

# Early hydrocarbon (propane) storage in granites - SC and VA (also see bottom center inset)





Tirzah, York County, SC - Propane was stored at a shallow depth by the Carolina Pipeline Company. The facility was co-located adjacent to a railroad and a natural gas pipeline. The cavern floor is about 450 ft below ground level. At that depth, where the temperature is 61° F, the natural hydrostatic ground water pressure exceeds the pressure required to contain the propane in a liquid state. Ground water in fractures acts as a seal confining the propane within the excavation. The cavern's storage capacity was 16 million gallons (Nystrom, 1976). The cavern was constructed in a coarse-grained adamellite (Butler, 1976).

See discussion of fracture closure depths for the Sharon Harris Nuclear power plant in Wake County, North Carolina in box below (The Sharon Harris Nuclear indicating fractured bedrock. A water cap was used to maintain geostatic pressure. Final Safety Analysis report, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, September 12, 2012). At the proposed refrigerated gas storage cavern depth of 3,000 ft, all fractures should be closed and sealed. Core drilling and rock testing will be required to confirm site specific conditions and acceptable rock quality.





Currently, LNG plants are considered more viable than Refrigerated Mined Caverns (RMC) along the Atlantic Seaboard. Even though capital costs for LNG plants have more than doubled since 2000 (Songhurst, 2014), capex is still less than that for a RMC of equivalent capacity.

Another advantage is that LNG plants can be built almost anywhere – those near the coast are built on unconsolidated sediment. RMC requires rocks with special geotechnical properties (certain granites, for example). A principal advantage of RMC is that, like salt caverns, gas can be stored, and removed, more efficiently than LNG plants. Consequently, RMC plants can meet several "peak" demand periods each year, whereas LNG plants have much slower cycle times (some sources indicate 1 cycle/year). Green dots with black centers are existing power plants.





Intersection of Transco Pipeline (blue line) with granite near Lexington, N.C. Geology from the Geologic map of the Charlotte 1 degree x 2 degrees quadrangle, North Carolina and South Carolina (Goldsmith; Milton, and Horton, 1978) available on-line at URL https://ngmdb.usgs.gov/Prodesc/proddesc\_9068.htm.



Granites intersecting Transco Pipeline (blue line) from Geologic map of the Charlotte 1 degree x 2 degrees quadrangle, North Carolina and South Carolina (Goldsmith; Milton and Horton, 1978) available on-line at URL https://ngmdb.usgs.gov/Prodesc/proddesc\_9068.htm.

PANEL #2 - Early mined cavern propane storage (SC and VA), and example pipeline-granite intersections in NC and VA.

# Underground Storage of Refrigerated Natural Gas in Granites of the Southeastern U.S.



Fairfax County, VA - In 1962 Washington Gas excavated an underground caver to store 13 million gallons of Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG). The Ravensworth Station reservoir was carved out of the nearly 500-million year old Occoquan granite bedrock west of Lake Accotink Park. The cavern had 25-ft high ceilings and used pillar support. Water leaked into the cavern during construction

https://www.washingtongas.com/-/media/d2067877df1e446991e9bece0a1749da.pdf.



Source: http://www.virginiaplaces.org/geology/naturalgasstorage.htm



Geologic map of the Annadale quadrangle, Fairfax and Arlington Counties, and Alexandria City, Virginia (1986). See URL https://ngmdb.usgs.gov/Prodesc/proddesc 92836.htm

# Pipeline-granite intersection #2

Blue Ridge (Crozet) railroad tunnel: A non-granite propane storage facility, Nelson Co., VA



East portals - Old and new, circa 1959

"In the 1950's, a gas company leased the old tunnel for large-scale storage of propane. Two concrete bulkheads, or plugs were constructed. One is 750 ft from the east portal. The other is 1,900 ft from the west portal. The barriers currently remain in place, though the storage plan was cancelled and the interior space never used." (Blue Ridge Tunnel oundation - http://blueridgetunnel.org/the-blue-ridge-railroad/. ang (2018) described two dominant fracture sets that may have been the cause for why the space was not used for propane storage. Photographs of the concrete portal plugs are on-line at

https://www.steamphotos.com/Railroad-Photos/Abandoned-Railroadnnels/Crozet-Blue-Ridge-Tunnel/. The near surface location precludes a confining water curtain to contain propane and to seal the fractures.

# **Groundwater and fracture closure depths - area examples**

Early mined caverns designed to store propane in Virginia and South Carolina (see above) were constructed at a very shallow depth (nominally ~450 ft. Their design included a water cap to contain the propane using geostatic pressure. Water inflow at Fairfax, VA, cavern indicates fractured bedrock. At the Tirzah (SC) site natural groundwater pressure in fractures acted as a seal to confine the propane in the excavation.

Lu (2010) discussed rock engineering problems related to underground hydrocarbon storage including unlined rock caverns. The Haje underground gas storage in the Czech Republic, the single example cited, is composed of about 45 km unlined tunne and cross-sections of 12-15 m<sup>2</sup> at a depth of 955-961 m below the ground surface. The groundwater table is 850 m above the caverns (Lu, 2010). The gas and cavern were not refrigerated.

Fracture closure depths were determined as a design criterion to define competent rock as part of the Sharon Harris geotechnical study in extreme southwestern Wake County, North Carolina, at the site of the Sharon Harris nuclear reactor. Results build on similar geotechnical studies at the adjacent parcel nominated to be the site (effort abandoned) for the southeastern regional low level radioactive waste (LLRW) disposal repository. The shallow surface aguifer has many interconnected fractures. However, "these fractures are common to depths of 100 feet below ground surface..., but become less prevalent with increased depth. At depths greater than 400 ft, the fractures are closed and sealed to water flow" (Sharon Harris Final Safety Analysis report, Section 2.5-56, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, September 12, 2012). Fractures and joint distribution and characteristics were studied for the Sharon Harris and geotechnical investigation (section 2.5-113) and the preceding LLRW geotechnical investigation (Section 2.5-114). Shear wave velocities were a design criterion used as a proxy to define competent rock. The nearby U.S. Geological Survey's Sears #1 well also has shear wave velocities that were used. Fracture closure depths of several hundred feet have been documented by two surface geotechnical investigations (U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, September 12, 2012).

The refrigerated granite cavern storage at a depth of 3,000 ft greatly exceeds the fracture closure depth. Geotechnical site investigations including continuous core drilling are part of a multi-step suitability study for candidate sites. Identified pipeline/granite intersections need to be geologically ranked and geotechnically evaluated.

5.46 miles





Sims Granite area. Outline of granite is shown in white. Outline of area of granitic outcrops is shown in red. Interior areas (not outlined) are an overlap of Coastal Plain sediment. Proposed route of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline is in yellow. Modified from Speer (1997).



Aeroradioactivity map for the vicinity of the Sims pluton, N.C. (U.S. Geological Survey, 1975). Values are total count gamma ray intensity. From Speer (1997).



Bouger gravity anomaly map for the Sims pluton and vicinity (Lawrence, 1996). Shaded triangles indicate location of the observations. From Speer (1997).

# Virginia pipeline-granite intersection examples



hag lands t/C pembus

Blue Ridge Tunnel Foundation - URL http://blueridgetunnel.org/the-blue-ridge-railroad/. Viewed 2 August 2 From the standpoint of population growth, the likelihood for underground storage along the Transco spurs is Bradley, Philip J.: Abraham, J., and Campbell, T., 2012, The Lithotectonic Map of the Southern Appalachians to detailed 1:24,000 less than that along the planned Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Brunswick County Power Station (yellow pin symbol) is located about 2.35 miles from the planned ACP and a potentially suitable granite body.



Brunswick Power Station is a 3-on-1 combined cycle power station fueled entirely by natural gas. The station uses the latest technology and is among the most efficient power stations in the country. Combined-cycle technology utilizes combustion turbines that are essentially gigantic jet engines. The station has three of the turbines that generate 280 megawatts each. The super heated air from the combustion turbines is used to generate steam that produces another 470 megawatts on a steam turbine. Brunswick County Power Station, Virginia – see URL http://www.power-technology.com/projects/brunswick-county-power-station-virginia/..



Relationship between Brunswick County Power Station, Atlantic Coast Pipeline (yellow line), and porphyroblastic biotite granite (white line) on a topographic base (a) and a Google Earth base (b). The distance between the Vulcan Lawrenceville Quarry (closed) and the Brunswick power plant is about 2.25 miles.

# **Discussion and Conclusions**

There are eleven major pipeline intersections with granite in North Carolina and southern Virginia identified in this report. If the need for underground storage justifies the costs of underground excavations, such as the type described by PB-KBB corporation, these granites would warrant further consideration as underground storage sites.

Initial follow-up would include: 1) additional literature searches, 2) geological traverses along pipeline-granite intersections and immediately adjacent areas documenting lithologies, discontinuities, and density of fractures and their orientation, and 3) baseline environmental impact studies to identify environmentally-sensitive areas along pipeline-granite intersections

A mined cavern storing refrigerated natural gas is a means to provide a secured gas supply to maintain the electrical grid during natural disasters or grid failure. Examples of potential natural disasters include weather (hurricanes and flooding), geomagnetic disturbances from solar coronal mass injections. Man made threats include electomagnetic pulse and cyber attacks. Gas-fired steam plants typically have a fuel supply on-site of <1 day (Greene, 2016); the fuel replenishment system is a pipeline. The pace of replacement of coal-fired steam plants with gas-fueled turbine generation plants in the Carolinas with the complete phase out of coal plants in the near future (Duke Energy) is accelerating.

### References

- scale geologic maps: Tools to understanding the occurrence and distribution of naturally-occurring groundwater contaminants in the Piedmont and Mountains of North Carolina, Geological Society of America Abstracts with Programs, Vol. 44, No. 7, p. 484. Available on-line at URL https://gsa.confex.com/gsa/2012AM/finalprogram/abstract\_209423.htm.
- Butler, J. Robert, 1976, Geology of the propane storage cavern near Tirzah, Central York County, South Carolina: Division of Geology, South Carolina Development Board, *Geologic Notes*, V. 20, No. 1, p. 26-32.
- Carpenter. Robert H.: Reid. Jeffrev C., and Mvers, C.W., 2017a, Underground storage of refrigerated natural gas in granites of the Southeastern U.S.: North Carolina Geological Survey, Open-File Report 2017-02, 29 document pages.
- arpenter. Robert H.; Reid, Jeffrey C., and Myers, Carl W., 2017b, Underground storage of refrigerated natural gas in granites in North Carolina and Southern Virginia: Southeastern Section meeting (Richmond, VA), Geological Society of America, Abstracts with programs, Vol. 49, No. 3. Available on-line at URL
- https://gsa.confex.com/gsa/2017SE/webprogram/Paper290036.html. Duke Energy, Decommissioning retired coal plants, URL

https://www.duke-energy.com/our-company/about-us/coal-plant-decommissioning-program. Viewed 11 July 2018. Greene, Sherrell R., 2016, Nuclear Power: Black Sky Liability or Black Sky Asset?: International Journal of Nuclear Security, Vol. 2, No. 3, p. 1-27. Available on-line at URL http://dx.doi.org/10.7290/V78913SR.

Goldsmith, Richard; Milton, D.J., and Horton, J.W., Jr., 1988, Geologic map of the Charlotte 1 degree x 2 degree guadrangle North Carolina and South Carolina: U.S. Geological Survey, Miscellaneous Investigations Series Map I-1251-E, scale 1:250,000.

- libbard, J.; van Staal, C.; Rankin, D., and Williams, H., 2006, Geology, lithotectonic map of the Appalachian Orogen (South), Canada-United States of America: Geological Survey of Canada, Map 02096A, scale 1:1500000. Link to Canadian Survey for http://geoscan.ess.nrcan.gc.ca/cgi-bin/starfinder/0?path=geoscan.fl&id=fastlink&pass=&format=FLFULL&search=R=221912;221
- and http://apps1.gdr.nrcan.gc.ca/mirage/mirage\_list\_e.php?id=221922. g, Katherine E., 2018, Tunnel vision: Kinematics of brittle and ductile deformation in the historic Blue Ridge Tunnel and Rockfish

Gap, Virginia: Southeastern Section, Geological Society of America, Abstracts with Programs, Vol. 50, No. 3. Available on-line at URL https://gsa.confex.com/gsa/2018SE/webprogram/Paper313224.html.

Lawrence, D.P., 1996, Simple bouquer gravity anomaly map, Raleigh 30x60-minute guadrangle: North Carolina Geological Survey, Geologic Map Series 4.

Lord, A.S., 2009, Overview of geologic storage of natural gas with an emphasis on assessing the feasibility of storing hydrogen: Sandia Report SAND2009-5878, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

- Lu, Ming, 2010. Rock engineering problems related to underground hydrocarbon storage: Journal of Rock Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering (on-line at URL wwww.rockgeotech.org), V. 2 (4), p. 289-297.
- Myers, Carl W., 2017, Potential for special-purpose underground facilities in granites of the Southeastern U.S.: Southeastern Section meeting (Richmond, VA), Geological Society of America, Abstracts with programs, Vol. 49, No. 3, Available on-line at URL https://gsa.confex.com/gsa/2017SE/webprogram/Paper290326.html with attachment.
- Myers, Carl W., and Reid, Jeffrey C., 2018, Underground Space Resource in Granitic Plutons of the Southeastern U.S. and the concept for an underground nuclear power plant with collocated facilities for spent fuel storage and deep borehole disposal. Presented 13 April 2018 at the Southeastern Section, Geological Society of America, Knoxville 2018 annual meeting, Abstract number 311855. Presentation accompanies the abstract. Available on-line at URL https://gsa.confex.com/gsa/2018SE/webprogram/Paper311855.html.
- Nystrom, Paul G., Jr., 1976, Geologic-engineering aspects of the propane storage cavern near Tirzah, York County, South
- Carolina: Division of Geology, South Carolina Development Board, Geologic Notes, V. 20, No. 1, p. 15-25. PB-KBB, 1998, Advanced underground gas storage concepts refrigerated-mined cavern storage, Final report DOE Contract Number DE-AC26-97FT34349, 162 pages. Available on-line at http://www.netl.doe.gov/KMD/cds/Disk19/FinalRpt.pdf,
- and at https://www.osti.gov/scitech/biblio/10495. Reid, Jeffrey C.; Carpenter, Robert H., and Myers, C.W., October 19, 2016, Underground storage of Natural gas in refrigeratedmined caverns (RMC) in granites: North Carolina and Southern Virginia, unpublished North Carolina Geological Survey (Division of Energy, Mineral and Land Resources N.C. Department of Environmental Quality (NCDEQ) internal working concept management presentation
- Reid, Jeffrev C.; Mvers, C.W., and Carpenter, Robert H., 2018, Underground Storage of Refrigerated Natural Gas in Granites of the Southeastern U.S.: American Association of Petroleum Geologists, Eastern Section annual meeting: Program & Abstracts (Two panel poster), 8-11 October 2018, Pittsburgh, PA. The abstract is available on-line at URL https://esaapg.org/admin/uploads/documents/1/abstracts.pdf.
- Sofregaz U.S. Inc. and LRC, 1999, Commercial Potential of Natural Gas Storage in Lined Rock Caverns (LRC), Topical Report SZUS-0005 DE-AC26-97FT34348-01. Sofregaz U.S, Houston, TX, and LRC, Sweden. Available on line at https://www.osti.gov/servlets/purl/774913.
- Songhurst, Brian, 2014, LNG plant cost escalation: The Oxford Institute for Energy Studies, University of Oxford, 33p. Available on-line at URL https://www.oxfordenergy.org/wpcms/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/NG-83.pdf.
- Speer, J. Alexander; McSween, Harry Y., Jr., and Gates, Alexander E., 1994, Generation, segregation, ascent, and emplacement of Alleghanian plutons in the Southern Appalachians: The Journal of Geology, Vol. 102, No. 3, p. 249-267.
- Speer, J. Alexander, 1997, The Sims Pluton, Nash and Wilson counties, North Carolina: North Carolina Geological Survey, Bulletin 97, 56p. Available on-line at URL http://digital.ncdcr.gov/cdm/ref/collection/p16062coll9/id/13550, or http://www.nc-maps.com/bu97siplnaan.html.
- U.S. Energy Information Administration, Office of Oil & Gas, Natural Gas Division, Gas Transportation Information System, December 2008.
- U.S. Energy Information Administration, Underground natural gas storage: Facility locations, by type (December 31, 2015). Viewed 26 July 2018 at URL https://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/ung/locations.htm. U.S. Geological Survey, 1975, Aeroradioactivity maps of parts of Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina, Total Count
- Gamma Ray Intensity: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 75-400, Sheet 13 of 15, scale: 1:235,000. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, September 12, 2012, Progress Energy Harris Nuclear Units 2 & 3 COLA (Final Safety Analysis Report), Rev. 4, Accession number ML 12122A656 (multiple sections), at
- URL http://pbadupws.nrc.gov/docs/ML1212/ML12122A656.html, and Chapter 2 addressing the geology and environment at URL http://pbadupws.nrc.gov/docs/ML1212/ML12122A240.pdf, 840 p., both viewed 10 April 2012.

## Acknowledgements

Philip J. Bradley, North Carolina Geological Survey, graciously modified the figure on Panel 1 showing ages of plutonic rocks by adding author supplied routes for the Transco and Atlantic Coast Pipelines.

We thank Dr. Rebecca Tippett, Director of Carolina Demography, Carolina Population Center, UNC-CH, for the graphic showing North Carolina projected population growth 2010-2035. The graphic was prepared using the most current projections from the