Identifying and Quantifying Emissions from Abandoned and Orphaned Oil and Gas Wells

HEI – Energy Webinar: Human Exposure Research in a Cyclical Industry: Abandoned and Orphaned Oil and Natural Gas Wells

November 30, 2021

Natalie Pekney, PhD NETL Research and Innovation Center





NATIONAL ENERGY TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY

This presentation was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference therein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed therein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

Acknowledgement: This technical effort was performed by and in support of the National Energy Technology Laboratory's ongoing research under the Natural Gas Infrastructure Field Work Proposal DOE 1022424.



Methane Emissions from Natural Gas Infrastructure

U.S. EPA Greenhouse Gas Inventory (2021)

Methane Emissions from Energy Total Methane: 256.2 MMT CO2 Eq

Methane Emissions from Natural Gas Systems

Total Methane: 157.6 MMT CO2 Eq









Classifying and Inventorying Abandoned Wells

- The US EPA began including abandoned wells as a GHG Emissions source in 2018 (2016 GHGI)
- From the Inventory:
 - The term "abandoned wells" encompasses various types of wells:
 - Wells with no recent production, and not plugged. Common terms (such as those used in state databases) might include: inactive, temporarily abandoned, shut-in, dormant, and idle.
 - Wells with no recent production and no responsible operator. Common terms might include: orphaned, deserted, long-term idle, and abandoned.
 - Wells that have been plugged to prevent migration of gas or fluids.
- The GHGI estimates methane emissions from abandoned wells by multiplying emission factors (mass of methane emitted per well) by activity levels (number of wells)
 - Significant uncertainty in both EFs and ALs



Abandoned Well Methane Emission Factors

- **NET NATIONAL ENERGY** TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY

Sample Size and Distribution Across the US





Locating Wells Using Magnetic Signature



Unmarked Abandoned Wells





Locating and Verifying Unmarked Legacy Wells Ground Magnetic Survey





Activity Level: Estimating Number of Wells

- History of success using aeromagnetic surveys to find wells
 - Magnetic surveys identify 46 59% more wells than recorded in state and national databases
- Estimated total number of wells
 - PA: 395,000-466,000
 - WY: 181,000-182,000

Extrapolating to U.S.: 6.04 ±19.97 million wells with 1.16 ± 3.84 designated as abandoned







Emission Factor: Estimating quantity of methane coming from a typical well

- Methodology: Directly collect methane emission rate measurements from wells using
 - Laser-based sensor
 - Optical gas imaging (FLIR GF-320)
 - High Flow sampling
 - Gas composition analysis









Emission Factor Results

- Pennsylvania
 - Hillman State Park: 31 wells, all unplugged, average emission rate for 22 not buried wells was 0.7 kg CH4/day
 - Oil Creek State Park: 138 wells, 67 unplugged/71 plugged, 10 unplugged wells were leaking with an average emission rate of 0.29 kg CH4/day
- Oklahoma: 179 wells, 159 unplugged/20 plugged, unplugged average emission rate of 0.065 kg CH4/day; plugged 0.096 kg Ch4/day (one "super emitter")
- Kentucky: 54 wells, 53 unplugged, 1 plugged (not leaking), average emission rate similar in magnitude to OK for the unplugged wells (PRELIMINARY)
- Future campaigns
 - KY, NY, TX
 - Gas vs. oil, other distinctions

Providing recommendations to state agencies for well finding, risk characterization, and optimization of mitigation strategies



Results: Oklahoma Field Campaign



Cherokee Platform – Near Tulsa





Gas Composition Analysis



Light Alkanes (C1-C5) by Gas Chromatography, Stable Carbon Isotopic Signature

| Analyte/well | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Mean ±SD | Min | Max |
|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|
| Methane | 98.73 | 99.42 | 96.76 | 96.28 | 95.06 | 97.62 | 97.25 | 95.30 | 95.85 | 98.55 | 97.08 ±1.50 | 95.06 | 99.42 |
| Ethane | 0.90 | 0.54 | 0.51 | 0.42 | 0.63 | 0.55 | 0.64 | 0.89 | 1.24 | 0.50 | 0.68 ±0.25 | 0.42 | 1.24 |
| Propane | n.d | 0.02 | 2.03 | 2.05 | 2.51 | 0.49 | 1.13 | 2.08 | 1.93 | 0.36 | 1.26 ±0.97 | n.d. | 2.51 |
| <i>i-</i> Butane | n.d | n.d | 0.20 | 0.35 | 0.42 | 0.24 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 0.34 | 0.18 | 0.24 ±0.16 | n.d. | 0.45 |
| <i>n</i> -Butane | 0.37 | 0.02 | 0.26 | 0.72 | 0.88 | 0.65 | 0.52 | 0.94 | 0.50 | 0.31 | 0.52 ±0.29 | 0.02 | 0.94 |
| <i>i-</i> Pentane | n.d | n.d | 0.11 | 0.15 | 0.28 | 0.22 | 0.15 | 0.23 | 0.13 | 0.11 | 0.14 ±0.09 | n.d. | 0.28 |
| <i>n</i> -Pentane | n.d | n.d | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.21 | 0.24 | 0.07 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.08 ±0.09 | n.d. | 0.24 |
| δ ¹³ C-CH ₄ (‰) | -44.4 | -54.4 | -50.5 | -52.6 | -50.2 | -51.8 | -48.3 | -47.7 | -49.3 | -51.5 | -50.1 ±2.8 | -54.4 | -44.4 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |









Key Findings To Date

- Current estimate of methane emissions from abandoned wells is 3% of contribution from energy sector
 - Large uncertainties remain
- Determining number of wells is difficult due to incomplete records
 - Aerial magnetic surveys a useful technique
- Emissions from wells vary widely
 - Plugged vs. Unplugged
 - Regional differences
 - Need more data to determine other factors that influence emissions
- Leaking gas is >95% methane





<u>Citizen Science:</u> <u>Orphan Wells Location</u> <u>Survey | netl.doe.gov</u>

VISITUS AT: www.NETL.DOE.gov







@NationalEnergyTechnologyLaboratory

CONTACT: Natalie Pekney <u>Natalie.Pekney@netl.doe.gov</u>

(412)386-5953

