

**Carbon Dioxide Capture for Storage
in Deep Geologic Formations –
Results from the CO₂
Capture Project**

**Geologic Storage of Carbon Dioxide
with Monitoring and Verification**

Volume 2

Elsevier Internet Homepage – <http://www.elsevier.com>

Consult the Elsevier homepage for full catalogue information on all books, major reference works, journals, electronic products and services.

Elsevier Titles of Related Interest

AN END TO GLOBAL WARMING

L.O. Williams

ISBN: 0-08-044045-2, 2002

FUNDAMENTALS AND TECHNOLOGY OF COMBUSTION

F. El-Mahallawy, S. El-Din Habik

ISBN: 0-08-044106-8, 2002

GREENHOUSE GAS CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES: 6TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

John Gale, Yoichi Kaya

ISBN: 0-08-044276-5, 2003

MITIGATING CLIMATE CHANGE: FLEXIBILITY MECHANISMS

T. Jackson

ISBN: 0-08-044092-4, 2001

Related Journals:

Elsevier publishes a wide-ranging portfolio of high quality research journals, encompassing the energy policy, environmental, and renewable energy fields. A sample journal issue is available online by visiting the Elsevier web site (details at the top of this page). Leading titles include:

Energy Policy

Renewable Energy

Energy Conversion and Management

Biomass & Bioenergy

Environmental Science & Policy

Global and Planetary Change

Atmospheric Environment

Chemosphere – Global Change Science

Fuel, Combustion & Flame

Fuel Processing Technology

All journals are available online via ScienceDirect: www.sciencedirect.com

To Contact the Publisher

Elsevier welcomes enquiries concerning publishing proposals: books, journal special issues, conference proceedings, etc. All formats and media can be considered. Should you have a publishing proposal you wish to discuss, please contact, without obligation, the publisher responsible for Elsevier's Energy program:

Henri van Dorssen

Publisher

Elsevier Ltd

The Boulevard, Langford Lane

Kidlington, Oxford

OX5 1GB, UK

Phone: +44 1865 84 3682

Fax: +44 1865 84 3931

E.mail: h.dorssen@elsevier.com

General enquiries, including placing orders, should be directed to Elsevier's Regional Sales Offices – please access the Elsevier homepage for full contact details (homepage details at the top of this page).

Carbon Dioxide Capture for Storage in Deep Geologic Formations – Results from the CO₂ Capture Project

**Geologic Storage of Carbon Dioxide
with Monitoring and Verification**

Edited by

Sally M. Benson

*Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
Berkeley, CA, USA*

and Associate Editors

Curt Oldenburg¹, Mike Hoversten¹ and Scott Imbus²

*¹Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory
Berkeley, CA, USA*

*²Chevron Texaco Energy Technology Company
Bellaire, TX, USA*

Volume 2



ELSEVIER

2005

Amsterdam – Boston – Heidelberg – London – New York – Oxford
Paris – San Diego – San Francisco – Singapore – Sydney – Tokyo

ELSEVIER B.V.
Radarweg 29
P.O. Box 211, 1000 AE Amsterdam
The Netherlands

ELSEVIER Inc.
525 B Street, Suite 1900
San Diego, CA 92101-4495
USA

ELSEVIER Ltd
The Boulevard, Langford Lane
Kidlington, Oxford OX5 1GB
UK

ELSEVIER Ltd
84 Theobalds Road
London WC1X 8RR
UK

© 2005 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

This work is protected under copyright by Elsevier Ltd, and the following terms and conditions apply to its use:

Photocopying

Single photocopies of single chapters may be made for personal use as allowed by national copyright laws. Permission of the Publisher and payment of a fee is required for all other photocopying, including multiple or systematic copying, copying for advertising or promotional purposes, resale, and all forms of document delivery. Special rates are available for educational institutions that wish to make photocopies for non-profit educational classroom use.

Permissions may be sought directly from Elsevier's Rights Department in Oxford, UK: phone (+44) 1865 843830, fax (+44) 1865 853333, e-mail: permissions@elsevier.com. Requests may also be completed on-line via the Elsevier homepage (<http://www.elsevier.com/locate/permissions>).

In the USA, users may clear permissions and make payments through the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, USA; phone: (+1) (978) 7508400, fax: (+1) (978) 7504744, and in the UK through the Copyright Licensing Agency Rapid Clearance Service (CLARCS), 90 Tottenham Court Road, London W1P 0LP, UK; phone: (+44) 20 7631 5555; fax: (+44) 20 7631 5500. Other countries may have a local reprographic rights agency for payments.

Derivative Works

Tables of contents may be reproduced for internal circulation, but permission of the Publisher is required for external resale or distribution of such material. Permission of the Publisher is required for all other derivative works, including compilations and translations.

Electronic Storage or Usage

Permission of the Publisher is required to store or use electronically any material contained in this work, including any chapter or part of a chapter.

Except as outlined above, no part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Publisher.

Address permissions requests to: Elsevier's Rights Department, at the fax and e-mail addresses noted above.

Notice

No responsibility is assumed by the Publisher for any injury and/or damage to persons or property as a matter of products liability, negligence or otherwise, or from any use or operation of any methods, products, instructions or ideas contained in the material herein. Because of rapid advances in the medical sciences, in particular, independent verification of diagnoses and drug dosages should be made.

First edition 2005

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

A catalog record is available from the Library of Congress.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record is available from the British Library.

ISBN: 0-08-044570-5 (2 volume set)

Volume 1: Chapters 8, 9, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 24 and 32 were written with support of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-FC26-01NT41145. The Government reserves for itself and others acting on its behalf a royalty-free, non-exclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license for Governmental purposes to publish, distribute, translate, duplicate, exhibit and perform these copyrighted papers. EU co-funded work appears in chapters 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 33, 34, 35, 36 and 37. Norwegian Research Council (Klimatek) co-funded work appears in chapters 1, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15 and 32.

Volume 2: The Storage Preface, Storage Integrity Preface, Monitoring and Verification Preface, Risk Assessment Preface and Chapters 1, 4, 6, 8, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 were written with support of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-FC26-01NT41145. The Government reserves for itself and others acting on its behalf a royalty-free, non-exclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license for Governmental purposes to publish, distribute, translate, duplicate, exhibit and perform these copyrighted papers. Norwegian Research Council (Klimatek) co-funded work appears in chapters 9, 15 and 16.

© The paper used in this publication meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper).

Printed in The Netherlands.

Working together to grow
libraries in developing countries

www.elsevier.com | www.bookaid.org | www.sabre.org

ELSEVIER

BOOK AID
International

Sabre Foundation

Chapter 29

MODELING OF NEAR-SURFACE LEAKAGE AND SEEPAGE OF CO₂ FOR RISK CHARACTERIZATION

Curtis M. Oldenburg¹ and André A.J. Unger²

¹Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA, USA

²University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

ABSTRACT

The injection of carbon dioxide (CO₂) into deep geologic CO₂ storage sites entails risk that CO₂ will leak away from the primary storage formation and migrate upwards to the unsaturated zone from which it can seep out of the ground. We have developed a coupled modeling framework called T2CA for simulating CO₂ leakage and seepage in the subsurface and in the atmospheric surface layer. The results of model simulations can be used to calculate the two key health, safety, and environmental (HSE) risk drivers, namely CO₂ seepage flux and near-surface CO₂ concentrations. Sensitivity studies for a subsurface system with a thick unsaturated zone show limited leakage attenuation resulting in correspondingly large CO₂ concentrations in the shallow subsurface. Large CO₂ concentrations in the shallow subsurface present a risk to plant and tree roots, and to humans and other animals in subsurface structures such as basements or utility vaults. Whereas CO₂ concentrations in the subsurface can be high, surface-layer winds reduce CO₂ concentrations to low levels for the fluxes investigated. We recommend more verification and case studies be carried out with T2CA, along with the development of extensions to handle additional scenarios such as calm conditions, topographic effects, and catastrophic surface-layer discharge events.

INTRODUCTION

The injection of carbon dioxide (CO₂) into deep geologic formations for CO₂ storage involves the risk that CO₂ will unexpectedly leak away from the target formation and migrate generally upward eventually reaching the shallow subsurface where CO₂ could seep out of the ground. In the near-surface environment, defined here roughly as within 10 m of the ground surface either above or below ground, high concentrations of CO₂ can pose significant health, safety, and environmental (HSE) risks. The assessment of HSE risks is an essential part of public acceptance, planning, and permitting of geologic CO₂ storage projects. Risk assessment in general can be divided into three parts: (1) definition of scenarios of what can go wrong; (2) assessment of the likelihood of those scenarios; and (3) assignment of a measure of severity to the consequences arising from a given scenario. When applying this approach to substances that pose a hazard to human health and ecosystems, the risk assessment process includes hazard identification and risk characterization. For geologic CO₂ storage, a recognized HSE hazard is CO₂ leakage and seepage from the storage site leading potentially to exposure by humans, plants, and animals to elevated CO₂ concentrations in air and water. Risk characterization requires the estimation or calculation of elevated CO₂ concentrations to which humans, plants, and animals may be exposed in the given failure scenarios. The research described here focuses on calculating CO₂ concentrations and fluxes using a coupled subsurface and atmospheric surface-layer numerical simulator.

A formal and consistent terminology is needed to describe the different modes of CO₂ migration. We define *leakage* as migration away from the primary storage formation, whereas *seepage* is CO₂ migration through an interface such as the ground surface, a basement floor or wall, or the bottom of a body of surface water. In Figure 1, we present a schematic of some of the important features that may affect HSE risk characterization for CO₂ leakage and seepage in the near-surface environment, a region that we define as within

approximately 10 m of the ground surface, either below (i.e. in the subsurface) or above (i.e. in the atmospheric surface layer). These features include a house with a basement and cracked floor through which CO₂ can seep, and a water well through which water with high dissolved CO₂ content could be produced if CO₂ leaked up through the aquifer. Also shown are plants, a tree, and roots that may be sensitive to elevated CO₂ concentrations in the shallow subsurface. We also show animals that live in the ground and therefore may be susceptible to elevated CO₂ concentrations in soil, along with their burrows that may provide fast-flow paths for CO₂ that enhance mixing by barometric pumping of soil gas and ambient air. Snow cover or ice (not shown) can also affect CO₂ flow and transport. In addition, we show in Figure 1 the saturated zone, unsaturated zone, surface water, and wind in the atmospheric surface layer all of which may be capable of diluting and attenuating leaking and seeping CO₂.




Figure 1: Sketch of near-surface environment with accompanying features relevant to HSE risk associated with CO₂ leakage and seepage.

In this chapter, we summarize our research into the development and demonstration of the coupled modeling framework T2CA applicable to the leakage and seepage of CO₂ from geologic carbon storage sites. The purpose of the coupled model is to calculate CO₂ fluxes and concentrations in the near-surface environment where risk to humans, plants, and animals is highest. The underlying premise of our approach is that the fundamental drivers of the HSE risk are the CO₂ flux and near-surface CO₂ concentrations, and that a capability to calculate these quantities is essential for a defensible HSE risk assessment. A new coupled model is required because to our knowledge there is no existing model that handles both subsurface and atmospheric surface-layer transport and dispersion along with the coupling at the subsurface–surface-layer interface at length scales of order 10²–10³ m. The focus of our approach is on diffuse and low-level leakage that could occur through the natural barriers in the subsurface as opposed to catastrophic leakage such as may occur through abandoned wells or well blowouts.

METHODOLOGY

Key Concepts

The methodology and structure of the coupled modeling framework are based on the following key concepts: (1) the human, plant, and animal receptors span the interface between the subsurface and surface

layer; (2) the flow processes involved in leakage and seepage are coupled; and (3) the main risk drivers are CO₂ flux and concentration. Before describing the methods and structure, we elaborate on these three key concepts and discuss the time and length scales appropriate to our approach.

First, HSE risk assessment applies to humans, plants, and animals. These environmental receptors live generally near the ground surface but may be entirely below, entirely above, or in both regions at different times. As examples of the importance of the subsurface, surface layer, and in-between environments, consider the house and basement and the burrows of animals shown in Figure 1. Clearly the house and the burrow are open to gas flow from both the subsurface and surface layer and therefore CO₂ in either the subsurface or surface layer has the potential to affect the environment in which people or animals live. The plants, trees and their roots similarly will be affected by CO₂ leakage and seepage in both the subsurface and surface-layer environments. Because exposure to CO₂ in the near-surface environment is the main risk associated with CO₂ leakage and seepage, we have developed a coupled modeling framework that focuses on this region.

Second, CO₂ leakage and seepage are coupled transport processes. Specifically, CO₂ gas in the near-surface environment will flow by advection and diffusion as controlled by pressure, density, and concentration gradients. For example, seeping CO₂ will be strongly advected by surface winds above the ground surface, while atmospheric pressure variations (i.e. barometric pumping) will cause CO₂ to move in and out of the subsurface. However, the low permeability of soils will tend to dampen subsurface advective transport driven by pressure variations and wind in the surface layer. Rainfall infiltration containing dissolved CO₂ can be another mechanism for CO₂ to return from the surface layer to the subsurface. Because these apparent coupled processes occur between the surface layer and subsurface, a coupled modeling framework capable of modeling these interactions is required.

Third, if high CO₂ concentrations are the fundamental adverse condition for HSE risk, then CO₂ seepage flux and near-surface CO₂ concentration are the main risk drivers. Seepage flux in terms of mass has units of kg CO₂ m⁻² s⁻¹ and is a measure of the rate at which CO₂ is passing out of the ground per unit area. If CO₂ is the only component of the gas stream seeping out of the ground, then flux and concentration are directly correlated. However, if the CO₂ is contained within a stream of another component (e.g. with steam in a geothermal vent), then there can be a high CO₂ flux with low CO₂ concentrations. In this sense, flux and CO₂ concentration must be considered independently. In the case where the only component in the seeping gas is CO₂, the seepage flux is a good indicator of whether the given surface-layer winds, surface-water flows, or plant uptake rates are capable of reducing CO₂ concentrations to near-ambient levels. Annual leakage rates given as percentages per year of given CO₂ storage projects should not be used for characterizing risk since they do not provide information on the form or nature of the leakage process. As for CO₂ concentrations, the location of the occurrence of high concentration and nature of the receptor control the attendant risk. For example, high CO₂ concentrations at a depth of 1 m in the ground may cause negligible risk to humans because people live mostly above the ground surface, while such concentrations would pose a serious risk to burrowing animals or to plants through exposure to their roots.

Given these key concepts, it is apparent that a quantitative coupled modeling capability is required to make defensible estimates of CO₂ flux and concentration for various expected leakage and seepage scenarios. Overly simplified models of the subsurface or surface layer alone may not stand up to public and scientific scrutiny. We have used a methodology and structure that is based on multiphase and multicomponent reservoir simulation. The fluxes and concentrations calculated by the coupled framework can be used as inputs to exposure models to calculate defensible HSE risks. The direct output from the present coupled modeling framework is also useful by itself since CO₂ flux and concentration are primary risk drivers. The approach we have taken can be used to model the whole leakage pathway from deep storage site to the surface, but here we focus the model description on the region where the main HSE hazards occur, namely the near-surface environment containing the unsaturated zone and surface layer.

Length and Timescales

With CO₂ storage operations potentially occurring on a large and widespread industrial scale, the length and timescales of interest to CO₂ risk characterization are quite large. Because broad and diffuse CO₂ seepage may occur over large areas for long periods of time, such leakage and seepage may be hard to detect and difficult to mitigate. As such, diffuse seepage is an important focus for risk assessment and risk

management. Catastrophic events such as well failures are also relevant, but such events are obviously serious HSE risks and everything possible will be done to stop such events. We have focused on the $10\text{--}10^3$ m length scale, and the 1 month to 10-year timescale consistent with the diffuse seepage scenario that is our focus. Over these length and timescales, averaging is defensible. For example, constant wind speed, pressure, rainfall infiltration, and other weather-related processes can be used along with appropriate parameterizations since the timescale is relatively long. While the coupled model is capable of nonisothermal simulations, we consider here only isothermal situations and we parameterize turbulence using variable- K theory to model atmospheric dispersion.

Subsurface Flow and Transport

The coupled modeling framework we are using is built on the TOUGH2 code [1], a multiphase and multicomponent integral finite difference reservoir simulator. Briefly, TOUGH2 uses a multiphase version of Darcy's law for fluid flow and the advective–dispersive model for component transport. Readers interested in greater detail and information on the theory or practical implementation of TOUGH2 should consult the user's guide [1] and the website (<http://www-esd.lbl.gov/TOUGH2>). The coupled model handles five components (H_2O , brine, CO_2 , a gas tracer, air) and heat. Air is a pseudocomponent that is approximated as a mixture of 21% oxygen and 79% nitrogen by volume. Real gas mixture properties are calculated so the full range from high-pressure storage-site conditions to low-pressure ambient surface-layer conditions can be modeled. We refer to the coupled model as T2CA, for TOUGH2 for CO_2 and Air. While the discussion below focuses on the CO_2 transport, all the gas-phase components are modeled in the TOUGH2 multicomponent framework, and an analogous treatment can be developed for heat.

Atmospheric Dispersion

The approach we use for atmospheric surface-layer transport is based on gradient transport and variable- K theory [2]. In this approach, the advection and dispersion of CO_2 are modeled with an advective–dispersive transport equation in which advection is unidirectional in the x -direction, velocity varies with height according to the logarithmic velocity profile applicable for neutral stability conditions, and the dispersivities K_y and K_z model eddy diffusion. The advective–dispersive transport equation with x -axis aligned with the unidirectional flow field can be written for CO_2 concentration (c) as

$$\frac{\partial c}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial c}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(K_y \frac{\partial c}{\partial y} \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left(K_z \frac{\partial c}{\partial z} \right) = 0 \quad (1)$$

where we assume advection dominates transport in the x -direction. The logarithmic velocity profile for neutral stability conditions [2,3] is given by the equation

$$u(z) = \frac{u_*}{k} \ln \left(\frac{z}{z_0} \right) \quad (2)$$

where u_* is the friction velocity, k the von Karman's constant ($k = 0.4$), z_0 the roughness length, and z the height above the ground surface. Turbulent eddies act to disperse gaseous components, and these eddies become larger with elevation above the ground surface. Arya [2] recommends use of an increasing K_z with elevation for neutral stability conditions according to:

$$K_z = ku_*z \quad (3)$$

Lateral dispersion K_y in variable- K theory is less well understood, and we avoid consideration of how to parameterize K_y by adopting a 2D model problem that neglects lateral dispersion of CO_2 and will therefore be conservative in that CO_2 concentrations will be overestimated relative to a case with lateral dispersion.

In summary, for atmospheric dispersion in the surface layer we use variable- K theory and assume neutral stability and a logarithmic velocity profile. The logarithmic velocity profile represents time-averaged surface winds to model advection in the surface layer, with turbulent mixing parameterized by a variable K_z . The velocity field in the surface layer is prescribed as an initial condition and stays constant throughout the simulation. The surface layer is defined simply by setting porosity to unity and layer permeabilities to a range of values, orders of magnitude larger than the subsurface parts of the domain and that specify the desired logarithmic profile for the given boundary conditions. The entire coupled subsurface–surface-layer

calculation is carried out using a single grid. Hence, the model regions are implicitly coupled. Full multiphase and multicomponent flow and transport are used throughout the domain.

Field experiments of dense gas dispersion have been used to develop correlations involving the most important parameters controlling atmospheric dispersion such as wind speed, density of released gas, and release flux [4,5]. These correlations were developed based on simple scale and dimensional analyses. One of these correlations relates the seepage flux and average wind speed at an elevation of 10 m to the form of the dispersion process, i.e. whether it is density-dependent or passive (not density-dependent) as appropriate for a gas tracer. In density-dependent dispersion of a dense gas like CO_2 , the gas can flow in response to its own density gradient relative to air, and it can resist mixing if contained in a low-lying area such as a valley or other topographic depression. In Figure 2, we have plotted this correlation with values appropriate for CO_2 -air mixtures for various source-area length scales along with the typical ecological flux of CO_2 emitted and taken up by plants, soil, and roots known as the net ecosystem exchange (NEE) [6]. As shown in Figure 2, seepage fluxes have to be quite high (note logarithmic scale) for windy situations for the resulting dispersive mixing process to be density-dependent. Note that wind conditions are averages over a period of 10 min.

In prior work [7], we have simulated subsurface migration of leaking CO_2 through the unsaturated zone with rainwater infiltration for various leakage rates specified at the water table. These leakage rates were given as annual mass leakage percentages of the total stored CO_2 of the order of 10^9 kg through a circular region with radius 100 m. Typical seepage fluxes for the $0.1\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$ leakage rate were of the order of 10^{-5} – $10^{-6} \text{ kg m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$. As shown in Figure 2, seepage fluxes of this magnitude lead to passive dispersion for all but the calmest wind conditions. It must be emphasized that deriving a leakage rate from annual percent leakage is case-specific in that doing so produces a leakage rate that is dependent on the mass of stored CO_2 , i.e. the size of the storage project. For example in this case, if the project were 100 times larger (stored CO_2 of the order of 10^{11} kg), seepage fluxes of the order of 10^{-5} – $10^{-6} \text{ kg m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ would result from leakage rates of $0.001\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$ for the same leak geometry. Similarly, $0.1\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$ leakage from a project 100 times larger would produce fluxes of order 10^{-3} – $10^{-4} \text{ kg m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ for the same geometry, which could produce density-dependent dispersion at higher wind speeds as shown in Figure 2. In general, the CO_2 leakage and seepage flux are the important quantities governing flow behavior, while percent leakage per year provides information only about mass loss and requires definition of the project size and leakage or seepage area.




Figure 2: Correlation for density-dependent and passive dispersion in the surface layer as a function of seepage flux and wind speed for four different source length scales.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Verification

The subsurface flow and transport methods in T2CA are well established by virtue of the long history of TOUGH2, the novel part being the equation of state module for the mass components water, brine, CO_2 , gas tracer, and air. We have compared physical properties of the gas mixtures in T2CA against independent predictions and observed good agreement [7]. Real gas mixture properties are calculated because they are needed at depth, e.g. below approximately 800 m where CO_2 becomes supercritical, although our focus here is on the unsaturated zone and surface layer where pressures are approximately 1 bar (0.1 MPa).

Here we present verification of the surface-layer methods in T2CA for the special case of uniform velocity and constant eddy diffusivity, in which the approach reduces to the well-known Gaussian plume dispersion model for which there are simple analytical solutions. We present in Figure 3 results of a verification study in which we compared the T2CA result of a 3D Gaussian plume dispersion problem against the analytical solution. In this problem, $u = 1 \text{ m s}^{-1}$, $D_{xx} = D_{yy} = D_{zz} = 5 \text{ m s}^{-2}$. The point-source strength $Q_{1/4} = 0.0785 \text{ kg s}^{-1}$, where $Q_{1/4}$ is the source strength for the one-quarter domain used in the T2CA simulation that takes advantage of the symmetry planes in the horizontal and vertical directions parallel to the flow direction. The main part of Figure 3 shows the 3D plume, while the upper inset shows the y - x plane with comparison of the T2CA result to the analytical solution given by Arya [2]. The agreement is very good and confirms our implementation of surface layer atmospheric dispersion processes in T2CA.




Figure 3: Contours of $\text{kg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-3}$ gas from T2CA for the Gaussian plume dispersion verification problem in 3D, and comparison to analytical solution in the x - y plane (inset).

Unsaturated Zone Attenuation

The purpose of this application is to examine the extent to which the unsaturated zone can attenuate CO_2 leakage, full details of which can be found in Ref. [7]. We consider a radial system with a thick (30 m) unsaturated zone into which a CO_2 leakage flux enters from below. The leakage fluxes are arbitrarily set

at 4.04×10^{-6} , 4.04×10^{-7} , and 4.04×10^{-8} $\text{kg m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$. For reference, a leakage flux of 4.04×10^{-6} $\text{kg m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ would correspond to an annual loss through a 100 m radius region of $0.1\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$ of a 4×10^9 kg CO_2 storage project, or $0.001\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$ of a project 100 times bigger (4×10^{11} kg CO_2). We point this out to emphasize again that leakage flux rather than annual percentage loss controls leakage and seepage processes. In some cases leakage rate and leakage flux will be loosely correlated because leakage area may scale with size of project, but in general these quantities represent distinct measures of storage integrity. The leakage area was one of the many properties of the system that was varied as part of the sensitivity analysis discussed below. Rainfall infiltration flows downward through the section and acts to dissolve CO_2 and transport it downward. Additional properties of the system for the base case are provided in Table 1.

Figure 4 shows the steady-state simulation results for the base case at the three different arbitrary leakage rates 4×10^6 , 4×10^5 and 4×10^4 kg yr^{-1} . Steady state is reached after approximately 0.3, 5, and 30 yrs for the three cases, respectively. Carbon dioxide concentrations in the shallow subsurface increase with increasing leakage rate, as diffusion and the specified rainfall infiltration are overwhelmed by larger leakage fluxes. Note further the limited degree to which the CO_2 spreads outward in the unsaturated zone despite the density contrast. Pressure gradients induced by the active leakage flux dominate over gravity effects here and thus lead to predominantly vertical CO_2 flow through the vadose zone to the ground surface [7].

Figure 5 shows seepage flux and near-surface CO_2 concentration (mole fraction) for a large number of simulations carried out as part of a sensitivity analysis [7]. For reference, we have plotted the typical ecological flux or NEE 4.4×10^{-7} $\text{kg m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ [6] and the soil-gas CO_2 mole fraction ($x_{\text{gas}}^{\text{CO}_2} = 0.3$) that appears to have caused tree mortality at Mammoth Mountain, California [8]. As shown, the leakage flux exerts the strongest control on flux and concentration at the ground surface. Permeability and permeability anisotropy are also very important in controlling CO_2 seepage flux and near-surface concentrations. Simulations of barometric pumping presented in prior work [7] show that pressure variations produce local temporal changes in flux and concentration but have little effect on long-term average values for this leakage scenario. The fundamental observation of the simulation results presented here is that subsurface CO_2 concentrations from leakage and seepage can be high in the near-surface environment, even when the fluxes are of the same order of magnitude as the NEE [6].

TABLE 1
HYDROGEOLOGICAL PROPERTIES OF THE UNSATURATED ZONE FOR
THE BASE CASE

Property	Value
Permeability ($k_r = k_z$)	$1 \times 10^{-12} \text{ m}^2$ (1 Darcy)
Porosity (ϕ)	0.2
Infiltration rate (i)	10.0 cm yr^{-1}
Temperature (T)	$15 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$
Residual water saturation (S_{r})	0.1
Residual gas saturation (S_{gr})	0.01
van Genuchten [10] α	$1 \times 10^{-4} \text{ Pa}^{-1}$
van Genuchten [10] m	0.2

Subsurface–Surface-Layer Coupling

We have also applied the new simulation capability to a coupled subsurface–surface-layer cartesian system, properties of which are listed in Table 2. The domain discretization and boundary conditions are shown in Figure 6. The bottom boundary is held at constant pressure, while the top boundary is closed. The side boundaries are closed in the unsaturated zone, and held at constant pressure in the surface layer to prescribe the logarithmic velocity profile. Further details of our modeling approach and this application can be found




Figure 4: Simulation results for leakage in a thick unsaturated zone where shading indicates mass fraction of CO₂ in the gas phase, and labeled contour lines indicate water saturation, and vectors show gas-phase pore velocity for steady-state leakage rates of 4×10^4 , 4×10^5 , and 4×10^6 kg yr⁻¹. The maximum vector size represents values of approximately (a) 0.057, (b) 0.53, and (c) 3.6 m d⁻¹.

in Ref. [9]. We present in Figure 7 simulation results after 6 months of leakage showing subsurface and surface-layer CO₂ concentrations (mass fraction) and gas-phase velocity vectors for the cases of winds of 1, 3, and 5 m s⁻¹ at a height of 10 m from the ground surface and neutral atmospheric conditions [2,3]. In Figure 7d we show a summary of the temporal evolution of the CO₂ gas mass fraction at $x = 645$ m (approximately 100 m downstream from the edge of the source). Figure 7a–c shows the strong effects of wind and atmospheric dispersion on seeping CO₂. Concentrations downwind from the source are strongly attenuated by turbulent mixing. Note further in Figure 7a–c the downward migration of CO₂ into the subsurface downwind of the source. This process is due to CO₂ dissolution in rainwater that is infiltrating at 10 cm yr⁻¹. It is important to note that in all the simulations we have assumed a zero background CO₂ concentration to emphasize the additional CO₂ that seeps from the ground in the various scenarios. Note that the mass fraction scale in Figure 7 shows that CO₂ concentrations in the surface layer are very low, barely above the background concentration of 370 ppmv which would be 0.00056 by mass fraction. The fundamental conclusion is that surface winds and atmospheric dispersion appear to be very effective at diluting diffuse CO₂ seepage fluxes over flat ground. We note that calm conditions, topographic depressions, and higher CO₂ seepage fluxes not yet analyzed can cause larger CO₂ concentrations to develop.

Given that HSE risks will be calculated based on exposures at certain locations in the flow field, we present in Figure 7d downwind CO₂ concentrations as a function of time for the test problem. Note that




Figure 5: Maximum seepage flux of CO₂ and maximum near-surface gas mole fraction CO₂ as a function of leakage rate at steady-state seepage conditions.

concentrations are conservative because of the assumption of a 2D system and the use of a closed boundary at the top of the surface layer. For this case of diffuse CO₂ seepage, concentrations would be elevated above background by approximately 23 ppmv (3.5×10^{-5} mass fraction) for the 1 m s^{-1} case, and concentrations decrease approximately linearly with reference wind speed. Although this test problem is 2D, the coupled modeling framework is a fully 3D capability.

CONCLUSIONS

We have demonstrated the use of a coupled modeling framework for modeling CO₂ fluxes and concentrations for risk characterization. This work is relevant and important to the development of geologic CO₂ storage because it provides a modeling capability for simulating CO₂ flow and transport from the deep CO₂ storage site all the way to the atmosphere. The approach is built on the assumption that the near-surface environment is the main region in which HSE risks will arise. In this region, CO₂ flux and concentration are the main risk drivers. The coupled model handles subsurface and atmospheric surface-layer flow and transport assuming that dispersion in the surface layer is passive and that the wind is described by a logarithmic velocity profile. Model results show limited unsaturated zone attenuation of leakage flux, with correspondingly large CO₂ concentrations possible in the shallow subsurface. These results suggest that if leakage leads to CO₂ migrating as far as the vadose zone, high CO₂ concentrations can occur in the root zone of the shallow subsurface with potentially harmful effects on plants, as well as

TABLE 2
 PROPERTIES OF THE COUPLED SUBSURFACE–SURFACE-LAYER MODEL SYSTEM

Property	Value
<i>Subsurface</i>	
Subsurface region extent (xyz)	1 km \times 1 m, 0 m $<$ z $<$ 35 m
Discretization ($N_x N_y N_z$)	100 \times 1 \times 35
Permeability ($k_x = k_z$)	1 \times 10 ⁻¹² m ²
Porosity (ϕ)	0.2
Infiltration rate (i)	10.0 cm yr ⁻¹
CO ₂ flux region	450 m $<$ x $<$ 550 m
CO ₂ mass flux (0.1, 0.01, and 0.001% yr ⁻¹)	4.04 \times 10 ⁻⁶ , 10 ⁻⁷ , 10 ⁻⁸ kg m ⁻² s ⁻¹
Residual water sat. (S_{lr})	0.1
Residual gas sat. (S_{gr})	0.01
van Genuchten [10] α	1 \times 10 ⁻⁴ Pa ⁻¹
van Genuchten [10] m	0.2
<i>Surface layer</i>	
Surface-layer region extent (xyz)	1 km \times 1 m, 35 m $<$ z $<$ 45 m
Discretization ($N_x N_y N_z$)	100 \times 1 \times 20
Pressure in surface layer	1 bar (0.1 MPa)
Temperature (isothermal)	15 °C
Atmospheric stability	Neutral
Velocity profile	Logarithmic
Reference velocity at $z = 10$ m	1, 3, or 5 m s ⁻¹
Friction velocity for $u_x = 1, 3, 5$ m s ⁻¹	0.0868, 0.261, 0.434 m s ⁻¹
Roughness length (z_0)	0.10 m

on humans or other animals in poorly ventilated subsurface structures such as basements or burrows. Coupled subsurface–surface-layer demonstration simulations show large degree of dilution that occurs in the surface layer, and the possible reflux of CO₂ to the subsurface that occurs when CO₂ dissolves in infiltrating rainwater.




Figure 6: Domain and discretization used in the coupled subsurface–surface-layer test problem.




Figure 7: Simulation results for the coupled subsurface–surface-layer problem showing mass fraction of CO₂ in the gas phase and gas velocity vectors: (a) wind speed 1 m s⁻¹; (b) wind speed 3 m s⁻¹; (c) wind speed 5 m s⁻¹; (d) mass fraction CO₂ in the gas vs. time at $x = 645$ m.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend development of additional capabilities for risk characterization related to leakage and seepage, along with further verification and testing of model approaches. Although the coupled modeling framework T2CA is applicable to many important leakage and seepage scenarios, it is neither applicable to absolute calm conditions where dense gas dispersion occurs, nor to very high fluxes such as might occur from an open well or catastrophic tank or pipeline release into the open atmosphere. In addition, buildings are neglected even though it is well established that exposures to people by soil–gas contaminants (e.g. radon) are most likely to occur indoors. We recommend that future research funding be directed toward model development for simulation of the foregoing processes. Finally, the surface-layer methods in T2CA should be compared against other atmospheric dispersion models for verification, and the methods should be refined if necessary.

NOMENCLATURE

2D	two-dimensional
3D	three-dimensional
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
HSE	health, safety and environmental (risks)
NEE	net ecosystem exchange (for CO ₂)
TOUGH2	reservoir simulator, <i>Transport Of Unsaturated Groundwater and Heat 2</i>
T2CA	for TOUGH2 for CO ₂ and Air
x	mole fraction
X	mass fraction

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Chin-Fu Tsang (LBNL) and two anonymous reviewers for constructive comments and reviews of this report. This work was supported in part by a Cooperative Research and Development Agreement (CRADA) between BP Corporation North America, as part of the CO₂ Capture Project (CCP) of the Joint Industry Program (JIP), and the US Department of Energy (DOE) through the National Energy Technologies Laboratory (NETL), and by the Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, managed by the University of California for the US Department of Energy under contract DE-AC03-76SF00098.

REFERENCES

1. K. Pruess, C. Oldenburg, G. Moridis, TOUGH2 User's Guide Version 2.0, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory Report LBNL-43134, November, 1999, 197 pp.
2. S.P. Arya, Air Pollution Meteorology and Dispersion, Oxford University Press, New York, 1999.
3. D.H. Slade (Ed.), Meteorology and Atomic Energy 1968, US Atomic Energy Commission, 1968, Chapter 2.
4. R.E. Britter, *Ann. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **21** (1989) 317–344.
5. R.E. Britter, J. McQuaid, Workbook on the Dispersion of Dense Gases, *Health Saf. Exec. Rep.*, Sheffield, UK, HSE Contract Research Report No. 17/1988, 1988.
6. D.D. Baldocchi, K.B. Wilson, *Ecol. Model.* **142** (2001) 155–184.
7. C.M. Oldenburg, A.J.A Unger, *Vadose Zone J.* **2** (2003) 287–296.
8. C.D. Farrar, M.L. Sorey, W.C. Evans, J.F. Howle, B.D. Kerr, B.M. Kennedy, Y. King, J.R. Southon, *Nature* **376** (1995) 675–678.
9. C.M. Oldenburg, A.J.A. Unger, Coupled vadose zone and atmospheric surface-layer transport of CO₂ from geologic carbon sequestration sites, *Vadose Zone J.* **3** (2004) 848–857.
10. M.T. Van Genuchten, *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* **44** (1980) 892–898.