ANALYSIS OF OPERATIONAL STRATEGIES FOR UTILIZING CO₂ FOR GEOTHERMAL ENERGY PRODUCTION
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ABSTRACT

Geothermal energy production can be limited by insufficient working fluid and pressure depletion, whereas geologic CO₂ storage (GCS) can be limited by overpressure, which may drive CO₂ leakage and cause induced seismicity. Integration of these complementary systems can realize synergy, enhancing the viability of each system. While most research on CO₂-based geothermal systems has emphasized using CO₂ as a heat-transfer working fluid, it is possible to also use CO₂ as a supplemental pressure-support fluid to generate artesian pressures at the CO₂ and brine producers. A well pattern consisting of a minimum of four concentric rings of horizontal producers and injectors is proposed to conserve pressure from the injection process, minimize loss of CO₂, control the lateral extent of overpressure, and segregate the CO₂ and brine production zones. We present simulations of this approach for an idealized reservoir model, consisting of a relatively permeable sedimentary formation, confined by two impermeable confining units. Consideration of more realistic (heterogeneous) geologic settings and wellbore flow effects will be necessary to more rigorously evaluate the potential economic advantages of this approach.

INTRODUCTION

Economic viability of geothermal energy production requires a resource with high enough temperature, which will yield individual well flow rates sufficient to justify project development costs. Geothermal energy production can be limited by insufficient working fluid and pressure depletion. This depletion increases the parasitic cost of powering the fluid recirculation system, which can include the expense of submersible pumps. Sedimentary basins are often associated with low resource temperatures; however, such resources have the advantages of higher permeability, compared to typical hydrothermal systems, together with much of that being matrix (rather than fracture) permeability. Because of their high permeability, these basins may be used for geologic CO₂ storage (GCS). The NATCARB Regional Carbon Sequestration Partnership (RCSP) database (Carr et al., 2007) has identified extensive regions suitable for GCS. A significant subset of this area has high enough temperature to be of economic value for CO₂-based geothermal energy production (Elliot et al., 2013).

Geothermal energy production and GCS can contribute to lowering atmospheric CO₂ emissions, necessary for mitigating climate change (IPPC, 2005; Socolow and Pacala, 2006). For large-scale GCS, overpressure can limit the ability to store CO₂, while geothermal energy production can be limited by pressure depletion (Buscheck et al., 2012a; 2012b; 2012c). It is possible to synergistically integrate these systems, with CO₂ injection providing pressure support to maintain the productivity of geothermal brine producers, while the net loss of brine provides pressure relief and improved injectivity for CO₂ injectors.

Enhanced geothermal energy systems (EGS), a geothermal concept using CO₂ instead of water as the working fluid was first proposed by Brown (2000). Pruess (2006) followed up on his idea by analyzing reservoir behavior and found CO₂ to be superior to water in mining heat from hot fractured rock, including reduced parasitic power consumption to drive the fluid recirculation system. This concept has been extended to GCS in sedimentary formations (Randolph and Saar, 2011a; 2011b; 2011c; Saar et al., 2010), which they call a CO₂-Plume Geothermal (CPG) system, to distinguish it from CO₂-enabled EGS in crystalline rock. Because it is targeted for large, porous, permeable sedimentary basins, CPG can result in more CO₂ sequestration and more heat extraction than CO₂-based EGS in crystalline rock.
MULTI-RING WELL-PATTERN APPROACH

While most research on CO\textsubscript{2}-based geothermal systems has emphasized using CO\textsubscript{2} as a working fluid (Pruess, 2006; Randolph and Saar, 2011a; 2011b, 2011c), it is possible to expand on this idea by using CO\textsubscript{2} as a pressure-support fluid to generate artesian pressures to drive both CO\textsubscript{2} and brine production. Initially, only brine is produced; however, as CO\textsubscript{2} breaks through to the producers, production transitions from brine to CO\textsubscript{2}. Hence, this approach takes advantage of using both brine and CO\textsubscript{2} as working fluids. A key goal of this approach is for brine production rates (per well) to exceed the capacity of submersible pumps to take advantage of the large productivity of long-reach horizontal wells. This would provide greater leveraging of well costs, which would be particularly valuable for deep reservoirs.

For reasons discussed later, this approach requires a well pattern consisting of a minimum of four concentric rings of horizontal producers and injectors (Figure 1). The inner ring consists of brine/CO\textsubscript{2} producers and the second ring consists of CO\textsubscript{2} injectors. The third and fourth rings consist of brine reinjectors and producers, respectively. Each of these rings can include additional rings at different depths to provide better control of fluid and energy recovery for improved sweep efficiency, which would reduce thermal drawdown and increase project lifetime. This configuration can take advantage of the fact that horizontal-well drilling technology allows for precise directional control; hence, it is realistic to create precisely curved injection and production intervals.

The reason for using four concentric rings is to conserve pressure from injection operations and to minimize the loss of CO\textsubscript{2}. This configuration implements a novel hydraulic ridge/divide strategy to assure only the inner-ring producers will ever extract CO\textsubscript{2}, with the outer-ring producers only extracting brine (Figure 1). The outer ring creates a hydraulic trough to limit the lateral extent of overpressure, as well as to capture any CO\textsubscript{2} that may pass through the hydraulic ridge. This configuration spreads out overpressure to limit its magnitude, reducing the risks of induced seismicity and CO\textsubscript{2} leakage. An advantage of this approach is that storage of CO\textsubscript{2} displaces (and frees up) an equivalent volume of formation brine for recirculation. Because brine comes from the same formation, it reduces the possibility of chemical incompatibility, which could be an issue if brine came from a separate formation.

MODELING APPROACH

Reservoir analyses were conducted with the NUFT code, which simulates multi-phase heat and mass flow and reactive transport in porous media (Nitao, 1998). The pore and water compressibility are \(4.5 \times 10^{-10}\) and \(3.5 \times 10^{-10}\) Pa\textsuperscript{-1}, respectively. Water density is determined by the ASME steam tables (ASME, 2006). The two-phase flow of CO\textsubscript{2} and water was simulated with the density and compressibility of supercritical CO\textsubscript{2} determined by the correlation of Span and Wagner (1996) and viscosity determined by the correlation of Fenghour et al. (1997).

A generic system is modeled, consisting of a 250-m-thick reservoir with a permeability of \(1 \times 10^{-13}\) m\textsuperscript{2}, bounded by impermeable confining units with a permeability of \(1 \times 10^{-18}\) m\textsuperscript{2}. Hydrologic properties (Table 1) are similar to previous GCS and GCS-geothermal studies (Zhou et al., 2008; Bushcheck et al., 2012a; 2012b; 2012c). Because conditions are laterally homogeneous, we can use a radially-symmetric (RZ) model. A geothermal gradient of 37.5°C/km and reservoir bottom depths of 2.5 and 5 km are considered. The RZ model is representative of rings of arc-shaped horizontal wells. Using an RZ model allows for fine mesh refinement, particularly around the injectors and producers to better model pressure gradients close to the wells. Gridblocks representing the injector and producer rings have dimensions similar to those of wellbores. All produced CO\textsubscript{2} is reinjected into the second ring and all produced brine is reinjected into the third ring. Initially, CO\textsubscript{2} injection rate is 480 kg/sec (15.2 MT/year), which is gradually increased to keep up with increasing CO\textsubscript{2} production.

Four- and five-ring well patterns of horizontal wells are considered. For the four-ring pattern, all of the wells are completed at the bottom of the reservoir (Figure 2). The inner production ring has a radius of 2 km. The second ring, representing CO\textsubscript{2} injectors, has a radius of 4 km. The third ring, representing brine injectors, has a radius of 6 km, and the fourth ring, representing brine producers, has a radius of 9 km. For the five-ring pattern, an additional inner ring of producers, with a radius of 1 km, is located in the upper portion of the reservoir (Figure 3). The purpose of the upper inner ring is to take advantage of the low density of CO\textsubscript{2} (compared to brine) and the influence of buoyancy, which will accelerate CO\textsubscript{2} breakthrough and increase its production and utilization as a working fluid for heat extraction. For the 2.5-km-deep reservoir, the bottomhole pressure of the producers is fixed to be 0.5 MPa greater than the ambient reservoir pressure at that depth. For the 5-km-deep reservoir, the bottomhole pressure of the producers is fixed to be 1.0 MPa greater than the ambient reservoir pressure at that depth. These assumed bottomhole pressures allow artesian flow up the well, while accounting for friction loss. Future reservoir analyses will include multi-phase wellbore models of brine and supercritical CO\textsubscript{2}. 
RESULTS

Four-ring well pattern, reservoir depth = 2.5 km

We start with the four-ring well pattern in a reservoir with a bottom depth of 2.5 km (Figures 1a, 2 and 4). A zone of maximum overpressure develops between the second ring of CO₂ injectors and the third ring of brine reinjectors (Figures 1a and 2a). This creates a hydraulic ridge/divide that restricts lateral migration of CO₂ (Figure 2b), thereby limiting the loss of CO₂, while conserving pressure buildup from CO₂ injection. The hydraulic ridge/divide segregates the CO₂- and brine-driven thermal plumes (Figure 2c and d), causing CO₂ to only be produced at the inner ring; with the outer ring only producing brine (Figure 4a). Initially, the inner ring only produces brine (Figure 4a), which is reinjected in the third ring. Because brine reinjection occurs in the zone of overpressure, driven by CO₂ injection (Figures 1a and 2a), it effectively drives flow “downhill” to the outer ring of producers, where it causes artesian flow. All brine produced in the outer ring is reinjected in the third ring. Overpressure and inner-ring brine production continue to increase for 8 years until CO₂ reaches the producers (Figure 4c). As CO₂ cut increases, inner-ring brine production decreases. Thus, there is less brine to be reinjected in third ring, which reduces the outer-ring brine production rate (Figure 4a). Note that the peak in outer-ring brine production lags slightly behind the peak for the inner producer ring.

All produced CO₂ is reinjected in the second ring. Because an important goal of this approach is to maximize the use of CO₂ as a working fluid, we continuously increased the CO₂ injection rate after CO₂ breakthrough (Figure 4a). Accordingly, the CO₂ injection rate was increased from an initial rate of 0.48 T/sec to greater than 4.0 T/sec. As the region between the first and second rings fills with CO₂, flow resistance between these rings is reduced, due to the low viscosity of CO₂, compared to brine. Thus, CO₂ delivery rate, which is the difference between the injection and production rates, declines from 15.2 MT/year to about 8 MT/year (Figure 4e). The reduction in CO₂ delivery rate decreases the rate at which net CO₂ storage accumulates, which is 373 and 1083 MT at 30 and 100 years, respectively (Figure 4e). As CO₂ cut increases, a greater fraction of produced
CO$_2$ is recirculated CO$_2$. At 20 years, 78 percent of produced CO$_2$ is recirculated, while 84, 90, and 92 percent of CO$_2$ production is recirculated at 30, 50, and 65 years, respectively (Figure 4f).

Thermal mixing causes an immediate small decline in extraction temperature, as cooler brine from the upper reservoir is drawn down to the producers at the bottom of the reservoir (Figure 4c). CO$_2$ breakthrough causes a small decline in extraction temperature at 8 years for the inner ring (Figure 4c). Because of the low heat capacity of CO$_2$, compared to brine, thermal drawdown is minimal until ~70 years. Because of the greater (3-km) spacing between the third and fourth (outer) rings, and because production rate per unit length of producer is less for the outer ring than it is for the inner ring, thermal drawdown is much less for the outer-ring producers.

Figure 2: Four-ring pattern of horizontal wells, reservoir bottom depth of 2.5 km: (a) overpressure ΔP at 10 years, (b) brine saturation $S_{\text{brine}}$ at 30 years, and (c,d) temperature $T$ at 30 and 100 years.
Figure 3: Five-ring pattern of horizontal wells, reservoir bottom depth of 2.5 km: (a) overpressure $\Delta P$ at 10 years, (b) brine saturation $S_{\text{brine}}$ at 30 years, and (c,d) temperature $T$ at 30 and 100 years.

At 30 years, the thermal plumes have not reached the producers (Figure 2c). At 100 years, the inner thermal plume has reached the inner producers, while the outer thermal plume has not yet reached the outer producers (Figure 2d). Because thermal decline for brine production is negligible, the brine-based heat extraction rate exactly corresponds to the brine production rate for both the inner and outer producers (Figures 4a and b). CO$_2$-based heat extraction rate corresponds exactly with CO$_2$ production rate until the thermal decline becomes significant at ~70 years (Figures 4a, b, and c).

**Power generation**

Using GETEM (DOE, 2012), we built a binary-cycle net-power generation table for resource temperatures of 90, 100, 125, 150, 175, 200, and 225°C, and depths of 2.5 and 5 km, assuming submersible pumps are not
required. This table was used to create conversion efficiencies to convert from heat extraction rate to net-power generation, which were used to interpolate values of conversion efficiency corresponding to the simulated extraction temperatures. For CO$_2$-based, direct-turbine, power generation, we used a table of CO$_2$ system conversion efficiencies that include all losses in the entire power system, including pumps and cooling equipment (Randolph, 2013). After applying the brine and CO$_2$ conversion efficiencies to the respective heat extraction rates, we determine brine-based, CO$_2$-based, and total net power generation (Figure 4d). At early time, power is entirely generated from brine production. Starting at 8 years, CO$_2$-based power generation begins. The contribution of CO$_2$-based power increases with time until it is almost equal to brine-based power. Tables 2 and 3 summarize power generation for the first 30 and 100 years, respectively, including power sales, and power sales per MT of net CO$_2$ storage.
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**Figure 4:** Four-ring pattern of horizontal wells, reservoir bottom depth of 2.5 km: (a) brine and CO$_2$ production rate, (b) brine- and CO$_2$-based heat extraction rate, (c) extraction temperature, (d) brine- and CO$_2$-based electrical power generation, (e) CO$_2$ delivery rate and net CO$_2$ storage, (f) instantaneous and cumulative ratio of CO$_2$ production to CO$_2$ injection.
Table 2: Summary of power generation for the first 30 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well pattern</th>
<th>Reservoir depth (km)</th>
<th>Total energy (brine) (kW-hr)</th>
<th>Total energy (CO₂) (kW-hr)</th>
<th>Total energy (brine+CO₂) (kW-hr)</th>
<th>Total sales @ 10¢/kW-hr (M$)</th>
<th>Net storage (CO₂) (MT)</th>
<th>$/MT (CO₂)</th>
<th>Average power (MWe)</th>
<th>Annual power sales (M$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four ring</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.94e10</td>
<td>2.01e9</td>
<td>3.14e10</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>119.4</td>
<td>104.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.09e11</td>
<td>4.34e9</td>
<td>1.13e11</td>
<td>11300</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td>429.7</td>
<td>376.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five ring</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.26e10</td>
<td>3.44e9</td>
<td>3.60e10</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>136.9</td>
<td>120.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.15e11</td>
<td>7.16e9</td>
<td>1.22e11</td>
<td>12248</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>27.04</td>
<td>465.7</td>
<td>408.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Summary of power generation for the first 100 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well pattern</th>
<th>Reservoir depth (km)</th>
<th>Total energy (brine) (kW-hr)</th>
<th>Total energy (CO₂) (kW-hr)</th>
<th>Total energy (brine+CO₂) (kW-hr)</th>
<th>Total sales @ 10¢/kW-hr (M$)</th>
<th>Net storage (CO₂) (MT)</th>
<th>$/MT (CO₂)</th>
<th>Average power (MWe)</th>
<th>Annual power sales (M$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four ring</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.09e10</td>
<td>2.17e10</td>
<td>8.26e10</td>
<td>8260</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.55e11</td>
<td>8.18e10</td>
<td>3.36e11</td>
<td>33600</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>26.58</td>
<td>383.3</td>
<td>336.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five ring</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.21e10</td>
<td>2.49e10</td>
<td>8.70e10</td>
<td>8700</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.48e11</td>
<td>9.06e10</td>
<td>3.39e11</td>
<td>33900</td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>26.53</td>
<td>361.7</td>
<td>339.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Five-ring well pattern, reservoir depth = 2.5 km**

In the preceding example, CO₂ breakthrough and production is delayed, in part, because the inner producers were located at the bottom of the reservoir. To promote earlier CO₂ breakthrough and production, we consider a five-ring pattern of horizontal wells, at the same reservoir bottom depth (2.5 km). This case is the same as the four-ring case, with the addition of an inner ring of producers at the top of the reservoir (Figures 1a and 3). CO₂ breakthrough occurs at just 5 years (Figure 5c), compared to 8 years in the 4-ring case. Earlier CO₂ breakthrough reduces brine production at the upper inner ring (Figure 5a). CO₂ production at the upper inner ring also reduces overpressure in the center of the reservoir (compare Figure 1b with 1a and Figure 3a with 2a), where it also prevents CO₂ storage (compare Figure 3b with 2b). The additional inner ring also increases inner-ring brine production, which increases the brine reinjection and outer-ring brine production rates. Increased CO₂ production reduces the CO₂ delivery rate and net CO₂ storage (compare Figure 5e with 4e). The ratio of produced to injected CO₂ is also increased (compare Figure 5f with 4f). The five-ring case generates more brine-based power, CO₂-based power, and total power, as well as more power sales per MT of net CO₂ storage (Tables 2 and 3).

**Four-ring well pattern, reservoir depth = 5 km**

We also considered the four- and five-ring cases for a reservoir bottom depth of 5 km (Figures 6 and 7). Because water viscosity decreases more steeply with temperature than does that of supercritical CO₂, the CO₂-to-brine mobility ratio decreases with temperature. This causes preferential CO₂ flow to be less pronounced at higher temperature, which delays CO₂ breakthrough and causes CO₂ cut to increase more slowly (compare Figure 6c with 4c). Reduced recirculation of previously produced CO₂ causes CO₂ delivery rate to remain high, increasing net CO₂ storage (compare Figure 6e with 4e) and reducing CO₂ production to injection ratio (compare Figure 6f with 4f). Reduced preferential flow of CO₂ also slows down thermal drawdown for the inner producers (compare Figure 6c with 4c). The larger volume of stored CO₂ displaces more brine, which increases brine production and reduces the rate of decline (compare Figure 6a with 4a). Thus, brine-base heat extraction remains high for 100 years (Figure 6b). Reduced thermal drawdown allows CO₂-based heat extraction to remain high. It is worth noting that increasing the reservoir bottom depth from 2.5 to 5 km, increases power generation by factors of 3.6 and 4 for 30 and 100 years, respectively, and triples power sales per MT of net CO₂ storage (Tables 2 and 3).

**Five-ring well pattern, reservoir depth = 5 km**

For a reservoir bottom depth of 5 km, the addition of the upper inner producer ring promotes earlier CO₂ breakthrough (compare Figure 7c with 6c), while increasing CO₂ production (compare Figure 7a with 6a). Thermal drawdown is negligible for the upper inner and outer producer rings (Figure 7c). For the lower inner producer ring, thermal drawdown is slower than it was for the five-ring case with a depth of 2.5 km (compare Figure 7c with 5c). For the upper inner and outer producer rings, negligible thermal drawdown allows the heat extraction history to almost exactly coincide with the corresponding fluid production history. The modest thermal drawdown starting around 70 years for the lower inner producer ring causes CO₂-
Based heat extraction to decline slightly. Increasing the depth from 2.5 to 5 km triples the power sales per MT of stored CO$_2$ for the five-ring cases, as it did for the four-ring cases (Tables 2 and 3).

During the first 30 years, the addition of the upper inner ring has a large effect, increasing brine-based power by 11 and 6 percent for the 2.5 and 5 km depths, respectively, while increasing CO$_2$-based power by a factor of 2.2 and by 65 percent (Table 2). Over a 100-year period, adding the upper inner ring has a smaller effect; reducing brine-based power by 3 percent, while increasing CO$_2$-based power by 11 percent (Table 3). Over a 100-year period, CO$_2$-based power is 26 and 24 percent of total power for the four-ring cases with 2.5 and 5 km depths, respectively, while increasing CO$_2$-based power by 11 percent, while increasing CO$_2$-based power by 11 percent, while increasing CO$_2$-based power by 11 percent, while increasing CO$_2$-based power by 11 percent, while increasing CO$_2$-based power by 11 percent, while increasing CO$_2$-based power by 11 percent, while increasing CO$_2$-based power by 11 percent, while increasing CO$_2$-based power by 11 percent, while increasing CO$_2$-based power by 11 percent.

Figure 5: Five-ring pattern of horizontal wells, reservoir bottom depth of 2.5 km: (a) brine and CO$_2$ production rate, (b) brine and CO$_2$-based heat extraction rate, (c) extraction temperature, (d) brine and CO$_2$-based electrical power generation, (e) CO$_2$ delivery rate and net CO$_2$ storage, (f) instantaneous and cumulative ratio of CO$_2$ production to CO$_2$ injection.
Figure 6: Four-ring pattern of horizontal wells, reservoir bottom depth of 5 km: (a) brine and CO₂ production rate, (b) brine- and CO₂-based heat extraction rate, (c) extraction temperature, (d) brine- and CO₂-based electrical power generation, (e) CO₂ delivery rate and net CO₂ storage, (f) instantaneous and cumulative ratio of CO₂ production to CO₂ injection.

Reservoir pressure

Maximum overpressure always occurs between the CO₂ injectors and brine reinjectors (Figures, 1, 2a, and 3a). Overpressure continues to increase until CO₂ reaches the inner producers. Because the five-ring pattern promotes earlier CO₂ breakthrough, peak overpressure is less (Figure 1). Because CO₂ and water viscosity decrease with temperature, hydraulic conductivity is greater for the reservoir bottom depth of 5 km than it is for a depth of 2.5 km, resulting in lower peak overpressure. For the cases considered in this study, peak overpressure never exceeds 8 MPa, which is 32 and 16 percent of hydrostatic pressure for depths of 2.5 and 5 km, respectively; which is far below fracture overpressure (typically approximated as 80 percent of hydrostatic pressure).
Figure 7: Five-ring pattern of horizontal wells, reservoir bottom depth of 5 km: (a) brine and CO$_2$ production rate, (b) brine- and CO$_2$-based heat extraction rate, (c) extraction temperature, (d) brine- and CO$_2$-based electrical power generation, (e) CO$_2$ delivery rate and net CO$_2$ storage, (f) instantaneous and cumulative ratio of CO$_2$ production to CO$_2$ injection.

FUTURE WORK

We present promising results for an innovative approach using CO$_2$ for pressure support to drive the recirculation of CO$_2$ and brine as working fluids, which could contribute to the next generation of geothermal energy production. We used a homogeneous model and future work should address the impact of realistic, heterogeneous geology and how this approach might be adapted to complex reservoir settings. Heterogeneity may result in earlier CO$_2$ breakthrough, which may increase the relative contribution of CO$_2$-based power, while decreasing the contribution of brine-based power. Heterogeneity may also reduce net CO$_2$ storage. To more rigorously determine the economic benefits of this approach, it will also be important to incorporate wellbore models of the multi-phase flow of CO$_2$ and brine. This will be important in assessing the potential...
brine-production capacity of long-reach horizontal wells, driven by artesian pressures. The use of a wellbore model will also allow for a more rigorous assessment of the influence of the thermosyphon effect, together with that of artesian pressure, on CO₂-production capacity of horizontal wells.

CONCLUSIONS

Much of the research in applying supercritical CO₂ to geothermal power systems has focused on using CO₂ as a working fluid. This stems from the advantageous thermophysical properties of CO₂, which can reduce the parasitic costs of powering fluid recirculation and enable more direct and efficient power conversion through a turbine. In this paper, we expand upon this idea by demonstrating how CO₂ can be also used as a pressure-support fluid to generate artesian pressures to drive both brine and CO₂ production, thereby using both fluids as working fluids. We develop a well-pattern concept to address the following goals:

- Conserve pressure from injection operations to maximize the fluid-production benefit.
- Minimize the loss of CO₂
- Manage overpressure to reduce related risks, such as induced seismicity and CO₂ leakage.
- Better control of fluid and energy recovery for improved sweep efficiency.
- Provide supplemental pressure-support and working fluids that are chemically compatible with the reservoir formation.

To meet these goals, we proposed and analyzed a well pattern consisting of a minimum of four concentric rings of horizontal producers and injectors, as follows:

1. Inner-ring brine/CO₂ producers
2. CO₂ injectors
3. Brine reinjectors
4. Outer-ring brine producers

For reservoir bottom depths of 2.5 and 5 km, we considered four- and five-ring well patterns, and find:

- A hydraulic ridge/divide is created that restricts lateral migration of CO₂, causing CO₂ production to only occur at the inner ring, while the outer ring only produces brine.
- Artesian pressures are created that drive large brine production rates, which generate power almost immediately, and provide a significant fraction of the total power.
- Because of the density difference between supercritical CO₂ and brine, the inclusion of production (and injection) intervals at multiple depths can enable better control of the relative rates of CO₂ and brine production, which can be a useful tool to improve sweep efficiency.
- After CO₂ breakthrough, CO₂-based power increases, while brine-based power decreases.
- Preferential CO₂ flow decreases with depth; thus, the fraction of produced CO₂ that is recycled decreases with depth, while net CO₂ storage increases.
- Increasing the reservoir bottom depth from 2.5 to 5 km, quadruples power generation over a 100-year period, while power sales per MT of stored CO₂ is tripled.
- Net storage of CO₂ frees up an equivalent volume of make-up brine for reinjection, with the distinct advantage of being derived from the same formation, which reduces the possibility of chemical incompatibility.

The results of our study indicate that the multi-ring, horizontal-well approach, which uses CO₂ as both a pressure-support and working fluid, has the potential of improving the economic viability of geothermal energy production in sedimentary formations.
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