**feeding a 200-kW generator. This could encourag**

**rations add production wells** 

## **Modeling Power Generation from Coproduced Geothermal Fluids**

#### **Introduction**

This analysis estimates power generation economics for oil or gas wellfield installations with flowrates of coproduced geothermal water above about 10,000 pounds per hour per production well (about 20 gpm or 700 BPD per well), and with wellhead temperatures ranging upward from 190 degrees °F. Under these conditions, producing wells could be harnessed together to produce electrical power at competitive cost. Modular, packaged generation sets are available at ratings of about 200 kW, operating on binary power cycles, and the results here are largely based on the 200-kW capacity. However, energy costs are sensitive to generator capacity, so comparisons are given to show electrical costs using 50- and 100-kW capacities for the packaged generation units.

The key variables of interest for estimating coproduction electricity costs include:



The scale of such applications is expected to be small in a developmental phase of implementing coproduction power projects. Initially, for example, sub-megawatt capacities might be generated from small numbers of wells configured as production units. This analysis defines a production unit to comprise a set of one or more production wells connected to one central injection well for return of produced waters. A sole exception to this definition is a singlet

**Modeling P o w**

Figure 4 shows two sets of cases plotting LCOE versus production well flowrate for all seven well configuration cases, using a single production unit. The two plots compare 100- and 200 kW generator capacities at a production temperature of 190°F. Figure 4 complements Figure 2, which illustrates a 200-kW case at 220 °F. These two plots are on common scales, so the visual effect shows the proportions between cases and configurations for all curves. This layout gives a good sense of the transitions between generation capacities. Other cases (more production wells, more production units, variable generator capacities) will scale from these plots. Energy Cost as Func J **Coproduction of Geothermal Power from Oil and Gas Fields**<br>Figure 4 shows to use to case plotting LCOE verso probable well because for all because the case<br>with continuous extent of the state plotter and the case of Confi mal Power from Oil and Gas Fields<br>LCOE versus production well flownte for all seven<br>obtained unit. The two plots compute 100- and 200-<br>obtained unit. The two plots compute formula and configurations from<br>the resp. This ha **m Oil and Gas Fields**<br>
production well flownate for all seven<br>
The two plots compare 100- and 200-<br>
The two plots compare 100- and 200-<br>
2.<br>
2. This layout gives a line visual<br>
come for all curves. This layout gives a<br>
co **Coproduction of Geolinemal Power from Oil and Gai Pitals**<br>  $P_{\text{eff}}(n) = 0$  dones the sets of most plants. LCDF stars, including and Barante in the 1,000<br>
AW entertaint requires the approximation dependent of CoPT. From 1 Fields<br>sowrate for all seven<br>papements Figure 2,<br>scales, so the visual<br>This layout gives a<br>This layout gives a<br>reproduction wells,<br>the production wells,<br>ts.<br>s.<br>ts.<br>allet and doublet well<br>ment. PTC is excluded.<br>papement and Copreduction of Geolinemaal Power From Oil and Gan Fields<br>
Figure 6. shows the sets of most plates LCDF, were consistent such about the 1.200<br>
We encode the specific of a probability imposition of COT. Figure 1.0000<br>
We e **i** even the state of all seven<br>pare 100- and 200-<br>plements Figure 2,<br>alse, so the visual plats, so the visual<br>plats, and doublet well,<br>reproduction wells,<br>the model state of the state of<br>errable geothermal<br>apacity.<br>And if

Curves are arranged from left to right as 9-spot, 7-spot, 5-spot, triangular, triplet, singlet, and doublet well configurations. In the bottom panel, the 9-spot and 7-spot curves are virtually coincident. PTC is excluded.

Figure 4 − Cost of Energy as a Function of Flowrate for All Wellfield Configurations

The flowrate ranges for each wellfield configuration in Figure 4 were selected to capture LCOE estimates between two pragmatic end-points: (a) a low-cutoff gpm value that limits LCOEs to about 10  $\mathcal{C}/kWh$ ; and (b) a maximum gpm value that delivers enough recoverable geothermal heat to operate a single generator unit at just under 100 percent of its nominal capacity.

The plots show that near the low-cutoff rate, LCOE takes on a steep trend. And if production flowrates go higher than the maxima, the generator loadings would exceed 100 percent.

While these cases were forced to stay under 100 percent generator utilization, the model is set up to automatically add generation units in cases for which capacity utilization would exceed 100 percent. This practice effectively reduces the geothermal fluid flow per generation unit each time a unit is added by the model. This gives a cost effect which graphically corresponds to sliding up

and to the left on the single-unit LCOE curves in Figure 4. That process will give a sawtooth pattern in the model estimates as flowrates increase, just what one would expect. The sawtooth pattern develops in Figure 3 as rising temperature and increasing production flowrates deliver more energy to a generation unit.

#### **Interpretation**

Some specific observations include:

- 1. As temperature levels of produced fluids decrease, the sensitivity of LCOE to production well flowrates increases, as indicated by the pronounced changes in slope of the 190°F curves beginning below about 40 gpm per well. For higher temperatures, the changes in sensitivity of the cost curves occur at progressively lower flowrates. That means that as temperature rises, competitive electricity costs may occur over ever-widening ranges of wellhead flowrates.
- 2. The analysis assumed that increasing wellfield thermal productivity (i.e., increasing geothermal energy recovery with some combination of well counts, flowrates, and temperatures) would be accommodated by adding modular generation sets of one capacity, rather than progressively raising the individual generation unit capacity to keep up with the productivity. This reflects both the pre-existence of field gathering systems (hence little or no piping costs to incur), and a limited variety of packaged power unit capacities for this kind of application. This assumption causes the cost curves to become nearly flat above a combination of flow and temperature at which a production unit produces sufficient energy to drive more than one generator set near their design rating.

In practice, if a viable power market were to evolve at the scale of applications that this analysis addresses, industry may offer packaged generator units over a series of discrete capacities. This would allow manufacturers to capture the benefits of standardization, assembly-line production, and progressive economies of scale. Likewise, it would help field developers to optimize long-term power costs and better plan their field build-out schedules. As illustrated by this analysis, the benefits to project cost competitiveness are apparent as reductions in LCOE.

- 3. The approach of this analysis uses a basic wellfield scheme for routing combined well flows within each production unit (of any particular configuration) to a dedicated facility with one or more generator sets per production unit. Schemes for optimizing such installations in actual practice could also include extending gathering system headers to connect multiple production units to share centralized generator facilities. This practice would spread generator costs across more wells, but would also increase the cost of piping in the overall installation. This model does not yet address that configuration.
- 4. Finally, this analysis assumes that field piping may need to be added to transport geothermal fluids to generating units. For existing oil or gas wellfields that will not always be the case. The coproduction model can optionally omit the costs of surface piping from the total capital cost of an estimate.

4. As shown in







### **References**

- 1. Tester, Jefferson, et al, "The Future of Geothermal Energy − Impact of Enhanced Geothermal Systems (EGS) on the United States in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century," Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, 2006.
- 2. Petty, Susan, Porro, Gian, "Updated U.S. Geothermal Supply Characterization," National Renewable Energy Laboratory ,NREL; March 2007)

#### **Acknowledgement**

The authors express their appreciation for the support of the U.S. Department of Energy Geothermal Technologies Program in producing this analysis. We also greatly appreciate the opportunity to present this through the auspices of the Department of Geological Sciences at Southern Methodist University.

# **Appendix A -- Model Description and Data Parameters**

# **Model Organization and Method**

This analysis uses a spreadsheet model that comp

**Coproduction of Geothermal Po**

### **5-Spot Wellfield Production Unit Configuration**

The configuration of the coproduction cost model relies on locating power generation units at centrally cited injection wells. This serves to define the wellfield geometry with which piping costs are estimated in the model.

For example, for sizing the piping systems for the seven wellfield configurations, the coproduction model uses definitions that all production and injection wells have respectively identical flowrates, and that the configuration geometries are scaleable to the user-specified acreage per production well. Piping costs are calculated based on these assumptions, using the input data values for flowrates and acreages for each case profile. There is a data input variable that gives the model an option to include or omit the calculated cost of the production gathering system piping from the total capital cost used to compute the LCOE. Injection piping is assumed to exist, and is not estimated as a cost component.

> A 5-spot pattern serves as the basis for calculating header lengths from production wells to a central injection well for each of the other six layout p43,56put data val