University of Wollongong
Research Online

University of Wollongong Thesis Collection

University of Wollongong Thesis Collections

2011

Factors affecting the drainage of gas from coal and methods to improve drainage effectiveness

Dennis John Black
University of Wollongong

Recommended Citation

Black, Dennis John, Factors affecting the drainage of gas from coal and methods to improve drainage effectiveness, Doctor of Philosophy thesis, School of Civil, Mining and Environmental Engineering, University of Wollongong, 2011. http://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/3339

Research Online is the open access institutional repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact Manager Repository Services: morgan@uow.edu.au.

NOTE

This online version of the thesis may have different page formatting and pagination from the paper copy held in the University of Wollongong Library.

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

COPYRIGHT WARNING

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site. You are reminded of the following:

Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material. Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

FACTORS AFFECTING THE DRAINAGE OF GAS FROM COAL AND METHODS TO IMPROVE DRAINAGE EFFECTIVENESS

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

from

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

by

DENNIS JOHN BLACK

B. Eng. (Hons) (Mining), Assoc. Dip. Mine Ventilation, Grad. Cert. Mgt

School of Civil, Mining and Environmental Engineering

2011

AFFIRMATION

I, Dennis John Black, declare that this thesis, submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy, in the Department of Civil, Mining and Environmental Engineering, University of Wollongong, is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. The document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

Dennis J. Black

The following publications are the result of this thesis project:

Black, D J, 2007. Gas management challenges at West Cliff Colliery, *ACARP Gas and Outburst Seminar* (ed: J Hanes), Mackay, Queensland, 29 June, pp 98-106.

Black, D J and Aziz, N I, 2008. Improving UIS gas drainage in underground coal mines, in *Proceedings of the 8th Underground Coal Operator's Conference COAL2008*, University of Wollongong, (eds: N I Aziz and J A Nemcik), Wollongong, 14-15 February, pp 186-196.

Black, D J and Aziz, N I, 2008. The evolution in coal mine gas extraction – a response to economic, environmental and community pressures, in *Proceedings of the 16th Coal Congress of Turkey*, Chamber of Mining Engineers of Turkey, Zonguldak, Turkey, 26-28 May, pp 149-156.

Black, D J and Aziz, N I, 2008. Improving UIS gas drainage in underground coal mines, in *Proceedings of the 16th Coal Congress of Turkey*, Chamber of Mining Engineers of Turkey, Zonguldak, Turkey, 26-28 May, pp 157-170.

Black, D J and Aziz, N I, 2008. Development of hydraulic fracturing in high stress conditions in Australian underground coal mines, in *Proceedings of the 16th Coal Congress of Turkey*, Chamber of Mining Engineers of Turkey, Zonguldak, Turkey, 26-28 May, pp 171-184.

Black, D J and Aziz, N I, 2008. Gas drainage improvement in underground coal mines, in *Proceedings of the 1st ASIA Pacific Coalbed Methane Symposium*, University of Queensland, Brisbane, 22-24 September, Paper No. 043.

Black, D J and Aziz, N I, 2008. Hydraulic fracturing in underground coal mines, in *Proceedings of the 1st ASIA Pacific Coalbed Methane Symposium*, University of Queensland, Brisbane, 22-24 September, Paper No. 044.

Black, D J and Aziz, N I, 2009. Reducing coal mine GHG emissions through effective gas drainage and utilisation, in *Proceedings of the 9th Underground Coal Operator's Conference COAL2009*. University of Wollongong, (eds: N I Aziz and J A Nemcik), Wollongong, 12-13 February, pp 217-224.

Black, D J and Aziz, N I, 2009. Reducing coal mine GHG emissions through effective gas drainage and utilisation, in *Proceedings of the 2009 International Coalbed & Shale Gas Symposium*, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, 18-22 May, Paper No. 0912.

Black, D J and Aziz, N I, 2009. Developments in coal mine methane drainage and utilisation in Australia, in *Proceedings of the Ninth International Mine Ventilation Congress*, Department of Mining Engineering, Indian School of Mines University, Dhanbad, India, 10-13 November, pp 445-460.

Black, D J and Aziz, N I, 2010. Outburst threshold limits – current research outcomes, in *Proceedings of the 10th Underground Coal Operator's Conference COAL2010*,

University of Wollongong, (eds: N I Aziz and J A Nemcik), Wollongong, 11-12 February, pp 203-209.

Black, D J and Aziz, N I, 2010. Impact of coal properties and operational factors on mine gas drainage, in *Proceedings of the 10th Underground Coal Operator's Conference COAL2010*, University of Wollongong, (eds: N I Aziz and J A Nemcik), Wollongong, 11-12 February, pp 229-240.

Black, D J and Aziz, N I, 2010. Coal properties and mine operational factors that impact gas drainage, in *Proceedings of the 13th U.S. / North American Mine Ventilation Symposium* (eds: S Hardcastle and D L McKinnon), Sudbury, Ontario, 13-16 June, pp 251-258.

Black, D J and Aziz, N I, 2011. Actions to improve coal seam gas drainage performance, in *Proceedings of the 11th Underground Coal Operator's Conference COAL2011*. University of Wollongong, (eds: N I Aziz, R J Kininmonth, J A Nemcik and T X Ren), Wollongong, 10-11 February, pp 309-316.

Black, D J, Aziz, N I and Florentin, R M, 2010. Assessment of factors impacting coal seam gas production, in *Proceedings of the 2010 International Coalbed & Shale Gas Symposium*, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, 17-21 May, Paper No. 1004.

Black, D J, Aziz, N I and Florentin, R M, 2010. Estimating total gas content from early stage gas emission data, in *Proceedings of the 2010 International Coalbed & Shale Gas Symposium*, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, 17-21 May, Paper No. 1005.

Black, D J, Aziz, N I, Jurak, M J and Florentin, R M, 2009. Outburst threshold limits – are they appropriate?, in *Proceedings of the 9th Underground Coal Operator's Conference COAL2009*, University of Wollongong, (eds: N I Aziz and J A Nemcik), Wollongong, 12-13 February, pp 185-192.

Black, D J, Aziz, N I, Jurak, M J and Florentin, R M, 2009. Gas content estimation using initial desorption rate, in *Proceedings of the 9th Underground Coal Operator's Conference COAL2009*, University of Wollongong, (eds: N I Aziz and J A Nemcik), Wollongong, 12-13 February, pp 193-198.

Black, D J, Aziz, N I and Ren, T X, 2011. Enhanced gas drainage from undersaturated coalbed methane reservoirs, in *Proceedings of the 3rd Asia Pacific Coalbed Methane Symposium*, University of Queensland, Brisbane, 3-6 May, Paper No. 50.

The following presentations are the result of this thesis project:

Black, D J, 2007. Gas management challenges at West Cliff Colliery, paper presented to the Gas and Outburst Committee Seminar, Wollongong, New South Wales, 27 June, pp 13-21.

Black D J, 2010. Appropriate risk control and drainage to avoid gas outbursts, paper presented to Mining Ventilation 2010, Brisbane, 01 September.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and thank my thesis supervisor Assoc. Professor Naj Aziz, Department of Civil, Mining and Environmental Engineering, University of Wollongong for his generous support, guidance and friendship throughout this study.

I would also like to acknowledge and thank my wife Dr Sarah Toole and children, Angus and Emma, for their support during the considerable time involved in completing this PhD study.

I would also like to acknowledge and thank the Australian Coal Association Research Program (ACARP) for the financial support provided to me through the ACARP post-graduate scholarship C18004. I would like to acknowledge and thank Mr Roger Wischusen (ACARP), Dr Chris Harvey (Gujarat NRE) and Assoc. Professor Naj Aziz who monitored the progress of my study on behalf of ACARP project C18004.

The work completed during this study was recognised with an award from the Royal Society of New South Wales in 2010 which is appreciated.

I would also like to acknowledge and thank the following people and organisations who have provided assistance and support to this study:

- Mr Matthew Jurak and Ms Kate Lennox, former undergraduate students from the Department of Civil, Mining and Environmental Engineering and Mr Adrian Hutton , formerly of the School of Geosciences, University of Wollongong;
- Mr Robert Seeley, Mr Andrew Filipowski, Mr Murray Bull, Mr Sal Castelo, Mr Mike Armstrong, Mr Hugo Kaag, Mr David Benson and Mr David Ashelford (formerly of GeoGAS), from BHP Billiton Illawarra Coal;
- Mr Andrew Newland from Newtuk Consulting;
- Mr Paul Maddocks from Xstrata Coal NSW;
- Mr Peter Liston, Mr Ken Lewthwaite and Mr Wayne Green from Peabody Energy Australia; and
- Mr Bruce Robertson formerly from Anglo American Metallurgical Coal.

I would also like to acknowledge the keen eye of Mr Bob Kininmonth and express my thanks for assisting with the editing of this PhD thesis.

ABSTRACT

The relationship between gas production from underground-to-inseam (UIS) drainage boreholes and various coal seam properties and operational factors were examined. Gas production from 279 UIS gas drainage boreholes was collated and assessed relative to a variety of coal geological properties and operational factors. The reasons for poor coal seam gas drainage performance from particular zones were investigated and actions to improve gas drainage performance have been recommended. Investigation were focussed on gas drainage performance from the Bulli seam of the Sydney Basin, focussing on West Cliff Colliery, where gas production was highly variable and many zones found to be difficult to drain.

The degree of saturation (DoS) was found to have a significant impact on coal seam gas drainage, with decreased gas production from highly undersaturated zones with low permeability. Within West Cliff Colliery, in the areas where gas drainage was found to be particularly difficult, conventional UIS drainage was shown to be incapable of reducing the reservoir pressure below the critical desorption point prior to roadway development.

From analysis of operational factors, drainage time was found to have a significant impact on gas production and appeared to be closely related to DoS indicating that coal with lower DoS required increased drainage time. Borehole length and orientation were found to have some impact on gas production with maximum gas production achieved from boreholes between 500 and 1 000 m long oriented between 5 and 60° to the face cleat and between 0 and 40° to the maximum horizontal stress. Boreholes drilled up-dip, with an apparent dip between 0.0 and $+3.0^{O}$ achieved increased gas production and the relationship was strongest in highly undersaturated coal. In saturated coal the initial gas flow rate tends to be high and the increased gas flow velocity supports the borehole to self-clear water and fines. With increasing age, gas flow velocity reduces which appears to affect the ability of the borehole to self-clear, particularly in boreholes oriented down-dip. Undulations such as troughs existing along the length of the boreholes also allow water and fines to accumulate which impedes gas drainage. No evidence was found to support a relationship between applied suction pressure and gas production. However where high suction pressure is applied to boreholes increased

leakage may occur. A new method for enhancing coal seam gas production using cyclic injection of inert gas is proposed.

The nature of coal seam gas emission from both fast and slow desorption gas testing methods was investigated using results from 4 185 gas tests collected from eight Australian underground coal mines, four located in Queensland and four in New South Wales.

The following equations were found to best represent the average relationship between each gas content component and the total measured gas content (Q_M):

- $Q_1 = 0.0064 \times {Q_M}^{2.0227}$
- $Q_2 = 0.0257 \times {Q_M}^{1.9692}$
- $Q_3 = 1.1631 \times {Q_M}^{0.7529}$

The following equations were proposed for use in estimating average and maximum Q_M based on Q_1 and initial desorption rate (IDR):

- $Q_{M(ave)} = 9.3729 \times {Q_1}^{0.3328}$
- $Q_{M(max)} = 2.5665 \times \ln(IDR) + 2.1686$
- $Q_{M(ave)} = 0.7413 \times \sqrt{IDR}$

- The relationship between Q_M and desorption rate index (DRI) was investigated and found to be different from the relationship presented in 1995, which is the basis for the DRI900 methodology used to determine outburst threshold limit values (TLV) applicable to non-Bulli seam mines. The impact of recent increases to outburst TLV at several Bulli seam mines and the relationship between Q_M and DRI identified during this study suggests that a TLV applicable to the Bulli seam may be directly transferrable to non-Bulli seam mines.
- From analysis of 3 355 fast desorption test results the relationship between Q_M and DRI was found to be independent of gas composition and represented by the following equation:
  - $Q_M = 0.008 \times DRI$

The following relationships were identified from analysis of slow desorption data.

- A linear relationship exists between Q_2 and Q_M that is independent of changes in seam gas composition. The rate of gas desorption was shown to be faster from

samples with increased Q_M. Extending total desorption time beyond 200 days was shown to have little impact on Q_2 or the Q_2:Q_M ratio.

- From analysis of Q_2 and the Q_2:Q_M ratio, no relationship was found between vitrinite content, porosity and mineral matter content of each sample, suggesting the nature of desorbed gas emission was independent of coal petrography.
- Q_3 did not vary significantly in response to increasing Q_M whereas the Q_3:Q_M ratio reduced. The results indicate coal samples with high Q_M, having increased DoS, desorb gas at a faster rate resulting in the Q_3:Q_M ratio being less than from samples with low Q_M that desorb gas at a slower rate. The relationship between Q_3 and Q_M appeared to be independent of changes in seam gas composition. Extending the total desorption time beyond 200 days had little effect on residual gas content.
- From analysis of Q_3 and the Q_3:Q_M ratio relative to the measured vitrinite content, porosity and mineral matter content of the coal samples, it was found that residual gas content was independent of coal petrography.

To reduce the risk of gas loss into solution from prolonged contact with the current conventional slow desorption testing apparatus; consideration should be given to the use of electronic gas testing apparatus for continual analysis of the desorbed gas from coal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AFFIRMATION ..... **II**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... **V**

ABSTRACT ..... **VI**

TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... **IX**

LIST OF FIGURES ..... **XIV**

LIST OF TABLES ..... **XXIV**

LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS ..... **XXV**

CHAPTER ONE – GENERAL INTRODUCTION **1**

1.1 COAL MINING IN AUSTRALIA 1
1.2 COAL SEAM GAS DRAINAGE AND UTILISATION 3
1.3 GEOLOGY OF THE ILLAWARRA COAL MEASURES 5
1.4 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 6
1.5 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES 7
1.6 SCOPE 8
1.7 THESIS OUTLINE 11

CHAPTER TWO – GAS GENERATION, STORAGE AND FLOW IN COAL **13**

2.1 INTRODUCTION 13
2.2 THE COALIFICATION PROCESS 13
2.2.1 Coal Rank *15*
2.2.2 Coal Type *16*
2.2.3 Coal Structure *17*
2.3 GENERATION OF COAL SEAM GAS 19
2.3.1 Coal Seam Gas in the Bulli seam, southern Sydney Basin *20*
2.4 GAS STORAGE IN COAL 24
2.4.1 Gas Sorption Capacity *26*
2.4.2 Factors Impacting Gas Sorption Capacity *27*
2.4.2.1 Coal Rank 27
2.4.2.2 Coal Type 27
2.4.2.3 Moisture Content 28
2.4.2.4 Ash and Mineral Content 29
2.4.2.5 Temperature and Pressure 30
2.4.2.6 Sample Particle Size 30
2.4.3 Impact of Gas Sorption on Coal Structure *31*
2.5 GAS FLOW AND EMISSION FROM COAL 32
2.5.1 Factors Impacting on Gas Emission from Coal *34*

2.5.1.1 Permeability 35
2.5.1.2 Coal Structure and Pore Volume 35
2.5.1.3 Effective Stress 36
2.5.1.4 Saturation 37
2.6 MEASUREMENT OF COAL SEAM GAS CONTENT 40
2.6.1 Direct Method 41
2.6.1.1 Lost Gas Component 42
2.6.1.2 Desorbed Gas Component 43
2.6.1.3 Crushed Gas Component 44
2.6.1.4 Fast Desorption Method 46
2.6.1.5 Slow Desorption Method 46
2.6.2 Indirect Method 47
2.7 USE OF GAS CONTENT IN OUTBURST MANAGEMENT 48
2.7.1 Outburst Threshold Limit Values – Bulli Seam Mines 49
2.7.1.1 Raising Bulli Seam Outburst Threshold Limit Values 52
2.7.1.2 Impact of Gas Analysis Measurement Accuracy 54
2.7.2 Outburst Threshold Limit Values – Non-Bulli Seam Mines 54
2.7.2.1 Impact of Changes to Bulli Seam Outburst Threshold Limit Values 55
2.8 SUMMARY 56

CHAPTER THREE – DRAINAGE OF COAL SEAM GAS 59

3.1 INTRODUCTION 59
3.2 DRAINAGE OF COAL SEAM GAS FROM UNDERGROUND 60
3.2.1 Background 60
3.2.1.1 Metropolitan Colliery 60
3.2.1.2 Leichhardt Colliery 63
3.2.1.3 Collinsville No.2 Colliery 64
3.2.1.4 West Cliff Colliery 64
3.2.1.5 Appin Colliery 65
3.2.2 Inseam Directional Drilling 67
3.2.3 Actions to Improve Directional Drilling Capability 74
3.2.3.1 Torque / Thrust Sensors 76
3.2.3.2 Annular Pressure Sensors 76
3.2.3.3 Coal Interface Detection 77
3.3 DRAINAGE OF COAL SEAM GAS FROM SURFACE 77
3.3.1 Vertical Drilling 78
3.3.2 Radius Drilling 79
3.4 MANAGEMENT OF BOREHOLE STABILITY 82
3.5 GAS DRAINAGE ENHANCEMENT 83
3.5.1 Under-Reaming 84
3.5.2 Open Hole Cavity Completion 86
3.5.3 Secondary Lateral Drilling 87
3.5.5 Hydraulic Fracturing 88

3.5.7 Enhanced Coalbed Methane (ECBM) *94*
3.6 SUMMARY 98

CHAPTER FOUR – IMPACT OF COAL PROPERTIES ON GAS DRAINAGE 101

4.1 INTRODUCTION 101
4.2 DATA ACQUISITION 101
4.2.1 Inseam Borehole Gas Production Data *102*
4.2.2 Coal Property Data *103*
4.3 ANALYSIS OF INSEAM BOREHOLE GAS PRODUCTION 105
4.4 ANALYSIS OF COAL PROPERTIES 108
4.4.1 Coal Rank *109*
4.4.1.1 Carbon Content 109
4.4.1.2 Volatile Matter Content 112
4.4.1.3 Vitrinite Reflectance 115
4.4.2 Coal Type *117*
4.4.2.1 Inertinite Maceral Component 118
4.4.2.2 Vitrinite Maceral Component 120
4.4.2.3 Mineral Matter Component 123
4.4.3 Ash Content *125*
4.4.3.1 Seam Ash 126
4.4.3.2 Coal Ash 129
4.4.4 Permeability *132*
4.4.5 Inherent Moisture Content *133*
4.4.6 Seam Thickness *136*
4.4.7 Coal Seam Gas *138*
4.4.7.1 Gas Content 139
4.4.7.2 Gas Composition 144
4.4.7.3 Total Gas in Place 148
4.4.8 Degree of Saturation *150*
4.5 SUMMARY 159

CHAPTER FIVE – IMPACT OF OPERATIONAL FACTORS ON GAS DRAINAGE 161

5.1 INTRODUCTION 161
5.2 DATA ACQUISITION 161
5.3 ANALYSIS OF OPERATIONAL FACTORS 162
5.3.1 Borehole Length *163*
5.3.2 Borehole Diameter *165*
5.3.3 Borehole Density *170*
5.3.4 Borehole Orientation *174*
5.3.4.1 Borehole Orientation Relative to Cleat 174
5.3.4.2 Borehole Orientation Relative to Stress 177
5.3.4.3 Borehole Orientation Relative to Seam Dip 181
5.3.4.4 Borehole Orientation Relative to North 185

5.3.5 Drainage Time *187*
5.3.6 Applied Suction *190*
5.3.7 Gas Drainage System Management *195*
5.4 SUMMARY 198

CHAPTER SIX – ANALYSIS OF FAST AND SLOW DESORPTION GAS TESTING DATA ... 200

6.1 INTRODUCTION 200
6.2 ANALYSIS OF GAS DATA FROM FAST DESORPTION TESTING 201
6.2.1 Data Acquisition – Fast Desorption Gas Testing *201*
6.2.2 Q_1 Gas Content Component *204*
6.2.3 Q_2 Gas Content Component *206*
6.2.4 Q_3 Gas Content Component *208*
6.2.5 Relationship between Gas Content Components *210*
6.2.5.1 Impact of Gas Composition on the Gas Content Component Relationship 212
6.2.5.2 Estimating Average Total Gas Content from Q_1 Lost Gas Content 214
6.2.6 Initial Gas Desorption Rate *216*
6.2.6.1 Impact of Gas Composition on Initial Gas Desorption Rate 217
6.2.6.2 Estimating Maximum Total Gas Content from the Initial Gas Desorption Rate 218
6.2.6.3 Estimating Average Total Gas Content from the Initial Gas Desorption Rate 218
6.2.7 Desorption Rate Index (DRI) *219*
6.2.7.1 Impact of Gas Composition on Desorption Rate Index 221
6.2.8 Impact on Outburst Threshold Limits *222*
6.3 ANALYSIS OF COAL SAMPLE GAS EMISSION – SLOW DESORPTION TESTING 224
6.3.1 Data Acquisition – Slow Desorption Gas Testing *225*
6.3.2 Q_1 Gas Content Component *230*
6.3.3 Q_2 Gas Content Component *231*
6.3.4 Q_3 Gas Content Component *235*
6.3.5 Relationship between Gas Content Components *237*
6.3.5.1 Gas Content 237
6.3.5.2 Gas Composition 239
6.3.6 Analysis of Gas Composition during Desorption *240*
6.3.6.1 Gas Composition during Slow Desorption Testing 240
6.3.6.2 Analysis of Gas Composition during Inseam Borehole Gas Production 244
6.4 ELECTRONIC GAS TESTING APPARATUS 250
6.5 SUMMARY 252

CHAPTER SEVEN – CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 258

7.1 CONCLUSIONS 258
7.2 RECOMMENDATIONS 264

REFERENCES 266

APPENDICES 287

APPENDIX 2.1: CH_4 LANGMUIR VOLUME RELATIVE TO MEASURED COAL PROPERTY VALUES 287
APPENDIX 2.2: CO_2 LANGMUIR VOLUME RELATIVE TO MEASURED COAL PROPERTY VALUES 288
APPENDIX 2.3: CH_4 AND CO_2 LANGMUIR VOLUME RELATIVE TO VITRINITE AND INERTINITE MACERAL CONTENT 289
APPENDIX 4.1: SUMMARY OF UIS BOREHOLE PPRODUCTION AND COAL PROPERTY DATA 290
APPENDIX 4.2: BULLI SEAM HYDROSTATIC PRESSURE RESPONSE TO MINE WORKINGS AND GAS DRAINAGE 293
APPENDIX 5.1: SUMMARY OF UIS BOREHOLE PRODUCTION AND OPERATIONAL FACTOR DATA 299
APPENDIX 6.1 – SUMMARY OF FAST DESORPTION TEST DATA 302
APPENDIX 6.2 – RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN Q_M AND Q_1 RELATIVE TO GAS COMPOSITION 325
APPENDIX 6.3 – RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN Q_M AND Q_1 FOR EACH MINE 326
APPENDIX 6.4 – IMPACT OF GAS COMPOSITION ON Q_M – IDR RELATIONSHIP RELATIVE TO $Q_{M(MAX)}$ ENVELOPE 327
APPENDIX 6.5 – Q_M – IDR DATA FROM EACH MINE RELATIVE TO $Q_{M(MAX)}$ ENVELOPE..... 328
APPENDIX 6.6 – IMPACT OF GAS COMPOSITION ON Q_M – **IDR** RELATIONSHIP..... 329
APPENDIX 6.7 – IMPACT OF MINE SPECIFIC CONDITIONS ON Q_M – DRI RELATIONSHIP 330
APPENDIX 6.8 – IMPACT OF GAS COMPOSITION ON Q_M – DRI RELATIONSHIP..... 331
APPENDIX 6.9 – SUMMARY OF SLOW DESORPTION TEST DATA 332
APPENDIX 6.10 – SLOW DESORPTION GAS EMISSION 333
APPENDIX 6.11 – SLOW DESORPTION COAL SAMPLES..... 338
APPENDIX 6.12 – GAS COMPOSITION AND EMISSION DURING SLOW DESORPTION TESTING..... 345
APPENDIX 6.13 – GAS COMPOSITION DURING SLOW DESORPTION TESTING (CROSDALE, 1998)..... 354
APPENDIX 6.14 – GAS COMPOSITION FROM UIS BOREHOLES ALONG 519 AND 520 PANEL 355
APPENDIX 6.15 – GAS COMPOSITION FROM UIS BOREHOLES ALONG 519 AND 520 PANEL 357

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Australia's operating black and brown coal mines as at December 2008 (ABARE, 2010)..... 2
Figure 1.2: Extent of the Southern Coalfield of the Sydney Basin (after Faiz *et al.* 2007b)..... 5
Figure 1.3: Stratigraphic section of the Sydney Basin (after Apex Energy NL, 2008)..... 5
Figure 1.4: Gas drainage risk classification for WCC Area 5 (Armstrong and Kaag, 2006)..... 7
Figure 1.5: Project flowchart (Stage 1) factors that impact on UIS gas drainage 9
Figure 1.6: Project flowchart (Stage 2) assessment of gas content test data 10
Figure 1.7: Structure of chapters in the thesis 11
Figure 2.1: Details of the processes, stages and products of coalification (UWYO, 2002a)..... 14
Figure 2.2: Changes in coal composition with increasing rank (Aziz, 2006)..... 15
Figure 2.3: Examples of coal maceral type as seen under reflected light microscopy (Esterle, 2007)..... 17
Figure 2.4: Illustration of coal cleat geometry in plan view (Laubach *et al.*, 1998)..... 18
Figure 2.5: Electron micrographs showing the coal matrix (Sereshki, 2005) 19
Figure 2.6: Bulli seam gas content contours relative to the WCC mine workings..... 21
Figure 2.7: Bulli seam gas composition (CH_4/(CH_4+CO_2)) relative to WCC mine workings..... 22
Figure 2.8: Results of pure gas adsorption testing on Bulli seam coal from WCC 26
Figure 2.9: Critical desorption point of a typical CH_4 and CO_2 rich Bulli seam coal sample..... 34
Figure 2.10: Measured CO_2 content relative to saturated storage capacity of Sydney Basin coal samples (after Faiz *et al.*, 2007a) 39
Figure 2.11: Bulli seam gas content relative to CO_2 and CH_4 isotherm indicating degree of saturation.... 40
Figure 2.12: Comparison of flow rate and cumulative gas production from inseam gas drainage boreholes in CO_2 and CH_4 zones at WCC 40
Figure 2.13: Q_1 lost gas determination (after SAA, 1999) 43
Figure 2.14: Desorbed gas volume measurement apparatus (after SAA, 1999)..... 44
Figure 2.15: Outburst Risk Matrix (after Black *et al.*, 2009) 49
Figure 2.16: Prescribed Bulli seam Outburst Threshold Limits (Clarke, 1994)..... 50
Figure 2.17: Recommended Bulli seam Outburst Threshold Limits (Lama, 1995c)..... 51
Figure 2.18: Annual Bulli seam Longwall Mine Production (after Cram, 1995-2010)..... 52
Figure 2.19: Revised Tahmoor Colliery TLV (after Tahmoor Colliery, 2003)..... 53
Figure 2.20: Revised WCC TLV (after West Cliff Colliery, 2007) 53
Figure 2.21: Q_M relative to DRI for CO_2 and CH_4 rich coal from 386 panel, WCC (after Williams and Weissman, 1995) 55
Figure 2.22: Impact of increased Bulli seam TLV on DRI used to determine non-Bulli seam TLV (after Williams and Weissman, 1995)..... 56
Figure 3.1: Conceptual underground mine layout indicating potential sources of coal seam gas emission (Black and Aziz, 2009)..... 59
Figure 3.2: (a) Internal view of downhole motor (Brunner, 2005); (b) View of the angle of the bent sub (Hungerford, 2008); (c) Impact of bent sub orientation on borehole trajectory (after Kravits and Schwoebel, 1994) 68

Figure 3.3: Profile of an inseam directionally drilled borehole (after Brunner *et al.*, 2008) 69
Figure 3.4: Effect of drill cuttings and annular pressure to increase drag forces leading to differential sticking of the drill string (Thomson, 2009) 72
Figure 3.5: Effect of overbalanced and underbalanced drilling conditions (Thomson, 2009) 73
Figure 3.6: Inseam drilling patterns available for coal seam gas drainage (after Thomson, 1998) 74
Figure 3.7: Reservoir model output comparing gas content reduction from vertical and SIS boreholes (after Thomson, 2007) 78
Figure 3.8: Illustration of coal seam gas drainage using vertical boreholes (Wight, 2005) 79
Figure 3.9: Categories of radius drilling (after Logan *et al.*, 1987) 80
Figure 3.10: Impact of vertical and horizontal stress on borehole stability (after Brown *et al.*, 1996) 82
Figure 3.11: Gas drainage enhancement methods ranked according to cost and application relative to coal seam permeability (after Loftin, 2009 and Johnson, 2010) 84
Figure 3.12: Cavity reaming tool in Closed and Open position (Harvest Tool Company, 2010) 85
Figure 3.13: Under-reamed vertical gas drainage borehole completion used in the Surat Basin (Arrow Energy, 2008) 86
Figure 3.14: Dual seam quad z-pinnate pattern developed by CDX Gas (Wight, 2005) 88
Figure 3.15: Fluids (gases, liquids and gels) used in hydraulic fracturing (after Palmer, 2008) 89
Figure 3.16: Zone of stress induced permeability damage surrounding an inflated hydraulic fracture (after Palmer, 1993) 91
Figure 3.17: Hydraulic fracturing schematic (USEPA, 2009) 92
Figure 3.18: Hydraulic fracturing schematic (Olsen *et al.*, 2003) 92
Figure 3.19: Hydraulic fracturing schematic (Olsen *et al.*, 2003) 93
Figure 3.20: Cyclic Inert Gas Injection to enhance coal seam gas drainage (after Black *et al.*, 2010) 98
Figure 4.1: Plan of UIS boreholes where flow data was recorded 103
Figure 4.2: Location of coal samples used to acquire coal quality analysis 104
Figure 4.3: Sites used to acquire coal seam geological and geotechnical data 104
Figure 4.4: Total drill stub gas production relative to panel drill stub location 105
Figure 4.5: Average drill stub gas production rate relative to panel drill stub location 105
Figure 4.6: Total gas production relative to borehole location along panel 106
Figure 4.7: Span and median total gas production in each of the four cut-through zones 106
Figure 4.8: Histogram showing distribution of total borehole gas production 106
Figure 4.9: Histogram showing distribution of total borehole gas production rate (m^3/m/day) 106
Figure 4.10: Gas emission rate curves from coal samples WE1189 and WE1198 107
Figure 4.11: Relationship between D50 and total gas production 108
Figure 4.12: Proportion of total gas removed at D50 relative to the total borehole gas production 108
Figure 4.13: Impact of drainage time on span and median D50 percentage of total gas production 108
Figure 4.14: Carbon content contours relative to mine workings and coal sample locations 110
Figure 4.15: Distribution of carbon content for all boreholes within the complete dataset 111
Figure 4.16: Distribution of carbon content for boreholes in each cut-through zone 111
Figure 4.17: Total gas production relative to carbon content 111

Figure 4.18: D50 gas production relative to carbon content 111
Figure 4.19: Total gas production relative to carbon content in each cut-through zone..... 112
Figure 4.20: D50 gas production relative to carbon content in each cut-through zone 112
Figure 4.21: Volatile matter contours relative to mine workings and coal sample location..... 113
Figure 4.22: Distribution of volatile matter content for all boreholes within the complete dataset 113
Figure 4.23: Distribution of volatile matter content for boreholes in each cut-through zone..... 113
Figure 4.24: Total gas production relative to volatile matter content..... 114
Figure 4.25: D50 gas production relative to volatile matter content 114
Figure 4.26: Total gas production relative to volatile matter content in each cut-through zone 114
Figure 4.27: D50 gas production relative to volatile matter content in each cut-through zone..... 114
Figure 4.28: Vitrinite reflectance contours relative to mine workings and coal sample location..... 115
Figure 4.29: Distribution of vitrinite reflectance for all boreholes within the complete dataset 116
Figure 4.30: Distribution of vitrinite reflectance for boreholes in each cut-through zone 116
Figure 4.31: Total gas production relative to vitrinite reflectance 116
Figure 4.32: D50 gas production relative to vitrinite reflectance..... 116
Figure 4.33: Total gas production relative to vitrinite reflectance in each cut-through zone 117
Figure 4.34: D50 gas production relative to vitrinite reflectance in each cut-through zone..... 117
Figure 4.35: Inertinite contours relative to mine workings and coal sample location 118
Figure 4.36: Distribution of inertinite content for all boreholes within the complete dataset 119
Figure 4.37: Distribution of inertinite content for boreholes in each cut-through zone 119
Figure 4.38: Total gas production relative to inertinite content 119
Figure 4.39: D50 gas production relative to inertinite content..... 119
Figure 4.40: Total gas production relative to inertinite content in each cut-through zone 120
Figure 4.41: D50 gas production relative to inertinite content in each cut-through zone..... 120
Figure 4.42: Vitrinite contours relative to mine workings and coal sample location 121
Figure 4.43: Distribution of vitrinite content for all boreholes within the complete dataset..... 121
Figure 4.44: Distribution of vitrinite content for boreholes in each cut-through zone 121
Figure 4.45: Total gas production relative to vitrinite content 122
Figure 4.46: D50 gas production relative to vitrinite content..... 122
Figure 4.47: Total gas production relative to vitrinite content in each cut-through zone..... 122
Figure 4.48: D50 gas production relative to vitrinite content in each cut-through zone 122
Figure 4.49: Mineral matter contours relative to mine workings and coal sample location..... 123
Figure 4.50: Distribution of mineral matter for all boreholes within the complete dataset..... 124
Figure 4.51: Distribution of mineral matter for boreholes in each cut-through zone 124
Figure 4.52: Total gas production relative to mineral matter content 124
Figure 4.53: D50 gas production relative to mineral matter content..... 124
Figure 4.54: Total gas production relative to mineral matter content in each cut-through zone 125
Figure 4.55: D50 gas production relative to mineral matter content in each cut-through zone..... 125
Figure 4.56: Span and average seam ash content in each cut-through zone..... 126
Figure 4.57: Span and average coal ash content in each cut-through zone 126

Figure 4.58: Coal ash mineral type and relative percentage 126
Figure 4.59: Seam ash contours relative to mine workings and coal sample location 127
Figure 4.60: Distribution of seam ash content for all boreholes within the complete dataset 128
Figure 4.61: Distribution of seam ash content for boreholes in each cut-through zone 128
Figure 4.62: Total gas production relative to seam ash content 128
Figure 4.63: D50 gas production relative to seam ash content 128
Figure 4.64: Total gas production relative to seam ash content in each cut-through zone 129
Figure 4.65: D50 gas production relative to seam ash content in each cut-through zone 129
Figure 4.66: Coal ash contours relative to mine workings and coal sample location 130
Figure 4.67: Distribution of coal ash content for all boreholes within the complete dataset 130
Figure 4.68: Distribution of coal ash content for boreholes in each cut-through zone 130
Figure 4.69: Total gas production relative to coal ash content 131
Figure 4.70: D50 gas production relative to coal ash content 131
Figure 4.71: Total gas production relative to coal ash content in each cut-through zone 131
Figure 4.72: D50 gas production relative to coal ash content in each cut-through zone 131
Figure 4.73: Permeability contours (mD) relative to mine workings and measurement locations 132
Figure 4.74: Inherent moisture contours relative to mine workings and coal sample location 134
Figure 4.75: Distribution of inherent moisture content for all boreholes within the complete dataset 135
Figure 4.76: Distribution of inherent moisture content for boreholes in each cut-through zone 135
Figure 4.77: Total gas production relative to inherent moisture content 135
Figure 4.78: D50 gas production relative to inherent moisture content 135
Figure 4.79: Total gas production relative to inherent moisture content in each cut-through zone 136
Figure 4.80: D50 gas production relative to inherent moisture content in each cut-through zone 136
Figure 4.81: Bulli seam thickness contours relative to mine workings and sample location 137
Figure 4.82: Distribution of seam thickness for all boreholes within the complete dataset 137
Figure 4.83: Distribution of seam thickness for boreholes in each cut-through zone 137
Figure 4.84: Total gas production relative to seam thickness 138
Figure 4.85: D50 gas production relative to seam thickness 138
Figure 4.86: Total gas production relative to carbon content in each cut-through zone 138
Figure 4.87: D50 gas production relative to carbon content in each cut-through zones 138
Figure 4.88: Gas content relative to gas composition for all UIS boreholes 139
Figure 4.89: Gas content relative to gas composition in each cut-through zone 139
Figure 4.90: Gas content contours relative to mine workings and coal sample location 140
Figure 4.91: Distribution of gas content for all boreholes within the complete dataset 141
Figure 4.92: Distribution of gas content for boreholes in each cut-through zone 141
Figure 4.93: Total gas production relative to gas content 141
Figure 4.94: D50 gas production relative to gas content 141
Figure 4.95: Total gas production relative to gas content in each cut-through zone 142
Figure 4.96: D50 gas production relative to gas content in each cut-through zone 142
Figure 4.97: Total gas production data range within each gas content zone 142

Figure 4.98: Total gas production relative to gas composition in each gas content zone 143
Figure 4.99: D50 gas production relative to gas composition in each gas content zone 143
Figure 4.100: Gas composition (CH_4/(CH_4+CO_2)) relative to mine workings and sample location..... 144
Figure 4.101: Distribution of gas composition for all boreholes within the complete dataset 145
Figure 4.102: Distribution of gas composition for boreholes in each cut-through zone 145
Figure 4.103: Total gas production relative to gas composition 145
Figure 4.104: D50 gas production relative to gas composition 145
Figure 4.105: Total gas production relative to gas composition in each cut-through zone 146
Figure 4.106: D50 gas production relative to gas composition in each cut-through zone..... 146
Figure 4.107: Total gas production data range within each gas composition zone 146
Figure 4.108: Total gas production relative to gas content in each gas composition zone..... 147
Figure 4.109: D50 gas production relative to gas content in each gas composition zone 147
Figure 4.110: GIP relative to each of the values for Area, Thickness and Gas content 148
Figure 4.111: Distribution of GIP for drill sites within the complete dataset 149
Figure 4.112: Distribution of GIP for drill sites within each cut-through zone..... 149
Figure 4.113: Gas production relative to GIP for drill sites within the complete dataset..... 149
Figure 4.114: Gas production relative to GIP for drill sites within each cut-through zone..... 149
Figure 4.115: Gas production relative to GIP for drill sites within each gas content zone 150
Figure 4.116: Gas production relative to GIP for drill sites within each gas composition zone 150
Figure 4.117: Characteristic coalbed water and gas production curves (Garbutt, 2004)..... 151
Figure 4.118: Typical Bulli seam *in situ* gas condition relative to CO_2 and CH_4 isotherms 152
Figure 4.119: Location of coal samples collected for isotherm testing 154
Figure 4.120: CH_4 isotherm curves determined for coal samples within mining area 154
Figure 4.121: CO_2 isotherm curves determined for coal samples within mining area 154
Figure 4.122: Piezometer readings, pressure contours, mine workings and UIS boreholes – February 2007 155
Figure 4.123: Piezometer readings, pressure contours, mine workings and UIS boreholes – September 2007 155
Figure 4.124: Gas content relative to pure gas isotherms within three gas composition zones..... 157
Figure 4.125: Gas content relative to DoS at each drill site 157
Figure 4.126: Gas composition relative to DoS at each drill site 157
Figure 4.127: Total gas production relative to DoS at each drill site 158
Figure 4.128: D50 gas production relative to DoS at each drill site..... 158
Figure 4.129: Total gas production relative to DoS in each cut-through zone 158
Figure 4.130: D50 gas production relative to DoS in each cut-through zone 158
Figure 4.131: Total gas production per borehole in each drill site relative to DoS 159
Figure 5.1: Location of UIS boreholes relative to mine workings 162
Figure 5.2: Distribution of borehole length for all boreholes within the complete dataset 163
Figure 5.3: Distribution of borehole length for boreholes in each cut-through zone 163
Figure 5.4: Total gas production relative to borehole length..... 164

Figure 5.5: D50 gas production relative to borehole length 164
Figure 5.6: Total gas production relative to borehole length in each cut-through zone 164
Figure 5.7: D50 gas production relative to borehole length in each cut-through zone 164
Figure 5.8: Total gas production per unit borehole length relative to borehole length 165
Figure 5.9: D50 gas production per unit length relative to borehole length 165
Figure 5.10: Results of gas flow relative to borehole diameter testing by Battino and Hargraves (1982) and Clark *et al*. (1983) 166
Figure 5.11: Impact of borehole diameter on CH_4 gas flow velocity and pressure loss relative to changes in total gas flow rate 168
Figure 5.12: Impact of borehole diameter on CO_2 gas flow velocity and pressure loss relative to changes in total gas flow rate 168
Figure 5.13: Borehole breakout in a UIS borehole at WCC 169
Figure 5.14: Calliper logging of a UIS borehole at WCC (after Mills *et al.*, 2006) 170
Figure 5.15: 519 26c/t drill pattern showing increased drilling density of the inbye zones 171
Figure 5.16: 519 11c/t drill pattern showing reduced drilling density of the outbye zones 171
Figure 5.17: Distribution of borehole density for drill sites within the complete dataset 172
Figure 5.18: Distribution of borehole density for drill sites within each cut-through zone 172
Figure 5.19: Total gas production relative to borehole density 172
Figure 5.20: D50 gas production relative to borehole density 172
Figure 5.21: Total gas production relative to borehole density in each cut-through zone 173
Figure 5.22: D50 gas production relative to borehole density in each cut-through zone 173
Figure 5.23: Macroscopic cleat network of a coal seam 174
Figure 5.24: Distribution of average orientation relative to cleat ($100/280^O$) for boreholes in the complete dataset 175
Figure 5.25: Distribution of average orientation relative to cleat ($100/280^O$) for boreholes in each cut-through zone 175
Figure 5.26: Total gas production relative to average borehole orientation to cleat ($100/280^O$) 176
Figure 5.27: D50 gas production relative to average borehole orientation to cleat ($100/280^O$) 176
Figure 5.28: Total gas production relative to average borehole orientation to cleat ($100/280^O$) in each cut-through zone 177
Figure 5.29: D50 gas production relative to average borehole orientation to cleat ($100/280^O$) in each cut-through zone 177
Figure 5.30: Borehole breakout in vertical boreholes aligned with minimum horizontal stress (Garbutt, 2004) 178
Figure 5.31: Stress measurement locations (after BHPBIC, 2006) 178
Figure 5.32: Distribution of average orientation relative to stress for boreholes in the complete dataset 179
Figure 5.33: Distribution of average orientation relative to stress for boreholes in each cut-through zone 179
Figure 5.34: Total gas production relative to average borehole orientation to stress ($075/255^O$) 180
Figure 5.35: D50 gas production relative to average borehole orientation to stress ($075/255^O$) 180

Figure 5.36: Total gas production relative to average borehole orientation to stress (075/255°) in each cut-through zone 180
Figure 5.37: D50 gas production relative to average borehole orientation to stress (075/255°) in each cut-through zone 180
Figure 5.38: Bulli seam floor contours at 5 m interval (after Armstrong and Kaag, 2008)..... 182
Figure 5.39: Section views of two UIS boreholes (after Black, 2007)..... 182
Figure 5.40: Distribution of average apparent dip for boreholes in the complete dataset 183
Figure 5.41: Distribution of average apparent dip for boreholes in each cut-through zone 183
Figure 5.42: Total gas production relative to apparent dip..... 183
Figure 5.43: D50 gas production relative to apparent dip 183
Figure 5.44: Total gas production relative to apparent dip in each cut-through zone 184
Figure 5.45: D50 gas production relative to apparent dip in each cut-through zone..... 184
Figure 5.46: Distribution of average orientation relative to north for boreholes in the complete dataset 185
Figure 5.47: Distribution of average orientation relative to north for boreholes in each cut-through zone 185
Figure 5.48: Total gas production relative to borehole orientation 186
Figure 5.49: D50 gas production relative to borehole orientation..... 186
Figure 5.50: Total gas production relative to borehole orientation in each cut-through zone 187
Figure 5.51: D50 gas production relative to borehole orientation in each cut-through zone 187
Figure 5.52: Distribution of drainage time for boreholes in the complete dataset 188
Figure 5.53: Distribution of drainage time for boreholes in each cut-through zone..... 188
Figure 5.54: Total gas production relative to drainage time..... 189
Figure 5.55: Total gas production relative to drainage time for boreholes in each cut-through zone 189
Figure 5.56: Total gas production relative to drainage time in each gas content zone..... 190
Figure 5.57: Total gas production relative to drainage time for boreholes in each gas composition zone190
Figure 5.58: UIS borehole gas flow and leakage response to applied suction (after Battino and Hargraves, 1982)..... 191
Figure 5.59: UIS borehole gas flow and air dilution response to applied suction (after Clark et al., 1983) 191
Figure 5.60: UIS borehole gas flow and leakage response to applied suction (after Lama, 1988a)..... 191
Figure 5.61: UIS borehole gas flow response to applied suction (after Marshall *et al*., 1982) 192
Figure 5.62: Distribution of median suction pressure applied to boreholes in the complete dataset..... 193
Figure 5.63: Distribution of median suction pressure applied to boreholes in each cut-through zone..... 193
Figure 5.64: Total gas production relative to median applied suction pressure 193
Figure 5.65: D50 gas production relative to median applied suction pressure..... 193
Figure 5.66: Total gas production relative to median applied suction pressure in each cut-through zone194
Figure 5.67: D50 gas production relative to median applied suction pressure in each cut-through zone 194
Figure 5.68: Change in drainage gas composition during UIS borehole gas production 195
Figure 5.69: Reduction in effective area due to fines accumulation (Black and Self, 2007) 196
Figure 5.70 – Conceptual gas, water, coal fines separation unit 197

Figure 6.1: Location of core samples tested using the fast desorption method 201
Figure 6.2: Distribution of Q_1 relative to Q_M 204
Figure 6.3: Distribution of Q_1:Q_M ratio relative to Q_M 204
Figure 6.4: Distribution of Q_1 gas content relative to sample gas composition 205
Figure 6.5: Distribution of Q_1:Q_M ratio relative to sample gas composition 205
Figure 6.6: Distribution of average Q_1 gas content relative to Q_M and gas composition 206
Figure 6.7: Distribution of average Q_1:Q_M ratio relative to Q_M and gas composition 206
Figure 6.8: Distribution of Q_2 gas content relative to Q_M 206
Figure 6.9: Distribution of Q_2:Q_M ratio relative to Q_M 206
Figure 6.10: Distribution of Q_2 gas content relative to sample gas composition 207
Figure 6.11: Distribution of Q_2:Q_M ratio relative to sample gas composition 207
Figure 6.12: Distribution of average Q_2 gas content relative to Q_M and gas composition 208
Figure 6.13: Distribution of average Q_2:Q_M ratio relative to Q_M and gas composition 208
Figure 6.14: Distribution of Q_3 gas content relative to Q_M 209
Figure 6.15: Distribution of Q_3:Q_M ratio relative to Q_M 209
Figure 6.16: Distribution of Q_3 gas content relative to sample gas composition 209
Figure 6.17: Distribution of Q_3:Q_M ratio relative to sample gas composition 209
Figure 6.18: Distribution of average Q_3 gas content relative to Q_M and gas composition 210
Figure 6.19: Distribution of average Q_3:Q_M ratio relative to Q_M and gas composition 210
Figure 6.20: Gas content component values plotted relative to Q_M (0-18 m^3/t), including linear trendlines 210
Figure 6.21: Gas content component values plotted relative to Q_M including linear trendlines 0-7 m^3/t and 7-18 m^3/t 211
Figure 6.22: Gas content component values plotted relative to Q_M including linear trendlines 0-7 m^3/t and 7-14 m^3/t 211
Figure 6.23: Gas content component values plotted relative to Q_M including power formula trendlines representing the average of each component 212
Figure 6.24: CO_2 rich gas content component values plotted relative to Q_M, showing linear trendlines 0-7 m^3/t and 7-14 m^3/t 213
Figure 6.25: CH_4 rich gas content component values plotted relative to Q_M, showing linear trendlines 0-7 m^3/t and 7-14 m^3/t 213
Figure 6.26: CO_2 rich gas content component values plotted relative to Q_M, showing power relationship 0-18 m^3/t 213
Figure 6.27: CH_4 rich gas content component values plotted relative to Q_M, showing power relationship 0-18 m^3/t 213
Figure 6.28: Impact of gas composition on average gas content component values relative to Q_M, based on linear average relationship 214
Figure 6.29: Impact of gas composition on average gas content component values relative to Q_M, based on power formula relationship 214

Figure 6.30: Q_M-Q_1 data for the complete dataset, including trendline representing average Q_M relative to Q_1 215
Figure 6.31: Impact of gas composition on the average Q_M to Q_1 gas content relationship 216
Figure 6.32: Impact of core sample origin on the average Q_M to Q_1 gas content relationship. 216
Figure 6.33: Average IDR and IDR30 relative to gas content and gas composition 217
Figure 6.34: Q_M relative to IDR, including maximum Q_M envelope 217
Figure 6.35: Q_M-IDR data from CO_2 rich coal, including $Q_{M(max)}$ envelope 218
Figure 6.36: Q_M-IDR data from CH_4 rich coal, including $Q_{M(max)}$ envelope 218
Figure 6.37: Q_M relative to square root of IDR 219
Figure 6.38: Q_M relative to DRI 220
Figure 6.39: Average DRI relative to gas content and gas composition 221
Figure 6.40: Q_M-DRI relationship within CO_2 and CH_4 rich seam gas conditions 221
Figure 6.41: Q_M relative to DRI for CH_4 and CO_2 rich Bulli seam coal samples (after Williams and Weissman, 1995) 222
Figure 6.42: Q_M relative to DRI for CH_4 and CO_2 rich Bulli and non-Bulli seam coal samples 223
Figure 6.43: Q_M-DRI relationship for determining TLV's applicable to non-Bulli seam mines 224
Figure 6.44: Location of core samples tested using slow desorption method 225
Figure 6.45: PVC core sample gas desorption canister and slow desorption testing apparatus 226
Figure 6.46: Hewlett Packard quad micro gas chromatograph 228
Figure 6.47: Slow desorption gas emission results representing samples WE1203 and WE1185 228
Figure 6.48: Q_1 gas content relative to Q_M 231
Figure 6.49: Q_1 gas content relative to gas composition 231
Figure 6.50: Q_2 gas content relative to Q_M 232
Figure 6.51: Q_2 gas content relative to gas composition 232
Figure 6.52: Q_2:Q_M ratio relative to Q_M 232
Figure 6.53: Q_2:Q_M ratio relative to gas composition 232
Figure 6.54: Gas emission from valid samples having CH_4 concentration less than 50% 232
Figure 6.55: Gas emission from valid samples having CH_4 concentration greater than 50% 232
Figure 6.56: Q_2 gas content relative to Q_M 233
Figure 6.57: Q_2 gas content relative to time to desorb 65%$Q_{M(d)}$ 233
Figure 6.58: Q_2 gas content relative to vitrinite content, porosity and mineral matter content 234
Figure 6.59: Q_2:Q_M ratio relative to vitrinite content, porosity and mineral matter content 234
Figure 6.60: Gas emission from valid samples having vitrinite content less than 30% 234
Figure 6.61: Gas emission from valid samples having vitrinite content greater than 30% 234
Figure 6.62: Q_3 gas content relative to Q_M 235
Figure 6.63: Q_3 gas content relative to gas composition 235
Figure 6.64: Q_3:Q_M ratio relative to Q_M 236
Figure 6.65: Q_3:Q_M ratio relative to gas composition 236
Figure 6.66: Q_3 gas content relative to total desorption time 236
Figure 6.67: Q_3 gas content relative to time to desorb 65%$Q_{M(d)}$ 236

Figure 6.68: Q_3 gas content relative to vitrinite content, porosity and mineral matter content 237
Figure 6.69: Q_3:Q_M ratio relative to vitrinite content, porosity and mineral matter content..... 237
Figure 6.70: Slow desorption gas content component values relative to Q_M 238
Figure 6.71: Fast desorption gas content component values relative to Q_M 238
Figure 6.72: Average slow desorption Q_M component percentage assessed relative to Q_M 239
Figure 6.73: Average fast desorption Q_M component percentage assessed relative to Q_M 239
Figure 6.74: Average slow desorption Q_M and gas content component percentage assessed relative to gas composition 239
Figure 6.75: Average fast desorption Q_M and gas content component percentage assessed relative to gas composition 240
Figure 6.76: Gas composition during slow desorption testing – results of samples WE1206 and WE1246 241
Figure 6.77: Variability in gas composition during slow desorption testing 242
Figure 6.78: Changes in gas composition during late stage desorption..... 242
Figure 6.79: Comparison of gas composition values from fast and slow desorption testing 244
Figure 6.80: Comparison of Q_M values from fast and slow desorption testing 244
Figure 6.81: Gas production mechanisms and change in produced gas composition during inseam borehole gas production (after Cui and Busten, 2006) 245
Figure 6.82: Composition of gas produced from UIS boreholes drilled along 519 and 520 panel 246
Figure 6.83: Composition of gas produced from individual UIS drainage boreholes 247
Figure 6.84: Location of UIS boreholes and core samples used to determine gas composition 247
Figure 6.85: Comparison of median gas composition of samples from UIS boreholes and coal core samples 249
Figure 6.86: Time-dependent composition change of a CO_2 rich gas in contact with a water column of (a) acidified water column, and (b) a linseed oil barrier (Danell *et al.*, 2003) 251
Figure 6.87: Simplified schematic of electronic gas testing apparatus..... 252

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1: Range of coal property values representing West Cliff Colliery, Area 5 6
Table 1.2: Classification of coal macerals (after SAA, 1998) 16
Table 4.1: Coal seam properties considered in analysis 102
Table 4.2: Coal rank classification (after Ward, 1984) 109
Table 4.3: Carbon content data source and summary information (after Clark, 1986-2007) 110
Table 4.4: Volatile matter data source and summary information (after Clark, 1986-2007) 112
Table 4.5: Vitrinite reflectance data source and summary information (after Clark, 1986-2007) 115
Table 4.6: Inertinite maceral data source and summary information (after Clark, 1986-2007) 118
Table 4.7: Vitrinite maceral data source and summary information (after Clark, 1986-2007) 120
Table 4.8: Mineral matter data source and summary information (after Clark, 1986-2007) 123
Table 4.9: Seam ash data source and summary information (after Clark, 1986-2007) 127
Table 4.10: Coal ash data source and summary information (after Clark, 1986-2007) 129
Table 4.11: Inherent moisture data source and summary information (after Clark, 1986-2007) 134
Table 4.12: Seam thickness data source and summary information (after Clark, 1986-2007) 136
Table 4.13: Summary of statistical correlation between gas production and coal properties within each gas content zone 143
Table 4.14: Summary of statistical correlation between gas production and coal properties within each gas composition zone 147
Table 4.15: Langmuir volume and pressure constants representing CH_4 and CO_2 saturation 154
Table 5.1: Operational factors considered in analysis 163
Table 5.2: Impact of diameter, length and flow rate on frictional pressure loss in a borehole carrying CH_4 gas 168
Table 5.3: Impact of diameter, length and flow rate on frictional pressure loss in a borehole carrying CO_2 gas 169
Table 6.1: Source of UIS gas testing data used in analysis 202
Table 6.2: Average gas analysis data grouped according to gas content and gas composition 203
Table 6.3: Slow desorption testing gas release schedule 227
Table 6.4: Assessment of gas emission data listing samples considered to be valid 229
Table 6.5: Assessment of gas emission data listing samples considered to be invalid 230
Table 6.6: Summary of gas composition (%CH_4) results recorded from different sample sources 248

LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACIRL	Australian Coal Industry Research Laboratories
BHPBIC	BHP Billiton Illawarra Coal
Φ	porosity (%)
CBM	coalbed methane
cc/g	cubic centimetres per gram
cm	centimetre
$CO_{2\text{-}e}$	carbon dioxide equivalent
D50	initial 50 days of gas production from UIS drainage boreholes
daf	dry and ash free
DRI	desorption rate index (ml)
DTV	defined threshold value
ECBM	enhanced coalbed methane
g	gram
GHG	greenhouse gas
Gt	gigatonnes ($1x10^9$ tonnes)
IDR	initial gas desorption rate ($\sqrt{ml \div \sqrt{min} \div kg}$)
IDR30	gas desorbed from sample in initial 30 secs of testing (m^3/t)
kPa	kilopascal
L/s	litres per second
L/min	litres per minute
LWD	logging-while-drilling
m	metre
mm	millimetre
m/day	metres per day
m^3	cubic metre
m^3/m	cubic metre per metre
m^3/t	cubic metre per tonne
m/s	metres per second
mD	milli Darcy
MPa	megapascal
MRD	medium radius drilling
Mt	megatonne ($1x10^6$ tonnes)
Mtpa	million tonnes per annum
MWD	measure-while-drilling
nm	nanometre ($1x10^{-9}$ m)
NCM	non-coal matter
NTP	normal temperature and pressure ($20^{O}C$ and 101.325 kPa)
P	absolute gas pressure
Pa	Pascal
P_{CDP}	critical desorption pressure
P_i	initial reservoir pressure

P_L	Langmuir pressure constant
P_O	atmospheric pressure (101.325 kPa)
Q_1	gas lost during coal core sample recovery (m^3/t)
Q_2	gas released from coal core sample during desorption testing (m^3/t)
Q_3	gas released from coal sample after crushing (m^3/t)
Q_M	total measured gas content; sum of Q_1, Q_2 and Q_3 (m^3/t)
STIS	surface to inseam
T	absolute strata temperature (^{O}K)
TLV	outburst threshold limit value
ρ	rho - density (t/m^3)
ROM	run-of-mine
rpm	revolutions per minute
µm	micrometre, or micron ($1x10^{-6}$ m)
UIS	underground to inseam
V_i	*in situ* gas content
V_L	Langmuir volume constant
V_{sat}	saturated gas content
WCC	West Cliff Colliery