Summary
Enhanced coalbed-methane (ECBM) recovery combines recovery of methane (CH₄) from coal seams with storage of carbon dioxide (CO₂). The efficiency of ECBM recovery depends on the CO₂ transfer rate between the macrocleats, via the microcleats to the coal matrix. Diffusive transport of CO₂ in the small cleats is enhanced when the coal is CO₂-wet. Indeed, for water-wet conditions, the small fracture system is filled with water and the rate of CO₂ sorption and CH₄ desorption is affected by slow diffusion of CO₂. This work investigates the wetting behavior of coal using capillary pressures between CO₂ and water, measured continuously as a function of water saturation at in-situ conditions. To facilitate the interpretation of the coal measurements, we also obtain capillary pressure curves for unconsolidated-sand samples. For medium- and high-rank coal, the primary drainage capillary pressure curves show a water-wet behavior. Secondary forced-imbibition experiments show that the medium-rank coal becomes CO₂-wet as the CO₂ pressure increases. High-rank coal is CO₂-wet during primary imbibition. The imbibition behavior is in agreement with contact-angle measurements. Hence, we conclude that imbibition tests provide the practically relevant data to evaluate the wetting properties of coal.

Introduction
Geological sequestration (Orr 2004) of CO₂ is one of the viable methods to stabilize the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and to satisfy the Kyoto protocol. The main storage options are depleted oil and gas reservoirs (Shpetani 2006; Pawar et al. 2004), deep (saline) aquifers (Kumar et al. 2005; Pruess et al. 2003; Pruess 2004), and unmineable coalbeds (Reeves 2001). Laboratory studies and recent pilot field tests (Mavor et al. 2004; Pagnier et al. 2005) demonstrate that CO₂ injection has the potential to enhance CH₄ production from coal seams. This technology can be used to sequester large volumes of CO₂, thereby reducing emissions of industrial CO₂ as a greenhouse gas (Plug 2007). The efficiency of CO₂ sequestration in coal seams strongly depends on the coal type, the pressure and temperature conditions of the reservoir (Siemons et al. 2006a, 2006b), and the interfacial interactions of the coal/gas/water system (Gutierrez-Rodriguez et al. 1984; Gutierrez-Rodriguez and Aplan 1984; Orumwense 2001; Keller 1987). It can be expected that in highly fractured coal systems the wetting behavior positively influences the efficiency of ECBM recovery. It is generally accepted that the coal structure consists of the macrocleat and fracture system (>50 nm) and the coal matrix (<50 nm). The macrofracture system is initially filled with water and provides the conduits where the mass flow is dominated by Darcy flow. The coal matrix can be subdivided in microcleats (from 2 to 50 nm), microcleats (from 0.8 to 2 nm), and the micropores (<0.8 nm). The matrix system is relatively impermeable, and the mass transfer is dominated by diffusion. After a dewatering stage, CO₂ is injected and flows through the larger cleats of the coal. Subsequently, CO₂ is transported through the smaller cleats and is sorbed in the matrix blocks (Siemons et al. 2006a). Depending on the wettability of coal, we can distinguish the following gas exchange mechanisms:
• The coal is water-wet, and CO₂ and CH₄ diffuse in the water-filled cleats.
• The coal is CO₂-wet or gas-wet, and countercurrent capillary diffusion can take place.
• The coal is gas-wet, and binary diffusion of CO₂ and CH₄ occurs.

Capillary diffusion finds its origin in capillary pressure ($P_c$) effects, where $P_c$ is defined as the pressure difference between the nonaqueous and aqueous phase. The storage rate for CO₂ is much smaller if the microcleat system is water-wet. This is because of the small CO₂ molecular-diffusion coefficient ($D_{CO₂}$=2×10⁻⁹ m²/s). For CO₂-wet conditions, a faster and more efficient sorption rate is expected and the molecular diffusion is much larger (i.e., $D_{CO₂}$=1.7×10⁻⁷ m²/s at 100 bar) (Bird et al. 1960). Therefore, we assert that the wettability of coal is important for ECBM recovery applications. For this reason, we have undertaken an experimental study to investigate the wetting properties of two different coal types under reservoir conditions, measuring the capillary pressure between CO₂ and water. The dissolution properties of CO₂ in water (Wiebe and Gaddy 1940), the interfacial tension between water and CO₂ (Chun and Wilkinson 1995), and the CO₂ sorption (Siemons et al. 2003) play important roles in the interpretation of capillary pressure experiments. The CO₂ will sorb on the coal and will cause a swelling-induced permeability decrease (Mazumder et al. 2006). The higher the pressure, the more CO₂ can be sorbed and the more the coal swells (Reucroft and Sethuraman 1987). The largest amount of sorption-induced swelling in intact coal is approximately 4%. It is found that the swelling for ground coal is much higher than intact coal and has been reported to be in the order of 15–20%. The swelling causes a porosity reduction, thus the water saturation decreases.

In the Background section, relevant literature about the wettability of coal and the capillary pressure is summarized. The Experimental Design section describes the experimental setup we have developed to measure the capillary pressure as a function of the CO₂ pressure. Furthermore, we describe the sample preparation and experimental procedure. In the Results and Discussion section, the experimental results are presented and discussed. We end with Conclusions.

Background
Wettability of Coal. Several methods exist to measure the wettability of rocks. We mention contact-angle measurements, imbibitions and forced displacement (Amott test), the US Bureau of Mines wettability method, and capillary pressure curves (Anderson 1986). Investigations of the wettability of coal reported in the literature are predominantly based on contact-angle measurements for coal/air/water systems at atmospheric pressures. In general, these measurements are performed by direct observations of drops attached to the solid viewed from one side (pendant-drop cell) (Siemons et al. 2006a).

Dry coal, like dry sand, is naturally hydrophobic, and its hydrophobicity varies from one sample to the other because of variations in coalification, genesis, and composition of coal (Gutierrez-Rodriguez et al. 1984). Previous studies (Gutierrez-Rodriguez et al. 1984; Gutierrez-Rodriguez and Aplan 1984; Orumwense 2001) were conducted to investigate the hydrophobicity of differ-
ent coal types. A comparative study of contact angles of air bubbles, oils, flocculants, and coagulant drops on flat, polished coal surfaces immersed in water was carried out by Orumwense (2001). From these experiments, a positive correlation between hydrophobicity and the coal rank of vitrinite-rich coals was found. It was also concluded that the hydrophobicity of coal decreased with decreasing fixed-carbon and total-carbon content. A series of experiments has been carried out by Gutierrez-Rodriguez et al. (1984) and Gutierrez-Rodriguez and Aplan (1984) with air and water for different coal types, varying from high to low rank. Qualitatively, the same results were reported as found by Orumwense (2001). Murata (1981) concluded that the contact angle depends on the hydrogen and oxygen content of the coal. Chi et al. (1988) observed an increasing contact angle between CO$_2$ and water on a coal surface with increasing pressures. Moreover, water-wet behavior was found when the ash content of the coal increased. Contact-angle measurements for the coal/CO$_2$/water system, using the pendant-drop cell, were carried out by Siemons et al. (2006a, 2006b). They concluded that wetting alteration from water-wet to CO$_2$-wet for high-rank coal already occurred at pressures above 2.7 bar. For medium-rank coal, the alteration was observed for pressures greater than 80 bar. The main reason for this wetting behavior was related to the difference in stability of the water film between the coal surface and the CO$_2$.

Capillary Pressure in Coal. The capillary pressure is defined as the pressure difference between the nonwetting phase and the wetting phase and is a function of the water saturation. In this study, we have measured the capillary pressure to investigate the wettability of the coal/CO$_2$/distilled water system at different CO$_2$ pressures in the range from 1 to 100 bar (Plug et al. 2006).

Conventional methodologies to determine capillary pressures are the porous-plate technique (Christoffersen and Whitson 1995), the micropore-membrane technique (Jennings et al. 1988; Longeron et al. 1995), mercury-drainage experiments (Anderson 1987), and the centrifuge method (Newsham et al. 2004). Conventional capillary pressure studies measure at static conditions (e.g., the multistep method) where an equilibrium water saturation ($S_w$) distribution is established (Hassanzadeh et al. 2002). Experimental data are also available in the literature for transient conditions, in which a continuous phase injection is applied (Kokkedee 1994; Wildenschild et al. 2001). Static $P_c$ measurements are time-consuming; therefore, we choose the quasistatic approach. This method has the advantage that static $P_c$ curves can be obtained for small flow rates [0.01 to 0.1 pore volumes (PV)/hour].

Capillary pressure measurements at reservoir conditions are reported mainly for the oil/water and the oil/gas system (Christoffersen and Whitson 1995), with the application to enhanced oil recovery. To our knowledge, capillary pressure between CO$_2$ and water in coal has not been investigated. Dabbous et al. (1976) measured the drainage capillary pressure between air and water of a Pocahontas and Pittsburgh coal at various pressure conditions. They found positive capillary pressure curves for both samples.

In this paper, we define drainage as injection of the nonaqueous phase to displace the water and define imbibition as the reverse process. These definitions are maintained regardless of the wetting conditions of the porous medium considered.

Experimental Design

Experimental Setup. The equipment is an optimized version of the setup presented in the work of Mazumder et al. (2003) and is based on the porous-plate technique combined with the micropore-membrane technique discussed extensively by Christoffersen and Whitson (1995); Jennings et al. (1988); Longeron et al. (1995); and Kokkedee (1994). A schematic of the setup is shown in Fig. 1. Two syringe pumps (Isco 260D) are connected to the inlet and outlet of the sample holder (Fig. 2) and can be set to a constant...
injection rate (±0.005 mL/h) or a constant pressure (±0.1 bar). The gas phase is injected or produced at the top of the sample holder, and the water is collected or injected at the bottom using the second syringe pump for pressures greater than 1 bar. For primary-drainage experiments at atmospheric conditions, Valve 7 is closed and Valve 8 is open and the water is produced in a beaker placed on a balance (±0.005 g). A layer of paraffin on top of the water prevents evaporation. The gas-pressure transducer (GPT) and the water-pressure transducer (WPT) record the single-phase pressures (0–100 bar, ±0.01 bar). The differential pressure between the gas and the water phase is measured by the pressure difference transducer (PDT), (0–500 mbar, ±0.1 mbar). This device is positioned at the same height as the middle of the sample such that no correction for gravity is required.

To maintain a constant temperature, we cover the entire setup with a Perspex box, sealed by polystyrene. Inside the box, two 60-W lightbulbs, which switch on and off, regulate the temperature from 25 to 40°C±0.5°C. We enable temperature equilibration for at least 2 days for gaseous and liquid CO₂/nitrogen (N₂) and at least 3 days when supercritical CO₂ is used.

The Sample Holder. The sample holder (Fig. 2) consists of a stainless-steel ring that contains the unconsolidated sample. The grains are kept in place using a combination of plates at the top and bottom of the sample holder. At the bottom, two porous plates with a permeability of 2×10⁻¹² m² and a porosity of 0.32 support the sample and protect the hydrophilic membrane. Two stainless-steel plates, both with 32 perforations (Dₚ,₁=90 mm), are used at the top directly above the sample in combination with a nylon filter. Between the plates is the option to place a hydrophobic membrane for the primary-imbibition process, prohibiting water production (Fig. 2). To avoid leakage of gas or water over the hydrophobic or hydrophilic membranes, we seal the outer perimeter with an O-ring. Concentric flow grooves in the endpieces redistribute the injected and produced phase over the total sample area to avoid preferential flow and fast breakthrough of the injected phase.

**Sample Description and Preparation.** Four types of unconsolidated rock material are used—a fine-grained sand, a coarse-grained sand, a medium-rank coal, and a high-rank coal (Table 1). The first series of experiments is conducted on unconsolidated quartz sand using CO₂ and N₂ as the nonwetting phase. The fine-grained sand samples have an average grain size of 160<D₅₀<210/µm. The capillary pressure curves are obtained to investigate the reproducibility and accuracy of the experimental technique. To facilitate the interpretation of the coal measurements, we obtain capillary pressure curves for unconsolidated coarse-sand samples with CO₂ and N₂ (Plug and Bruining 2007). These coarse samples (360<D₅₀<410/µm) have grain diameters comparable to the coal. For the examination of the capillary pressure and wettability in coal, we have used the same two coal samples as described in the work of Siemons et al. (2006a, 2006b). The medium-rank Warndt-Luisenthal coal is high in volatile-matter content and low in fixed carbon content compared to the high-rank Selar-Cornish sample (Table 2). The coal samples are collected from a coal matrix, of which 2 kg of coal has been crushed in different grain-size fractions. For the coal experiments, we use grain-size fractions of 500<D₅₀<630 µm. The moisture and ash content are determined according to the American Society for Testing and Materials 3173 and 3174 standard methods. Ground coal samples are used for the experiments to expose the relevant surface area to water and CO₂. Volumetric physiosorption of CO₂ at 0°C was performed to determine the micropore area and micropore volume of the void space. These data are reported in Table 2 with the composition of the coal samples.
### TABLE 1—CORRELATION BETWEEN THE EXPERIMENT NUMBERS AND THE EXPERIMENTAL PROPERTIES AND CONDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Grain-Size (µm)</th>
<th>Gas</th>
<th>P (bar)</th>
<th>T (°C)</th>
<th>φ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>160 &lt; D&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; &lt; 210</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>P&lt;sub&gt;atm&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>160 &lt; D&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; &lt; 210</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>P&lt;sub&gt;atm&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>160 &lt; D&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; &lt; 210</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>P&lt;sub&gt;atm&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>360 &lt; D&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; &lt; 410</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>P&lt;sub&gt;atm&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>360 &lt; D&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; &lt; 410</td>
<td>N&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>P&lt;sub&gt;atm&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>360 &lt; D&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; &lt; 410</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>360 &lt; D&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; &lt; 410</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>360 &lt; D&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; &lt; 410</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>360 &lt; D&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; &lt; 410</td>
<td>N&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Warndt-Luisenthal</td>
<td>500 &lt; D&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; &lt; 630</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Warndt-Luisenthal</td>
<td>500 &lt; D&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; &lt; 630</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Warndt-Luisenthal</td>
<td>500 &lt; D&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; &lt; 630</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Warndt-Luisenthal</td>
<td>500 &lt; D&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; &lt; 630</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Selar-Cornish</td>
<td>500 &lt; D&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; &lt; 630</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Selar-Cornish</td>
<td>500 &lt; D&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; &lt; 630</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Selar-Cornish</td>
<td>500 &lt; D&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; &lt; 630</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Selar-Cornish</td>
<td>500 &lt; D&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; &lt; 630</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Selar-Cornish</td>
<td>500 &lt; D&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; &lt; 630</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Selar-Cornish</td>
<td>500 &lt; D&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; &lt; 630</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Selar-Cornish</td>
<td>500 &lt; D&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; &lt; 630</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2—COAL PROPERTIES OF THE MEDIUM- AND HIGH-RANK COAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Stratigraphy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warndt-Luisenthal</td>
<td>Westphalian C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selar-Cornish</td>
<td>Westphalian B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proximate analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Warndt-Luisenthal</th>
<th>Selar-Cornish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moisture</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volatile matter, w.f.** (%)</td>
<td>40.51</td>
<td>10.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash, w.f. (%)</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed carbon, d.a.f.*** (%)</td>
<td>58.36</td>
<td>89.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ultimate analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Warndt-Luisenthal</th>
<th>Selar-Cornish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbon (C) (%)</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>85.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen (H) (%)</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen (%)</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur (%)</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxygen (O) (diff.) (%)</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/C</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/C</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Coal petrology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Warndt-Luisenthal</th>
<th>Selar-Cornish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V&lt;sub&gt;max&lt;/sub&gt; (%)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitrinite</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liptinite</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inertinite</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Internal properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Warndt-Luisenthal</th>
<th>Selar-Cornish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific surface (m²/g)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micropore volume (cm³/g)</td>
<td>0.03545</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* high volatile Bituminous b
** water-free
***dry, ash-free
Experimental Procedure. Before the start of each experiment, the setup is cleaned and the porous plates are dried. The assembling of the sample holder is from the bottom upward (Fig. 2). For each experiment, we use new hydrophilic filters and new O-rings. When Endpiece 2, including the porous plates and O-rings, and the stainless-steel ring are mounted together, we pour the unconsolidated sample into the sample holder. The sample is vibrated for 10 minutes to obtain a better packing. Finally, we put Endpiece 1, including the perforated plates, the hydrophobic filter, the nylon filter, and O-rings, on top of the stainless-steel ring. Now, the sample holder is placed in between Valves 4 and 5 (Fig. 1) and the entire system is evacuated for 1 hour. The porosity, $\phi$, is determined with helium (Plug and Bruining 2007). For the sand and coal samples, we found a porosity of 0.34–0.37 and 0.42–0.47, respectively. Subsequently, the total system is again evacuated for 1 hour and filled with either water or gas.

When an experiment starts with the primary drainage process, the hydrophobic filter is left out. This makes it easier to pressurize the system. Through the high pressure, small air bubbles carried along with the distilled water are dissolved. In the same way, the hydrophobic filter is removed for primary imbibition tests. In this work, we consider three types of experiments:

**Case 1—Primary Drainage at Atmospheric Pressure, $P=0$ atm.** The total sample holder is initially filled with water from Valve 4 up to Valve 5 (Fig. 1). Subsequently, the water pump is used to apply a pressure of 10 bar to remove all possible air and to obtain 100% water saturation. Then, Valve 7 is closed. The gas tubing and pump are flushed and filled with either N$_2$ or CO$_2$. Finally, we set a constant temperature and let the system equilibrate. We open Valve 8, and the water pressure decreases toward atmospheric pressure. The primary drainage experiment starts when a constant gas-injection rate is applied and Valve 4 is opened. Because of operational restrictions of the syringe pumps for pressures less than 1 bar, no secondary imbibition tests are performed for atmospheric conditions.

**Case 2—Primary Drainage and Secondary Imbibition at $P>1$ bar.** For these experiments, the sample holder is filled initially with water and the water pump is set to the pressure we apply during the drainage experiment. Valve 4 is closed, and the gas tubing and pump are filled with either N$_2$ or CO$_2$. A gas booster, connected to Valve 1 (Fig. 1) is used to increase the gas pressure. We set a constant temperature and let the system equilibrate. Subsequently, when both the water and gas pressures are equal, a constant gas-injection rate is applied, the water pump is set to a constant pressure, and Valve 4 is opened. After the primary drainage process, the secondary imbibition process starts when the water pump is set to a constant injection rate and the gas pump is set to a constant production pressure. Since a constant water-injection rate is applied, the imbibition must be considered as a forced imbibition process.

**Case 3—Primary Imbibition and Secondary Drainage at High Pressures, $P>1$ bar.** The total sample holder is initially filled with gas from Valve 4 (open) up to Valve 5 (Fig. 1), and the water pump and tubing are filled and flushed with water. The absolute pressure is kept constant by the gas pump, and the water pressure in the tubing is increased using the water pump. We set a constant temperature and let the system equilibrate. The primary (forced) imbibition starts when a constant water-injection rate is applied, the gas pump is set to a constant pressure, and Valve 5 is opened. After the primary imbibition process, the secondary drainage process starts when the water pump is set to a constant production pressure and the gas pump is set to a constant injection rate.

Data Analysis. The capillary pressure used in this section is defined by the difference between the gas (CO$_2$/N$_2$) pressure and the water pressure and is measured directly by the PDP (Fig. 1). In the analysis, no correction for the viscous pressure drop ($\Delta P_{\text{visc}}=\mu u \Delta \sigma_{\text{eff}}$) has been made because $\Delta P_{\text{visc}}$ is negligible (=10$^{-6}$ bar). Here, $k_{\text{eff}}$ (≈10$^{-11}$ m$^2$) is derived from the harmonic average of the permeability of the (coal/sand) sample ($k_{\text{sample}}$=10$^{-11}$ m$^2$), the porOUS plate, and the hydrophilic filter ($k_{\text{filter}}$=10$^{-15}$ m$^2$). For the low capillary number ($Ca=10^{-10}$), the flow during the experiments is dominated by capillary forces.

The water saturation is obtained by the mass of water produced for the atmospheric conditions or by the change in volume of the water pump for high-pressure conditions ($P>1$ bar). Moreover, the integral mass balance is checked by weighing all the separate parts of the sample holder at the end of the experiment, from which an estimation of the final water saturation in the sample can be obtained.

For the high-pressure drainage experiments, the amount of water in the pump is measured to validate whether only negligible amounts of free gas are produced. For imbibition tests, we apply essentially the same procedure to validate that there is only negligible water production. It turns out that the gas volume in the water pump never exceeds 1% of the volume (Jennings et al. 1998). The capillary pressure curves are obtained on the basis of the following:

- The decrease (increase) in water saturation is derived from the mass/volume produced (injected).
- The initial water (gas) saturation for primary drainage (imbibition) is 1.
- The viscous pressure drop is neglected.
- For the drainage experiments, all the water from Endpiece 1 and the perforated plates is drained before the gas reaches the sample (Fig. 2).
- During the drainage process, all the water remains in pore space of the porous plates, in the hydrophilic filter, and in the void space of Endpiece 2 (Fig. 2).
- A sudden pressure drop marks the beginning of the primary imbibition process, independent of the water volume injected.
- Compressibility of water is neglected for all pressure conditions.
- The porosity and the permeability for all samples used are assumed constant during the drainage and imbibition processes.

Results and Discussion

We have tested the experimental method for both the fine- and coarse-grained unconsolidated-sand samples, applying different temperature and pressure conditions using either N$_2$ or CO$_2$. Moreover, a comprehensive analysis can be done by comparing the coal measurements with the results obtained for the coarse-sand sample. To clarify the correlation between the experiments and the numbering, an overview of the sample and system properties applied during the experiments is given in Table 1.

Capillary Pressure of the Unconsolidated-Sand/CO$_2$/Water System. Here, we describe the precision of the experimental method (Plug et al. 2007) and the influence of the applied flow rates on the $P_w$ vs. $S_w$ curves. The precision of the experimental procedure is estimated from the reproducibility of three experiments conducted on three different fine-sand samples at ambient conditions (Fig. 3). The highest precision (±1.5 mbar) is found for the intermediate water-saturation range (0.4$<S_w<0.8$). Near the endpoint saturations, the precision of the measurements is ±3 mbar.

In Fig. 4, Experiment 4 represents the capillary pressure curve between water and CO$_2$ at atmospheric conditions in coarse sand. During this experiment, the CO$_2$-injection rate is altered between 0 and 1 mL/h to investigate the influence of viscous forces and the possible dynamic behavior on $P_w$ for the applied conditions. No significant effect in capillary pressure is observed for increasing or decreasing injection rates.

An additional atmospheric experiment, Experiment 4b, has been carried out for the N$_2$/water system in coarse sand (Fig. 4). The comparison between Experiments 4 and 4b is used to investigate the effect on the capillary pressure of CO$_2$ dissolution in water. This effect will be discussed further in the next section.

Primary Drainage and Secondary Imbibition in Coarse Sand. Drainage and imbibition curves have been measured for coarse-sand samples at elevated pressures and temperatures. A decrease in capillary pressure is measured for increasing CO$_2$ pressures (Fig. 4). This is a result of the pressure dependence of the interfacial
tension (Chun and Wilkinson 1995). Hence, the capillary pressure curves can be scaled according to the interfacial tension (Plug and Bruining 2007). From Fig. 4, it can be seen that the capillary pressures for liquid CO₂ (Experiment 6) and supercritical CO₂ (Experiment 7) are of the same range.

The irregular behavior of the primary drainage curve obtained for Experiment 7 (Fig. 4) is ascribed to phase instabilities in the vicinity of the critical point. Small system perturbations, such as temperature variations and corresponding thermal-expansion effects, will cause occasional water imbibition during continuous CO₂ injection. Furthermore, for all cases, the capillary pressure is positive.

In Fig. 5, the secondary imbibition curves for Experiments 5 and 7 are presented. For supercritical conditions (Experiment 7), the imbibition process has stopped before the residual CO₂ saturation has been reached. A postmortem of Experiments 5 and 7 shows that no water is produced. A decrease in imbibition capillary pressure is observed for increasing CO₂ pressures. For \( S_w > 0.5 \), the capillary pressure becomes negative for supercritical CO₂, indicating temporary CO₂-wet behavior. A tentative explanation for this behavior is that gas trapped in the crevices of the sand only slowly dissolves in the water. Therefore, the water will “see” a surface consisting of sand and gas patches (Plug and Bruining 2007). In contrast to the supercritical drainage curve, the corresponding secondary imbibition curve, shown in Fig. 5, is smooth. This implies that, for water-flow-controlled processes, the alternate drainage and imbibition effects do not occur.

The injection and production behavior for primary drainage with CO₂ under both atmospheric-pressure conditions and high-pressure conditions (85 bar) is presented in Fig. 6. Additionally, the cumulative injection and production volumes are shown for the atmospheric N₂ experiment (Experiment 4b). The difference between the injected and produced volumes for Experiment 4 (atmospheric pressure) is an indication for the dissolution effects of CO₂ in water. However, when liquid CO₂ is injected (Experiment 6), these effects are not observed and the cumulative gas volume injected is equal to the cumulative water volume produced (Plug and Bruining 2007).

The comparison between the atmospheric CO₂ and N₂ experiments (Experiments 4 and 4b) shows the large effect of the dissolution of CO₂ on the injection/production behavior. However, the capillary pressure is not influenced by dissolution effects, because the capillary pressure curves obtained for the CO₂/water and N₂/water systems (Fig. 4) are of the same range (Plug and Bruining 2007).
Primary Imbibition in Coarse Sand. We have investigated the properties of the setup during primary imbibition processes. Therefore, an imbibition experiment is conducted for the coarse-sand/N₂/water system (Fig. 5, Experiment 8). Fig. 7 plots the capillary pressure and the cumulative water injection vs. time for the period before the imbibition process. Distinct events can be observed: The capillary pressure drops rapidly when the water reaches the porous plates (A) and subsequently rises toward a stable situation (B), where water is imbibing in the porous plates until (C). The pressure difference increases rapidly when the water starts to imbibe in the sample (D). From the water-balance computation, we determine that only 15% of the pore space of the porous plates is saturated. We obtain the water saturation after (D), assuming that the total volume of water injected from this moment is present as pore water in the sample. The corresponding primary imbibition curve of Experiment 8 is presented in Fig. 5. The imbibition capillary pressure curve is positive, and the residual N₂ saturation is 0.16. Because the hydrophobic filter is used, no water can be produced in the gas pump. For the water saturation range of 0.1 < S_w < 0.4, the data acquisition system has failed.

Capillary Pressure and Wettability for the Coal/CO₂/Water System. Medium-Rank Coal. Fig. 8 shows the reproducibility for drainage experiments for the Warndt-Luisenthal coal (medium rank) for liquid CO₂ (Experiments 9, 10, and 11). The moment the CO₂ has entered the sample and the capillary entry pressure has been reached is comparable for all three cases. As a result of the water production at the beginning of the experiments, small differences in starting times occur. The difference in initial water production is caused by the initial pressure difference between the water and CO₂ pump. However, as can be seen in Fig. 9, the influence on the capillary pressure saturation behavior of the water-production evolution before the drainage process is hardly visible. For both liquid CO₂ and gaseous CO₂ (Experiment 12), positive drainage capillary pressures are measured. The positive sign means that the medium-rank coal is water-wet during the drainage process because a water film exists between the coal surface and the advancing CO₂. This film prevents the exposure of the coal surface to CO₂. Similar to the sand experiments (Fig. 4), the differences in drainage capillary pressure are directly related to the interfacial tension, as reported by Chun and Wilkinson (1995). More information is obtained when the CO₂ injection rate is set to zero (Experiment 11, A and B in Fig. 9). During these equilibration steps at S_w/11505 = 0.81 and S_w/11505 = 0.38, respectively, the capillary pressure decreases toward zero (Fig. 10). Because no dynamic or viscous behavior is observed for the capillary pressure during continuous CO₂ injection, the decrease in P_c must be ascribed to another process. A plausible explanation for this behavior is that the surface-wetting film is ruptured by the presence of the high-pressure CO₂ (Hirasaki 1991). Because the rupture of wetting films can be a slow process, this CO₂-wet behavior will not necessarily...
be observed in the time frame of our experiments or even in field applications.

The results for the secondary imbibition process for the medium-rank coal are shown in Fig. 9. A decrease of the secondary imbibition capillary pressure from positive to negative is observed for increasing CO₂ pressures. Because negative interfacial tensions are excluded (Chun and Wilkinson 1995), this change in sign is ascribed to the wettability alteration from water-wet (P_c>0) to CO₂-wet (P_c<0). The reproducibility of the capillary behavior in the medium-rank coal can be estimated from Experiments 9, 10, and 11 (Fig. 9) and is also applicable for the 35-bar drainage experiment (Fig. 9, Experiment 12).

The results are in agreement with the pressure-dependent wettability of the medium-rank coal discussed by Siemons et al. (2006b). They measured increasing contact angles (θ) for increasing CO₂ pressures for the medium-rank-coal/CO₂/water system where the crossover from water-wet (θ>90°) to CO₂-wet (θ<90°) behavior occurs in the range of 80 to 85 bar.

Comparison of the secondary imbibition curves measured for the medium-rank coal and for coarse sand (Experiment 7, Fig. 5) shows that the capillary pressure in coal immediately drops to a negative value, indicating that no spontaneous imbibition takes place. This behavior is not observed for the water-wet sand (Experiment 7), which shows a gradual decrease of the secondary imbibition capillary pressure.

The wettability alteration of the medium-rank coal is also emphasized by the water-production behavior. Early water breakthrough is observed for pressures greater than 85 bar (Experiments 9 and 10). No water was produced for the gaseous CO₂ experiment (Experiment 12). At the end of this experiment, we have aborted the imbibition process before the residual-gas saturation has been reached. As opposed to the corresponding experiments in coal (Experiments 9 and 10), no water breakthrough is observed during the secondary imbibition experiment in the coarse sand (Experiment 7, Fig. 5).

The production and injection curves for the primary drainage in medium-rank coal at 35 and 87 bar (Experiments 12 and 9, respectively) are presented in Fig. 11. The same conditions as those in Experiment 9 are applied for Experiment 6 (primary drainage in coarse sand, Fig. 6). Comparison of the water production vs. gas injection for Experiments 6 and 9 shows that the effect of CO₂ sorption in coal on the production behavior is negligible. Similar to the drainage experiment in coarse sand, the cumulative-production and -injection curves for coal are parallel. The deviation in cumulative volumes at the end of the drainage process is ΔV = 0.36 mL and ΔV = 1.45 mL for the sand and the medium-rank coal, respectively. We also mention that the amount of sorbed CO₂ on the coal is difficult to determine because of the sorption of CO₂ in the O-rings.

**High-Rank Coal.** Primary drainage curves for the high-rank Selar-Cornish coal at pressures between 85 and 90 bar and temperatures varying from 24 to 36°C are shown in Fig. 12. In all drainage cases, the high-rank coal shows water-wet behavior because the P_c vs. S_w curves are positive. In contrast to the high-pressure drainage experiments conducted on the medium-rank coal (Fig. 9), the P_c vs. S_w curves are irregular, especially when the temperature approaches or becomes higher than the critical temperature of CO₂. The imbibition events (denoted by A, B, and C in Fig. 12) occurring in Experiment 15 are also observed during the primary drainage with supercritical CO₂ in sand (Experiment 7, Fig. 4).

We also have conducted a series of primary imbibition experiments on the high-rank coal, and the results are presented in Fig. 13. Here, the primary imbibition measurement conducted for the sand/N₂/water system (Experiment 8, Fig. 5) is used as a reference to indicate the time when the imbibition process starts. Fig. 13 plots the primary imbibition curves for the high-rank coal. Negative capillary pressures are measured for both gaseous CO₂ (9 bar and 27°C) and supercritical CO₂ (from 85 to 87 bar, 40°C). It is clear from Fig. 13 that the capillary pressure behavior for supercritical CO₂ is also irregular under imbibition conditions.
which are caused by sudden drainage events. The average magnitude of the imbibition \( P_i \) is approximately \(-8 \) mbar for Experiment 16 and approximately \(-5 \) mbar for Experiments 17, 18, and 19. The capillary pressure in the water saturation range of \( 0 < S_w < 0.1 \) shows a distinct character for Experiments 17 and 18. The reasons for this are not yet clear.

For all pressure conditions, the high-rank coal shows \( \mathrm{CO}_2 \)-wet behavior during imbibition, which again is emphasized by the fast water breakthrough occurring at \( S_w < 0.5 \).

From the imbibition results of Experiment 12 (Fig. 9) and Experiment 19 (Fig. 13), it is clear that the high-rank coal compared to the medium-rank coal is \( \mathrm{CO}_2 \)-wet for much lower \( \mathrm{CO}_2 \) pressures. Our results are in agreement with the findings described by Siemons et al. (2006a). For the high-rank coal, they found a wetting alteration for system pressures higher than 2.6 bar.

Although we have not measured secondary imbibition curvatures for the high-rank coal, it can be expected that \( \mathrm{CO}_2 \)-wet behavior will also be observed. In general, the wetting behavior, with respect to the carbon content and the rank of the coal (Table 2), corresponds to the results obtained by Gutierrez-Rodriguez et al. (1984), Gutierrez-Rodriguez and Aplan (1984), and Orumwense (2001). It appears that imbibition experiments provide good qualitative information regarding the wettabilities of coal. This implies that the water-saturation history plays an important role for the wetting characteristics of coal (Private communication with M. Blunt, 16th International Conference on Computational Methods in Water Resources, 18–22 June 2006, Copenhagen).

**Conclusions**

- A capillary pressure setup has been developed and validated that can be used to determine the wettability of the coal/\( \mathrm{CO}_2 \)/water system as a function of the system pressure.
- The interpretation of the complex coal experiments can be facilitated by comparison of the sand/\( \mathrm{CO}_2 \)/water and coal/\( \mathrm{CO}_2 \)/water experiments at a range of pressure and temperature conditions. The reproducibility of the experiments is considered good.
- Increasing \( \mathrm{CO}_2 \) pressures result in decreasing primary drainage capillary pressures for all samples used. This can be explained by the decrease in interfacial tension (Chun and Wilkinson 1995).
- Both the medium- and high-rank coal are water-wet during the primary drainage process.
- With increasing system pressures, the wettability of the medium-rank coal changes from water-wet to \( \mathrm{CO}_2 \)-wet. High-rank coal is \( \mathrm{CO}_2 \)-wet during primary imbibition experiments in the entire pressure range. The behavior during imbibition corresponds to contact-angle data (Siemons et al. 2006a).
- Fast water breakthrough during the imbibition process indicates \( \mathrm{CO}_2 \)-wet behavior.
- Imbibition tests provide relevant data to evaluate the wetting properties of coal.
- The difference between imbibition and drainage experiments can be explained by the stability of a water layer on the coal. Such a film must be ruptured (Hirasaki 1991) before the coal becomes \( \mathrm{CO}_2 \)-wet.
- This film rupture may imply that the time scale in laboratory experiments is not representative of field-scale behavior.

**Nomenclature**

- \( D_{\mathrm{CO}_2} \) = molecular-diffusion coefficient of \( \mathrm{CO}_2 \), m\(^2\)/s
- \( D_{\text{sample}} \) = sample diameter, mm
- \( D_s \) = diameter of hydrophobic filter, mm
- \( D_p \) = diameter of perforations, mm
- \( D_r \) = diameter of porous plate, mm
- \( D_{r50} \) = diameter of perforated plate, mm
- \( D_w \) = diameter of hydrophilic filter, mm
- \( D_{\text{ave}} \) = average particle size, \( \mu \)m
- \( H \) = sample height, mm
- \( P \) = pressure, bar
- \( P_{\text{atm}} \) = atmospheric pressure, bar
- \( P_c \) = capillary pressure, mbar
- \( S_w \) = water saturation
- \( t \) = time, s
- \( T \) = temperature, °C
- \( \theta \) = contact angle, degrees
- \( \phi \) = porosity
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### SI Metric Conversion Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Conversion Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cp</td>
<td>$10^{-3}$ N s m$^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ft</td>
<td>$3.048$ m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>md</td>
<td>$9.869$ 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psi</td>
<td>$6.8948$ MPa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Conversion factor is exact.*