

CAVERN CLUSTER UPDATE: HENGELO BRINEFIELD

Topical Report RSI-1866



prepared for

Akzo Nobel Chemicals bv
Boortorenwed 20, P.O. Box 25
7550 GC Hengelo Ov
Netherlands

February 2006



CAVERN CLUSTER UPDATE: HENGELO BRINEFIELD

Topical Report RSI-1866

by

5.1.2.e

RESPEC
P.O. Box 725
Rapid City, South Dakota 57709
United States

prepared for

Akzo Nobel Chemicals bv
Boortorenwed 20, P.O. Box 25
7550 GC Henfelo Ov
Netherlands

February 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 CAVERN CLUSTER ANALYSIS.....	1
3.0 CONCLUSIONS	4
4.0 REFERENCES	5

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1 Geometrical Parameters and Calculated Allowable Cluster Pillar Heights (Previous and Updated to Account for Changes in Cavern Outlines)	2

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Over the past 2 years, RESPEC has evaluated aspects of the stability of closely spaced caverns (cavern clusters) and the measured surface subsidence at Akzo Nobel's Hengelo brinefield. Two reports have been prepared relative to cavern clusters: Van Sambeek [2004] and Van Sambeek [2005]. This report updates the analysis in those reports by examining the effect of changing the cavern geometries from their current to their planned (ultimate) cavern size.

Because this report primarily updates our analyses, the report does not repeat background information on the Hengelo brinefield nor provide detailed descriptions of the technical methods used; the reader should refer to the reports referenced above to obtain such background information. The reanalysis of the cavern clusters no longer separates the clusters with inactive wells from the clusters with active wells; all clusters are reevaluated as one group.

2.0 CAVERN CLUSTER ANALYSIS

In the Hengelo brinefield, the term “cavern cluster” is used to describe a group of closely spaced caverns arranged in a way that more-or-less isolates a salt pillar between three or four caverns. The stresses in this “pillar” are calculated using equations presented in Van Sambeek [2004]. The potential for dilatancy (strength-reducing volumetric deformation) in the pillar is assessed using these calculated stresses and the BGR criterion for salt damage [Eickemeier and Heusermann, 2004]. As described by Van Sambeek [2004; 2005], the stability of the pillar depends on the height of the pillar relative to its diameter, or H:D ratio. Using the calculated stresses and the damage criterion, an allowable pillar height (defined as the allowable cavern heights) was calculated for each inactive- and active-cavern cluster.

Since the Van Sambeek reports of 2004 and 2005, the maximum diameter (sonar) outlines of several inactive caverns have been updated and the future, or projected, outline of active cavern clusters is now available. In that regard, the allowable heights for all 21 previously defined cavern clusters were checked and updated, when appropriate, to include these new cavern outlines. The calculation sheets showing the geometry of each cluster are attached as Appendix A. The calculation information and calculated average stresses and allowable pillar height are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Geometrical Parameters and Calculated Allowable Cluster Pillar Heights (Previous and Updated for Changes in Cavern Boundaries) (Page 1 of 3)

	Cluster	Cavern Series #1	Cavern Series #2	Cavern Series #3	W (m)	Wo (m)	Beta (deg)	Hmax old (m)	Hmax new (m)
Average Height (m)	1	239	248	270	80	162	237	20.3	n/c
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		29	30	24					
		-0.2	-0.3	-0.1					
Average Height (m)	2	201	305	308	117	297	204	34.6	30.5
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		15	15	24					
		-0.1	-0.1	-0.2					
Average Height (m)	3	237	248	251	92	229	222	27.2	23.1
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		22	27	27					
		0.1	-0.1	0.0					
Average Height (m)	4	182	198	352	101	228	211	30.1	26.6
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		15	21	24					
		-0.2	-0.1	0.0					
Average Height (m)	5	314	317	325	111	300	227	37.9	27
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		15	13	19					
		-0.2	-0.3	-0.3					
Average Height (m)	6	237	248	265	133	232	204	37.7	38.1
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		22	27	27					
		0.1	-0.1	0.0					
Average Height (m)	7	275	278	287	126	209	189	36.7	37.6
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		16	15	15					
		-0.5	-0.5	-0.2					
Average Height (m)	8	275	278	290	129	263	190	43.6	36.3
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		16	15	15					
		-0.5	-0.5	-0.2					
Average Height (m)	9	225	314	331	96	223	239	30.4	23.5
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		29	29	15					
		-0.3	-0.3	-0.2					
Average Height (m)	10	207	259	262	109	203	191	31.9	n/c
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		15	15	n/a					
		0.0	-0.3	-0.5					
Average Height (m)	11	393	396	402	118	270	179	37.8	33.2
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		10	10	10					
		-0.1	0.0	0.0					
Average Height (m)	12	402	405	414	117	249	149	33.7	35.2
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		10	10	10					
		-0.9	-1.3	-1.3					
Average Height (m)	13A	209	253	211	88	185	215	23.4	n/c
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		26	18	24					
		-0.3	-0.3	-0.5					

Table 1. Geometrical Parameters and Calculated Allowable Cluster Pillar Heights (Previous and Updated for Changes in Cavern Boundaries) (Page 2 of 3)

	Cluster	Cavern Series #1	Cavern Series #2	Cavern Series #3	W (m)	Wo (m)	Beta (deg)	Hmax old (m)	Hmax new (m)
Average Height (m)	13B	253	256	211					
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		20	19	14	98	166	264	25.6	n/c
		-0.9	-1.0	-0.6					
Average Height (m)	13C	256	215	211					
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		17	22	25	74	159	247	18.2	n/c
		0.0	0.1	0.0					
Average Height (m)	14A	102	104	140					
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		11	10	5	116	216	196	33.1	n/c
		-2.7	-2.1	-2.2					
Average Height (m)	14B	104	122	180					
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		5	15	24	132	228	209	37.7	n/c
		-2.2	-1.1	-0.4					
Average Height (m)	14C	180	140	104					
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		23	26	37	115	205	189	33.6	n/c
		-1.2	-1.2	-1.1					
Average Height (m)	14D	122	170	180					
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		24	22	23	113	216	205	31.5	n/c
		-0.4	-0.5	-0.4					
Average Height (m)	15	110	112	116					
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		32	15	10	105	176	169	32.1	n/c
		-0.9	-0.2	-0.3					
Average Height (m)	16	118	120	128					
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		40	35	31	126	226	190	36.7	n/c
		-0.2	-0.2	-0.2					
Average Height (m)	17	118	223	225					
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		40	40	33	137	240	205	39.2	n/c
		-0.2	-0.1	0.0					
Average Height (m)	18	78	80	112					
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		9	21	43	148	221	193	45.5	n/c
		-0.2	-0.7	-0.5					
Average Height (m)	19A	144	156	159					
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		41	39	35	103	249	235	31	25.2
		-0.6	-0.6	-0.2					
Average Height (m)	19B	142	144	159					
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		14	25	41	68	224	256	19.7	14.7
		-0.8	-0.6	-0.6					
Average Height (m)	19C	132	142	159					
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		39	27	14	47	164	345	10.5	7.8
		-1.3	-0.8	-0.8					

Table 1. Geometrical Parameters and Calculated Allowable Cluster Pillar Heights (Previous and Updated for Changes in Cavern Boundaries) (Page 3 of 3)

	Cluster	Cavern Series #1	Cavern Series #2	Cavern Series #3	W (m)	Wo (m)	Beta (deg)	Hmax old (m)	Hmax new (m)
Average Height (m)	19D	96	98	132					
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		21	11	0	119	233	188	37.5	34
		-1.2	-1.1	-1.0					
Average Height (m)	20	57	88	90					
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		27	21	9	109	191	191	31.9	n/c
		-1.3	-1.2	-1.0					
Average Height (m)	21	239	248	448					
Avg Sub Rate (mm/yr)		29	30	24	38	119	216	31.5	n/c
		-0.2	-0.3	-0.1					

Cluster 12 has a notable change in the updated allowable cavern height in that the new height is greater than the former allowable height (35.2 versus 33.7 meters). Van Sambeek [2004] attempted to project the future outline of all three caverns involved. In this analysis, the projected outline for Cavern 405 was provided by Akzo Nobel and Caverns 402 and 414 were fixed in size. These changes in the outline provide a larger cluster pillar (117 versus 111 meters) but about the same exposure angle (149 versus 150 degrees); hence, the allowable cavern height increased relative to the earlier calculation.

Clusters 6 and 7 also have updated allowable cavern heights that are slightly greater than the former allowable cavern heights. These two small increases in allowable cavern height relate to refinements in obtaining the geometrical details (pillar diameter, tributary diameter, and exposure angles). Similar small changes in the allowable height might also have occurred in other cavern clusters because of refinements; however, those small changes are masked by much larger changes caused by incorporating the future projected cavern outlines.

3.0 CONCLUSIONS

The 21 cavern clusters were reanalyzed to account for known changes in cavern geometry and for enlargement of active caverns to their ultimate size. The reanalysis determined new maximum heights for several of the caverns. The allowable maximum cavern heights are listed in Table 1 for each cluster.

4.0 REFERENCES

Eickemeier, R. and S. Heusermann, 2004. *Standortsicherheitsberechnungen zu den Kavernen-Clustern 209-211-215-253-256 und 245-281-287*, Tagebuch-Nr.10527/04, prepared for Akzo Nobel Salt bv, Hengelo, Niederlande, by Bundesanstalt Für Geowissenschaften Und Rohstoffe (BGR), Hannover, Germany, November.

Van Sambeek, L. L., 2004. *Cluster Analysis of Active Caverns: Akzo Nobel – Hengelo Brinefield*, RSI-1774, prepared for Akzo Nobel Chemical, Hengelo, Netherlands, by RESPEC, Rapid City, SD, USA, April.

Van Sambeek, L. L., 2005. *Stability Analysis of Inactive Caverns: Hengelo Brinefield*, RSI-1793, prepared for Akzo Nobel Chemical, Hengelo, Netherlands, by RESPEC, Rapid City, SD, USA, January.

APPENDIX A

INDIVIDUAL CAVERN CLUSTERS



















































