### **Natural Gas Dehydration**

Lessons Learned from the Natural Gas STAR Program

ConocoPhillips The Colorado Oil and Gas Association, and The Independent Petroleum Association of Mountain States

Producers Technology Transfer Workshop Durango, Colorado September 13, 2007

epa.gov/gasstar







## Natural Gas Dehydration: Agenda

- Methane Losses
- Methane Recovery
- Is Recovery Profitable?
- Industry Experience
- Discussion



## Methane Losses from Dehydrators

- Dehydrators and pumps account for:
  - 17 Billion cubic feet (Bcf) of methane emissions in the production, gathering, and boosting sectors



EPA. *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990 – 2005.* April, 2007. Available on the web at: http://yosemite.epa.gov/oar/globalwarming.nsf/content/ResourceCenterPublicationsGHGEmissions.html Natural Gas STAR reductions data shown as published in the inventory. 2



## What is the Problem?

- In Produced gas is saturated with water, which must be removed for gas transmission
- Glycol dehydrators are the most common equipment to remove water from gas
  - 36,000 dehydration units in natural gas production, gathering, and boosting
  - Most use triethylene glycol (TEG)
- Glycol dehydrators create emissions
  - Methane, Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs) from reboiler vent
  - Methane from pneumatic controllers



Source: www.prideofthehill.com



### Basic Glycol Dehydrator System Process Diagram





## **Methane Recovery**

- Optimize glycol circulation rates
- Flash tank separator (FTS) installation
- Iectric pump installation
- Sero emission dehydrator
- Replace glycol unit with desiccant dehydrator
- Other opportunities



# **Optimizing Glycol Circulation Rate**

- Gas pressure and flow at wellhead dehydrators generally declines over time
  - Glycol circulation rates are often set at a maximum circulation rate
- Glycol overcirculation results in more methane emissions without significant reduction in gas moisture content
  - A Partners found circulation rates two to three times higher than necessary
  - Methane emissions are directly proportional to circulation
- Lessons Learned study: optimize circulation rates



## Installing Flash Tank Separator (FTS)

- Methane that flashes from rich glycol in an energyexchange pump can be captured using an FTS
- Many units are <u>not</u> using an FTS





## **Methane Recovery**

- Recovers about 90% of methane emissions
- Reduces VOCs by 10 to 90%
- Must have an outlet for low pressure gas
  - Version Fuel



Low Capital Cost/Quick Payback



## Flash Tank Costs

- Lessons Learned study provides guidelines for scoping costs, savings and economics
- Capital and installation costs:
  - Capital costs range from \$3,500 to \$7,000 per flash tank
  - Installation costs range from \$1,684 to \$3,031 per flash tank
- Negligible Operational & Maintenance (O&M) costs



### **Electric Pump Eliminates Motive Gas**





## **Overall Benefits**

- Financial return on investment through gas savings
- Increased operational efficiency
- Reduced O&M costs (fuel gas, glycol make-up)
- Reduced compliance costs (HAPs, BTEX)
- Similar footprint as gas assist pump



## **Is Recovery Profitable?**

#### **Three Options for Minimizing Glycol Dehydrator Emissions**

Option	Capital Costs	Annual O&MEmissionsCostsSavings		Payback Period <sup>1</sup>
Optimize Circulation Rate	Negligible	Negligible	394 to 39,420 Mcf/year	Immediate
Install Flash Tank	\$6,500 to \$18,800	Negligible	710 to 10,643 Mcf/year	4 to 11 months
Install Electric Pump	\$1,400 to \$13,000	\$165 to \$6,500	360 to 36,000 Mcf/year	< 1 month to several years

1 - Gas price of \$7/Mcf



## **Zero Emission Dehydrator**

- Combines many emission saving technologies into one unit
  - Vapors in the still gas coming off of the glycol reboiler are condensed in a heat exchanger
  - Non-condensable skimmer gas is routed back to the reboiler for fuel use
  - Electric driven glycol circulation pumps used instead of energy-exchange pumps



#### **Overall Benefits: Zero Emissions Dehydrator**

- Reboiler vent condenser removes heavier hydrocarbons and water from non-condensables (mainly methane)
- The condensed liquid can be further separated into water and valuable gas liquid hydrocarbons
- Non-condensables (mostly methane) can be recovered as fuel or product
- Sy collecting the reboiler vent gas, methane (and VOC/HAP) emissions are greatly reduced



## **Replace Glycol Unit with Desiccant Dehydrator**

- Desiccant Dehydrator
  - Wet gasses pass through drying bed of desiccant tablets
  - Tablets absorb moisture from gas and dissolve
- Moisture removal depends on:
  - Type of desiccant (salt)
  - Gas temperature and pressure

Hygroscopic Salts	Typical T and P for Pipeline Spec	Cost	
Calcium chloride	<47°F @ 440 psig	Least expensive	
Lithium chloride	<60°F @ 250 psig	More expensive	



### **Desiccant Performance**

Desiccant Performance Curves at Maximum Pipeline Moisture Spec (7 pounds water / MMcf)





### **Desiccant Dehydrator Schematic**





## **Estimate Capital Costs**

- Other amount of desiccant needed to remove water
- A Determine diameter of vessel
- Costs for single vessel desiccant dehydrator
  - Capital cost varies between \$3,500 and \$22,000
  - Gas flow rates from 1 to 20 MMcf/day
    - Capital cost for 20-inch vessel with 1 MMcf/day gas flow is \$8,100
    - Installation cost assumed to be 75% of capital cost
- Normally installed in pairs
  - One drying, one refilled for standby



### **How Much Desiccant Is Needed?**

#### **Example:**

B = 1/3

D = ? F = 1 MMcf/day I = 21 pounds/MMcf O = 7 pounds/MMcf

#### Where:

- D = Amount of desiccant needed (pounds/day)
- F = Gas flow rate (MMcf/day)
- I = 21 pounds/MMcf I = Inlet water content (pounds/MMcf)
  - O = Outlet water content (pounds/MMcf)
  - B = Desiccant/water ratio vendor rule of thumb

Calculate: D = F \* (I - O) \* B D = 1 \* (21 - 7) \* 1/3D = 4.7 pounds desiccant/day



Source: Van Air



### **Calculate Vessel Diameter**

#### **Example:**

T = 7 days

H = 5 inch

D = 4.7 pounds/day

B = 55 pounds/cf

ID = ?

#### Where:

ID = Internal diameter of the vessel (inch)

- D = Amount of desiccant needed (pounds/day)
- T = Assumed refilling frequency (days)
- B = Desiccant density (pounds/cf)
- H = Height between minimum and maximum bed level (inch)

#### **Calculate:**

ID = 
$$12 \sqrt[*]{\frac{4*D*T*12}{H*B*\pi}} = 16.2$$
 inch

Standard ID available = 20 inch



Source: Van Air

cf = cubic feet



## **Operating Costs**

- Operating costs
  - Model Desiccant: \$2,556/year for 1 MMcf/day example
    - \$1.50/pound desiccant cost
  - In Brine Disposal: Negligible
    - \$1.40/bbl brine or \$20/year
  - Labor: \$2,080/year for 1 MMcf/day example

💧 \$40/hour

Total: about \$4,656/year



# Savings

#### Gas savings

- Gas vented from glycol dehydrator
- Gas vented from pneumatic controllers
- Gas burned for fuel in glycol reboiler
- Gas burned for fuel in gas heater
- Less gas vented from desiccant dehydrator
- Methane emission savings calculation
  - Glycol vent + Pneumatics vents Desiccant vents
- Operation and maintenance savings
  - In Glycol O&M + Glycol & Heater fuel Desiccant O&M



## **Gas Vented from Glycol Dehydrator**

#### **Example:**

- GV = ?
- F = 1 MMcf/day
- W = 21-7 pounds  $H_2O/MMcf$
- R = 3 gallons/pound
- OC = 150%
- G = 3 cf/gallon

#### Where:

- GV= Gas vented annually (Mcf/year)
- F = Gas flow rate (MMcf/day)
- W = Inlet-outlet H<sub>2</sub>O content (pounds/MMcf)
- R = Glycol/water ratio (rule of thumb)
- OC = Percent over-circulation
- G = Methane entrainment (rule of thumb)

#### Calculate:

GV = <u>(F \* W \* R \* OC \* G \* 365 days/year)</u> 1,000 cf/Mcf

GV = 69 Mcf/year



Glycol Dehydrator Unit Source: GasTech



### **Gas Vented from Pneumatic Controllers**

#### Example:

- GE = ?
- PD = 4
- EF = 126 Mcf/device/year

#### Where:

- GE = Annual gas emissions (Mcf/year)
- PD = Number of pneumatic devices per dehydrator
- EF = Emission factor (Mcf natural gas bleed/ pneumatic devices per year)

Calculate: GE = EF \* PDGE = 504 Mcf/year



Norriseal Pneumatic Liquid Level Controller

Source: norriseal.com



### Gas Burned as Fuel for Glycol Dehydrator

- Gas fuel for glycol reboiler
  - 1 MMcf/day dehydrator
  - Removing 14 lb water/MMcf
  - Reboiler heat rate: 1,124 Btu/gal TEG
  - Heat content of natural gas: 1,027 Btu/scf

- Gas fuel for gas heater
  - 1 MMcf/day dehydrator
  - Meat gas from 47°F to 90°F
  - Specific heat of natural gas: 0.441 Btu/lb-°F
  - Density of natural gas: 0.0502 lb/cf
  - 6 Efficiency: 70%

 Fuel requirement: 17 Mcf/year  Fuel requirement: 483 Mcf/year



## **Gas Lost from Desiccant Dehydrator**

#### **Example:**

#### Where:

GLD = ?%G = 45% $P_{1} = 15 Psia$ 

- $P_2 = 450 Psig$
- T = 7 days

GLD = Desiccant dehydrator gas loss (Mcf/year) ID = 20 inch (1.7 feet) ID = Internal Diameter (feet) H = 76.75 inch (6.4 feet) H = Vessel height by vendor specification (feet)

- %G = Percentage of gas volume in the vessel
- $P_1$  = Atmospheric pressure (Psia)
- $P_2$  = Gas pressure (Psig)
- T = Time between refilling (days)

#### **Calculate:**

 $GLD = H * ID^2 * \pi * P_2 * %G * 365 days/year$ 4 \* P<sub>1</sub> \* T \* 1,000 cf/Mcf GLD = 10 Mcf/year

> Desiccant Dehydrator Unit Source: usedcompressors.com





# **Natural Gas Savings**

Gas vented from glycol dehydrator:	69 Mcf/year
Gas vented from pneumatic controls:	+504 Mcf/year
Gas burned in glycol reboiler:	+ 17 Mcf/year
Gas burned in gas heater:	+483 Mcf/year
Minus desiccant dehydrator vent:	- 10 Mcf/year
Total savings:	1,063 Mcf/year

Value of gas savings (@ \$7/Mcf):

\$7,441/year



### Desiccant Dehydrator and Glycol Dehydrator Cost Comparison

Type of Costs and Savings	Desiccant (\$/yr)	Glycol (\$/yr)
Implementation Costs		
Capital Costs		
Desiccant (includes the initial fill)	16,097	
Glycol		24,764
Other costs (installation and engineering)	12,073	18,573
Total Implementation Costs:	28,169	43,337
Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs		
Desiccant		
Cost of desiccant refill (\$1.50/pound)	2,556	
Cost of brine disposal	20	
Labor cost	2,080	
Glycol		
Cost of glycol refill (\$4.50/gallon)		206
Material and labor cost		6,240
Total Annual Operation and Maintenance Costs:	4,656	6,446

Based on 1 MMcf per day natural gas operating at 450 psig and 47°F Installation costs assumed at 75% of the equipment cost



### **Desiccant Dehydrator Economics**

#### NPV= \$19,208 IRR= 51% Payback= 21 months

Type of Costs						
and Savings	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Capital costs	-\$28,169					
Avoided O&M						
costs		\$6,446	\$6,446	\$6,446	\$6,446	\$6,446
O&M costs -						
Desiccant		-\$4,656	-\$4,656	-\$4,656	-\$4,656	-\$4,656
Value of gas						
saved <sup>1</sup>		\$7,441	\$7,441	\$7,441	\$7,441	\$7,441
Glycol dehy.						
salvage value <sup>2</sup>	\$12,382					
Total	-\$15,787	\$9,232	\$9,232	\$9,232	\$9,232	\$9,232

1 - Gas price =<sup>37</sup>/Mcf, Based on 563 Mcf/year of gas venting savings and 500 Mcf/year of fuel gas savings 2 - Salvage value estimated as 50% of glycol dehydrator capital cost



## **Partner Experience**

- One partner routes glycol gas from FTS to fuel gas system, saving 24 Mcf/day (8,760 Mcf/year) at each dehydrator unit
- Texaco (now Chevron) has installed FTS
  - Recovered 98% of methane from the glycol
  - Reduced emissions from 1,232 1,706 Mcf/year to <47 Mcf/year



## **Other Partner Reported Opportunities**

- Flare regenerator off-gas (no economics)
- With a vent condenser,
  - A Route skimmer gas to firebox
  - A Route skimmer gas to tank with VRU
- Instrument air for controllers and glycol pump
- Mechanical control valves
- In Pipe gas pneumatic vents to tank with VRU (not reported yet)



### **Lessons Learned**

- Optimizing glycol circulation rates increase gas savings, reduce emissions
  - Negligible cost and effort
- FTS reduces methane emissions by about 90 percent
  - Require a low pressure gas outlet
- Electric pumps reduce O&M costs, reduce emissions, increase efficiency
  - Require electrical power source
- Sero emission dehydrator can virtually eliminate emissions
  - Requires electrical power source
- Desiccant dehydrator reduce O&M costs and reduce emissions compared to glycol
- Miscellaneous other PROs can have big savings



## Discussion

- Industry experience applying these technologies and practices
- Limitations on application of these technologies and practices
- Actual costs and benefits