



Hydrogen injectivity and recovery in porous media

Eike Marie Thaysen

PhD Biogeochemistry Researcher in underground gas storage and groundwater quality

eike.thaysen@ed.ac.uk



European Union



Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council





Scales and deliverability of hydrogen storage



Where can we store 20 TWh of H₂?



Interseasonal porous media H₂ storage– a technology in its infancy shoes



Parameters that affect H₂ injectivity and recovery

Key parameter: Wettability (contact angle between H₂, brine and rock)



organic acids, oil and biofilm coating affect the wettability and, depending on measurement technique (buoyancy, capillary and gravitational forces acting) salinity, temperature, pressure

- Porosity, permeability, tortuosity, pore network connectivity also important descriptors for H₂ fluid flow beware microorganisms!
- Cushion gas



Davies, D. (2003). Understanding biofilm resistance to antibacterial agents. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery (2), 114–122





Clogging of pores and pipes

Experiments on H₂ injectivity and recovery at Diamond Light Source, UK



Rock sample inside X-ray transparent pressure vessel

Pumps for injecting H₂ and brine and for the confining pressure and backpressure

Residual H₂ saturation increases with pore fluid pressure

5 MPa 2 MPa 7 MPa 49.5 % $49.8 \pm 0.01\%$ 51.7 ±0.66% H₂ saturation after injection into brine saturated rock @C_a= 1.7*10⁻⁸ 1 mm 1 mm 1 mm Total: 10.0 ± Total: 21.4 % Total: 11.5 ± 0.02% 0.64% **Residual H**₂ saturation Percentage Percentage Percentage after brine imbibition of injected: of injected: of injected: 20 % 24% 43% @C_a= 2.4*10⁻⁶ mm **1** mm mm

(all at constant confining pressure of 8 MPa)

Thaysen et al., Pore-scale imaging of hydrogen displacement and trapping in porous media, Int J Hydrogen J, in press, 2022

Rock dependency Experimental condition Methodology

H ₂ Injectivity	Residual H ₂ (recovery)	Rock material	Method	Reference
4 %	Less than 2 % trapped (more than 50 % recovered)	Fontainebleau sandstone	Nuclear Magnetic Resonance at 0.4 MPa and ambient temperature	Al-Yaseri et al. (2022)
65 %	41 % trapped (39 % recovered)	Gosford sandstone (very short sample**)	Micro-CT ambient temperature and pressure	Jha et al. (2021)
36 %	25 % trapped (30 % recovered)	Bentheimer sandstone	Micro-CT 10 MPa and 50°C	Jangda et al. (2022)
50 %	10-21 % trapped (57-80 % recovered)	Clashach sandstone	Micro-CT 2-7 MPa and ambient temperature	Thaysen et al. (2022)

How can we avoid reduced injectivity and withdrawal by clogging ?

Site selection: Growth criteria of major cultivated H₂ consuming microbes



- Microbial life limits with regards to temperature,
 pH and salinity for four key hydrogen consuming
 bacteria:
 - Methanogens (consume hydrogen/produce methane)
 - Homoactogens (consume hydrogen/produce acetone)
 - Sulphur species reducing (consume hydrogen/produce hydrogen sulphide)
- Conditions are unfavourable to bacterial activity:
 - Above temperatures of 122°C
 - Above salinities of 4.4 M NaCl

Thaysen et al., 2022, Estimating microbial growth and hydrogen storage in porous media, Renew Sustain Energ Rev, 151(111481), 1-15

- No risk: fields with a temperature >122°C can be considered as sterile, as no H₂ consuming bacteria have been found above this temperature. 9 UKCS gas fields
- Low risk: fields >90 °C are considered paleosterile. 35 UKCS gas fields
- Medium risk: fields >55°C and a salinity > 1.7 mol L⁻¹ NaCl, as no cultivated H₂ consuming bacteria can grow in this combination. 22 UKCS gas fields
- High risk: fields <55°C and < 1.7 mol L⁻¹
 NaCl because these are conditions optimal for growth. 9 UKCS gas fields



Thaysen et al., 2023, Microbial risk assessment for underground hydrogen storage in porous rocks, in review.

Microbial risk in depleted gas fields¬-in-use pipelines

Southern North Sea holds many not-inuse pipelines which could be repurposed for H₂ transport to 'no risk´ or ´low risk´ depleted gas fields

in porous rocks, in review.



Northern and Central North Sea

- H₂ injectivity ~4-65% of the pore space and independent of pore fluid pressure
- 30-80 % of the injected H_2 can be recovered making the H_2 storage operation <u>feasible</u>
- H₂ recovery decreases with pore fluid pressure, indicating that shallow reservoirs are more favourable for H₂ storage
- H₂ storage sites should be carefully selected with respect to temperature and salinity as microbial activity can reduce the injectivity and recovery (& consume H₂)

Thank you!

Eike Marie Thaysen <u>eike.thaysen@ed.ac.uk</u>





No show stoppers... so far

- Perspective paper on enabling large-scale hydrogen storage in porous media the scientific challenges <u>https://doi.org/10.1039/D0EE03536J</u>
- ✓ Biological site screening: We suggest that storage reservoirs over 122°C or with salinities above 4.4 M NaCl equivalent will be less favourable to microbial growth <u>https://authors.elsevier.com/c/1dYWP4s9Hw2Eu4</u>
- ✓ No significant geochemical reactions have been observed in our reactive experiments <u>https://pubs.acs.org/doi/full/10.1021/acsenergylett.2c01024</u>
- ✓ Column height calculations indicate hydrogen will have a higher column height than methane and that this increases with increasing depth. <u>https://doi.org/10.1021/acsenergylett.1c00845</u>
- Developed a online tool to provide high accuracy thermodynamic property estimations of hydrogen mixtures (CO2, N2, CH4, natural gas) over a range of temperatures and pressures. <u>https://www.nature.com/articles/s41597-020-0568-6</u>
- Cushion gas will play an important role in controlling both injectivity and productivity during hydrogen storage. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2021.09.174</u>
- ✓ Significant storage capacity in depleted gas fields, minimising subsurface competition with other low carbon geoenergy applications such as CCS or CAES. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2020.116348</u> and <u>https://doi.org/10.1021/acsenergylett.1c00845</u>