

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**Modelling and Analysis of Hydrogen-based  
Wind Energy Transmission and  
Storage Systems:  
  
HyLink System at Totara Valley**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

**Master of Technology in Energy Management**

at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

**Peter Sudol**

Dipl.-Ing. (FH)

**2009**

## Abstract

Distributed generation has the potential to reduce the supply-demand gap emerging in New Zealand's electricity market. Thereby it can improve the overall network efficiency, harness renewable energy resources and reduce the need for upgrading of existing distribution lines.

A typical New Zealand rural community consisting of three adjacent farms at Totara Valley near Woodville represents a demonstration site on distributed generation for Massey University and Industrial Research Limited. Local renewable energy resources are being used for the purpose of sustainable development. Alternative micro-scale technologies are being combined to achieve a valuable network support.

This paper is an in-depth report on the implementation process of the HyLink system; a system which utilises hydrogen as an energy carrier to balance and transport the fluctuating wind power. The report documents its development from the laboratory stage to commissioning at Totara Valley, which was carried out under direction of Industrial Research Limited.

The PEM electrolyser's performance at different stack temperatures was investigated. It was found that hydrogen production increases at the same voltage with a higher stack temperature. This is due to the improved kinetics of the electrochemical reactions and decreased thermodynamic energy requirement for water electrolysis. The electrolyser efficiency measurement at the half of its maximal power input (247 W) resulted in 65.3 %. Thereby the stack temperature attained less than half of the allowed limit of 80°C. The capture of the excess heat by insulation can improve the electrolyser's efficiency.

Pressure tests were performed on the 2 km long pipeline at Totara Valley using hydrogen and natural gas in order to test their permeability. The results were compared with previous studies at Massey University and with data obtained from the industry. The hydrogen permeability was measured to be  $5.5 * 10^{-16} \text{ mol m m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ Pa}^{-1}$  for a 2 km MDPE pipe. This is about half the result obtained from previous studies on

hydrogen permeability through MDPE at Massey University which was undertaken at room temperature. The reason for this discrepancy is likely to be the lower ambient temperature during the measurement at Totara Valley, which can be supported with the Arrhenius equation. It was furthermore measured that the power loss due to hydrogen diffusion through the pipeline walls during the fuel cell operation is about 1.5 W at the current system operation mode.

A techno-economic analysis of the system was undertaken applying the micro-power optimisation software HOMER as a simulation tool. Two operation modes of the system were investigated, the load following and the peak demand compensating. The simulation results reveal that the durability and the cost of the electrochemical energy conversion devices; electrolyser and fuel cell, are the main hurdles which need to be overcome on the path in introducing hydrogen based energy systems like HyLink.

Finally, economic optimisation modelling of the small-scale system by best component alignment was performed. It was found that the electrolyser capacity down-rating of 80% in relation to the wind turbine capacity, leads to a minimal system levelised cost. In addition to this, the impact of various wind turbine/electrolyser subsystems and pipeline storage capacities on the fuel cell capacity factor and on the system levelised cost in the load following operation mode was analysed. The outcomes can be useful for further HyLink related energy system planning.

## **Acknowledgements**

My first thanks go to my research supervisors Prof Ralph Sims and Dr Attilio Pigneri for providing support and inspiration throughout the overall programme duration.

My thanks extend out to Mr Alister Gardiner, the energy research manager of Industrial Research Limited (IRL), and his engineering team: Mr Eoin McPherson, Mr Steve Broome and Dr Edward Pilbrow. I gained immense experience from their invitation to their laboratory in Christchurch, as well as from all the lessons I learnt during the system installation at Totara Valley. Thanks for involving me in your work.

My thanks are also owed to Mr Tom Lambert, the HOMER software co-developer of the Mistaya Engineering Inc., for his advice during the HyLink system modelling.

Thanks to Totara Valley residents, especially Geoff and his father, not just for allowing me to visit their farms and perform tests on the HyLink system, but also for lending me their farm bike when it was too slippery for a 4WD.

I also would like to thank Dr Jim Hargreaves of Massey University for advice in wind turbine mechanics, Dr Phil Murray of Allco Wind Energy NZ for providing me with data needed for the system simulation and Mr Mark Carter for advice in electronics.

Heartfelt thanks to my wife Ingrid and my children Layla, Jeremy and Benjamin for their love, devotion and support.

# List of Contents

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>List of Contents</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Objectives	3
<b>2. Background</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 Motivation for Hydrogen as an Energy Carrier	4
2.2 Hydrogen as a Means of Balancing Wind Power	7
2.2.1 Large-Scale Considerations	7
2.2.2 Renewable Hydrogen Pilot Projects	10
2.3 Previous Studies at Massey University	11
2.3.1 Totara Valley Community Electricity Load Profiles	11
2.3.2 Wind Energy Resource – Totara Valley Region	12
2.3.3 Pipe Material Selection	14
<b>3. HyLink System in the Laboratory Stage</b>	<b>17</b>
3.1 Overall System Description	17
3.2 Electrolysis Setup Description	17
3.3 Integrated Electrolyser Stack	19
3.4 Integrated Alkaline Fuel Cell	22
3.5 Estimating the Overall System Efficiency	24
3.5.1 Lynntech Electrolyser Efficiency	24
3.5.2 DCI 1200 Fuel Cell Efficiency	25
3.6 Recording VI Curves at Various Electrolyser Stack Temperatures	26
<b>4. HyLink System Transition to Totara Valley</b>	<b>29</b>
4.1 Pipeline Installation	29
4.2 Electrolysis Setup	31
4.3 PEM Fuel Cell Integration	32
4.4 Installing the Wind Turbines	34
4.4.1 Proven	34

4.4.2 Air-X	36
4.5 Wind Power to Water Electrolysis Connection	38
4.6 HyLink versus Power Line	39
<b>5. Pressure Tests</b>	<b>41</b>
5.1 Estimating the Frictional Pressure Drop	41
5.2 Hydrogen Diffusion Rate Measurement	42
5.3 Permeability Comparison with Previous Studies at Massey University	44
5.4 Methane Test	46
5.5 Estimating the Maximal Power Transfer through the Pipeline	48
<b>6. HyLink Modelling with HOMER – Data Inputs</b>	<b>50</b>
6.1 Electricity Load Data	50
6.2 Wind Resource Data	52
6.3 Solar Resource Data	54
6.4 Grid Inputs	56
6.5 Wind Turbine Inputs	57
6.6 Photovoltaic Inputs	59
6.7 Electrolyser Inputs	59
6.8 Hydrogen Tank Inputs	60
6.9 Fuel Cell Inputs	61
<b>7. Simulation of the Current HyLink Configuration</b>	<b>65</b>
7.1 PV Role within the HyLink System	65
7.2 Air-X Power Output	67
7.3 First Simulation Run	68
7.4 HyLink as a Stand-Alone System in HOMER	71
7.4.1 Economic Considerations	71
7.4.2 Energy Flow within the HyLink System	73
7.5 Simulation of the Grid-Connected HyLink System	76
7.5.1 HyLink Cost Reduction	76
7.5.2 Constraining the Grid Capacity	77
7.6 HyLink in the Load Following Operation Mode	81
<b>8. HyLink Optimisation Modelling</b>	<b>84</b>
8.1 Investigating the Wind Generator/Electrolyser Arrangement	84
8.1.1 Current System Configuration	84
8.1.2 Planned System Configurations	87

8.2 Investigating the Overall System Arrangement	91
8.2.1 Using the Present Pipeline Size	91
8.2.2 Using Different Pipeline Capacities	93
<b>9. Conclusion</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>10. Appendices</b>	<b>102</b>
Appendix A	102
Appendix B	109
Appendix C	110
Appendix D	111
Appendix E	112
<b>11. References</b>	<b>113</b>

## List of Figures

<b>Figure 1.1</b>	<i>Totara Valley community</i>	2
<b>Figure 2.1</b>	<i>The 1-year modelled domestic and farm load profile for the community (Murray, 2005)</i>	11
<b>Figure 2.2</b>	<i>The 1-year modelled water heating electricity load profile for the community (Murray, 2005)</i>	12
<b>Figure 2.3</b>	<i>Wind sites monitored in the previous study</i>	13
<b>Figure 3.1</b>	<i>Electrolysis system setup (left) and MDPE pipe container (right)</i>	18
<b>Figure 3.2</b>	<i>Water tank (left), H<sub>2</sub> production unit with circulating water reservoir underneath (middle), H<sub>2</sub> dehydration unit (right)</i>	19
<b>Figure 3.3</b>	<i>Electrolyser stack connection</i>	20
<b>Figure 3.4</b>	<i>Electrolyser stack connection from another perspective to show better the hydrogen outlet with the hydrogen pressure gauge</i>	20
<b>Figure 3.5</b>	<i>Expanded view of the Lynntech electrolyser stack without titanium endplate (source: Lynntech Industries)</i>	21
<b>Figure 3.6</b>	<i>Alkaline fuel cell DCI 1200 setup</i>	22
<b>Figure 3.7</b>	<i>DCI 1200 system overview (RISE, 2006)</i>	23
<b>Figure 3.8</b>	<i>LabVIEW user interface for the DCI-1200 fuel cell (IRL)</i>	24
<b>Figure 3.9</b>	<i>Recorded electrolyser stack VI curves at various temperatures with a reference VI curve recorded by Lynntech at 60°C</i>	27
<b>Figure 4.1</b>	<i>HyLink system overview</i>	29
<b>Figure 4.2</b>	<i>Mole ploughing of the pipe (left), an electrofusion coupling between two pipeline sectors (right)</i>	30
<b>Figure 4.3</b>	<i>Electrofusion welder</i>	30
<b>Figure 4.4</b>	<i>Hose clamps (left), crimping method (right)</i>	31
<b>Figure 4.5</b>	<i>Electrolysis setup in the container</i>	32
<b>Figure 4.6</b>	<i>PEM fuel cell integration</i>	33
<b>Figure 4.7</b>	<i>Proven wind turbine on the hilltop (left), Zebedee furl system drawing by Proven (right)</i>	34
<b>Figure 4.8</b>	<i>Proven wind turbine installation</i>	36
<b>Figure 4.9</b>	<i>Air-X (manufactured by Southwest Windpower) during operation on the hilltop</i>	37

<b>Figure 4.10</b>	<i>Wind power and water electrolysis control in the container</i>	38
<b>Figure 4.11</b>	<i>Container from the outside</i>	39
<b>Figure 5.1</b>	<i>Pressurising the pipe with hydrogen at the top riser</i>	43
<b>Figure 5.2</b>	<i>Pressurising the pipe with CNG (left) and nitrogen (right) at the bottom riser</i>	47
<b>Figure 5.3</b>	<i>The maximum energy flowrate of hydrogen versus nozzle or pipe size, over a 4 bar pressure differential (IRL)</i>	48
<b>Figure 6.1</b>	<i>Mean hourly electricity load profiles for the whole Totara Valley community including the domestic load, the farm load and the water heating</i>	50
<b>Figure 6.2</b>	<i>The primary load inputs in HOMER</i>	51
<b>Figure 6.3</b>	<i>The primary load inputs in HOMER after applying random variability</i>	51
<b>Figure 6.4</b>	<i>Wind resource inputs in HOMER</i>	53
<b>Figure 6.5</b>	<i>Wind speed variation with height in HOMER</i>	53
<b>Figure 6.6</b>	<i>Weibull probability density distribution of the simulated wind speed data</i>	54
<b>Figure 6.7</b>	<i>Solar resource inputs in HOMER</i>	55
<b>Figure 6.8</b>	<i>Global horizontal solar radiation (<math>\text{kW/m}^2</math>) daily profiles for each month at the subject site</i>	55
<b>Figure 6.9</b>	<i>The entered grid values for HOMER simulation</i>	57
<b>Figure 6.10</b>	<i>Air-X wind turbine inputs in HOMER</i>	58
<b>Figure 6.11</b>	<i>Air-X power curve provided by the manufacturer</i>	58
<b>Figure 6.12</b>	<i>PV inputs in HOMER</i>	59
<b>Figure 6.13</b>	<i>Electrolyser inputs in HOMER</i>	60
<b>Figure 6.14</b>	<i>Hydrogen tank inputs in HOMER</i>	61
<b>Figure 6.15</b>	<i>PEM fuel cell inputs in HOMER</i>	62
<b>Figure 6.16</b>	<i>Schematic of the HyLink system in HOMER after accomplishing the data inputs</i>	62
<b>Figure 6.17</b>	<i>The ReliOn's hydrogen consumption in HOMER</i>	63
<b>Figure 7.1</b>	<i>File Preferences in HOMER</i>	65
<b>Figure 7.2</b>	<i>Simulated PV power output over a year</i>	66
<b>Figure 7.3</b>	<i>Wind power based HyLink system schematic</i>	67

<b>Figure 7.4</b>	<i>Simulated Air-X power output over a year based on the power curve provided by the manufacturer</i>	67
<b>Figure 7.5</b>	<i>HyLink stand-alone system schematic</i>	71
<b>Figure 7.6</b>	<i>Costs of the HyLink components – overview</i>	72
<b>Figure 7.7</b>	<i>HyLink related cash flows over the project lifetime of 25 years</i>	73
<b>Figure 7.8</b>	<i>Comparison of the mean hourly power profiles - primary load, wind turbine output and fuel cell output</i>	74
<b>Figure 7.9</b>	<i>Ratio of the wind turbine and the fuel cell generation</i>	74
<b>Figure 7.10</b>	<i>Pipe content distribution</i>	76
<b>Figure 7.11</b>	<i>Ratio of the grid, Air-X and PEMFC generation</i>	77
<b>Figure 7.12</b>	<i>HyLink fully compensating the peak demand in May</i>	78
<b>Figure 7.13</b>	<i>HyLink’s not optimal peak demand compensation in July</i>	78
<b>Figure 7.14</b>	<i>Wind turbine’s output flows prior to capacity shortages</i>	79
<b>Figure 7.15</b>	<i>Daily pipeline filling process with hydrogen</i>	79
<b>Figure 7.16</b>	<i>Pipe content frequency for HyLink as a peak demand compensation unit</i>	80
<b>Figure 7.17</b>	<i>Cost of the HyLink components in the load following operation mode</i>	81
<b>Figure 7.18</b>	<i>Pipe content frequency for HyLink in the load following operation mode</i>	83
<b>Figure 8.1</b>	<i>Graphical presentation of HyLink’s COE in relation to the electrolyser’s capacity factor and the electrolyser/wind turbine arrangement</i>	86
<b>Figure 8.2</b>	<i>Air-X’s excess generation versus electrolyser capacity</i>	86
<b>Figure 8.3</b>	<i>Electrolyser/Air-X capacity ratio versus excess wind generation fraction</i>	87
<b>Figure 8.4</b>	<i>Air-X/Proven inputs in HOMER</i>	88
<b>Figure 8.5</b>	<i>Graphical presentation of HyLink’s COE in relation to the electrolyser’s capacity factor and the electrolyser/wind turbine arrangement considering the planned system configuration</i>	89
<b>Figure 8.6</b>	<i>Both wind turbines’ excess generation versus electrolyser capacity</i>	90
<b>Figure 8.7</b>	<i>Electrolyser/wind turbines capacity ratio vs. excess wind power fraction</i>	90

<b>Figure 8.8</b>	<i>Comparison of Air-X and Proven power output profiles</i>	91
<b>Figure 8.9</b>	<i>Relative system levelised cost at different wind turbine/electrolyser subsystem capacities</i>	92
<b>Figure 8.10</b>	<i>Capacity factors of the HyLink components at different wind turbine/electrolyser subsystem capacities</i>	93
<b>Figure 8.11</b>	<i>Impact of different pipeline sizes on the relative system levelised cost at different wind turbine/electrolyser subsystem capacities</i>	94
<b>Figure 8.12</b>	<i>Impact of different pipeline sizes on the fuel cell capacity factor</i>	95
<b>Figure 8.13</b>	<i>Annual capacity factors for pipes with different storage capacities</i>	96
<b>Figure 8.14</b>	<i>Annual fuel cell operational hours for modelled system configurations</i>	97
<b>Figure 8.15</b>	<i>Relative system COE versus fuel cell capacity factor</i>	98
<b>Figure 8.16</b>	<i>Relative System COE versus pipeline capacity factor</i>	99
<b>Figure 10.1</b>	<i>VI curve at 8 - 9°C</i>	102
<b>Figure 10.2</b>	<i>VI curve at 8 – 10.5°C</i>	103
<b>Figure 10.3</b>	<i>VI curve at 9 – 10°C</i>	103
<b>Figure 10.4</b>	<i>VI curve at 11 – 13°C</i>	104
<b>Figure 10.5</b>	<i>VI curve at 16 – 18°C</i>	104
<b>Figure 10.6</b>	<i>VI curve at 22 – 24°C</i>	105
<b>Figure 10.7</b>	<i>VI curve at 23 – 24°C</i>	105
<b>Figure 10.8</b>	<i>VI curve at 26.5 – 28.5°C</i>	106
<b>Figure 10.9</b>	<i>VI curve at 30 – 31°C</i>	106
<b>Figure 10.10</b>	<i>VI curve at 34 – 36°C</i>	107
<b>Figure 10.11</b>	<i>VI curve at 36 – 37.5°C</i>	107
<b>Figure 10.12</b>	<i>VI curve at 60°C</i>	108

## List of Tables

<b>Table 2.1</b>	<i>The physical and chemical properties of hydrogen as compared with methane and propane (Ackermann, 2005)</i>	4
<b>Table 2.2</b>	<i>Summary of fuel cell types (Larminie &amp; Dicks, 2003)</i>	6
<b>Table 2.3</b>	<i>Model calculation for surplus wind energy that cannot be absorbed by the electricity grid as a function of wind penetration in the grid (Steinberger-Wilckens, 1993)</i>	8
<b>Table 2.4</b>	<i>The descriptive statistics useful for wind modelling in HOMER at the end of the monitoring duration (Murray, 2005)</i>	14
<b>Table 2.5</b>	<i>Specifications of the pipes tested at MU (Sims, Hargreaves, McQueen &amp; Guldin, 2005)</i>	15
<b>Table 2.6</b>	<i>Permeability values calculated for each pipe tested (Sims, Hargreaves, McQueen &amp; Guldin, 2005)</i>	16
<b>Table 4.1</b>	<i>HyLink comparison with the alternative power line installation</i>	40
<b>Table 7.1</b>	<i>Summarised yearly PV data</i>	66
<b>Table 7.2</b>	<i>Summarised yearly Air-X data</i>	68
<b>Table 7.3</b>	<i>Optimisation results of the first simulation run</i>	70
<b>Table 7.4</b>	<i>Cost of the HyLink stand-alone system over the project lifetime of 25 years</i>	72
<b>Table 7.5</b>	<i>Summarised yearly fuel cell data</i>	75
<b>Table 7.6</b>	<i>Summarised yearly fuel cell performance data</i>	75
<b>Table 7.7</b>	<i>Cost of the HyLink in load following operation mode over the project lifetime of 25 years</i>	81
<b>Table 7.8</b>	<i>Summarised yearly fuel cell data in the load following operation mode</i>	82
<b>Table 7.9</b>	<i>Summarised yearly fuel cell performance data in the load following operation mode</i>	82
<b>Table 8.1</b>	<i>HyLink's relative levelised cost and electrolyser's capacity factor at different electrolyser capacities</i>	85
<b>Table 8.2</b>	<i>Relative levelised cost and electrolyser's capacity factor at different electrolyser capacities for the planned system configuration</i>	88

<b>Table 8.3</b>	<i>Relative system COE and component capacity factors at different wind turbine/electrolyser subsystem capacities</i>	92
<b>Table 8.4</b>	<i>Relative system levelised cost at different pipeline sizes and different wind turbine/electrolyser subsystem capacities</i>	94
<b>Table 8.5</b>	<i>Fuel cell capacity factor at different pipeline sizes</i>	95
<b>Table 8.6</b>	<i>Pipeline capacity factor at different system configurations</i>	96
<b>Table 8.7</b>	<i>Fuel cell's operational hours at different system configurations</i>	97