



Hot Dry Rocks Pty Ltd
Geothermal Energy Consultants

HEAD OFFICE
PO Box 251
South Yarra, Vic 3141
Australia
T +61 3 9867 4078
F +61 3 9279 3955
E info@hotdryrocks.com
W www.hotdryrocks.com

ABN: 12 114 617 622

SERVICES

Exploration
Rock Property Measurements
Project Development
Portfolio Management
Grant Applications

Thermal conductivity of core samples KEN021–KEN042

Prepared for KUTh Energy Limited

18 June 2008

Graeme Beardsmore

Executive summary

KUTh Energy Ltd commissioned Hot Dry Rocks Pty Ltd (HDRPL) to measure the thermal conductivity of twenty-one (21) core specimens collected on 13 May 2008. Measurements were made on the twenty-one specimens using a steady state divided bar apparatus calibrated for the range 1.4–9.8 W/mK. Up to five samples were prepared from each specimen to investigate variation in thermal conductivity over short distance scales and to determine mean conductivity and uncertainty. All values were measured at a standard temperature of 30°C. The uncertainty for individual samples is between $\pm 4\%$ and $\pm 10\%$.

HDRPL considers the following points to be important:

- Results are relatively high for sedimentary material, owing largely to a strong, sub-vertical foliation and the silicified nature of many of the specimens.
- While the specimens were chosen to represent the cored geological sections from which they came, there is no guarantee that the sections themselves are typical of the overall geological formations.
- It is to be expected that the thermal conductivity of a given formation will vary from place to place if the porosity or orientation of the dominant foliation of the formation varies.
- Thermal conductivity of rocks is sensitive to temperature. This should be kept in mind when developing models of *in situ* thermal conductivity.

Disclaimer

The information and opinions in this report have been generated to the best ability of the author, and Hot Dry Rocks Pty Ltd hope they may be of assistance to you. However, neither the author nor any other employee of Hot Dry Rocks Pty Ltd guarantees that the report is without flaw or is wholly appropriate for your particular purposes, and therefore we disclaim all liability for any error, loss or other consequence which may arise from you relying on any information in this publication.

Table of Contents

1.0 INTRODUCTION	2
2.0 METHODOLOGY	4
3.0 RESULTS.....	5
4.0 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	7

CONFIDENTIAL

1.0 Introduction

Thermal conductivity is the physical property that controls the rate at which heat energy flows through a material in a given thermal gradient. In the S.I. system of units, it is measured in watts per metre-kelvin (W/mK). In the Earth, thermal conductivity controls the rate at which temperature increases with depth for a given heat flow. The thermal conductivity distribution within a section of crust must be known in order to calculate crustal heat flow from temperature gradient data, or to predict temperature distribution from a given heat flow. This report describes the results of laboratory thermal conductivity measurements on a series of drill core samples from KUTh Energy Ltd (KEN).

KEN commissioned Hot Dry Rocks Pty Ltd (HDRPL) to undertake this study. HDRPL took delivery of twenty-one core specimens¹ from the wells Tower Hill 1, Temple Bar 1, Epping 1 and Ben Lomond 1 in May 2008 (Table 1). Thermal conductivity measurements were made on all of these specimens using a steady state divided bar apparatus calibrated for the range 1.4–9.8 W/mK.

Thermal conductivity is sensitive to temperature, in general decreasing as temperature increases. The measurements contained in this report were made within $\pm 2^\circ\text{C}$ of 30°C .

¹ In this report the word “specimen” refers to a raw piece of rock delivered to HDRPL, while “sample” refers to part of a specimen prepared for conductivity measurement. In general, three samples are prepared from each specimen.

Table 1. Specimens presented for thermal conductivity measurement.

Specimen	Well Name	Depth From	Depth To
KEN-021	Tower Hill 1	162.80 m	163.05 m
KEN-022	Tower Hill 1	174.85 m	175.10 m
KEN-023	Tower Hill 1	204.23 m	204.48 m
KEN-024	Tower Hill 1	218.85 m	219.10 m
KEN-025	Tower Hill 1	245.05 m	245.22 m
KEN-026	<i>Collected but not measured due to non-representative mineralogy</i>		
KEN-027	Temple Bar 1	153.50 m	153.68 m
KEN-028	Temple Bar 1	169.18 m	169.38 m
KEN-029	Temple Bar 1	220.00 m	220.18 m
KEN-030	Temple Bar 1	260.70 m	260.88 m
KEN-031	Temple Bar 1	284.77 m	284.95 m
KEN-032	Epping 1	147.70 m	147.90 m
KEN-033	Epping 1	185.15 m	184.35 m
KEN-034	Epping 1	198.00 m	198.20 m
KEN-035	Epping 1	240.20 m	240.40 m
KEN-036	Epping 1	267.70 m	267.88 m
KEN-037	Ben Lomond 1	135.55 m	135.80 m
KEN-038	Ben Lomond 1	150.33 m	150.55 m
KEN-039	Ben Lomond 1	176.37 m	176.56 m
KEN-040	Ben Lomond 1	210.25 m	210.49 m
KEN-041	Ben Lomond 1	247.55 m	247.80 m
KEN-042	Ben Lomond 1	265.10 m	265.30 m

2.0 Methodology

Hot Dry Rocks Pty Ltd selected samples of rock from each of twenty-one cores, based on them being visually representative of the average lithological composition of the formation being sampled. The specimens were labelled, bagged and shipped to HDRPL's laboratory in South Yarra.

Each specimen was prepared for thermal conductivity measurement in a divided bar apparatus². Three to five disks, each approximately 1/3 to 1/2 the diameter of the core in thickness, were cut from each consolidated core to investigate variation in thermal conductivity over short distance scales and to determine mean conductivity and uncertainty. The samples were all of a circular/cylindrical shape. Each sample was ground flat and polished, then evacuated under >95% vacuum for a minimum of three hours. Samples were then submerged in water prior to returning to atmospheric pressure. Water saturation continued at atmospheric pressure for a minimum of three hours, and all samples remained in water until just prior to conductivity measurement.

Values were measured at a standard temperature of 30°C ($\pm 2^\circ\text{C}$). Harmonic mean conductivity (see Figure 1) and one standard deviation uncertainty were calculated for each specimen. Results are presented in the next section.




Figure 1. The average conductivity of samples in series (e.g. A and B) is found using the harmonic mean. The average conductivity of samples in parallel (e.g. A and C) is found using the arithmetic mean.

² Divided bar apparatus: An instrument that places an unknown sample in series with a standard of known thermal conductivity, then imposes a constant thermal gradient across the combination in order to derive the conductivity of the unknown sample.

3.0 Results

Table 2 displays the thermal conductivity for each individual sample, and the harmonic mean conductivity and standard deviation for each specimen. All values are for a standard temperature of 30°C. The uncertainty for individual samples is between $\pm 4\%$ and $\pm 10\%$ (based on the instrument precision of the divided bar apparatus).

Table 2. Thermal conductivity of samples at 30°C, and harmonic mean and uncertainty³ for each specimen.

Well	Depth From	Depth To	Sample	Conductivity (W/mK)		
Tower Hill 1	162.8	163.05	KEN 021	A	5.21	5.23 ± 0.28
				B	4.97	
				C	5.53	
Tower Hill 1	174.85	175.1	KEN 022	A	4.31	4.26 ± 0.05
				B	4.27	
				C	4.21	
Tower Hill 1	204.23	204.48	KEN 023	A	5.30	5.18 ± 0.17
				B	4.98	
				C	5.26	
Tower Hill 1	218.85	219.1	KEN 024	A	4.84	4.76 ± 0.14
				B	4.82	
				C	4.85	
				D	4.55	
Tower Hill 1	245.05	245.22	KEN 025	A	4.05	4.06 ± 0.06
				B	4.01	
				C	4.13	
Temple Bar 1	153.5	153.68	KEN 027	A	2.53	2.48 ± 0.06
				B	2.42	
				C	2.49	
Temple Bar 1	169.18	169.38	KEN 028	A	2.39	2.49 ± 0.15
				B	2.43	
				C	2.66	
Temple Bar 1	220	220.18	KEN 029	A	2.52	2.49 ± 0.04
				B	2.50	
				C	2.44	

³ Uncertainty of the thermal conductivity for each specimen is the standard deviation of the individual sample measurements.

Temple Bar 1	260.7	260.88	KEN 030	A	2.38	2.34 ± 0.05
				B	2.29	
				C	2.35	
Temple Bar 1	284.77	284.95	KEN 031	A	2.26	2.28 ± 0.02
				B	2.29	
				C	2.30	
Epping 1	147.7	147.9	KEN 032	A	2.09	2.09 ± 0.01
				B	2.09	
				C	2.10	
Epping 1	185.15	184.35	KEN 033	A	1.88	1.87 ± 0.05
				B	1.91	
				C	1.82	
Epping 1	198	198.2	KEN 034	A	1.94	1.97 ± 0.03
				B	1.96	
				C	2.01	
Epping 1	240.2	240.4	KEN 035	A	2.16	2.18 ± 0.03
				B	2.21	
				C	2.16	
Epping 1	267.7	267.88	KEN 036	A	2.10	2.10 ± 0.02
				B	2.08	
				C	2.12	
Ben Lomond 1	135.55	135.8	KEN 037	A	3.87	3.94 ± 0.11
				B	3.88	
				C	4.07	
Ben Lomond 1	150.33	150.55	KEN 038	A	4.28	4.24 ± 0.05
				B	4.23	
				C	4.19	
Ben Lomond 1	176.37	176.56	KEN 039	A	3.79	4.10 ± 0.30
				B	4.21	
				C	4.36	
Ben Lomond 1	210.25	210.49	KEN 040	A	3.88	3.87 ± 0.20
				B	3.68	
				C	4.08	
Ben Lomond 1	247.55	247.8	KEN 041	A	4.37	4.37 ± 0.06
				B	4.43	
				C	4.32	
Ben Lomond 1	265.1	265.3	KEN 042	A	4.21	4.41 ± 0.17
				B	4.51	
				C	4.25	
				D	4.54	
				E	4.56	

4.0 Discussion and conclusions

In most cases, the measured values agree closely for samples taken from the same specimen. This implies that variation in thermal conductivity is not significant over the scale of centimetres for the specimens examined.

The conductivities recorded from these specimens are relatively high for sedimentary units. Many of the units display a dominant foliation sub-parallel to the vertical axis of the core; generally greater than 70° to the horizontal. This alone could explain the relatively high values, as conductivity along a foliation is typically higher than across it. Formations with thermal conductivity >2.5 W/mK under surface conditions are unlikely to make adequate thermal insulation units for the purpose of geothermal energy exploration.

The following additional points must be considered if extrapolating the results in this report to *in situ* formations:

1. The samples upon which the thermal conductivity measurements were made are only several square centimetres in surface area. While the specimens were chosen to represent the geological sections from which they came, there is no guarantee that the sections themselves are typical of the overall geological formations. This is especially true for heterogeneous formations. This introduces an unquantifiable random error into the results.
2. Porosity exerts a primary influence on the thermal conductivity of a rock. Water is substantially less conductive than typical mineral grains⁴, and water saturated pores act to reduce the bulk thermal conductivity of the rock. Gas-filled pores reduce the bulk conductivity even more dramatically. Results reported in this document are whole-rock measurements. No adjustments were made for porosity. It is to be expected that the thermal conductivity of a given formation will vary from place to place if the porosity of the formation varies (conductivity decreases with increasing porosity).
3. Foliations within the fabric of a rock also exert a dominant influence on thermal conductivity, with conductivity along the foliation typically significantly higher than

⁴ Beardsmore, G.R. and Cull, J.P. (2001). *Crustal heat flow: A guide to measurement and modelling*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 324pp.

across it. HDRPL intends to use some of the samples already collected to investigate the anisotropy in thermal conductivity of these units by preparing samples to measure conductivity across the foliation.

4. Thermal conductivity of rocks is sensitive to temperature, typically decreasing with increasing temperature. This should be kept in mind when developing models of *in situ* thermal conductivity.

CONFIDENTIAL