fig. 15 and Fig. 16, respectively. All acoustic waveforms are normalized by the maximum peak-to-peak amplitude of the acoustic waves measured before $scCO_2$ injection. After induced fracturing, all locations show significant reduction in wave amplitude except 9 and 10, indicating that big fractures trespassing locations 1-8 and 11-12 were generated between faces 1 and 3.



Fig. 11. Pressure and temperature during CO₂ injection into sample 4.



Fig. 12. Tri-axial tresses for slick-water injection into sample 5.



Fig. 13. Slick-water injection pressure for sample 5.



Fig. 14. Acoustic wave measurement locations (small dots) on faces 1 and 5.

P and S waves measured from faces 2 and 4 are normalized by the maximum peak-to-peak amplitude of the acoustic waves measured before $scCO_2$ injection, as shown in Fig. 17 and Fig. 18, respectively. At locations 3-5 and 11, both P and S wave signatures have been dramatically damped as compared to their counterparts measured before $scCO_2$ injection at the same locations, indicating that induced fractures were generated along the acoustic transmission pathways of these measurement locations. Combining with the acoustic signatures on faces 1 and 3, it can be inferred that a big fracture that is slightly sinuous across the locations 3-5 of faces 2 and 4 between faces 1 and 3 was radially generated from the open hole section of the cubic shale sample. Location 11 suggests an extension of a branch fracture from the major fracture.

Fig. 19 and Fig. 20 show the normalized signatures of P and S waves measured from faces 5 and 6 of sample 1, respectively. Before injection, amplitudes of signals from locations 1–4 are much smaller than those from locations 5–8, suggesting that the



Fig. 15. P-wave signatures measured before (black) and after (red) scCO₂ injection from faces 1 and 3 of sample 1. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)



Fig. 16. S-wave signatures measured before (black) and after (red) scCO₂ injection from faces 1 and 3 of sample 1. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

horizontal interfaces between these locations were open or weakly bonded. After injection-induced fracturing, all acoustic signatures of P and S waves, except 6 and 8, changed remarkably in both waveform and arrival time, indicating that these preexisting interfaces were further widened.

Shale samples 3–5 were first treated by injecting epoxy to seal the preexisting fractures and interfaces, and then acoustic wave was employed to evaluate the effectiveness of epoxy bonding. In Fig. 21, all acoustic waves from faces 1 and 3 of sample 3 are normalized by the maximum peak-to-peak amplitude of the acoustic waves measured after epoxy treatment. Acoustic measurements after epoxy treatment clearly showed that the P wave amplitudes were magnified and arrival times were shifted earlier, at locations 1–8 and 11 in particular. This is an indicator that injected epoxy has solidified in the preexisting fractures extending across these locations, which facilitated the transmission of acoustic waves. After scCO₂ injection-induced fracturing, the P wave signatures were again substantially attenuated in amplitude



Fig. 17. P-wave signatures measured before (black) and after (red) scCO₂ injection from faces 2 and 4 of sample 1. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)



Fig. 18. S-wave signatures measured before (black) and after (red) scCO₂ injection from faces 2 and 4 of sample 1. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

and retarded in arrival time due to reopened and/or newly generated fractures. Comparison of active acoustic waves effectively captured these changes of fractures inside nontransparent shale samples after each treatment.

Here for the sake of brevity, other acoustic data for shale samples 2–5 are omitted.

4.3. Borehole pressure decay curves

Borehole pressure decay is a direct indicator of the permeability of shale cubes. Before and after CO_2 injection-induced fracturing, we conducted pressure decay tests by first pressurizing the borehole to 100 psig and then allowing it to draw down to quantify the contribution of induced fractures to sample permeability. For shale samples 3–5, pressure decay tests were also used to evaluate the effectiveness of epoxy bonding of preexisting fractures and interfaces.



Fig. 19. P-wave signatures measured before (black) and after (red) scCO₂ injection from faces 5 and 6 of sample 1. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)



Fig. 20. S-wave signatures measured before (black) and after (red) scCO₂ injection from faces 5 and 6 of sample 1. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

Pressure decay curves measured before and after CO₂ injection for shale sample 1 are compared in Fig. 22. Before injection-induced fracturing, pressure decay is very slow, indicating that there were no preexisting fractures connecting the borehole to the outer faces. After fracturing, borehole pressure decreased from 100 to 0 psig in only a few seconds, which shows a significant permeability increase in the shale block due to injection-induced fractures.

Pressure decay curves measured before and after CO_2 injection for sample 2 are compared in Fig. 23, demonstrating obvious permeability increase due to injection-induced fractures. Before injection, although there were a few big fractures appearing on the cube faces, pressure decay is very slow. Apparently, they were not connected to the borehole. As compared to sample 1, the decline rate after fracturing, however, is much slower, indicating that the induced fractures are much smaller or more confined than those generated in sample 1.

Fig. 24 compares the pressure decay curves before and after the



Fig. 21. P-wave signatures measured before (blue) and after epoxy treatment (black), and after CO_2 injection-induced fracturing (red) from faces 1 and 3 of shale sample 3. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)



Fig. 22. Pressure decay curves before and after injection-induced fracturing of sample 1.

epoxy treatment of preexisting fractures in shale sample 3, showing that the fractures connecting to the borehole have been successfully sealed, at least in the near borehole region. The pressure decay curve measured after CO_2 injection demonstrated that the gas leak rate significantly increased due to fractures generated inside the shale cube.

Similar to shale sample 3, preexisting fractures and interfaces in sample 4 were also first treated using epoxy, during which several locations along the preexisting horizontal fractures showed epoxy seepage. Fig. 25 compares the pressure decay curves before and after the epoxy treatment, demonstrating that the fractures connecting to the borehole, at least in the near borehole region, have been successfully sealed. After CO₂ injection-induced fracturing, the borehole gas pressure dropped to atmosphere nearly instantaneously, and to increase the borehole pressure to 100 psig needed very high flow rate from the nitrogen gas cylinder.

Epoxy treatment of preexisting fractures in shale sample 5 was not successful. As indicated by the pressure decay curves in Fig. 26,



Fig. 23. Pressure decay curves before and after CO₂ injection for sample 2.



Fig. 24. Pressure decay curves before and after epoxy treatment of preexisting fractures, and after CO_2 injection for sample 3.

epoxy injection and solidification, rather than sealed the preexisting fractures, further widened them. The acoustic wave tests did show enhanced signal intensity after epoxy treatment though. One postulation is that the preexisting fracture planes had been severely weathered and thus were abundant with weakly attached or freely movable shale fines, which undermined the consolidation effect of epoxy in the fractures. The pressure decay rate after slickwater injection significantly accelerated, due to fractures reopened or generated inside the shale cube.

4.4. Injection-induced fracture morphology

After pressure decay tests, dye solution was injected into the borehole at low pressure to color the injection-induced fractures. Finally, the shale samples were broken down by high-pressure nitrogen gas under tri-axial stresses to disclose the injection-induced fractures.

The assembled faces after dye injection and the fracture planes after gas breakdown of shale sample 1 are shown in Fig. 27. After scCO₂ injection (left), vertical fractures denoted by yellow dashed lines that are generally perpendicular to the minimum horizontal stress (i.e. x-stress applied on faces 1 and 3) appeared on faces 2 and 6. Blue dye seeped out of the induced fractures and stained on



Fig. 25. Pressure decay curves before and after epoxy treatment of preexisting fractures, and after CO_2 injection for shale sample 4.



Fig. 26. Pressure decay curves before and after epoxy treatment of preexisting fractures, and after slick-water injection for shale sample 5.

the sample faces. After gas breakdown (right), the cross section shows only one big circular fracture induced by $scCO_2$ injection, which is sinuous around the open hole section. Fracture propagation, reflected by the plane smoothness, was barely affected by the calcite-filled fractures. The demarcation of $scCO_2$ fracture and nitrogen gas fracture (red curve) is quite clear, as can be identified from the transition of the relatively smooth to ragged planes. There are no secondary fractures seen in the picture except that nitrogen gas created an additional fracture along the bedding interface above the open hole section. Also note that the limited propagation of the fracture plane to the upper corners in the right corresponds to the least changes in acoustic signatures in Figs. 15 and 16.

Comparing the faces of sample 2 after CO_2 injection to its original faces in Fig. 2 does not show any new fractures on all six faces, so the pictures are not included here. Nonetheless, the pressure decay test after CO_2 injection revealed a few gas leaking points along the preexisting fractures on faces 1 (numbered #2) and 2, as denoted in Fig. 28 (left). Thus, fractures were primarily induced along the weakly bonded preexisting fractures during CO_2 injection.

Pressurized up to 200 psig, penetration of the blue dye solution from the open hole into the shale matrix is still quite confined, as circled by the red curves in Fig. 28 (right), indicating that the



Fig. 27. Faces of sample 1 after blue dye coloring and scCO₂ injection-induced fracture morphology (unfolded from face 2) after gas breakdown. Yellow dashed lines denote the appeared induced fractures (left) and red curves demarcate the inner scCO₂ induced fracture and outer gas fracture planes. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)



Fig. 28. Leaking points on faces 1 (numbered #2) and 2 during pressure decay after CO₂ injection align on preexisting fractures highlighted by yellow dashed lines (left), and CO₂ injection-induced fractures circled by red curves (right) of sample 2. The golden mineral is pyrite. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

induced fractures are too tight or thin for liquid to flow deeply into over the timescale of the injection. Considering the gas leaking traces (left), dye coloring, as an effective means for fracture visualization, underestimated the extension of the CO_2 injection-induced fractures. The gas fracture mainly opened along the pentahedral bubbling traces. It is necessary to point out that the major pentahedral fracture (right, upper) does not directly cut through the open hole section but is connected to it via a small horizontal fracture (right, lower), which corresponds to the very slow pressure decay curve measured initially before CO₂ injection. The small horizontal fracture, against the maximum vertical stress, was induced along the weak bedding interface. This discontinuity is also responsible for the poor injectivity of the blue dye solution. Induced fracturing of sample 2 demonstrated that when there are weakly bonded or open preexisting fractures, CO₂ pressurized in the open hole would preferentially break into and extend these fractures.

As shown in Fig. 2, originally shale sample 3 has more preexisting vertical fractures on faces 1, 3, 5, and 6 than faces 2 and 4, on



Fig. 29. Faces of sample 3 after dye injection (left) and scCO₂ injection-induced fracture planes (right, a and b) unfolded from face 1. In the left image, dark stains on faces 1 (numbered #3) and 4 are epoxy, yellow dashed lines denote the induced fractures; in the right image, green dashed lines circle the areas covered by epoxy, red color denotes the induced fracture planes, the closed red curve indicates a new fracture perpendicular to the minimum horizontal stress. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

which the maximum horizontal stress was applied. So there is a high tendency that vertical fractures could be initially induced on faces 1, 3, 5, and 6. Fig. 29 (left) shows the faces of sample 3 after epoxy treatment and CO_2 injection. Dark epoxy stains can be seen on faces 1 (numbered #3) and 4, but no new induced fractures were observed on six faces. After dye injection, purple color seeped out of induced fractures on faces 1, 3, and 6, which are generally overlapping with preexisting fractures.

High-pressure nitrogen gas finally broke the sample down, disclosing the fracture planes inside the sample, as shown in Fig. 29 (right), based on which several aspects of the experiments are made clear. Note that a and b were opened from face 1, a was broken into c, which was further broken into d. First, one preexisting vertical fracture and one horizontal interface that had been bonded by epoxy are identified, as circled by the green dashed lines. Basically, the preexisting vertical fracture (a and b) corresponds to the epoxy stains on face 1, and the horizontal interface (d) corresponds to the stains on face 4 in Fig. 29 (left). Second, scCO₂ injection-induced fractures preferentially initiated and propagated along the preexisting fractures, even they were bonded with epoxy, as evidenced by the purple color over all epoxy stained areas. The probable reasons for scCO₂ breaking through the epoxy bonded fractures are that the preexisting fracture planes are not clean or consolidated enough to enable the nominal tensile strength of 1500 psi with the epoxy solution, due to detachable fines on the weathered preexisting fracture planes and/or epoxy shrinkage during solidification. And under a relatively small stress difference of 500 psi, they are still weak planes to be split. Third, the small colored fracture perpendicular to faces 1 and 3 (i.e. minimum horizontal stress direction) as circled by the closed red curve in Fig. 29 c (left), is a new fracture induced by scCO₂ injection under tri-axial stresses, because there are no epoxy stains on it. Nitrogen gas fracturing further extended these induced fractures and opened other preexisting fractures, which are mostly either parallel or perpendicular to the minimum horizontal stress. Therefore, under a stress difference of 500 psi, preexisting fractures, even being weakly bonded, still dominated the scCO₂ injection-induced fracturing process.

When red dye solution was injected into shale sample 4 to color the CO_2 injection-induced fractures without any pressurization, it flowed out of the continuous preexisting horizontal fractures in the middle of the sample and the downturned fractures that newly appeared on the lower halves of faces 1 and 3, as shown in Fig. 30 (left). The sample was later broken down by high-pressure nitrogen gas under no tri-axial loading, as shown in Fig. 30 (right), which was taken by placing borehole to the left and opening face 2.

As can be seen from the cross section, the epoxy had covered the whole horizontal fracture plane at the middle of the z-axis, which was also indicated by the enhanced acoustic intensity measured after epoxy treatment. However, different from newly cracked planes, slight rubbing smeared these horizontal fracture planes very easily (a and b), meaning that this preexisting horizontal fractures is severely weathered and contains abundant detachable fines. Furthermore, the fines on the fracture planes could be responsible for the failing of epoxy bonding, which did not effectively prevent the CO₂ break through. Red color all over the horizontal plane verified that CO₂ preferentially reopened this weakly bonded plane by conquering the z-stress. In Fig. 30 c (right), there is a newly generated fracture, which was not stained with epoxy but was colored by red dye. It dips with an angle of about 45° to the horizontal plane, and along its tip, gas fracturing further reached the bottom face 6.

These observations suggest that CO_2 injection-induced fractures preferentially initiate and propagate in the weakly bonded preexisting fractures, even if they are opening against the maximum vertical z-stress. Meanwhile, under the high stress difference of 900 psi, new fractures can be induced against the horizontal stresses. That is, weakly bonded preexisting fractures and *in-situ* stress with high contrast compete to dominate the CO_2 injection-induced fracturing process.

During slick-water fracturing of shale sample 5, red slick-water seeped out of faces 1, 3, 4, and 5 from preexisting fractures (yellow dashed lines), but there are no noticeable new fractures generated on the sample faces, as shown in Fig. 31 (left). On the fracture planes in Fig. 31 (right), epoxy covered the fractures near the borehole (green dashed lines), which are also colored by slick-water, verifying that slick-water preferentially flowed into the epoxy bonded preexisting fractures. The red curve circles the revealed slick-water fracture plane based on coloring and seepage. Other major fracture planes without color were created by nitrogen gas fracturing, they are generally perpendicular to either x-stress or y-stress. Similar to shale samples 2 and 3, with a stress difference of 500 psi, preexisting fractures dominated the slick-water fracturing initiation and propagation.

The surface conditions of preexisting and newly generated fractures were examined using an Olympus BX60 microscope, as shown in Fig. 32. Both the preexisting and new fracture surfaces, before examination, were cleaned by blowing high rate air. As is obvious, the preexisting fracture surface has many more fines that seem readily detachable than the newly generated fracture surface, which corroborates the speculation that the preexisting fractures are severely weathered and detachable fines are responsible for the



Fig. 30. Faces of sample 4 after dye injection and fracture morphology after gas breakdown (unfolded from face 2 by placing borehole to the left). Yellow dashed lines denote the major induced fracture along the preexisting horizontal interface and the newly created downward fracture, as is circled by the red curve in c, red color (right) covers the induced fracture planes. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)



Fig. 31. Faces of sample 5 after slick-water fracturing (left) and fracture morphology after gas breakdown. Yellow dashed lines denote the reopened preexisting fractures (left), green dashed lines indicate the epoxy stained area, red curves circle the revealed slick-water fracture plane. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)



Fig. 32. Microscopic surface conditions of preexisting (left) and newly generated (right) fractures from shale sample 5. The green-yellow dots in the left image represent detachable fine particles. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

defective epoxy bonding between the fracture planes.								
Experimental	results	of	four	shale	samples	fractured	by	

supercritical or gas CO₂ and one fractured by slick-water are summarized in Table 2, including tri-axial stress conditions, breakdown pressure and temperature, stress responses to breakdown pressures during injection, N₂ gas fracturing peak pressures under triaxial stresses, and brief description of injection-induced fracture morphology and orientation.

4.5. Breakdown pressure analyses

Breakdown pressure refers to the peak pressure during fluid injection, which can be predicted using Eq. (1) or (2) based on different assumptions of rock properties. However, to open a preexisting fracture, the injection pressure only needs to counterbalance the *in-situ* stress applied on the fracture planes. Although permeability of Niobrara shale is very low, on the order of 10 micro-Darcy [47], Eq. (1) obviously overestimates the breakdown pressures by a large proportion, so it is not used here.

With typical Biot's coefficient and Poisson's ratio [47,54] as well as real tri-axial stress readings and reasonably assigned tensile strength, breakdown pressures of shale samples 1–4 are predicted using Eq. (2), as compared with experimental values in Table 3. But

Table 2

Summary of	CO ₂ /slick-water	injection-induced	fracturing	for shale same	ples

Summary of Co ₂ /suck-water injection-induced nacturing for share samples.								
Shale #	Injected fluid, ml/min	Tri-axial stress x:y:z psi	P _b , psig T, °C	T drop, stress response	$N_2 P_b$	Induced fracture orientation and morphology		
1	scCO ₂ , 40	1600:2100: 2600	1300.1, 37.4	Yes, obvious	1448.0	Big radial and sinuous fracture around borehole, $\pm x$ -stress		
2	gas CO ₂ , 80	1100:1600: 2100	953.6, 46.2	Yes, not obvious	1715.5	Tiny fractures connected to unbonded preexisting fractures and interfaces		
3	scCO ₂ , 80	1100:1600: 2100	1392.5, 39.7	Yes, not obvious	2263.8	Reopened big weakly epoxy bonded fracture \perp y-stress, and a small new fracture \perp x-stress		
4	gas CO ₂ , *	1200:2100: 3000	804.3, 54.0	Yes, not obvious	1803.3	Reopened big weakly epoxy bonded interface ⊥z-stress, and a new fracture ~45° against y-stress		
5	Slick-water, 1	1100:1600: 2100	1602.5, 19.6	No, not obvious	1316.4	Reopened big weakly epoxy bonded fracture $\perp y$ -stress, and a small one ~45° against x-stress		

Note: *-fractured when valve was opened; P_b-breakdown pressure with an accuracy of ±0.25%; T-temperature with an accuracy of ±0.5 °C; ⊥-perpendicular to.

Table 3

Matching of measured breakdown pressures with Eq. (2).

Shale #	Tri-axial stresses x:y:z psi	Tensile strength psi		P _b from eqn. (2)	Measured P _b exp.	Deviation %
1	1603.7:2101.7:2595.1	0	Biot's constant $\alpha = 0.9$	1823.6	1300.1	-28.7
2	1065.3:1585.3:2094.4	0	Poisson's ratio $v = 0.3$	1084.1	953.6	-12.0
3	1073.4:1593.2:2095.6	442		1392.6	1392.5	0.0
4	1220.4:2082.2:2999.7	0		1062.8	804.3	-24.3
5	1112.8:1657.5:2101.5	700		1602.5	1602.5	0.0

Note: the accuracy of tri-axial stresses is $\pm 0.5\%$.

still, the experimental breakdown pressures are overestimated for samples 1, 2, and 4, even assuming zero tensile strength. Two major contributing factors are the low viscosity of CO₂ and the preexisting fractures, which together eased the fracture initiation. Specifically, the nonconformable preexisting fractures in samples 2 and 3, as shown in Fig. 28 (right) and Fig. 29 (right), could possibly sidestep under tri-axial stresses to generate high stress anisotropy or even unloading regions around the nonconformity. In addition, decreasing tri-axial stress levels and increasing stress differences should be favorable for reducing breakdown pressures, e.g. samples 1 vs. 2 and samples 1–3 vs. 4, respectively. Nonetheless, sample 3 deviated from the declining trend with a depressed stress level relative to sample 1 owing to uncertainties of epoxy bonding strength and the irregularities of preexisting fractures.

The breakdown pressure of sample 3 can be perfectly matched by assigning a tensile strength of 442 psi; however, it should be noted that the major fracture plane of sample 3 in Fig. 29 (right) is perpendicular to the maximum horizontal stress, which is contradictory with linear elastic assumptions of Eq. (2). Similarly, assigning a tensile strength of 700 psi engenders a perfect match for sample 5; nonetheless, the major fracture plane in Fig. 31 (right) is also perpendicular to the maximum horizontal stress. Seeing that in both samples 3 and 5, induced fractures were predominantly initiated along weakly bonded preexisting fractures, the measured breakdown pressures are essentially the opening pressures of these preexisting fractures that are perpendicular to the maximum horizontal stress. That is, their breakdown pressures should approximate the applied y-stresses. Comparing with the *in-situ* y-stress, measured breakdown pressure of sample 3 is 14.4% lower, and that of sample 5 is only 3.4% lower, the difference between which should be attributed to the viscosity disparity of scCO₂ and slick-water.

Therefore, in contrast with poroelastic breakdown pressure model and slick-water injection-induced fracturing, gas CO₂ and scCO₂ tend to induce fracturing in shale samples of all three types of preexisting fractures at much lower injection pressures, which could even be lower than the minimum horizontal stress.

5. Conclusions

In consideration of safe and permanent CO_2 geological sequestration and storage in aquifers and depleted oil and gas reservoirs underlying caprocks with faults, weak interfaces, and natural or artificial fractures, we experimentally investigated the gas and supercritical CO_2 injection-induced fracturing processes in shale rocks with strongly and weakly bonded fractures under varied triaxial stresses. Based on experimental observations, we can draw the following conclusions.

- For borehole injection without pore pressure, gas or supercritical CO₂ induced fractures initiated and propagated to the rock boundary instantly associated with temperature drops, due to low fluid viscosity as well as volume expansion and vaporization during leakage. CO₂ expansion helped alleviate fluid pressure drop and further promoted fracture propagation as the required propagation pressure decreases with enlarging fracture size.
- 2) Calcite-filled fractures that are strongly bonded with little variations in mineralogy on both sides almost have no influence on transverse fracturing induced by supercritical CO₂ injection. In shale samples with preexisting fractures that are weakly bonded or open, gas or supercritical CO₂ and slick-water injection preferentially opened or continued to extend the preexisting fractures, regardless of their orientations to the *in-situ* stresses. Given sufficiently high stress differences, new fractures perpendicular to the minimum horizontal stress can be generated.

- 3) Gas or supercritical CO₂ injection-induced fracturing of shale samples with strongly and weakly bonded fractures occurred at much lower breakdown pressures than both poroelastic model predictions and slick-water breakdown pressure, attributing to preexisting fractures and low viscosity of CO₂. In general, decreasing tri-axial stress levels and increasing stress differences lowered the breakdown pressure. Briefly, when the minimum horizontal stress is not perpendicular to the preexisting fractures, preexisting weak fractures and tri-axial stresses compete for the dominance of the injection-induced fracturing process.
- 4) Active acoustic wave measurements and borehole pressure decay tests provide effective but nondestructive means for qualitative and quantitative characterization of CO₂ injection-induced fractures in nontransparent shale samples.

This laboratory study with real shale rocks directly demonstrated the effect of preexisting fractures on CO_2 injection-induced fracturing processes in aquifer and reservoir caprocks. These experimental observations and quantitative assessments are critical for understanding and predicting geomechanical effects on field-scale CO_2 injection, flow, and storage as well as evaluating storage site selection, storage capacity, injection designs, and long term leakage risks in fractured aquifers and oil and gas reservoirs. These experimental achievements will be incorporated into reservoir simulators, such as TOUGH2-CSM [55] and TOUGH-FLAC [56], to simulate field-scale CO_2 injection processes and guarantee safe and permanent storage in fractured reservoirs.

Acknowledgement

Financial supports from National Energy Technology Laboratory of US Department of Energy (Quantitative characterization of impacts of coupled geomechanics and flow on safe and permanent geological storage of CO₂ in fractured aquifers, Project number: DE-FE0023305) and Foundation CMG are greatly appreciated. The authors also thank CEMEX Lyons Plant for providing the shale rock samples.

References

- Global CCS Institute (GCI). Introduction to industrial carbon capture and storage. June, 2016. Global Status of CCS: special report.
- [2] Mondal MK, Balsora HK, Varshney P. Progress and trends in CO₂ capture/ separation technologies: a review. Energy 2012;46(1):431-41.
- [3] Zhao C, Chen X, Zhao C. K₂CO₃/Al₂O₃ for capturing CO₂ in flue gas from power plants. Part 1: carbonation behaviors of K₂CO₃/Al₂O₃. Energy & Fuels 2012a;26(2):1401–5.
- [4] Zhao C, Chen X, Zhao C, Wu Y, Dong W. K₂CO₃/Al₂O₃ for capturing CO₂ in flue gas from power plants. Part 3: CO₂ capture behaviors of K₂CO₃/Al₂O₃ in a bubbling fluidized-bed reactor. Energy & Fuels 2012b;26(5):3062–8.
- [5] Iribarren D, Petrakopoulou F, Dufour J. Environmental and thermodynamic evaluation of CO₂ capture, transport and storage with and without enhanced resource recovery. Energy 2013;50:477–85.
- [6] Cuéllar-Franca RM, Azapagic A. Carbon capture, storage and utilisation technologies: a critical analysis and comparison of their life cycle environmental impacts. J CO₂ Util 2015;9:82–102.
- [7] Esposito R, Harvick C, Shaw R, Mooneyhan D, Trautz R, Hill G. Integration of pipeline operations sourced with CO₂ captured at a coal-fired power plant and injected for geological storage: SECARB phase III CCS demonstration. Energy Procedia 2013;37:3068–88.
- [8] Koperna Jr GJ, Kuuskraa V, Riestenberg D, Rhudy R, Trautz R, Hill G, et al. The SECARB anthropogenic test: status from the field. Energy Procedia 2013;37: 6273–86.
- [9] Buttinelli M, Procesi M, Cantucci B, Quattrocchi F, Boschi E. The geo-database of caprock quality and deep saline aquifers distribution for geological storage of CO₂ in Italy. Energy 2011;36(5):2968–83.
- [10] Pham VTH, Riis F, Gjeldvik IT, Halland EK, Tappel IM, Aagaard P. Assessment of CO₂ injection into the south Utsira-Skade aquifer, the North Sea, Norway. Energy 2013;55:529–40.
- [11] Vulin D, Kurevija T, Kolenkovic I. The effect of mechanical rock properties on CO₂ storage capacity. Energy 2012;45(1):512–8.

- [12] Zweigel P, Arts R, Lothe AE, Lindeberg EB. Reservoir geology of the Utsira Formation at the first industrial-scale underground CO₂ storage site (Sleipner area, North Sea). Geol Soc Lond Spec Publ 2004;233(1):165–80.
- [13] Iding M, Ringrose P. Evaluating the impact of fractures on the performance of the In Salah CO₂ storage site. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2010;4(2):242–8.
- [14] Rutqvist J, Vasco DW, Myer L. Coupled reservoir-geomechanical analysis of CO₂ injection and ground deformations at In Salah, Algeria. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2010;4(2):225–30.
- [15] White JA, Chiaramonte L, Ezzedine S, Foxall W, Hao Y, Ramirez A, et al. Geomechanical behavior of the reservoir and caprock system at the In Salah CO₂ storage project. Proc Natl Acad Sci 2014;111(24):8747–52.
- [16] Global CCS Institute (GCI), https://www.globalccsinstitute.com/projects/ sleipner%C2%A0co2-storage-project, retrieved by June 6, 2017.
- [17] Ringrose PS, Mathieson AS, Wright IW, Selama F, Hansen O, Bissell R, et al. The In Salah CO₂ storage project: lessons learned and knowledge transfer. Energy Procedia 2013;37:6226–36.
- [18] Chadwick RA, Arts R, Eiken O, Kirby GA, Lindeberg E, Zweigel P. 4D seismic imaging of an injected CO₂ plume at the Sleipner field, Central North Sea. Geol Soc Lond Memoirs 2004;29(1):311–20.
- [19] Oye V, Aker E, Daley TM, Kühn D, Bohloli B, Korneev V. Microseismic monitoring and interpretation of injection data from the In Salah CO2 storage site (Krechba). Alger Energy Procedia 2013;37:4191–8.
- [20] Vasco DW, Rucci A, Ferretti A, Novali F, Bissell RC, Ringrose PS, et al. Satellitebased measurements of surface deformation reveal fluid flow associated with the geological storage of carbon dioxide. Geophys Res Lett 2010;37(3).
- [21] Bissell RC, Vasco DW, Atbi M, Hamdani M, Okwelegbe M, Goldwater MH. A full field simulation of the In Salah gas production and CO₂ storage project using a coupled geo-mechanical and thermal fluid flow simulator. Energy Procedia 2011;4:3290–7.
- [22] Suehiro Y, Nakajima M, Yamada K, Uematsu M. Critical parameters of $\{xCO_2+(1-x) CHF_3\}$ for x = (1.0000, 0.7496, 0.5013, and 0.2522). J Chem Thermodyn 1996;28(10):1153–64.
- [23] Pan PZ, Rutqvist J, Feng XT, Yan F. Modeling of caprock discontinuous fracturing during CO₂ injection into a deep brine aquifer. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2013;19:559–75.
- [24] Rinaldi AP, Rutqvist J, Cappa F. Geomechanical effects on CO₂ leakage through fault zones during large-scale underground injection. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2014;20:117–31.
- [25] Zhang R, Yin X, Winterfeld PH, Wu YS. A fully coupled thermal-hydrologicalmechanical-chemical model for CO₂ geological sequestration. J Nat Gas Sci Eng 2016;28:280–304.
- [26] Huang ZQ, Winterfeld PH, Xiong Y, Wu Y-S, Yao J. Parallel simulation of fullycoupled thermal-hydro-mechanical processes in CO₂ leakage through fluiddriven fracture zones. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2015;34:39–51.
- [27] Ishida T, Aoyagi K, Niwa T, Chen Y, Murata S, Chen Q, et al. Acoustic emission monitoring of hydraulic fracturing laboratory experiment with supercritical and liquid CO₂. Geophys Res Lett 2012;39(16).
- [28] Ishida T, Chen Y, Bennour Z, Yamashita H, Inui S, Nagaya Y, et al. Features of CO₂ fracturing deduced from acoustic emission and microscopy in laboratory experiments. J Geophys Res Solid Earth 2016;121(11):8080–98.
- [29] Chen Y, Nagaya Y, Ishida T. Observations of fractures induced by hydraulic fracturing in anisotropic granite. Rock Mech Rock Eng 2015;48(4):1455–61.
- [30] Li X, Feng Z, Han G, Elsworth D, Marone C, Saffer D, et al. Breakdown pressure and fracture surface morphology of hydraulic fracturing in shale with H₂O, CO₂ and N₂. Geomech Geophys Geo-Energy Geo-Res 2016;2(2):63–76.
- [31] Zhang X, Lu Y, Tang J, Zhou Z, Liao Y. Experimental study on fracture initiation and propagation in shale using supercritical carbon dioxide fracturing. Fuel 2017;190:370–8.
- [32] Vilarrasa V, Carrera J. Geologic carbon storage is unlikely to trigger large earthquakes and reactivate faults through which CO₂ could leak. Proc Natl Acad Sci 2015;112(19):5938–43.
- [33] Zoback MD, Gorelick SM. Earthquake triggering and large-scale geologic storage of carbon dioxide. Proc Natl Acad Sci 2012;109(26):10164–8.
- [34] Hubbert MK, Willis DG. Mechanics of hydraulic fracturing. 1972. p. 239–57.[35] Haimson B, Fairhurst C. Initiation and extension of hydraulic fractures in
- rocks. SPE J 1967;7(03):310–8.
- [36] Detournay E, Cheng A. January. Influence of pressurization rate on the

magnitude of the breakdown pressure. In: In the 33th US symposium on rock mechanics. American Rock Mechanics Association; 1992.

- [37] Tyler LD, Vollendorf WC, January. Physical observations and mapping of cracks resulting from hydraulic fracturing in situ stress measurements. In: Fall meeting of the society of petroleum engineers of AIME; 1975. SPE-5542-MS.
- [38] Irwin GR. Analysis of stresses and strains near the end of a crack traversing a plate. In: Presented at the applied mechanics division summer conference, Berkeley, California, June 13–15. American Society of Mechanical Engineers; 1957.
- [39] Liu C. Optimizing hydraulic fracture spacing and lateral well spacing in tight/ unconventional resource development through fully coupling stress shadowing effects and fluid flow: an integrated approach. Doctoral Dissertation. Colorado School of Mines; 2016.
- [40] O'Neal DL. Chemostratigraphic and depositional characterization of the Niobrara formation, CEMEX quarry, Lyons, CO. Master's Thesis. Colorado School of Mines; 2015.
- [41] Cha M, Yin X, Kneafsey T, Johanson B, Alqahtani N, Miskimins J, et al. Cryogenic fracturing for reservoir stimulation–Laboratory studies. J Pet Sci Eng 2014;124:436–50.
- [42] Wang L, Yao B, Cha M, Alqahtani NB, Patterson TW, Kneafsey TJ, et al. Waterless fracturing technologies for unconventional reservoirsopportunities for liquid nitrogen. J Nat Gas Sci Eng 2016;35:160–74.
- [43] Cha M, Alqahtani NB, Yao B, Yin X, Wu Y-S, Kneafsey TJ. Development of laboratory system for cryogenic fracturing study. Energy Geotech 2016: 381–8.
- [44] Yao B, Wang L, Patterson T, Kneafsey TJ, Yin X, Wu Y-S. Experimental study and modeling of cryogenic fracturing treatment of synthetic rock samples using liquid nitrogen under tri-axial stresses. In: SPE unconventional resources conference, 15–16 February, Calgary, Alberta, Canada; 2017. SPE 185050.
- [45] Alqahtani NB, Cha M, Yao B, Yin X, Kneafsey TJ, Wang L, et al. Experimental investigation of cryogenic fracturing of rock specimens under true triaxial confining stresses. In: SPE Europec, featured at 78th EAGE conference and exhibition; 2016, May. SPE-180071-MS.
- [46] Wang L, Yao B, Xie H, Kneafsey TJ, Winterfeld PH, Yin X, et al. Experimental investigation of injection-induced fracturing during supercritical CO₂ sequestration. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2017;63:107–17.
- [47] Yao B. Experimental study and numerical modeling of cryogenic fracturing process on laboratory-scale rock and concrete samples. Master's Thesis. Colorado School of Mines; 2016.
- [48] Hirata T, Nagayasu H, Yonekawa T, Inui M, Kamijo T, Kubota Y, et al. Current status of MHI CO₂ capture plant technology, 500 TPD CCS demonstration of test results and reliable technologies applied to coal fired flue gas. Energy Proc 2014;63:6120–8.
- [49] Sneddon I. The distribution of stress in the neighbourhood of a crack in an elastic solid,. Proc R Soc Lond A Mathe Phys Eng Sci 1946;187(1009):229–60.
- [50] Sonnenberg SA. The Niobrara petroleum system, Rocky Mountain Region. AAPG Artic 2012:80206.
- [51] Gale JF, Laubach SE, Olson JE, Eichhubl P, Fall A. Natural fractures in shale: a review and new observations, AAPG Bull 2014;98(11):2165–216.
- [52] Daneshy AA. Hydraulic fracture propagation in layered formations. SPE J 1978;18(01):33-41.
- [53] Daneshy AA. Hydraulic fracture propagation in the presence of planes of weakness. In: SPE European spring meeting, 29-30 May, Amsterdam, Netherlands; 1974. SPE-4852-MS.
- [54] Maldonado A, Batzle M, Sonnenberg SA. Mechanical properties of the Niobrara formation. In: AAPG Rocky Mountain section meeting, 25-29 June, Cheyenne, Wyoming, USA; 2011.
- [55] Winterfeld PH, Wu Y-S. Coupled reservoir-geomechanical simulation of caprock failure and fault reactivation during CO₂ sequestration in deep saline aquifers. In: SPE reservoir simulation conference, 20-22 February, Montgomery, Texas, USA; 2017. SPE-182605-MS.
- [56] Rutqvist J, Liu HH, Vasco DW, Pan L, Kappler K, Majer E. Coupled nonisothermal, multiphase fluid flow, and geomechanical modeling of ground surface deformations and potential for induced micro-seismicity at the in Salah CO₂ storage operation. Energy Proc 2011;4:3542–9.