Modelling of open loop systems

Dave Banks, Holymoor Consultancy Ltd., Chesterfield

Fiona Todd*, Grontmij Group Ltd., Leeds

Lee Clarke**, Carbon Zero Consulting, Draycott, Derbys.

> * work performed as part of MSc thesis at University of Leeds
> ** numerical modelling carried out under contract for Environment Agency





Listen carefully

I have a shameful secret...

... I have a small peccadillo...

....I have a hidden vice....





I like mathematics !

...in particular, I like equations and analytical models

$$W(u) = -0.5772 - \ln u + u - \frac{u^2}{2.2!} + \frac{u^3}{3.3!} - \frac{u^4}{4.4!} + \frac{u^5}{5.5!} - \dots$$

...but...why use analytical equations when we have so many fancy numerical models?

$$\Psi = \frac{Q}{2\pi m} \left(\tan^{-1} \left(\frac{y}{x-d} \right) - \tan^{-1} \left(\frac{y}{x+d} \right) \right) - (yU_x - xU_y)$$



 $\Psi = \frac{Q}{2\pi m} \left(\tan^{-1} \left(\frac{y}{x-d} \right) - \tan^{-1} \left(\frac{y}{x+d} \right) \right) - (yU_x - xU_y)$

Just as we assign contours of equal head an *equipotential value*,

We can assign each streamline (crossing the equipotentials as right angles) a stream potential value (stream function in complex number space). We can find the critical streamline that delineates the thermal plume

Well separation L = 2d U = Darcy velocity m = aquifer thickness (assumes wells are fully penetrating and located at coordinates (-d,0) and (d,0)

Selby doublet cooling scheme



Hazelwood Foods in North Yorkshire use groundwater from the Sherwood Sandstone for passive industrial cooling Operating since 1998 (10 years at time of study)





2-D Numerical model

Simple model created in SHEMAT Model simulated 10 years, using a single source of heat injection

Time = 10 years

K = 11m/d

SHEMAT cell size = 50x50m

Dispersion observed

- Real? Numerical?







ዋጫ<mark>ዋ ዲገ ዋ</mark>ል

₫ⁿ

scale 200

Generic modelling of thermal plumes





Comparison with analytical models





Generic modelling of thermal plumes

Parameter	FEFLOW [®] Model	Analytical model
Single well		
Plume length (L_{pl}) – from reinjection well	935 m	824 m
Plume width (W_{pl})	298 m	333 m
Time to breakthrough in OBH (500 m d/s)	3552 days	4435 days
Well Doublet $(2d = 100 \text{ m})$		
Plume length (L_{pl}) – from reinjection well	854 m	824 m
Plume width (W_{pl})	255 m	266 m
Time to breakthrough (15°C) in OBH <i>i</i> (500 m d/s)	4030 days	4435
First breakthrough in Abstraction well		457 days
Time to breakthrough (50%) in Abstraction well	628 days	
Equilibrium temp. in abstraction well	11.79°C	12.0°C



Generic modelling of thermal plumes





2D versus 3D models



Here's where a 3-D numerical model may be of use !



FEFLOW (for example) can simulate the 3rd dimension

Heat may be lost by vertical conduction into overlying and underlying strata

(left) Example of FEFLOW modelling work performed by Carbon Zero Consulting and Holymoor Consultancy for the Environment Agency on generic well-doublet systems



Generic modelling of thermal plumes





CONCLUSIONS

- Let's reopen the analytical toolbox that was developed in the 1920s to 1980s (before numerical models turned our brains to wet cardboard)
- Analytical tools provide rapid and accurate means of first assessment of thermogeological risk
- In this case, 2-D equations are conservative (they ignore vertical heat conduction)
- Fire up the numerical models only at a later "tier" of risk assessment, when you feel you have a good understanding of the analytical solutions
- Remember both analytical and numerical models typically assume porous media, Darcian flow and instantaneous thermal equilibrium...



References

- Banks, D. (in prep.). A practical analytical solution to the thermal plume from a well doublet ground source heating / cooling scheme. Submitted to *Quarterly Journal for Engineering Geology and Hydrogeology*.
- Banks, D. (2009). Thermogeological assessment of open-loop well-doublet schemes: a review and synthesis of analytical approaches. *Hydrogeology Journal* **17**, 1149-1155.
- Gandy, C.J., Clarke, L., Banks, D. & Younger, P.L. (in press). Predictive modelling of groundwater abstraction and artificial recharge of cooling water. In press *Quarterly Journal of Engineering Geology and Hydrogeology.*
- Güven, O., Falta, R.W., Molz, F.J. & Melville, J.G. 1986. A simplified analysis of two-well tracer tests in stratified aquifers. *Ground Water*, **24(1)**, 63-71.
- Hoopes, J.A. & Harleman, D.R. 1967. Wastewater recharge and dispersion in porous media. *Journal of the Hydraulics Division, ASCE*, **93/HY5**, 51-71.
- Javandel, I. & Tsang, C.F. 1986. Capture-zone type curves: a tool for aquifer cleanup. *Ground Water*, 24(5), 616-625.
- Lippmann, M.J. & Tsang, C.F. 1980. Groundwater use for cooling: associated aquifer temperature changes. *Ground Water*, 18(5), 452-458.
- Luo, J. & Kitanidis, P.K. 2004. Fluid residence times within a recirculation zone created by an extractioninjection well pair. *Journal of Hydrology* **295**, 149-162.
- Shan, C. 1999. An analytical solution for the capture zone of two arbitrarily located wells. *Journal of Hydrology*, **222**, 123-128.
- Todd, F.K. & Banks, D. (2009). Modelling of a thermal plume in the Sherwood Sandstone: A case study in North Yorkshire, UK. Proc. *"Effstock 2009"*, 11th International Conference on Thermal Energy Storage, Stockholm, June 14th-17th 2009.

