

EPA reviewed AoR modeling information for the CTV III Class VI project and provided technical questions to the applicant on 10/31/24. CTV responded on 2/14/25. EPA’s evaluation of the responses is in the far-right column of the table below. Evaluation of the applicant’s responses are provided in **red**. Follow up requests for the applicant are provided in **red**.

Section	Q #	Comment/Question for CTV	Text Section Update	Response	Evaluation of Response	Response and Evaluation of 2/14/25 Response (in <b>red</b> )
Summary of Significant Comments	1	CTV models the Midland Fault to the west, the Stockton Arch Fault to the east, and the West Tracy Fault as no-flow boundaries. The impact of the three no-flow boundaries is to limit the extent of the AoR boundary to the south while allowing greater extent of the AoR to the north. <b><i>Please provide strong evidence about the impermeability of these faults that would justify their consideration as no-flow boundaries. Alternatively, expansion of the western, eastern and southern boundaries of the modeled domain beyond these faults, and implementation of appropriate properties for these fault zones, could be used to show that these faults are appropriate no-flow boundaries.</i></b>	Attachment A Section 2.3.1	Additional analysis of fault sealing was added to Attachment A section 2.3.1	<b><i>Please describe, in Attachment A, the shale gouge ratio (SGR) and shale smear factor (SSF) methodology and calculations.</i></b>  <b><i>Please provide a figure that shows the results of SGR and SSF.</i></b>  <b><i>Please justify why the calculated values of SGR and SSF provided for the Midland Fault, the Stockton Arch Fault, and the West Tracy Fault support that these faults are sealing.</i></b>	Supporting information and calculations have been added to Attachment A, Section 2.3.  <b>See EPA’s evaluation of the site characterization responses and follow up questions about the faults.</b>

Section	Q #	Comment/Question for CTV	Text Section Update	Response	Evaluation of Response	Response
	2	The model horizontal extent should be larger than the current version. The pressure plume is expected to preferentially extend toward the north, north-east boundary given that combination of no-flow boundaries at the top and bottom and south and west sides. The current boundary location will artificially impose a pressure gradient that will not be reflective of an open flow boundary condition in spite of the use of a large volume multiplier for the boundary blocks. <b><i>To accurately represent the open flow boundary condition, please use GEM’s “aquifer” option and test the sensitivity of the predicted pressure plume (and subsequent AoR) to the parameters used to set up the open flow boundary condition.</i></b>	Attachment B Section 2.2.2	<p>Reference Case 1 and Cases 2 to 9, listed in Table B-5 were run using a Carter Tracy Aquifer connected to the Northern and Eastern open boundaries of the Model. The aquifer thickness, porosity, permeability and ratio of aquifer radius to model radius were varied to understand the sensitivity of the Aquifer size and properties. The permeability, followed by thickness of the Aquifer had the most impact on the CO2 plume area volumetric pressure (Figure B-27), but none of them were considered to be significantly different from the reference Case 1. Similarly, the plume area maps (Figure B-26) for all the cases show negligible variability in comparison to reference Case 1.</p> <p>The originally submitted reference Case 1 used large volume modifiers at the edge cells of the northern and a portion of the eastern boundaries to model an infinite aquifer. A sensitivity run was completed between the originally submitted Case 1 and the Carter Tracy aquifer option described above (new reference Case 1). CO2 plume area volumetric pressure (Figure RtC-1, attached at the bottom of this matrix), and CO2 plume area maps (Figure RtC-2, attached at the bottom of this matrix) between the two cases do not show any significant differences between one another. In response to EPA comment #2 this application will use the new Reference Case 1 with the Carter Tracy aquifer option moving forward. However, since the plume boundary differences between the original reference case and the new reference Case 1 are not significant, the original plume boundary shape is currently used in all maps except for Figure B-26 to best represent the relative CO2 plume boundary differences between the sensitivity cases. Figures RtC-1 and RtC-2 are attached at the bottom of this document.</p>	<p><b><i>Please justify why the original reference case 1 with the northern and eastern open boundaries is replaced with the new reference case 1 with the Carter Tracy aquifer option.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Please justify why the values for aquifer permeability, aquifer radius to reservoir radius, aquifer thickness, and aquifer porosity used in Cases 2-9 are adequate for determining the sensitivity of the predicted AoR to these parameter uncertainties.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>What is the threshold for significant difference the applicant considers in these sensitivity analyses, and what about for negligible difference?</i></b></p>	<p>Please refer to EPA comment #2 and #13 from the May 2024 Technical Review (“Comment/Question for CTV” column) where a request for modeling the model boundary using the aquifer option was made. CTV agrees with the assessment of using an aquifer to model the boundary condition.</p> <p>The model boundary condition has changed from an open flow boundary using a large pore volume multiplier to an aquifer boundary condition with Carter Tracy aquifer. A large pore volume multiplier provides a pressure communication with the extended reservoir at the boundary of the model and can lead to a large pressure change at the boundary. The aquifer boundary condition accounts for average reservoir parameter values and the size of the aquifer, which mitigates the effect of large pressure changes at the boundary and provides a mechanism to model the pressure changes interacting with an extended reservoir region.</p> <p>The reservoir parameters for the extended aquifer were obtained (Technical Review May, 2024) after studying well logs beyond the model domain and obtaining average values of thickness (600 feet), porosity (0.30) and permeability (200 millidarcy). The properties of effective reservoir radius, contact angle and aquifer radius to reservoir radius were obtained from the Carter Tracy aquifer definition provided by the CMG modeling documentation. The aquifer thickness by definition is the average reservoir thickness of the modeled domain and not the extended region beyond the modeled boundary, as obtained from the modeling documentation. The average reservoir thickness was revised to 1,000 feet based on the average net thickness of the model domain and utilized for sensitivity studies. However, no changes to the properties of porosity and permeability were observed. The updated thickness along with other reference properties for Case 1 are displayed in Attachment B, Table B-5.</p> <p>The average of the difference between the reference case plume acreage and sensitivity cases is less than 10 percent which is considered negligible. The plume shape for the sensitivity cases is similar, as shown in Attachment B, Figure B-26.</p> <p>The P10 and P90 cases of permeability variation create the most difference in the pressure front which is within the expected range of values. CTV expects to reduce this uncertainty using site specific permeability data. The difference in the average pressure fronts for the remaining sensitivity cases versus the reference case lie within a 10 percent range of uncertainty which is considered negligible.</p> <p><b>CTV provided a justification for their use of the Carter Tracy aquifer option, and they describe the source of the reservoir parameters. The logs are from beyond the model domain (and presumably outside AoR).</b></p> <p><b>CTV described the threshold for a negligible difference in the sensitivity analysis results; this should provide a suitable base for evaluating monitoring data in the context of AoR reevaluations. The modeled results are generally similar under the alternate assumptions (i.e., showing plume and pressure front movement in the same general direction); the differences would not affect monitoring needs.</b></p>

						Pending pre-operational testing results that confirm these assumptions with site-specific data, EPA has no further questions.
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

Section	Q #	Comment/Question for CTV	Text Section Update	Response	Evaluation of Response	Response
	3	In the absence of site-specific data, the applicant used relative permeability curves measured on cores from a different formation from the neighboring gas field. The residual liquid saturation on this data is rather high. Given that the residual saturation and subsequently the gas relative permeability affect the CO <sub>2</sub> plume extent and post-injection migration, it will be important to understand the sensitivity of these to the assumed relative permeability curve parameters. <b><i>Please conduct a thorough uncertainty analysis of relative permeability-capillary pressure-saturation function parameters (ideally also including hysteresis).</i></b>	Attachment B Section 2.2.2	The reference Case 1 uses end point scaling with an end point of 0.34 for irreducible water saturation and critical water saturation. Hysteresis is modeled in the existing simulation runs using CMG hysteresis option and specifying parameters for end point scaling on the relative permeability curves. Case 11 utilizes the Moke Capillary pressure data and Case 13 reduces end points of irreducible water saturation and critical water saturation to 0.25 (Table B-5). Both case variations do not show any change to the CO <sub>2</sub> plume extent (Figure B-26) or the pressure in the CO <sub>2</sub> plume area (Figure B-27).	<b><i>Please provide the capillary pressure value used for Case 11 and justify why the value is adequate for determining the sensitivity of the predicted AoR to this parameter uncertainty.</i></b>  <b><i>Please justify why the saturation values for irreducible water and critical water used in Case 13 are adequate for determining the sensitivity of the predicted AoR to these parameter uncertainties.</i></b>	The capillary pressure value is based on available data which was acquired in 2013 from the Mokelumne formation nearest to the CTV III project (Figure RtC-3, attached at the bottom of this matrix). This capillary pressure is sufficient to model effects of pore pressure, unless data is acquired at pre-operational testing which would suggest higher values.  Additional data on irreducible water saturations from the Mokelumne River Formation was referenced (DOGGR, 1998) from nearby fields in the basin. These values varied from 0.25 - 0.4. The sensitivity cases 12 and 13 were modeled using the above end points and do not show any difference in results with the reference case, which is explained in the response to EPA comment #2. As new data is collected from pre-operational testing the simulation scenarios will be revised.  <b>The response is acceptable; as noted above, pre-operational testing should confirm the assumptions and model inputs.</b>  Reference: <i>California Department of Conservation Division of Soil, Gas and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR). 1998. California Oil and Gas Fields. Volume III – Northern California</i>
Summary of Significant Comments (cont.)	4	The applicant has postulated that the target zone is under-pressured due to gas production from the same formation. This implies that there is potential for pressure communication between the proposed injection operations and any active gas production operations within the boundary of the pressure plume. <b><i>Please take into consideration this potential interference and its effect on CO<sub>2</sub> and pressure plumes in the model.</i></b>	N/A	The pressure depletion seen in the injection zone is believed to be from historic gas production in the project area. Currently there is no active oil or gas production within the project pressure front.	<b><i>Please model, as a sensitivity case, the potential interference due to active oil or gas production in the injection zone within the project area.</i></b>	Please refer to Attachment B, Section 1.8 for initial pressure consideration. Any further initial pressure data updates will be completed after pre-operational testing. There is no active oil and gas production within the project pressure front in the Mokelumne River Formation.  <b>Section 1.8 describes initial model conditions, including an initial pressure of hydrostatic less 128 pounds per square inch (psi), based on repeat formation test pressure data from an analog PGE test injection well. The response is acceptable, pending gathering of pressure data during pre-operational testing.</b>

Section	Q #	Comment/Question for CTV	Text Section Update	Response	Evaluation of Response	Response
	5	The approach used to determine the sensitivity of the predicted AoR to porosity and permeability values may not be adequate. <b><i>Please develop P10, P50, P90 realizations of porosity and permeability to assess the sensitivity of predicted pressure and saturation fronts (and related AoR) to those parameter uncertainties.</i></b>	Attachment A Section 2.2.2	Sensitivity Cases 16 through 19 were run to address P10 and P90 realizations for permeability and porosity. Refer to response to EPA question #23.	<b><i>Please explain how the porosity and permeability multipliers used correlate with the P10 and P90 realizations for porosity and permeability.</i></b>  <b><i>Were P50 realizations run for porosity and permeability?</i></b>	<p>The difference between well log and core data were used to determine that porosity multipliers of 0.83x and 1.1x represent the P10 and P90 range, respectively. These multipliers were then applied to the model's reference case porosity to calculate the corresponding P10 and P90 porosity properties.</p> <p>CTV estimates that the permeability multipliers of 0.5x and 2x adequately capture the expected uncertainty in the well log calculated permeability values. We expect to further refine this uncertainty estimate with site specific data collected during pre-operational testing.</p> <p>The reference case 1 in Table B-5 is a representative case of P50 properties obtained from the distribution.</p> <p><b>The response is acceptable, pending gathering of porosity and permeability data during pre-operational testing.</b></p>
Model Suitability	6	The CMG-GEM compositional simulator has capabilities to accommodate site-specific geologic conditions, including faults, and operational conditions such as wells with multiple perforations and varying injection schedules. The applicant simulated known faults that are shown to be barriers to flow, including the Midland, West Tracy, and Stockton Arch faults to define the western and southern boundaries.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	7	<b><i>It is not specified how injection occurs into the well: is there a wellbore model, a source at the top of the well and a large vertical permeability in grid blocks representing the well, or mass sources distributed along the well with strength proportional to permeability-thickness product of the layer?</i></b>	N/A	Appendix 4: Operational Procedures was formulated using a wellbore model with the source at the top of the well and large vertical permeability in the injection zone. As mentioned in Appendix 4: Operational Procedures, Petroleum Experts' Prosper was utilized to create this model, taking inputs from the reservoir model to enable the calculation of near wellbore effects of CO2 injection. Allocation of CO2 injection within CMG-GEM is based on KH of each layer the well injects into.	This explanation is sufficient to address the question. <u>Text should be expanded in Section 1.9 of Appendix B pointing to the Appendix 4 for details on this topic. The current language was too sparse to guide the reader to the information.</u>	N/A  It does not appear that CTV inserted additional text to Section 1.9 to address EPA's suggestion. However, the section does reference Table B-3, operating details at each injection well.
--	---	--	-----	---	---	--

Section	Q #	Comment/Question for CTV	Text Section Update	Response	Evaluation of Response	Response
	8	Salt precipitation is not mentioned. Salt precipitation can decrease near-well porosity and permeability, thereby decreasing injectivity. Site-specific relative permeability and capillary pressure curves, and a fine grid around the injection well are required to assess this issue, which should be done when site-specific data becomes available.	N/A	N/A	<u>Please consider salt precipitation in the model when site-specific data, such as site-specific relative permeability and capillary pressure curves, become available.</u>	N/A  Salt precipitation does not appear to be discussed in the AoR and Corrective Action Plan. While the request refers to updates following pre-operational testing, the AoR and Corrective Action Plan is intended to guide future modeling efforts throughout project operations.  <b><i>Please describe in the AoR and Corrective Action Plan that salt precipitation will be considered in model updates during AoR reevaluations.</i></b>
	9	No temperature changes are shown. Minor effects are expected if CO <sub>2</sub> injection temperature is the same as initial reservoir temperature, but injection temperature is not provided.	Attachment B Section 1.9	The anticipated injection temperature at the wellhead is 90 – 130° F.	Acceptable response and modification.	N/A

Model Design	10	[see PDF for full text] This calculation indicates that the lateral extent of the current grid may be too small. <b><i>Please provide results of the predicted pressure at the end of the injection and the end of the simulation time.</i></b> Given that three side boundaries and the top and bottom of the injection zone are no flow boundaries, the pressure front will extend unsymmetrically towards the north, north-east side of the model domain and most probably beyond the current model boundary.	Attachment B Section 2.1	New figures B-21 and B-22 have been added to display pore volume averaged pressure in the CO2 plume area; and initial, peak, and delta pressure across the model domain.	Acceptable response and modification.	N/A
--------------	----	--	-----------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	-----



Section	Q #	Comment/Question for CTV	Text Section Update	Response	Evaluation of Response	Response
Model Design (cont.)	11	Lateral spacing ranges from 50' x 50' around the injectors, increasing to 500' x 500' and to 100' x 100' in the far-field. The grid spacing is probably fine for the bulk of the model, but it is much too coarse to properly resolve near-injection-well effects such as the actual pressure increase during injection, formation of a dryout zone, and salt precipitation. <b>Please revise the model to include smaller grid spacing near the injectors.</b>	Attachment B Section 2.2.2	Reference Case 1 uses a Tartan grid with a local grid refinement (LGR) around the injector well bores. Local grid cells around the injectors have dimensions of 50- by 50-feet. New sensitivity Case 10 was run with LGR around injector well bores with a refinement of 20 grid cells for each grid block, resulting in grid dimensions of 25- by 25-feet (Table B-5). The results do not show any significant difference in bottom hole pressures provided for injectors C1 & C2 (Figure B-28) or pore volume averaged pressure in the CO2 plume area (Figure B-27). Further refinement is not expected to change the near well-bore pressure response.	<b>Was the new sensitivity Case 10 run for injectors E1, E2, W1, and W2?</b>	Case 10 with Local Grid Refinement of 25 feet grid cells, as provided in Table B-5 was run for all the injectors C1, C2, E1, E2, W1 and W2. None of the wells show changes to the well-bore pressure response with additional grid refinement. Figures B-28a, B-28b, and B-28c provides a comparison of injection bottom hole pressure data for each of the injectors.  The requested figures were provided. No further questions.
	12	The injection rate is constant, and the resulting pressure response stays below maximum operating pressure. However, the grid resolution at the injection well is too coarse to properly calculate the near-injection well pressure. Unless the model includes a special well feature that eliminates the need for fine grid resolution near the well (which CMG-GEM has but is not mentioned in the application), then modeled pressure will be too small, possibly enabling injection rate to be too large.	Attachment B Section 2.2.2	New sensitivity Case 10 described in response to EPA question #11 demonstrates that LGR around the injectors results in no significant difference from reference Case 1. Further refinement is not expected to change the near well-bore pressure response.	See Comment 11 above.	N/A

Section	Q #	Comment/Question for CTV	Text Section Update	Response	Evaluation of Response	Response
	13	<p>The Western, Southern, and part of the Eastern edge of the model domain, defined by the Midland, West Tracy and Stockton Arch faults are set as no-flow boundaries. The remaining Northern and part of the Eastern Edges of the model domain are stated to be “modeled as open boundaries using large volume modifiers at the edge cells to model an infinite aquifer.” However, large volume modifiers make the boundary a constant-property boundary, in particular a constant-pressure boundary. As mentioned earlier, the pressure plume will likely extend beyond the current grid boundary. The predicted pressure response will be sensitive to the value of the volume modifier especially given that the grid used for simulations may not be adequately large. The combination of the grid dimension and assumed volume modifier value will artificially influence predicted pressure. This could dampen the modeled pressure response to injection and make the predicted AoR too small. CMG-GEM has an “aquifer” option available for lateral boundary conditions, which enables the boundary to model an infinite aquifer. <b><i>Please use the “aquifer” option instead of using large volume modifiers. It is recommended to study the sensitivity of the predicted pressure response to both grid dimension and the parameters used to set up the infinite aquifer.</i></b></p>	Attachment B Section 2.2.2	<p>See response to EPA question #2 for “aquifer” option sensitivity results. The CO2 plume area is the Area of Review of the model; therefore the modeled grid dimension provides sufficient coverage to evaluate incremental pressure in the area.</p>	See Comments 2 and 11 above.	N/A



Section	Q #	Comment/Question for CTV	Text Section Update	Response	Evaluation of Response	Response
	14	In the absence of site-specific data on the caprock, the applicant has assumed that the caprock (shale) has the same geomechanical response as the target zone (sandstone) and assumed that the fracture pressure of the caprock is the same as that of the target zone. <b><i>Please provide justification for these assumptions.</i></b>	N/A	Based on available fracture gradient data, the fracture gradient in the injection zone and surrounding shales appear to be quite similar (Table A-8). No fracture gradient data was available for the upper confining zone, so data from the H&T shale beneath the injection zone was assumed to be analogous for surrounding shales. Fracture gradient for both the injection zone and confining zone will be acquired via step rate test as part of the preoperational testing plan. Core rock mechanics data from both the injection zone and upper confining zone will be acquired as part of the preoperational testing plan. This will help to better assess the assumption of similar geomechanical response between the two formations.	This explanation is acceptable pending collection of site-specific data on the caprock during pre-operational testing. <u><i>Consider adding this text to the AoR document or the Narrative.</i></u>	N/A  The AoR and Corrective Action Plan does not incorporate the text as suggested; however, gathering confining zone data and performing step-rate testing are pre-operational testing objectives. No further questions.
Model Design (cont.)	15	<b><i>Please create plots of CO<sub>2</sub> saturation/pressure vs. lateral distance from the injection wells at various times, CO<sub>2</sub> saturation/pressure vs. time at the distance corresponding to the leading edge of the plume after CO<sub>2</sub> injection is terminated, and distance traversed by the plume for the injection and post-injection periods vs. time, in order to provide further evidence that plume movement has ended and that pressure has stabilized.</i></b>	Attachment B Section 2.1	Figures B-18, B-21, B-22, and B-23 have been added to provide further evidence that plume movement has ended and that CO <sub>2</sub> saturation and pressure have stabilized.	Acceptable response and modification.	N/A

Section	Q #	Comment/Question for CTV	Text Section Update	Response	Evaluation of Response	Response
Input Parameters vs. Site-Specific Conditions	16	<b><i>Please clarify how temperature, pressure, and salinity were populated throughout the model domain.</i></b> It appears that the model was run as isothermal at average reservoir temperatures despite its large thickness. The application does not discuss the local geothermal gradient and how much the temperature would vary based on the target injection zone. Given that CO <sub>2</sub> properties including density and viscosity are strongly dependent on the temperature and these properties affect the CO <sub>2</sub> movement and plume extent, it will be important to assess the variability of the temperature over injection interval and subsequent variability in the CO <sub>2</sub> plume extent and migration. <b><i>Please clarify whether the initial pressure condition in the reservoir was set based on a hydrostatic equilibrium or constant pressure.</i></b>	Attachment B Section 1.8	The temperature is set as variable with depth using a gradient of 0.013 deg/F, approximated from logging run bottom hole temperature data (Figure B-13) and an initial pressure was determined to be hydrostatic less 128 psi which is obtained as RFT pressure data from an analog PGE test injection well (Figure B-14 and Figure B-15). The pressure is defined at a datum depth, from which the reservoir simulation software equilibrates pressure for the model. Salinity of 15,500 PPM was used approximated from water analysis as discussed Attachment A, Section 2.8.2. Refer to Table B-2 for initial conditions summary.	Acceptable response and modification.	N/A
	17	Hysteretic gas-phase relative permeability is claimed to be used, but the plots provided of relative permeability and capillary pressure (Figures 3.10 and 3.11) are non-hysteretic. <b><i>Please provide hysteretic gas-phase relative permeability plots.</i></b>	Attachment B Section 1.5	A hysteretic gas-phase relative permeability plot has been added as Figure B-12.	Acceptable response and modification.	N/A
	18	<b><i>Please provide the values used for the vertical permeability and the pore compressibility.</i></b>	Attachment B, Section 1.4	The permeability in the vertical direction is approximated as 1/5 <sup>th</sup> of the horizontal permeability in the model. Pore compressibility is 3.5e-6.	<b><i>What is the horizontal permeability used in the model?</i></b>	Refer to Attachment A, Section 2.4.2 and Attachment B, Figure B-8.  Table A-6 in Attachment A provides data from core samples within the Mokelumne Formation (from 4 wells), including horizontal permeability. Values range from 5 to ~1,900 MD. These are consistent with Figure B-8. No further questions.

Section	Q #	Comment/Question for CTV	Text Section Update	Response	Evaluation of Response	Response
	19	The applicant determined the fracture gradient of the injection zone from the results of formation integrity tests in the Mokelumne River formation in nearby wells, and thereby determined the maximum pressure allowable in the storage formation. Plots of average pressure resulting from CO <sub>2</sub> injection suggest that reservoir pressure neared but did not come anywhere close to that value. However, pressure at the wells will be much larger than average reservoir pressure. <b><i>Please verify that the pressure at the wells will be less than the fracture gradient of the injection zone.</i></b>	Attachment B, Section 1.10	Comparing the bottom hole pressure of the maximum design rate to the reservoir pressure at the end of the project life yields a difference of less than 110 psi in all modeled wells, which is greater than 1,000 psi below the fracture pressure of the injection zone. Each injectors bottom hole pressure is shown in Figure B-16 and grid block pressures surrounding the injection wells are reported in Figure B-17.	Acceptable response and modification.	N/A

Section	Q #	Comment/Question for CTV	Text Section Update	Response	Evaluation of Response	Response
Description of Computational Modeling Results	20	<p>The critical pressure calculation was not documented adequately. Figure 3.17 shows that the storage formation is underpressured relative to the deepest USDW. However, the applicant does not use EPA's suggested formula for the underpressured case (EPA 2013, Method 1, Eq-1, Eq-2). Instead, they use EPA's suggested formula (Nicot et al., 2009, Eq. 9) designed for the hydrostatic case, with an ad hoc correction to account for underpressure (Eqs. (1) and (2)), with no explanation or justification. Even if Eqs. (1) and (2) do represent a reasonable approach, the applicant did not show the values for any of the variables that go into these equations except one (the amount of underpressure). They do not show any resulting critical pressure values, only the corresponding AoR footprint. A better approach would be to consider the geometry for which critical pressure will be a minimum (the smallest distance between the top of the storage formation and the bottom of the USDW), and calculate that one value of critical pressure, for which there is one set of input parameters to Eqs. (1) and (2). Then all the parameters should be displayed in a table. Also, as stated earlier the sensitivity of predicted pressure with respect to the imposed boundary condition and grid will affect the predicted AoR.</p> <p><b>Please revise the critical pressure calculation.</b></p>	Attachment B Section 3; Appendix 10	Attachment B Section 3 (AoR delineation) and Appendix 10 have been revised to rely on risk-based AoR delineation, and the pressure calculations are no longer used.	<p>The risk-based AoR delineation method used by the applicant is not the recommended method for a storage reservoir system that is under-pressured. Page 39 of EPA's Class VI AoR and Corrective Action Guidance lists Method 1 as the recommended method for calculating the threshold or critical pressure that defines the pressure front used to delineate the AoR for under-pressured systems.</p> <p><b>Please perform the critical pressure calculation using Method 1 outlined in EPA's Class VI Well AoR Evaluation and Corrective Action Guidance for an under-pressured reservoir. Please use one set of input parameter values to Equations 1 and 2 of Method 1 and show these parameters and the resulting critical pressure value in a table.</b></p> <p><b>Please provide a figure that shows the contour line that encompasses the maximum extent of the separate-phase CO2 plume or pressure front. See Figure 3-6 on page 47 of EPA's UIC Class VI Well AoR Evaluation and Corrective Action Guidance for an example.</b></p>	<p>As requested, all calculations for Box 3-2 were incorporated into a workflow in the Petrel Geomodeling software. This workflow uses the top of reservoir and base of USDW depth surfaces to calculate a spatially varying depth difference, leading to a more accurate critical pressure determination.</p> <p>The critical pressure front boundary calculated using critical pressure surface is provided in Appendix B-4, Report 1, Figure 1.</p> <p>Table RtC-1 (attached at the end of this matrix) shows an example of critical pressure calculation using Method 1 at one location along the surface (EPA Class VI Well Area of Review Evaluation and Corrective Action Guidance, Section 3.4.1).</p> <p><b>The critical pressure calculation in Table RtC-1 is consistent with the methods in the AoR and Corrective Action Guidance. CTV also provided the requested figure.</b></p> <p><b>Please update the CTV III – AoR Critical Pressure Calculation document based on this response.</b></p>

Section	Q #	Comment/Question for CTV	Text Section Update	Response	Evaluation of Response	Response
	21	<b><i>In Figure 3.12, which shows CO<sub>2</sub> saturation at 100 years as a color map, please include values on the color scale.</i></b> This will make it possible to see whether a dryout zone developed.	Attachment B Figures	Figure B-18 has been updated as requested.	Acceptable response and modification.	N/A
	22	<b><i>In Figure 3.12 and Figure 3.13, please identify the horizon or depth of the cross sections in plan view.</i></b>	Attachment B Figures	Figures B-18 & B-19 have been updated as requested.	<b><i>In Figure B-19, is this the maximum saturation at any depth? This should be stated in the text in Section 2.1 of Attachment B and on the figure.</i></b>	Yes, Figure B-19 displays the maximum plume area at depth in the injection zone through time. Attachment B, Section 2.1 and Figure B-19 have been updated as requested.  Section 2.1 references Figure B-19, which displays the maximum plume area with depth at various time steps through the project. No further questions.
Model Calibration and Sensitivity Analyses	23	A regression relationship between porosity and horizontal permeability was derived from well log and core analysis using 13 data points from two wells located near the AoR. Then porosities from well-logs from about 70 wells within the model footprint were used to create a 3D porosity distribution and then a 3D horizontal permeability distribution. Permeability and porosity values were only varied by 10% from the mean. This is a very low variability and is not really a rigorous uncertainty quantification. <b><i>Please develop P10, P50, P90 realizations of porosity and permeability to assess the sensitivity of predicted pressure and saturation fronts (and related AoR) to those parameter uncertainties.</i></b> This should not be too time-consuming or computationally expensive given that the applicant has already utilized a sequential gaussian based kriging approach.	Attachment B Section 2.2.2	The uncertainty range in porosity was further studied and the range was expanded based on differences between core and log data. This resulted in an uncertainty range of -17% to +10% for porosity. The permeability uncertainty range was also increased and is now -50% to +100%. These changes are captured in sensitivity cases 16 to 19 (Table B-5). These changes to porosity and permeability have minimal effect on the AoR. Changes to the volumetric averaged pressure in the CO2 plume area and CO2 plume area are displayed in Figures B-27 and B-26, respectively. These sensitivity cases do not result in any additional corrective action wells. These are very large ranges, and they should adequately capture the expected uncertainty; CTV expects to narrow down the uncertainty range with site specific data during preoperational testing.	See Comment 5 above.	N/A

Section	Q #	Comment/Question for CTV	Text Section Update	Response	Evaluation of Response	Response
	24	Based on the range of porosity and permeability values, the sensitivity analysis does not represent a conservative approach since the range of variability used by the applicant is too small.	Attachment B Section 2.2.2	Please refer to response to EPA question #23.	See Comment 5 above.	N/A
	25	<b>Please perform a mesh refinement sensitivity study.</b> The applicant claimed to use 50' wide cells in the injection zone, but these are not shown in the grid figure. Even 50' is too large to properly model a potential water vaporization/dry out region and salt precipitation, and accurately reproduce pressure changes at the well.	Attachment B Section 2.2.2	Please refer to response to EPA question #11.	See Comment 11 above.	N/A
General Comments	26	<b>Geomechanical modeling is needed because of the presence of the faults. A leakage risk assessment for faults and penetrating wells is also needed.</b>	Attachment A Section 2.3.1 and 2.5.3	Fault sealing analysis and reactivation modeling have been added to Attachment A Sections 2.3.1 & 2.5.3, as requested.	See Comment 1 above.	N/A
	27	Many figures and tables are too low resolution - details cannot be read.	Attachment B Figures	Figures throughout the report have been revised or replaced, as requested.	Acceptable response and modification.	N/A
	28	References for critical pressure calculation are missing: Nicot et al., 2009 and McCutcheon et al., 1993.	N/A	These references are no longer included.	See Comment 20 above.	N/A

Section	Q #	Comment/Question for CTV	Text Section Update	Response	Evaluation of Response	Response
	29	The residual liquid saturation (Slr=0.53) is very large, making both liquid and gaseous relative permeabilities rather small. It would be worthwhile trying smaller values of Slr in the sensitivity studies (possibly in conjunction with higher intrinsic permeability), to see if the CO <sub>2</sub> plume moves more post-injection. As it is currently, it scarcely moves at all.	Attachment B Section 2.2.2	The reference Case 1 uses end point scaling with an end point of 0.34 for irreducible water saturation and critical water saturation. Hysteresis is modeled in the existing simulation runs using CMG hysteresis option and specifying parameters for end point scaling on the relative permeability curves. Case 11 utilizes the Moke Capillary pressure data and case 13 reduces end points of irreducible water saturation and critical water saturation to 0.25 (Table B-5). Both case variations do not show any change to the pressure in the CO2 plume area (Figure B-27) or the CO2 plume extent (Figure B-26).	See Comment 3 above.	N/A
	30	The brine density (1010 kg/m3) and viscosity (1.26E-3 Pa-sec) at reservoir conditions (T = 151 °F = 66 °C and P = 19.7 MPa = 2860 psi, salinity 15,500 ppm) both seem too big. Justification for these values is needed.	Attachment A Tables	Table A-15 has been updated to display reservoir condition fluid properties.	<b><i>Please provide justification and documented evidence of the values displayed in Table A- 15.</i></b>	Refer to Attachment A, Section 2.8.2 for TDS ranges. Properties of density and viscosity were derived from MBAL software (Petroleum Experts v12.5) for Brine at the initial conditions shown in Table B-2. Brine viscosity is derived using a combination of proprietary correlations (at a certain temperature and salinity) and pressure corrected values from Bradley et. al, 1987 (Petroleum Engineering Handbook, Figure 24). Formation volume factor is derived from Frick Petroleum Engineering Handbook, 1962, which provides density from specific gravity of brine.  The salinity values are provided in Attachment A, and water chemistry reports are included. The wells are outside the AoR, but baseline geochemistry will be collected during pre-operational testing. No further questions.
	31	The lowermost USDW is referred to as " <i>undifferentiated non-marine sediments</i> " in one place and as " <i>the Markley Formation</i> " elsewhere. Please clarify the inconsistency.	Attachment A Section 2.2.2 and 2.7.3	The lowermost USDW is the Upper Markley Formation. Section 2.2.2 and 2.7.3 and Figures A-12 and B-1 have been updated to clarify the discrepancy.	Acceptable response and modification.	N/A



	32	The file “Att A – CTV III Storage Project_V4.pdf” (Project Narrative), Figure 2.7-4 shows a cross section B-B'. Along the cross-section, intersections with other cross-sections are indicated: C-C' seems to be in the wrong place, D-D' and E-E' are never mentioned, and B-B' does not make sense for a cross-section to intersect itself.	Attachment A Figures	Figure A-48 and A-49 were modified from GEI Tracy Subbasin GSP, Nov 2021, figure 4-10, p.112. Cross sections on Figure A-48 and A-49 have been relabeled to correct the issue.	Acceptable response and modification.	N/A
	33	Some Figures were numbered incorrectly, e.g., Figure 3.2 was used twice on pages 5 and 8 of the “Att B - AoR_CA CTV III V3.1.pdf” file.	Attachment B Figures	The figure was mislabeled and has been updated to reflect the correct figure number, Figure B-4.	Acceptable response and modification.	N/A
	34	On page 20 of the “Att B - AoR_CA CTV III V3.1.pdf” file, the applicant notes that “The results of CTV’s simulation compare favorably against the previous work by LBNL regarding storage capacity and CO <sub>2</sub> plume size.” The applicant neither shows any comparison plot nor cited the LBNL’s study that was referenced.	Attachment B Section 2.2 and References	References have been added to Section 2.2 and the reference section of Attachment B	<b><i>Please provide a copy of or a link to the LBNL’s study.</i></b>	It does not appear the study was provided. This will be needed for the permit record.  <b><i>Please provide a copy of or a link to the LBNL’s study.</i></b>
	35	On page 20 of the “Att B - AoR_CA CTV III V3.1.pdf” file, Figure 1 should be named Figure 3.15.	Attachment B Section 2.2.1	The figure reference was mislabeled and has been updated to reflect the correct figure number, Figure B-24.	Acceptable response and modification.	N/A
	36	On page 20 of the “Att B - AoR_CA CTV III V3.1.pdf” file, the applicant notes that “The CO <sub>2</sub> plume for Injectate 1 and Injectate 2 is consistent with the plume outline for 100% CO <sub>2</sub> injectate (Figure 1), which was defined by a 0.05 global CO <sub>2</sub> mole fraction for all 3 cases. The 100 year post end of injection plumes for the 3 cases are shown below in Figure 1.”. There is no Figure 1 in the report.	Attachment B Section 2.2.1	The figure reference was mislabeled and has been updated to reflect the correct figure number, Figure B-24.	Acceptable response and modification.	N/A

	37	On page 27 of the “Att B - AoR_CA CTV III V3.1.pdf” file, the applicant states that “Attachment B-3 shows diagrams for the current well configuration and proposed corrective action.” Attachment B-3 is missing.	Attachment B Section 4.5	This reference was mislabeled. It has been updated to reflect the correct name, Appendix B-3.	Appendix B-3 is still missing. <b><i>Please provide a copy of the appendix.</i></b>	Appendix B-3 is provided as an attachment to this submission.  CTV provided the appendix as requested. No further questions.
--	----	---	--------------------------	---	---	--

Section	Q #	Comment/Question for CTV	Text Section Update	Response	Evaluation of Response	Response
Project Interference with the Pelican Renewables and CTV V Projects	38	EPA guidance <sup>1</sup> states that “In all cases, EPA recommends that AoR delineation models account for all wells injecting into (including any injection wells associated with other UIC well classes or other Class VI operations) or pumping from the injection zone or any other zones that are hydraulically connected to the injection zone.” Pressure plumes follow the principle of superposition, where pressure is additive. Thus, to correctly calculate the AoR for these three close sites, CTV and Pelican should include the pressure buildup of the other sites in their calculations; for example, add an extra injection well to reflect the total injection volume from the other projects in the simulations. Please propose how CTV would like to proceed. Pelican has been provided this information as well, and their application materials can be found on the EPA’s website <sup>2</sup> . If it would be helpful, EPA can facilitate a meeting between CTV and Pelican to discuss this issue.	Attachment B Section 3; Appendix 10	The permit application was revised to evaluate interference from the 3 projects. Case 12 simulation run considers interference from all three projects. Specifically, risk-based AoR delineation accounted for the combined pressure increase from the 3 projects (see Appendix 10).	<p>The applicant states that they ran a sensitivity Case 12 to examine the impacts of pressure interference from Pelican and CTV-V. They state that the addition of these pressure sources did not impact the results from the risk-based AoR delineation. However, as stated in the Evaluation Summary and Comment 20 above, the risk-based approach for AoR delineation is not recommended for an under-pressured storage reservoir system.</p> <p><b><i>Please re-run the Case 12 simulation based on the AoR delineated according to the four steps described in Box 3-2 on pages 56-60 of EPA UIC Class VI Well AoR and Corrective Action Guidance<sup>2</sup>.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Please provide a discussion around the impact on magnitude of pressure increases and AoR boundary without and with the interference of the Pelican and CTV-V projects.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Please provide a figure that shows the pressure difference between the case with and the case without the interference of the Pelican and CTV-V projects.</i></b></p>	<p>The interference case was rerun as an independent scenario with all 3 projects (CTV III, CTV V, and Pelican Renewables) beginning injection simultaneously. Refer to Attachment B, Section 2.2.2.</p> <p>Less than 5% increase in well bottom hole injection pressure(s) is observed in the interference case above the reference base case, and less than 1% change in areal coverage. This leads to a negligible change in the AoR boundary as defined in the risk-based AoR methodology, Appendix B-4 and Attachment B, Section 3.</p> <p>Pressure difference maps for both the reference base case and the interference case are available in Appendix B-4 as Figure 3a and Figure 3b, respectively.</p> <p><b>CTV performed the additional sensitivity analysis as requested, and Figures 3a and Figure 3b of Appendix B-4 support the response above (i.e., limited pressure increase and change in the AoR). The response is acceptable.</b></p>
EPA December 20, 2024 Evaluation Summary	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><b><i>Please delineate the Area of Review (AoR) according to the four steps described in Box 3-2 on pages 56-60 of the Guidance.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Please re-run all the sensitivity analyses to assess the impact on the boundary of this AoR.</i></b></p>	<p>All sensitivity cases were rerun as provided in Table B-5. Refer to the response to EPA comment #2 which explains impacts to the plume AoR. The plume boundaries for the sensitivity cases are depicted in Attachment B, Figure B-26.</p> <p><b>A row for the interference case was dropped from Table B-5 of Attachment B Version 5. <i>Please add this row back to the table.</i></b></p>