

Leakage of CO₂ from Geological Storage and Its Impacts on Fresh Soil-Water Systems: A Review

Pankaj Kumar Gupta¹, Basant Yadav²

¹Post-Doctoral Fellow, Faculty of Environment, University of Waterloo, Canada
Postal Address: 200 University Ave W, Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1
Email ID: pk3gupta@uwaterloo.ca

²Postdoctoral Fellow in Rural Water Supply, Cranfield University
Cranfield Water Science Institute, Cranfield University, Vincent Building
Cranfield, Bedford, MK43 0AL
Email ID: Basant.Yadav@cranfield.ac.uk

Abstract

Leakage of CO₂ from the geological storage is a serious issue for the sustainability of receiving fresh soil-water system. Subsurface water quality issues are no longer related to one type of pollution in many regions around the globe. Thus, an effort has been made to review studies performed to investigate supercritical CO₂ (scCO₂) and CO₂ enrich brine migration and leakage from geological storage formations. Further, the study also reviewed its impacts on fresh soil-water systems, soil microbes and vegetation. First part of the study discussed scCO₂/CO₂ enrich brine migration and its leakage from storage formations along with its impact on pore dynamics of hydrological regimes. Later, a state-of-the-art literature survey has been performed to understand the role of CO₂-brine leakage in groundwater dynamics and its quality along with soil microbes and plants. It is observed in the literature survey that most of the studies on CO₂-brine migration in storage formations reported significant CO₂-brine leakage due to over-pressurization through wells (injections and abandoned), fracture and faults during CO₂ injection. Thus, changes in the groundwater flow and water table dynamics can be the first impact of the CO₂-brine leakage. Subsequently three major alterations may also occur -i) drop in pH of subsurface water, ii)

enhancement of organic compounds, and iii) mobilization of metals and metalloids. Geochemical alteration depends on the amount of CO₂ leaked and interactions with host rocks. Therefore, such alteration may significantly affect soil microbial dynamics and vegetation in and around CO₂ leakage sites. In-depth analysis of the available literature fortifies that a proper subsurface characterization along with the bio-geochemical analysis is extremely important and should be mandatory to predict the more accurate risk of CO₂ capture and storage activities on soil-water systems.

Keywords: CO₂ capture and storage, Leakage, Dissolution, Subsurface Pollution, Microbial Shifting

1.0 Introduction

CO₂ capture and storage (CCS) is emerging as an important tool for the mitigation of the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by deep cutting of the global atmospheric CO₂ concentration (Herzog, 2001; Bruant et al. 2002; Figueroa et al. 2008). Further, CCS projects were getting high interest globally not only to cut GHG emissions but also to enhance recovery of oil/gas (Michael et al. 2010). In early stage, the major attention was paid to develop economically acceptable techniques to capture CO₂ (Figueroa et al. 2008) and on estimations of potential geological sinks (Herzog, 2001). Herzog (2001) reported about the storage capacity of different geological units including ocean, saline formations, coal seams for future CCS activities. In 1990s, Alberta basin (Acid Gas) in Canada was the first geological sequestration project in which CO₂ was injected with H₂S for storage in deep zone. In early 2000s, the saline aquifer CO₂ storage (SACS) project, Sleipner in middle of the North Sea was a first commercial CCS project. This project established as an example for the global community gaining international acceptance and provided an option for CO₂ mitigation (Herzog, 2001; Torp and Gale, 2004). Since initial days, the tendency of CO₂

to escape from the storage zone to atmosphere via cap rock leakages was highlighted as a major concern for CCS project's success (Bruant et al. 2002; Zhou and Birkholzer, 2011; Lewicki et al. 2007).

Non-isothermal, two phase and multicomponent flow occurs once the supercritical (sc) CO₂/CO₂ enrich brine leaks from the storage zone to overlying aquifers (Birkholzer and Zhou, 2009). The dissolution of CO₂ in formation water significantly affect its migration in deep aquifers (Lions et al. 2014). Similarly, precipitation of the minerals is another dominating geochemical processes occurs due to introduction of CO₂. These geochemical processes significantly affect the pore water dynamics by dissolving host minerals and precipitations of other materials (Andre et al. 2007; Fritz et al. 2010; Jin et al. 2016). Thus, previous studies reported significant impacts of the CO₂ injection, migration and its leakage on groundwater table dynamics and on flow regimes (Nicot, 2008; Yamamoto et al. 2009).

Further, introduction of CO₂-brine in fresh groundwater zone may also cause three major geochemical changes, 1) drop in pH; 2) enrichment of organic compounds; 3) mobilization of metalloids. These changes were commonly found in previous studies as an impacts of CO₂/CO₂ enrich brine in fresh aquifer zones (Kharaka et al. 2010; 2017; Zheng and Spycher, 2018). Acidification of soil-water systems may significantly enhance the sorption of exiting pollutants, especially like arsenic (As); Lead (Pb), Iron (Fe) and Manganese (Mn) (Smyth et al. 2009; Lu et al. 2010; Humez et al. 2013). Studies considering impacts of CO₂-brine leakage on behaviors of metals and metalloids indicate that 1) one category of metals and metalloids (Ca, Mg, Si, K, Sr, Mn, Ba, Co, B, Zn) rapidly increases its concentration then stabilize with time; 2) second category (Fe, Al, Mo, U, V, As, Cr, Cs, Rb, Ni and Cu) may increase its concentrations with the start of CO₂ flux for some time then decline with progress of time (Smyth et al. 2009; Lu et al. 2010). Likewise, some

studies also reported increment in organic compounds like benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene and xylene (BTEX), Phenol and naphthalene (Siirila and Maxwell, 2012; Atchley et al. 2013). Furthermore, degradation of groundwater quality can also be expected once CO₂-brine leaked from storage formations (Newmark et al. 2010; Derakhshan-Nejad et al. 2019). Geochemical alteration due to the leakage of CO₂/CO₂ enrich brine may also affect the soil microbe, vegetation and ultimately human health. However, very little attention has been paid in past to understand potential impacts of CO₂-brine leakage on subsurface microbiological resources, and plants at CCS sites. Generally, the elevated CO₂ concentration in the vadose zone may negatively affect root water absorption, chlorophyll, starch content and total biomass. Furthermore, plants exposed to high CO₂ shows significant impacts on its growth by reducing plant height, root length, leaf number, leaf area, seed number, pod number (Al-Traboulsi et al. 2012; Wu et al. 2014) and by altering physiological stress (Zhao et al. 2017).

Groundwater resources are depleting with fast rate around the globe (Famiglietti, 2014). It's quality decreases day-by-day due to occurrence of large number of pollutants (Strokal et al. 2019). Thus, the production of safe groundwater resources for drinking purpose is key challenge for policy makers and scientists. In this highly demanding situation, one can't ignore the risk associated with CO₂ intrusion from geological storage or during geological sequestration and their impact on the groundwater quality. Therefore, analysis of the reasons for the deterioration of groundwater resources around the CCS sites may be the first step towards the better maintenance of CCS activities. Thus, an effort has been made to present current understanding and knowledge gaps in the areas of CO₂ leak from storage reservoirs and its geochemical interactions in the groundwater zone; its impact on groundwater quality, subsurface microbes, and plants. Figure 1

demonstrating the scope of this review article in which numbers in red circle indicating the scope of different section of this review manuscript.




Figure 1: Schematic diagram of CO₂ leakage along faults, fracture, and wells (injection and abandoned) and its impact on the fresh soil-water system.

2.0 Experiencing CO₂ Leakage

Field scale CO₂ release experiments have been conducted in different regions of the world to understand the CO₂ leakage from subsurface/vadose zone (Table 1). An effort has been made by Roberts and Stalker, (2017) to list such field CO₂ release experiments. Nine studies (ASGARD-UK, QICS-UK, CO₂FieldLab-Norway, Grimsrud Farm-Norway, CO₂DEMO-France, PISCO₂-

Spain, Ginninderra-Australia, Ressacada Farm-Brazil, and ZERT-USA) out of 14 studies revealed the leakage of CO₂ at experimental sites as listed in table 1. In these experiments, the injection rate of CO₂ varies from 0.04 gs⁻¹ [1.3 t(CO₂)pa] to 4.9 gs⁻¹ [153.3 t(CO₂)pa] where 5% (CO₂FieldLab-Norway) to 90% (ZERT-USA) of CO₂ leaked from the release zone. In which, 34% of total CO₂ were seep at ASGARD site in England, 82% from Grimsrud Farm in Norway, 78% from CO₂-DEMO site in France, 82.3% from PISCO₂ site in Spain and 90% from ZERT in USA. Global data on CO₂ leakage has been discussed by Roberts and Stalker, (2017). They highlighted that the CO₂ flux was reported for 39 sites (70% of the dataset), seep rate at 49 sites (90% of the dataset) and both flux and seep rate measurements were reported for 30 sites (55% of the dataset).

These field scale CO₂ release experiments were performed either in top soil (Grimsrud Farm site), or vadose zone (PISCO₂; Ginninderra; CO₂-DEMO; ASGARD sites) or shallow saturated zone (QICS; CO₂ Field Lab; Vrøgum sites) to track the potential leakage and its pathways (table 1). Lassen et al. (2015) performed an experimental study in shallow aquifers formations at a site located in Vrøgum in the western Denmark where 45 kg gaseous CO₂ was injected at the depth of 8 m. CO₂ plume was monitored using cross-borehole ground penetrating radar (GPR). The results of this study demonstrates that several CO₂ gas pockets of gas saturation upto 0.3 formed below lower-permeable sand layers. This study conclude that the lateral migration of CO₂ gas was significant in case of the leakage from CCS site. Further, CO₂ leakage during its injection from the deep saline aquifer was investigated by Hu et al. (2016) using the pressure tomography. Results of this study show that the CO₂ migrate upward through the permeable seal and the leaky path with 0.62 and 0.86 CO₂ saturation level, respectively, into the overlying aquifer. In some cases, CO₂ plume was also observed at the upper aquifer due to the long injection and its leakage through leaky pathways. Likewise, a Shallow Injection Monitoring Experiment (SIMEx) was

performed by injecting 550.6 t(CO₂)pa in 15 m deep shallow in 3.5 hours. At this site, no leakage was experienced but alternation in geochemical makeup was clearly demonstrated (Pezard et al. 2016).

At industrial scale, CCS projects have experienced CO₂ leakage from storage geological formations in past due to mechanical disturbance i.e. injection process, geochemical processes and or natural geological disturbances like earthquake (Zoback, and Gorelick, 2012). Generally, the supercritical CO₂ is injected in deep geological formations shallower than 3 km, where CO₂ would be stored. Mechanical disturbances may occur due to variations in operational parameters like injection pressures, which may further cause changes in dynamics flow regimes and the fracture in the heterogeneous cap-rocks. The injected CO₂ can also displace the brine and increases its flow velocity which results in high brine discharged rate to near the surface zone/lake or stream (Bergman and Winter, 1995). Similarly, Nicot (2008) described that the pressure pulse travels much faster than the mass of the CO₂ plume as injection progress, which has the potential to displace reservoir fluids swiftly. Over-pressurization/large-scale pressure build-up in response to the injection may cause fracture in the caprock and in the overlying subsurface zones (Zhou and Birkholzer, 2011). Such pressurization may also cause the upward movement of CO₂-brine through localized pathways. In conclusion, there were high experience of CO₂ leakage occurs through faults, fractures and rock discontinuities at natural sites and from operational wells due to cracked/corrosion well casing and or well blowout at industrial (Lewicki et al. 2007). Thus, a better understanding of CO₂ seep mechanisms, pathways, and associated risk is needed in and around CCS sites.

2.1 Effects on the porosity and permeability

Alternation in pore dynamics has been highlighted as first and direct effect of CO₂ injection. Further, changes in geochemical processes, especially mineral dissolution, have also been associated with CO₂ injection. It is also expected that complex geochemical reactions can occur due to fluid-rock interactions during the CO₂ injection and its storage. Such geochemical processes significantly affect pore dynamics by dissolving host minerals and other materials (Andre et al. 2007; Fritz et al. 2010; Jin et al. 2016). A study performed by Andre et al. (2007) to investigate rock-water interactions during the CO₂ injection in the Dogger aquifer (Paris Basin, France) suggests that the dissolution of carbonate by the acidic aqueous solution due to CO₂ injection significantly affects the porosity and permeability of media. Such changes in the porosity and permeability of media after injection of CO₂ causes significant variations in hydrodynamic regimes. Likewise, Fritz et al. (2010) performed experiment to investigate hydro-thermodynamics associated with CO₂ injections and their impacts on the porosity. This study fortifies that the hydrothermal circulation in granite increases the porosity of domain. A saturated high porosity zone can storage more energy than non-affected area which may create fractures and fault. Such fractures may act as potential CO₂ leakage pathways to overlying subsurface zones. A study by Jin et al. (2016) highlights that the high risk can be observed in the area having dolomite due to its high dissolution rate in presence of CO₂. These studies clearly indicate that CO₂ induced dissolution significantly affect the hydrological conditions by altering the porosity and permeability of CO₂ storage zones which further increases the risk of CO₂ leakage.

2.2 Precipitation of salts and their effects on the pore dynamics

Precipitation of host or other minerals in salt form due to the injection of unsaturated CO₂ is another potential geochemical process which significantly affect the porosity and permeability of storage zones (Pruess, and Müller, 2009; Guyant et al. 2015; Guodong et al. 2016). In the

reservoir, the pore water evaporates due to large volume of the dry supercritical CO₂ injection which enhance the concentration of salts in the brine and it will precipitate out as exceeds solubility limit under reservoir (thermodynamic) conditions (Miri and Hellevang, 2016). Such precipitated salts diffuse and occupy the available pore space which further alter the porosity and permeability of the domain (figure 2). A core flood experiment performed by Muller et al. (2009) in CO₂SINK Project, a European Union research project, reported halite precipitation over the entire pore network of the Berea sandstone core which reduced the CO₂ permeability by approx. 60% and the porosity by approx. 16%. Bacci et al. (2011) performed a core flooding experiment on a St. Bees sandstone core to investigate porosity and permeability changes due to salt precipitation during the CO₂ injection. Results of this study indicates the porosity and permeability reduction ranged from ~4 to 29 % and 30 to 86% from the initial value. Another experiment performed by Bacci et al. (2013) indicates that the porosity reduction of about 3 - 5 % and the permeability reduction between 13 to 75 %. Likewise, Tang et al. (2018) reported a reduction in the porosity and permeability by 58% and 93.9%, respectively. Most of studies (Ott et al. 2010; 2013; Oh et al. 2013; Kim et al. 2013; Peysson et al. 2014; Nooraiepour et al. 2018) performed to investigate impacts of CO₂ injections on alternation of reservoir properties are reported a significant reduction in the porosity and the permeability of the host domain. Upward pressure is exerted on the caprock layer when the pore space reduced for large volume injections and or CO₂ changes its phase from supercritical to liquid or to gaseous form, after injection (Shukla et al. 2010). One can refer a review by Miri and Hellevang, (2016) for better understanding of the physics of salt precipitation during the CO₂ injection.

Risk of CO₂ leakage will intensify due to changes in hydrodynamics of pore space, however, very limited information is available on the role of salt precipitation and or dissolution

of minerals on risk associated with CO₂ leakages during CCS activities. To the date, the geochemical impacts on alternation of the hydrodynamic due to the CO₂ injection has mainly been studied at near well conditions. Current knowledge clearly indicates that the variation in injection rate/style, improperly constructed well, fault and fracture zone can act as fast and direct conduits for CO₂ leakage from depth to the surface (Lewicki,et al. 2007). Qualitative estimation of the combined risk associated with CO₂ injections and geochemically induced leakage for reservoir scale and for basin scale will be needed for the accurate prediction. A better understanding the CO₂ flow mechanisms, magnitude of leakage, and steps to remedy leakage are important factors for the risk assessment and the risk management.




Figure 2: Schematic illustration of core flooding experiment performed to estimate effects of salt precipitation on pore dynamics and different physical mechanisms contributing to the process of salt precipitation.

3.0 CO₂-Brine Migration and its Leakage

If CO₂ migrates upward through a fracture or an abandoned well, supercritical CO₂ changes their phase as liquid- CO₂, or gas- CO₂ to receiving aquifers under controlled temperature-pressure regimes (Wilkin and DiGiulio, 2010). Just after the CO₂-brine leakage, one can expect a highly non-isothermal, two-phase and multicomponent flow in the domain. A study by Birkholzer and Zhou (2009) performed simulation for the Illinois basin scale (570Km ×550Km), where CO₂ was injected at the rate of 5 million tonnes of CO₂ for 50 years. A three dimensional mesh (1.2 million grid-blocks and more than 3.7 million connections) was constructed to simulate the two-phase flow and the multi-component transport of CO₂-brine in the response to CO₂ injection under isothermal mode. Mount Simon Formation, the Eau Claire caprock and the weathered portion of the granite base rock were considered as lithofacies. CO₂ was injected in the high permeability and the high porosity part of the Mount Simon formation. The results of this study show that the shale-sandstone sequences of the Mount Simon help to retard upward migration of CO₂. The thickness of the Mount Simon and the slop of structural surfaces affect the shape of the CO₂ plume which elongate it to 6-8 km long lateral CO₂ plume. Discharge of the brine from top and lateral boundaries was observe equivalent to the Darcy flow velocity of 0.47 mm/year and 0.2m/year for 50 years, respectively. The cumulative volume of the brine released from different boundaries accounts 9% at 50 years and 86% at 200 years of the total displaced brine.

Another study was performed by Zhou et al. (2010) by incorporating 20 injection wells for the injection of CO₂ at the rate of 5 Mt CO₂/year/well for 50 years at the Illinois basin scale (570Km

×550Km). In this study, number of injection wells were considered twice and a five-fold more injection rate to Birkholzer and Zhou, (2009). A CO₂ plume of size 9-13.5 km was observed in the lateral direction which indicates slow migrations of CO₂. Displacement of the brine was significant in the injection area and thus a cumulative volume of $1.57 \times 10^9 \text{ m}^3$ was predicted to leak in 200 years. The fraction of leakage rates increases from 0 to 0.22 in 50 years, which accounts 9.5 % and 62% of the total brine volume displaced at 50 and 200 years, respectively. After Birkholzer and Zhou, (2009) and Zhou et al. (2010), another Illinois basin scale modeling was performed to investigate basin scale hydrological impacts of CO₂ sequestration by Person et al. (2010) using the single and multiphase i.e. sharp-interface model. In this study, CO₂ was injected in 726 wells at the rate of 0.11 Mt CO₂/year/well for 100 years and then the fate of pressure and CO₂ plume was observed for next 100 years. They found that the CO₂ plume of size 0.5-2 km developed radially after 100 years of continuous injection. The calculated pressure anomaly in this study was 6 time high than reported pressure anomaly by Birkholzer and Zhou, (2009) i.e. 3MPa. This study indicates that pressure anomalies restricted to a distance of 25 Km from injection well while Zhou et al. (2010) indicates it reaching the limit of the basin. Upward displacement of the brine into the Eau Claires was also observed at slow migration rates. These studies indicate that numbers of well can significantly affects CO₂ plume size and directions. For example, the plume change from 6 - 8 km in study by Birkholzer and Zhou (2009) to 9 - 13.5 km in study by Zhou et al. (2010). Thus, it is important to investigate the role of factors as the thickness, number of well, the slope to the variation of direction and maximum size of the plume. In conclusion, the pressure buildup in the Mt. Simon has capability to push the brine upward through the Eau Claire caprock into overlying formations. However, this is unknown that at what extend this discharged volume will affects above-lying groundwater resources. One can improve this study by considering aquifers above the

Eau Claire caprock, as this study does not incorporate any groundwater zones to reduces the load on computation.

Likewise, a high performance supercomputer based numerical study performed by Yamamoto et al. (2009) to investigate the impact of two phase flow i.e. CO₂- groundwater migration on regional groundwater flow of an area of about 60km × 70km in Tokyo Bay using the multiphase flow simulator TOUGH2-MP/ECO2N. Ten injection wells were considered to inject CO₂ at a depth of 1 km under Tokyo Bay at the rate of 10 million tons/year for 100 years. The results indicate that the lateral plume appears in the injection layer extending over a range of 4-5 km. This study demonstrate that the dissolution of CO₂ plume gradually increases and finally becomes dominant in the domain. A large CO₂ plume-groundwater interaction area is the main driving factor to enhance dissolution of CO₂ into the surrounding groundwater. However, the vertical velocity of CO₂ plume was low because of the two-phase flow affected by the low relative permeability and the high capillary pressure in the deep groundwater zone. However, one can expect more local leakages of CO₂ from seal containing alternate layers of the sandstone and the mudstone which was not considered in this study. By developing a precise lithofacies model for the seal one can upscale this study for Tokyo Bay. Similarly, Pan et al. (2011) highlights a transient two-phase, non-isothermal flow of CO₂-water mixture after its leakage. This study also indicates that leakage dynamics is much more complicated than the simple quasi-steady-state flow.

Impacts of CO₂ leakage on groundwater depend on the formation permeability, if leakage occurs from the high permeability zone, it will result in high flow variations (Wainwright et al 2013). Zhao et al. (2012) investigated the CO₂ plume migration and the pressure buildup due to CO₂ injections at the rate of 3Mt CO₂/year/well for 50 years in five wells of the Sanzhao Depression, Songliao Basin, China. Results of this study indicate that a 7.8MPa pressure buildup

in the high permeability zone of the formation while it can even reach to 10.5MPa in low permeability layers. CO₂ plume size in the formation was about 5.8Km at 100 years, while interference of CO₂ occurs at 200 years. CO₂ migrations toward the Southeast of the depression indicate a potential risk of freshwater pollution. This fortifies that the permeability of the storage formation is the main factor to control the pressure buildup, CO₂-brine migration and impact of CO₂ leakage on above-lying formations. Furthermore, the CO₂-brine flow in low permeability saline aquifers in the Ordos basin was studied by Xie et al. (2015a) and Xie et al. (2015b) using one injection well having different injection rates i.e. 5.42 Kg s⁻¹ and 3.17 Kg s⁻¹, respectively. CO₂ migrate in the radially shape of size 658m, 913m, 1013m at 3.65, 53.65, and 103.65 years, respectively, after the beginning of the injection in the simulation domain of Xie et al. (2015a). While in Xie et al. (2015b), CO₂ plume moves 330, 550, 680, 780 m at 1,3,40, and 103 years respectively. Pressure buildup data matches well with the observed pressure profiles in both the studies. However, both studies indicate acceptable leakage of CO₂ i.e. 0.02 and 0.1% of injected CO₂ volume as the gas phase CO₂. Such a small fraction of the predicted CO₂ leakage was considered acceptable in this study as up to 2% of the injected volume was suggested valuable by van der Zwaan and Gerlagh, (2009). All these study clearly indicates that formation permeability is most important parameter which control the plume extension and risk of CO₂-brine leakage.

<Insert Table 1 here> Table 1: Summary of experimental studies reported CO₂ leakage at various sites around the globe.

4.0 CO₂-Brine Leakage and its Impact on Groundwater Flow Dynamics

The growing literature indicates that the variability in the pressure buildup, and CO₂-brine migration patterns in varying permeable zones of the storage formation causes significant leakage of pure/dissolved CO₂ and brine to shallow groundwater systems (Lions et al. 2014). A numerical

study performed by Nicot (2008) to investigate impact of pressure build-up due to the CO₂ injection on the groundwater system in the Gulf Coast Basin. Two case studies were performed by incorporating 1Mt CO₂/year/well and 2Mt CO₂/year/well injection rates in 50 injection wells for 50 years in MODFLOW by incorporating site specific aquifer parameters along with the groundwater evapotranspiration condition. This study indicates that the CO₂ injection equivalent to 50 million tons of CO₂/year for 50 years resulted in an average increases of the water table by ~1m with significant increase in the groundwater evapotranspiration. While the base flow of surface water bodies did not increase significantly in case of the actual base condition, but could increase by two fold for the high injection rate condition. Finally, the groundwater flow direction was reversed during the CO₂ injection from the bottom of the basin. Similarly, in Tokyo Bay study by Yamamoto et al. (2009) upward groundwater migration due to the injection of CO₂ was observed with maximum vertical pore velocities of about 50mm/year. The groundwater flow direction before injection was from the mountainous area toward Tokyo Bay, however, CO₂ injection changed the flow direction, especially in and around the reservoir.

Another significant study was performed by Bricker et al. (2012) to investigate the effect of CO₂ injection on the shallow groundwater table in the Sherwood Sandstone aquifer, UK using a groundwater flow model ZOOMQ3D. Injection of 15 Mt/year of the CO₂ for 20 years was considered into the Sherwood Sandstone Group (SSG) underlying zone to the Mercia Mudstone Group (MMG) and the Chalk group of aquifers. Four leakage scenarios were simulated by considering leakage coefficients, $C_z=0$ (MMG as perfect seal), $C_z=10^{-7}$ (Preferred leakage value), $C_z=10^{-6}$ (leakage increased by one order of magnitude), $C_z=10^{-8}$ (leakage reduced by one order of magnitude) and vertical hydraulic conductivity of 0, 10^{-6} , 10^{-5} , and 10^{-6} m/day, respectively (table 2). The results show that approximately 40Ml/day of saline water would leak out from the

formation to MMG even in case of preferred leakage. In case of $C_z=10^{-7}$, an increase of 0.01-10m and <1m was observed in groundwater heads in the potable confined aquifer and in the unconfined aquifer, respectively, with a corresponding increase in river flows by 10-15%. Sensitivity analysis fortifies that one-fold increase in leakage magnitude results in reduction of the groundwater heads of (un-) confined aquifers by two fold. However, if the leakage co-efficient reduces by one fold then there will be a five-fold increase in groundwater heads of (un-) confined aquifers. This indicate that the degree of impact on shallow groundwater systems is highly sensitive to the vertical leakage assigned to the caprock. Groundwater head increases of this proportion could result in the groundwater flooding in and around the Humber Estuary of the study area.

<Insert Table 2 here> Table 2: Summery of parameters and conditions used to simulate groundwater model by Bricker et al. (2012) to understand CO₂ leakage scenarios.

The upper shallow aquifer formation was not assign in simulation domain of Yamamoto et al. (2009) and Bricker et al. (2012). One can improve results of these study by incorporating more precise lithofacies and by considering upper heterogeneous shallow soil-water systems. Other major limitation of these studies was the single phase model approach which may cause variance in the results as Nicot (2008) reported about 10% and less than 20% variation in results if simulated using single phase models. Although, these study indicate regional scale variations in groundwater flow dynamics, it hasn't demonstrated local variations of the groundwater system. Table 3 listed summery of studies addressing the field and plume scale hydrological impacts of CO₂ injection and storage. To frame management plan and to improve the groundwater quality, it is important to understand the local impacts of such CO₂-brine leakage in the near surface environment.

<Insert Table 3 here> Table 3: Summery of studies addressing the field and plume scale hydrological impact of CO₂ injection and storage.

5.0 Groundwater Quality Concerns

CO₂ leakage from deep storage reservoirs may induce geochemical reactions and lead to degradation of (ground-) water quality, which is likely the greatest concern associated with CO₂ migration from deep storage sites to the near-surface environment. In past, variations in the groundwater geochemistry due to CO₂ leakage has been considered as a monitoring tool. However, the assessment of leak magnitudes leading to endangerment of the drinking water is still an area of active research (Wilson et al. 2007). A better understanding of impacts of CO₂ leakage on the groundwater quality help to frame a better management and remediation plan at CCS sites.

5.1 Mixing of the CO₂/Brine-Fresh Groundwater and Changes in the Groundwater Chemistry

Leakage of the CO₂/CO₂-enriched brine to a fresh aquifer might directly affect the groundwater chemical state by modifying (i) the pH, (ii) the redox potential and (iii) mobilization of inorganic and organic contaminants (Harvey et al. 2012; Lions et al. 2014). In general, the chemical reactions between the fresh groundwater-formation materials or by mixing of fresh groundwater-saline/CO₂ enriched waters alter the pH and the redox potential of fresh zone groundwater (Lions et al. 2014).

Precipitation and dissolution of minerals are dominating geochemical processes occurs in aquifers once scCO₂/CO₂-enriched brine leaked. In table 4, the host rock-water-scCO₂/CO₂ enrich brine interactions occurs during CO₂ injection, storage and its leakage are presented. Mixing of the CO₂/brine-fresh groundwater or dissolved CO₂ induced reactions forms H_2CO_3 (Reaction 2a) causing an imminent drop in the pH of the brine or the fresh groundwater. H_2CO_3 (acid) interact with minerals of the host rock like carbonate and rapidly buffer the pH (Reaction 2b). The bicarbonate ion may then dissociate to form the carbonic ion as in Reaction 4 (table 4) and later

these Carbonate ion form minerals like calcite (5a); magnesite (5b); and dolomite (5c). At a low pH (~4), the production of H_2CO_3 dominates and at a mid pH (~6), production of HCO_3^- dominates. However, at a high pH (~9) CO_3^{2-} production dominates. Cui et al. (2017) performed a laboratory experiments using rock samples from typical sandstone and carbonate reservoirs. Experimental results show that CO_2 can lead to the dissolution of ankerite and clay minerals and the precipitation of plagioclase, which can result in increases of Ca^{2+} and Mg^{2+} in the formation water of sandstone test. While in case of the carbonate test, CO_2 can induce the dissolution of dolomite and the precipitation of ankerite and calcite. Subsequently, the changes in the pH influence the dissolution of soil minerals (e.g., calcite, dolomite, K-feldspar, and plagioclase) as highlighted in reaction 6-9 of table 4. Furthermore, the dissolution of minerals can extend to the silicates as well as carbonates with examples for albite (reaction 10 and 11) and Fe-rich chlorite (reaction 12). There is growing literature on rock-water interactions in the near-well high saline environment as a result of the dissolution and precipitation, but only few studied has been reported in case of low-salinity environments. Farquhar et al. (2015) investigated CO_2 -water-rock interactions in a low-salinity reservoir system. This study indicates the partial dissolution and desorption of calcite, carbonates, chloritic clays and annite followed by the long term dissolutions of additional silicates, such as feldspars. Furthermore, the host mineral-dissolved CO_2 brine interaction in vadose zone or near surface environment has still not studied. Review article by Gaus (2010) present further details on rock-water interactions considering CO_2 injection and storage in formations.

<Insert Table 4 here> Table 4: Host rock-water- CO_2 / CO_2 enrich brine interactions occurs during CO_2 injection, storage and its leakage.

5.2 Drop in pH

Introduction of CO₂ or CO₂-rich brines in the fresh groundwater enhance the dissolution of CO₂ (CO₂(aq)) resulting in increase of carbonic acid (H₂CO₃) concentrations, followed by its deprotonation and thus in turn decreasing the pH of fresh groundwater. However, decrease in the pH depends on the nature of water-rock system due to the proton interactions with various solid phases in the soil-water system during the precipitation/dissolution and adsorption/desorption processes (Lions et al. 2014). Low pH condition due to increase in bicarbonate ion concentrations (HCO₃⁻) could lead the high saturation of water with respect to carbonate minerals and to the precipitation of minerals (Druckenmiller and Maroto-Valer, 2005). Carbonate, clay, and feldspars minerals tend to buffer the pH and cause the brine to be less acidic. Reaction 2 of table 4, can rapidly reach equilibrium under suitable conditions however the dissolution of these minerals characterize by slow reaction kinetics. Previous research indicates that the CO₂/CO₂-enriched brine significantly drop the pH, especially in sandy soils as these are more sensitive to an increase in CO₂ concentrations due to the low buffering capacity than the clay-rich soil with a higher buffering capacity (Harvey et al. (2012); Derakhshan-Nejad et al. 2019). In modeling studies by Birkholzer et al. (2008), Carroll et al. (2009) and Zheng et al. (2009) with CO₂ injections rates of 2.36, 10³-10⁶, and 2.36 tons of CO₂/year, respectively in the carbonate sedimentary, confined non-carbonate, confined carbonate aquifer indicate a drop of pH of ~2, ~2 and ~1.5 units respectively. Likewise, *In-situ* CO₂ experiment performed by injecting 300 kg of CO₂ (30 days) in the alluvial deposit by Kharaka et al. (2010) indicates a pH drop of about 1-1.4 units. Similarly, Lu et al. (2010) performed a laboratory experiment with and without carbonates by applying CO₂ bubbling for 15 days and observed a drop in pH of ~1.5-2.5 and ~1.5-2.2, respectively. Zheng et al. (2012) model the unconfined sandy aquifer at the Montana State University Zero Emission Research and

Technology (MSU-ZERT) field site and observed a pH drop of ~1-1.7 in groundwater. Further, a field based study in which 5700 ppm dissolved CO₂ was injected (30 days) in confined sandy aquifer by Trautz et al. (2012) show a pH drop of ~2.4-2.9 units. Similarly, Peter et al. (2012) perform *in-situ* experiment by injecting 787 kg of CO₂ at a depth of 18 m below surface level into a quaternary sand aquifer close to the town of Wittstock in the Northeast Germany. The results show that the total inorganic carbon concentrations increased and the pH decreased to a level of 5.1 (drop of ~0.8-1.8 units) after injection of CO₂. Another *in-situ* experiment was performed by Cahill and Jakobsen (2013) in which 45Kg of CO₂ was injected at 10 m depth in Aeolian and glacial sands at the Vrøgum field site. They observed a plume of depressed pH ranging 5.6-4.7, which indicates a drop of ~1.5 pH units. The study has shown that the CO₂ and or CO₂ enrich brine can alter the pH of groundwater of fresh aquifer but CO₂ gas stream can also change the pH conditions. A batch and column scale study performed by Wang et al. (2016) by injecting CO₂ gas into oxidizing carbonate aquifer indicates a drop of pH by two units. As pH decreases with CO₂ leakage, one can consider the pH monitoring in initial phase of CO₂ risk analysis at CCS sites. Similarly, alkalinity might also be used as a monitoring parameter. However, for small CO₂ release, the pH variation might be less than the detection limits. Likewise, the alkalinity of a solution may not be necessarily modified by CO₂ leakage and can be the results of water-rock interactions (Lions et al. 2014). Although there are numbers of study highlighted a drop of pH in the groundwater due to CO₂ leakage (all phase), it is also important to see how such changes affect the vadose zone water quality and plume of exiting pollutants, if any, under site specific conditions.

5.3 Alteration of Dissolved Organic Carbon (DOC)

Soil acidification due to release of CO₂ from the deep subsurface may alter the dissolved organic carbon (DOC) concentrations. The host soil has some buffering capacity, and it will exchange

extra H^+ with basic cations. This will lead to an increase in base cations in leachates and will further affect the quality of the water in the saturated zone. Organic soils have been found to have higher buffering capacity than the sub-surface mineral soils (Moonis et al. 2017). Composition is important because it is closely related to pH buffering, ion exchange, especially in case of mineral host soils (Lee et al. 2016). For example, Lime ($CaCO_3$) dominating host media may have high buffering capacity to against CO_2 -induced acidity than sandy soils. The combined influences of buffering capacity, injection amount of CO_2 , hydraulic characteristics may lead to alternation in the DOC concentration (Moonis et al. 2017). A study was performed by Kharaka et al. (2006; 2009), where 1600 tons of CO_2 was injected at 1500 m depth into a 24-m thick sandstone section of Frio Formation, US Gulf Coast. The DOC values obtained from the subarkosic fine-grained quartz and feldspar sandstone during the CO_2 injection increased moderately to 5–6 mg/L; the values however, increased unexpectedly by a factor of 100 in samples collected 20 days after injection stopped. Such variation in CO_2 injection induced DOC concentrations has high significance value to understand occurrence and fate of polar polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and BTEX compounds. Another study performed by Moonis et al. (2017) to investigate the impact of CO_2 leakage on DOC in different soils by applying 100% CO_2 for 32 days indicates that the DOC significantly increases in organic soil while decreases in mineral soil and alteration in DOC significantly affect mobilization of organics.

5.4 Mobilization of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs)

Leakage of the CO_2 in supercritical phase significantly mobilize non-to moderately PAHs compounds present in soil-water system as it is known to be an excellent solvent. For example, Hexane and benzene, small apolar and weakly monopolar PAHs have relatively the high solubility in the sc- CO_2 than small polar PAHs compounds such as acetic acid and phenol. Larger

compounds, longer chain of alkanes, large PAHs with a molecular weight greater than 200g/mol, have the low solubility in the sc-CO₂ (Burant et al. 2012). However, the solubility of organic compounds in the sc-CO₂ plume depends upon temperature, pressure and salinity. A review article by Burant et al. (2012) can be referred by the readers for more details on the partitioning behavior of organic contaminants in carbon storage environments. In this direction, a study performed by Scherf et al. (2011) by injecting the sc-CO₂ into the sandstone at the CO₂SINK site near Ketzin, Germany observed free and ester-bound fatty acids, especially *n*-hexadecanoic acid, *n*-octadecanoic, isomeric *n*-octadecenoic and *n*-octadecadienoic acids. Additionally, acetate, propionate, butanoic and pentanoic acid as well as lactic, pyruvic, and glycolic and gluconic acid were also detected in varying amounts in certain samples. Since CO₂ injection started, concentrations of these organic compounds were detected in the downhole fluid samples from observation wells. Similarly, Kharaka et al. (2006; 2009) observed a high concentration of formate, acetate, oxalate and toluene after CO₂ injection, however VOCs and semi-VOCs concentrations were low near the zone of injection wells. Results of previous studies indicates that the sc-CO₂ in the formation may significantly enhance the mobilization of hydrocarbons. Therefore, the mobilization of hydrocarbons from non-oil bearing saline aquifers could have major implications for the groundwater quality concern. Low pH induced increment in DOC and PAHs may significantly alter the metals and metalloids as a result of de-sorption of fresh groundwater systems (Zheng and Spycher, 2018). Likewise, the drop of pH, high DOC, PAHs accelerates the dissolution of calcite, and then the increase in the concentration of Ca triggers a series of cation-exchange reactions that cause an increase in the concentrations of metals and metalloids (Zheng et al. 2016). Further study is required to understand the role of the near surface environment on the mobilization of wide range of organic compounds due to the leakage of sc-CO₂/dissolved CO₂ into fresh

groundwater systems. Similarly, a better understanding of PAHs, n-alkane, MTBE and other organics on mobilization of metals and metalloids will help to predict future risk and planning related to management of CCS sites.

5.5 Mobilization of Metals and Metalloids

The mobilization of metals and metalloids are the major groundwater quality concern in case of CO₂ leakage from a storage site to the subsurface environment. The growing literature indicates that the presence of CO₂ and CO₂ enrich brine plume can modify the subsurface environment mainly by two mechanisms: (i) alteration of oxidation-reduction potential of the aquifer system and (ii) amending the sorption/desorption reactions. Unconfined aquifers can be either oxic in the upper part where redox potential is high, and anoxic at the bottom of the aquifer where redox potential is comparatively low and dynamic (Lions et al. 2014). The redox status of the groundwater system mainly controlled by two mechanisms: (i) dynamically fluctuating groundwater table conditions and/or (ii) contamination by oxidizing or reducing components such as O₂, organic matter, CH₄, and HS⁻ (McMahon and Chapelle, 2008; Lions et al. 2014). A rising water table towards unsaturated zone can replace the initial oxic condition by the anoxic condition leading to the decrease of redox potential in the saturated zone. In case of CO₂ injection or leakage, a rise in water table was reported by Nicot (2008) and other researchers (refer section 3.2). Thus, change in the redox status are expected due to introduction of oxidizing and/or reducing components due to the rise in the water table condition under the influence of CO₂ sequestration activities.

Leakage of brines significantly enhance the organic compounds (acetate, formate etc.) in the fresh groundwater zone (section 4.3) which serve as energy sources for the endogenous microorganisms in the aquifer zone. This energy induced microbial metabolic activity results in

the reduced concentration of electron acceptors (oxygen) in the aerobic zone. While in the anaerobic zones increased concentrations of organic compounds may lead to the increased iron, sulphate reduction and or methanogenesis (Lions et al. 2014). Furthermore, the co-injected substances can also be strongly oxidizing (i.e. O₂, SO₂, NO_x) or reducing (i.e. H₂S) agents. Recently, Zhang et al. (2019) observed changes in the redox condition due to injections of the SO₂ in the saline sandstone formation and their significant impacts on native microbes under co-injected SO₂ in CO₂ storage formations. It is evident from the literature survey that inadequate studies have been performed to characterize the impact of the co-injected substances on redox status of overlaying aquifers. Thus, advancing the monitoring techniques based on redox status along with impact of- (i) dynamically fluctuating water table and (ii) co-injected chemicals are active area of research to mitigate the risk of CO₂ into fresh overlaying aquifers.

Impacts of CO₂ leakage on metals and metalloids fall into two categories: (i) metal(loid)s that are of health concern drinking-water (e.g. As, Cd, Cr, Hg, Ni, Pb, Se) and (ii) that are of low or zero health concern (e.g. Al, Ba, B, Cu, Fe, Mn, F, Zn, Sb) are the major risk to the groundwater quality associated with the CO₂ geological storage. Indeed, these chemicals can be present naturally in soil-water systems as geochemical background and their concentrations depending upon the lithology. Table 5 is presented with a summary of *in situ* field, laboratory and modeling studies performed to investigate the impact of CO₂ leakage on the mobilization of metal(loid)s.

<Insert Table 5 here> Table 5: Summary of studies investigated role of CO₂/CO₂ enrich brine on mobilization of metalloids in fresh groundwater zone.

Indeed, CO₂ leakage into groundwater system could enhance the release of the initially sorbed metal(loid)s and or accelerate dissolution of minerals that contain it. Smyth et al. (2009) and Lu et al. (2010) performed batch scale experiments by applying the high CO₂ to the aquifer

media from the Texas Gulf Coast region. Results of these studies observed two types of response and then categories elements accordingly. Type-I: cations are Ca, Mg, Si, K, Sr, Mn, Ba, Co, B, Zn, which showed a fast increasing concentrations at the start of the CO₂ injection that become steady before the end of the experiment. While in case of type-II cations (Fe, Al, Mo, U, V, As, Cr, Cs, Rb, Ni and Cu) initial increases in their concentrations were observed followed by a decreases to values less than background level. Similarly, Little and Jackson, (2010) performed laboratory experiment for the CO₂ infiltration under oxidizing conditions through the freshwater aquifer media. It was observed that two fold of concentration was increases in case of the alkali, alkaline, Mn, Cb, Ni and Fe. While, the uranium and barium concentration kept increasing throughout experimental durations. Other laboratory experiments (table 5) were performed by Druckenmiller and Maroto-Valer (2005), Wei et al. (2011), Viswanathan et al. (2012), Humez et al. (2013), Wunsch et al. (2014), Kirsch et al. (2014), Farquhar et al. (2015), Pearce et al. (2015), Shao et al. (2015) and Wang et al. (2016) to investigate the impacts of CO₂ leakage on the mobilization of different metal and metalloid contaminants. These experiments evaluated various types of aquifer media such as essentially carbonate free (Varadharajan et al. 2012), carbonate-dominated (Wunsch et al.2014) under the varying conditions in terms of redox state (Varadharajan et al. 2012) oxidizing (Little and Jackson, 2010) and pressure conditions (Varadharajan et al. 2012, Humez et al. 2013), with reaction times ranging from a couple of days to months. Most of these study observed two types of behaviours of metals and metalloids, first increases rapidly after CO₂ injection and then stabilize with the time or in late phase of experiments. While, second types of contaminants concentration increases with the CO₂ injection and then decreases with the time or as pH stabilize (Smyth et al. 2009; Lu et al. 2010). Commonly, all of the above studies have highlighted increases in metals mobilization after the CO₂ introduction but reported less

concentrations than drinking water standards by the EPA or other agency (Kirsch et al. 2014). Dissolution of the host rock (for example calcite) or precipitation of minerals found to be the main driving mechanism of the high metals mobilization after the CO₂ introduction in laboratory setups. Although laboratory scale experiments enhance the understanding of the behavior of CO₂ on subsurface contaminants, they cannot accurately represent *in-situ* field conditions.




Figure 3: Concentrations of Mn, F, Br, Sr, Fe, Mg, and Ca in groundwater reported by Kharaka et al. (2010) from selected ZERT wells plotted as a function of time of sampling.

In field scale, Kharaka et al. (2010) performed CO₂ release test to investigate changes in the shallow groundwater at the ZERAT field site, where ~300 kg/day of CO₂ was injected. Groundwater samples were collected from 10 shallow monitoring wells for analysis of trace elements. It was observed that the concentrations of Ca, Mg, Fe, and Mn were increases significantly (Figure 3). Increases in Fe concentration was related to the dissolution of siderite (carbonate minerals) due to the acidification by the CO₂ injection. Fe and Mn are at the greatest

abundance in the groundwater and increase rapidly after the injection of CO₂ but it can decrease with time in the oxidizing zone. Likewise, Peter et al. (2012) observed water samples on a site where CO₂ was injected through three wells for 10 days at depth of 18 into aquifer in Northeast Germany. They showed a moderate increase (~15%-40%) in Ca, K, Mg and Fe and high increase (~120%-180%) in Al, Si, Mn in the groundwater. Similarly, an increase in concentrations of trace elements by ~260% and 320%~ for Ca and Mg, respectively were observed by Cahill and Jakobsen, (2013) at pilot test site (unconfined aquifer) in the Denmark. In this study, an increase of ~50% in Na and Si concentrations were observed along with ~730%, 370%, 330%, and 160% increment for Al, Ba, Sr, and Zn, respectively. In the Southern Norway, the groundwater assessment was performed by Gal et al. (2013) for a site where 6-day injection of CO₂ into a shallow glacio-fluvial aquifer at a depth of 20 m was done. They observed a significant increase in dissolved Ca and Si concentrations. A recent study by Choi, (2019) investigated the groundwater quality in the Chungcheong region (South Korea) where they studied leakage of CO₂ gas and CO₂-rich water into shallow aquifers. The study observed three different sites as-Group I (acidic CO₂-rich waters with low TDS), Group II (slightly acidic CO₂-rich waters with high TDS), and Group III (CO₂-poor waters with low TDS). Results of this study show that the concentration of trace elements (Al, Ba, Be, Cr, Cs, Fe, Mn, Ni, Rb, and U) in case of Group-I was is higher than Group-III. Whereas, concentration of Al, Mn (slightly) and Be (6.5 fold) exceeds the EPA drinking water limit. In addition, concentration of Fe and Mn exceed by 27.7 fold and 16.1 fold, respectively then the EPA drinking water limits. In conclusion, the understanding from both field and laboratory show an increase in the dissolved concentrations of metals and metalloids upon the CO₂ leakage into shallow aquifer zones. Mobilization of metals and metalloids especially As, Pb, Ba, Zn, Mn and Cd are more frequently in these studies. Although several studies have been performed to

investigate potential impacts of CO₂ on the groundwater quality or on the mobilization of metals and metalloids in saturated zone, it has not been demonstrated that how these pollutants in the vadose zone or the unsaturated zone at CCS sites behaves. Furthermore, there is lack of information on the connectivity of dynamic hydrological responses of subsurface and the mobilization of metals and metalloids under different CO₂ leakage conditions.

6.0 Impacts on Soil Microbes and Vegetation

Previous section of this manuscript demonstrated that the leaked CO₂ could significantly alter groundwater quality of the fresh groundwater zone (Refer table 5). Thus, it is important to assess potential impacts of the CO₂ leakage on near surface microorganisms and vegetation including crops, to make sure these impacts could be tolerated. Thus, this section of manuscript is focused to understand the impact of the CO₂ leakage on soil microorganisms, vegetation and crops.

6.1 Shifts in Microbial Communities

Intrusion of CO₂ into the biosphere may alter microbial community composition, thus understanding their response to short and long-term changes is crucial for ecological balance. In this direction, only few research studies have been performed to investigate the impact of CO₂ leakage on the soil microbial community in natural analogues (Beaubien et al. 2008; Krüger et al. 2009, 2011; Oppermann et al. 2010; Frerichs et al. 2013; Zhao et al. 2017) and at artificial CO₂ release sites (He et al. 2019). Table 6 present summery of studies performed to see impacts of CO₂ leakage on soil microbes and plants. Beaubien et al. (2008) investigated the impact of CO₂ on the bacterial populations near a naturally occurring CO₂ gas vent located in Mediterranean pasture ecosystem, Central Italy. Extremely low bacterial cell counts were observed in area of vent core (>90% CO₂) having high CO₂ flux and low plant cover. Bacteria cell counts increase as moved

away from the vent core. Likewise, Oppermann et al. (2010) investigated the compositions of microbial communities at the CO₂ vent (Beaubien et al. 2008) and at the reference site, using Q-PCR and observed that bacteria, archaea, and eukaryota decreased with increasing CO₂ concentration in the soil gas by 2-orders of magnitude. While, methanogens and SRB (anaerobic bacteria's) substantially increased in the CO₂-rich vent site. The family *Geobacteraceae* are anaerobes using Fe (III) were found less in two orders of magnitude at the CO₂ vent than at the reference site. Frerichs et al. (2013) observe that the bacterial sequences were affiliated to the *Betaproteobacteria*, *Acidobacteria* and *Bacilli*, while archaea to the *Thaumarchaeota*. They also report that the *Geobacteraceae* showed a significant decrease under high CO₂ concentrations. Likewise, Krüger et al. (2009, 2011) studied the impacts of CO₂ release from reservoir on abundance and diversity of microorganisms at a natural CO₂ vent at Laacher site in Germany and reported that the bacteria gene copies decrease from $9.6 \times 10^9 \text{ g}_{\text{dw}}^{-1}$ of soil at reference site to $8.7 \times 10^8 \text{ g}_{\text{dw}}^{-1}$ of soil towards the vent. While archaea were increased from control site towards the vent, with 7.7×10^6 and 6.5×10^7 gene copies $\text{g}_{\text{dw}}^{-1}$ of soil. Similar trends were also observed by Ziogou et al. (2013) at a natural CO₂ vent in Florina, Greece.

At the ZERT field site, Morales and Holben, (2013) investigated the impacts of CO₂ leakage on microbial functional groups in surface and near-surface soils. A significant alteration in microbial communities was observed due to the elevated CO₂ at ZERT field site. Seasonal variations of the soil moisture and temperature also play important role in microbial shifting. A reduction in free living-nitrogen fixer community was also observed at the elevated CO₂ site. Likewise, 16S rRNA genes sequencing studies have also been carried out by de Miera et al. (2014) at the Campo de Calatrava natural CO₂ site in Spain. It was observed that the relative abundance of *Chloroflexi* increases while the relative abundance of *Acidobacteria*, *Verrucomicrobia* and

Gemmatimonadetes phyla decreases as CO₂ flux increases. Within the *Chloroflexi* phylum, the genera *Thermogemmatispora*, *Ktedonobacter* and *Thermomicrobium* dominated bacterial communities sampled in sites with the highest CO₂ flux.

An artificial CO₂ release experiment was conducted on a farmland at the campus of China University of Mining and Technology, Xuzhou, China by Chen et al. (2017) to investigate the potential impacts on soil microbes. Fluxes of CO₂ were applied at different intensities (400-2000 g m⁻² d⁻¹) and 16S rRNA genes sequencing was performed. It was observed that the relative abundance of *Bacteroidetes* phylum decreases while the relative abundance of *Firmicutes*, *Acidobacteria* and *Chloroflexi* phyla increases as CO₂ flux increased. The abundances of *Acidobacteria* increased with increasing CO₂ leakage, which indicated that they might be potentially important indicators for the detection and resolution of gas leakage (in-line with results of Oppermann et al. 2010). However, Ma et al. (2017) found that the abundance of *Acidobacteria* and *Chloroflexi* phylum decreased with increased CO₂ flux, may be due to high abundance of *Proteobacteria* or other environmental conditions. Microbial shifting is not straightforward but these studies indicate that high molecular gene and microbiome sequencing can be an indicator to CO₂ leakage and risk evaluation. However, very little research has been focused towards the risk analysis of CO₂ seep at industrial CCS sites on soil archaea and bacteria from these environments.

<Insert Table 6 here> Table 6: Summary of studies performed to investigate impacts of the elevated CO₂ on soil microbes and vegetation.

6.2 Impacts on Vegetation

Like soil microbes, a better understanding of impacts of CO₂ leakage at CCS sites is important to evaluate risk, to restore sites and to manage resources. In this direction, Beaubien et al. (2008)

investigated the impact of CO₂ on the vegetation near a naturally occurring CO₂ gas vent located in Mediterranean pasture ecosystem, Central Italy. It was observed that vegetation distribution increases as we move away from the vent core. This fortifies that the high CO₂ flux significantly affects the biosphere at a site of naturally leaking CO₂. A study was performed by Male et al. (2010) to investigate the impact of CO₂ on vegetation using hyperspectral plant signatures during the 2008 ZERT CO₂ sequestration field experiment in Bozeman, Montana. During the experiment, the pure phase CO₂ was injected through a 100-m long horizontal well at a flow rate of 300 kg day⁻¹. On daily base from first day of injection, the spectral (visible-near infrared) signature of plants located inside and outside of CO₂ leakage zone was measured. Stress on plants was observed around the injection wells, which cover large area in the late phase of experiment. Similar observation was also reported by Krüger et al. (2011) at a terrestrial CO₂ vent at Laacher See, Germany. They observed that the dicotyledon is more sensitive than monocotyledon for CO₂ injection in a natural terrestrial CO₂ vent. Likewise, West et al. (2015) reported the impacts of elevated CO₂ on two different sites (Laacher See, Germany and Latera, Italy) located in the Mediterranean climatic zone. It was observed that *Agrostis capillaris* L. which is an acid tolerant grass starts growing on the edge of vent core. This indicate drop in pH, which support growth of such acid tolerant grass.

A field scale assessment of CO₂ leaking was performed by Zhao et al. (2017) at an experimental site in the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau and its impacts on the native vegetation, microorganisms, soil dwelling animals. Six sites as S002 (Blank), S03, S06, S10, S12 and S29 were selected for such analysis under the CO₂ leakage with different concentrations of 500ppm, 6000ppm, 18000ppm, 23000ppm, 12000ppm, and >112000ppm respectively. Plant quality under different CO₂ concentrations was determined by the soluble protein and the surge. Concentrations

of other parameters like catalase (CAT), peroxidase (POD), superoxide dismutase (SOD) and proline (PRO), chlorophyll a, b and carotenoids were also determined. The plant distribution advocates that *Agropyron cristatum*, *Equisetum ramosissimum* and *Artemisia indica* Willd, *Herba lxxeris* were increased in the high CO₂ concentration site, whereas *Agropyron cristatum* and *Plantago asiatica* were stable. However, the plant growth (total weight, stem length, number of leave and root length), except for *Herba lxxeris* and *Equisetum ramosissimum*, was high at the site where the CO₂ concentration was 66400 ppm.




Figure 4: The effect of elevated CO₂ on protein contents in *Argentina anserine* and *Plantago asiatica* at CO₂ leaking site in the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau.

For evaluating impacts of elevated CO₂ on physiological system, *Argentina anserina* and *Plantago asiatica* were selected. It was observed that both plant indicates a high stress even in case of lower CO₂ concentrations possibly due to the soil acidification. Likewise, no trend was observed for photosynthetic pigments including chlorophyll a, chlorophyll b and carotenoid in this study. In *Argentina anserine*, sugar concentrations decrease sharply with the higher CO₂ concentration. Figure 4 indicates that the protein (mg/g) was high in case of *Argentina anserine* and low in case

of *Plantago asiatica* located in plot having high CO₂ concentrations. This strengthens that the elevated CO₂ concentration significantly alter the protein contents of crop plant. Furthermore, it was also seen that starch content of wheat decreased from 70.93% to 61.75% in nearby farmlands. Very recently, He et al. (2019) performed a greenhouse experiment to investigate impact of high soil CO₂ on plant growth. A negative impact was observed on the root water absorption, chlorophyll, starch content and total biomass at the elevated CO₂. In conclusion, previous studies consistently reported that plants exposed to the high CO₂ showed significant impacts on its growth by reducing plant height, root length, leaf number, leaf area, seed number, pod number (Al-Traboulsi et al. 2012; Wu et al. 2014) and by altering physiological stress (Zhao et al. 2017). However, it is important to note that the most of these studies performed at natural analog, thus results of such studies may not be valid for assessment of the CO₂ leakage associated risks CCS sites.

7.0 Isotope and Geochemical Modeling for Assessing CO₂ Leakage

Geochemical modeling has been performed as monitoring tool for assessing scCO₂/CO₂-brine leakage and subsequently to understand hydrological and geochemical implications at natural analogue and industrial CO₂ geological storage sites (Gal et al. 2012). For geochemical studies, most commonly applied models are TOUGHREACT (Liu et al. 2019), TOUGH2/ECO2N (Zhou et al. 2010; Yamamoto et al. 2009), PHREEQC (Rillard et al. 2019), MODFLOW (Nicot, 2008), Sharp-interface model (Person et al. 2010), MINTEQA2 (Wang and Jaffe, 2004) and NUFT (Yang et al. 2019). These modelling tools were used to predict single and multiphase flow of CO₂ from different CCS sites, listed in table 3. Furthermore, such modeling approaches have also been applied for the predication of potential impact on fresh groundwater systems (Birkholzer et al. 2008; Zheng et al. 2009; Jones et al. 2015) and vadose zone. Recently, Liu et al. (2019) used

TOUGHREACT to predict the carbonates mineralization with CO₂ injection in unaltered and altered basalt formations. A good agreement between the computerized tomography (CT) scan results and TOUGHREACT modeling was observed which can reasonably describe the reaction of CO₂ and mineral carbonations. Similarly, Yang et al. (2019) successfully used Nonisothermal Unsaturated Flow and Transport (NUFT) code by coupling wellbore-leakage simulations to 3-D reactive, multi-phase flow of brine and CO₂ leakage plume migration in aquifers overlying the CO₂ storage reservoir. Results show that the carbonate alkalinity along with pressure monitoring can confirm CO₂ leakage more easily and help differentiate CO₂ seep from other sources. A detail review has been performed by Klusman (2011) to compare the surface and near-surface geochemical methods for detection of gas microseepage from CO₂ sequestration. Geochemical modeling based on isotopic analysis has also been a promising tool for CO₂ leakage detection, pathway identification and impact assessment in and around CCS sites.

Isotopic test has been performed in past using the dynamic characteristics of C, H, and O isotopes of CO₂, carbonates, silicates and water molecules (Gal et al. 2012; Flude et al. 2016). A study by Choi (2019) evaluated the impact of leaking CO₂ gas and CO₂-rich waters on groundwater quality at Daepyeong and Daejeong sites in the Chungcheong region, South Korea. It was observed that the CO₂-rich waters at the Daepyeong site have $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ - dissolved inorganic carbon values within the range of CO₂ from deep storage zone (ca. -1‰ to -8‰), which reveals that the CO₂ gas in CO₂- rich waters originated from deep source. Likewise, Kim et al. (2019) used carbon isotopic compositions to understand the flow path of CO₂ in Daepyeong area. A high soil CO₂ concentration (36%) flux (546.2 g/m²/d) and relatively high $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ -CO₂ (-5.7‰) revealed the origin of CO₂ to be deep-seated CO₂ and its pathway to be degassing from CO₂-rich water at the water table. Similar isotope study was performed at the Illinois Basin–Decatur Project carbon

sequestration site (Shao et al. 2019). They also observed relatively high $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CO}_2$ (~5‰) from deep formation. Recently, Amonette et al. (2019) performed column experiment to detect CO_2 leakage using noble-gas isotopes as tracer through a core collected from the proposed FutureGen 2.0 carbon storage site (Jacksonville, IL, USA). In which ratio of different noble-gas isotopes ($^4\text{He}/^{22}\text{Ne}$; $^{20}\text{Ne}/^{36}\text{Ar}$; $^{20}\text{Ne}/^{22}\text{Ne}$; $^{21}\text{Ne}/^{22}\text{Ne}$; $^{38}\text{Ar}/^{36}\text{Ar}$; $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{26}\text{Ar}$; $^{84}\text{Kr}/^{26}\text{Ar}$; $^{132}\text{Xe}/^{84}\text{Kr}$) in control site and atmosphere were used to understand leakage dynamics.

Even small leakage or microseepage can be detected using noble-gas isotopes tracer in field conditions (Klusman, 2011). Recently, Ju et al. (2019) used Kr, He, Ar as tracers to evaluate the CO_2 leakage at K-COSEM site, South Korea. PHREEQC was used to model $p\text{CO}_2$ using alkalinity, pH, temperature, major cation and anion concentrations as input parameters. They successfully demonstrated a relatively small amount of CO_2 saturated groundwater spiked with He and Kr tracers into a shallow aquifer. Readers can get further details on noble-gas isotopes application in CO_2 leakage and impact evaluation in following studies: Stalker et al. (2009); Myers et al. (2013); Amonette et al. (2014); Jenkins et al. (2015); McIntosh et al. (2018). Although it has been reported that noble-gas isotopes can be easily applied to detect CO_2 leakage, however in-depth investigations of its behaviors will also be required as some may not be completely conservative, for example Sulfur hexafluoride. In future, further work is required to develop more realistic frame-work for selection of appropriate geochemical modeling and isotope analysis approaches for groundwater and vadose zone as many soil biochemical processes creates noise in measurements, especially in biogenic interferences.

8.0 Conclusive Remarks

An effort has been made to review literatures on the leakage of CO_2 and CO_2 enrich brine from the storage formation and its potential impacts on the groundwater quality, soil microbes and

plants. It was observed that 1) a significant leakage of CO₂/CO₂ enrich brine through faults, fractures and wells (injection and abandoned) has been experienced by many CCS projects in past, 2) a non-isothermal, two-phase and multicomponent flow occurred once the CO₂ leak into fresh aquifers, 3) the leakage of CO₂/brine may significantly affect groundwater flow regimes, 4) the mixing of CO₂/brine and potable aquifer water may alter pH (generally drop of pH) and redox potential conditions, however such changes also depends on host rock conditions, 5) alteration of the DOC and mobilization of subsurface pollutants (organics and inorganics) has been experienced in previous studies, 6) two type of nature in cations were observed, one group increases once CO₂ leaked and remain stable while second group increases after CO₂ leakage and thereafter decreases with time, 7) the soil acidification due to the CO₂ leakage may significantly affect soil microbes by alternating their metabolic activities and the mutation, 8) the plant also gets affected by reducing plant height, root length, leaf number, leaf area, seed number and 9) the accelerated metalloids and organic compound (like BTEX) may increases the human health risk. Based on the knowledge developed by reviewing literature here, four main directions for future research have been listed as-

1) A proper subsurface characterization and demonstrative evaluation of impacts of CO₂ leakage is required before the implementation of large scale CCS projects. Subsurface characterizations must include- i) pilot/lab scale investigations of two phase/multiphase flow of CO₂ under varying subsurface conditions ii) incorporation of realistic groundwater table and flow dynamics iii) CO₂ flow behaviors in vadose zone iv) understanding of bio-geo chemical interactions of the (un)-saturated zone. While, in case of demonstrative evaluation of impacts of CO₂ leakage, realistic experimentations are required by conducting the controlled plot scale performance of CO₂ injection in subsurface.

2) There is a need to develop further understanding of behaviors of multi-pollutants under dynamically CO₂ leakage conditions by performing plot/lab scale experiments and numerical modeling.

3) More research is needed for the accurate prediction of risk of CO₂ and CO₂ enrich brine on soil microbes, plants and on human for the short and long time scale. In past, most of risk analysis were based on either small scale laboratory case or hypothetical case based on large number of assumptions. Only few studies have been reported on human health risk assessment, which needed further evaluation for realistic CCS sites.

4) Management and remediation of polluted resources in and around the CCS sites is an important topic of interest and strongly recommended for future research works. More research is needed to develop remediation technologies to reduce the risk of elevated metalloids and organic contaminations in highly acidic and saline subsurface environment.

Conflicts of Interest: No any

Data Availability

No data, models, or code were generated or used during the study (e.g., opinion or data-less paper).

Acknowledgement: Helps from Writing and Communication Center and the library of University of Waterloo are well acknowledged. Author would like to thank the Editor-in-Chief and anonymous reviewer for the valuable comments that enabled much improvement to this paper.

REFERENCES

807 Al-Traboulsi, M., Sjögersten, S., Colls, J., Steven, M., and Black, C., (2012). Potential impact of
808 CO₂ leakage from carbon capture and storage systems on field bean (*Vicia faba*). *Physiologia*
809 *plantarum*. 146(3), 261-271.

810 Amonette, J. E., Johnson, T. A., Spencer, C. F., Zhong, L., Szecsody, J. E., & Vermeul, V. R.
811 (2014). Geochemical Monitoring Considerations for the FutureGen 2.0 Project. *Energy*
812 *Procedia*, 63, 4095-4111.

813 Amonette, J. E., Zhong, L., Darrah, T. H., Grove, B. S., & Cole, D. R. (2019). Noble and major
814 gases released from rock core materials as intrinsic tracers for detecting carbon dioxide leakage—
815 Laboratory evaluation. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 89, 76-88.

816 André, L., Audigane, P., Azaroual, M., and Menjoz, A., (2007). Numerical modeling of fluid–rock
817 chemical interactions at the supercritical CO₂–liquid interface during CO₂ injection into a
818 carbonate reservoir, the Dogger aquifer (Paris Basin, France). *Energy conversion and*
819 *management*. 48(6), 1782-1797.

820 Atchley, A. L., Maxwell, R. M., & Navarre-Sitchler, A. K. (2013). Human health risk assessment
821 of CO₂ leakage into overlying aquifers using a stochastic, geochemical reactive transport
822 approach. *Environmental science & technology*, 47(11), 5954-5962.

823 Bacci, G., Durucan, S., & Korre, A. (2013). Experimental and numerical study of the effects of
824 halite scaling on injectivity and seal performance during CO₂ injection in saline aquifers. *Energy*
825 *Procedia*, 37, 3275-3282.

826 Bacci, G., Korre, A., & Durucan, S. (2011). Experimental investigation into salt precipitation
827 during CO₂ injection in saline aquifers. *Energy Procedia*, 4, 4450-4456.

828 Barrio, M., Bakk, A., Grimstad, A. A., Querendez, E., Jones, D. G., Kuras, O., ... & Baudin, E.
829 (2014). CO₂ migration monitoring methodology in the shallow subsurface: Lessons learned from
830 the CO₂FIELDLAB project. *Energy Procedia*, 51, 65-74.

831 Beaubien, S. E., Ciotoli, G., Coombs, P., Dictor, M. C., Krüger, M., Lombardi, S., ... & West, J.
832 M. (2008). The impact of a naturally occurring CO₂ gas vent on the shallow ecosystem and soil
833 chemistry of a Mediterranean pasture (Latera, Italy). *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas*
834 *Control*, 2(3), 373-387.

835 Bergman, P. D., & Winter, E. M. (1995). Disposal of carbon dioxide in aquifers in the US. *Energy*
836 *Conversion and Management*, 36(6-9), 523-526.

837 Birkholzer, J. T., & Zhou, Q. (2009). Basin-scale hydrogeologic impacts of CO₂ storage: Capacity
838 and regulatory implications. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 3(6), 745-756.

839 Birkholzer, J., Apps, J., Zheng, L., Zhang, Y., Xu, T., Tsang, C.-F., 2008. Research Project on
840 CO₂ Geological Storage and Groundwater Resources: Large-scale Hydrogeological Evaluation
841 and Impact on Groundwater Systems, Annual Report October 1, 2007 to September 30, 2008.
842 Report, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA, USA.

843 Blackford, J., Stahl, H., Bull, J. M., Bergès, B. J., Cevatoglu, M., Lichtschlag, A., ... & Naylor, M.
844 (2014). Detection and impacts of leakage from sub-seafloor deep geological carbon dioxide
845 storage. *Nature climate change*, 4(11), 1011.

846 Bricker, S. H., Barkwith, A. K. A. P., MacDonald, A. M., Hughes, A. G., & Smith, M. (2012).
847 Effects of CO₂ injection on shallow groundwater resources: A hypothetical case study in the
848 Sherwood Sandstone aquifer, UK. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 11, 337-348.

849 Bruant, R., Guswa, A., Celia, M., & Peters, C. (2002). Safe Storage of CO₂ in Deep Saline
850 Aquifers. *Environmental Science and Technology-Washington DC-*, 36(11), 240A-245A.

851 Burant, A., Lowry, G. V., & Karamalidis, A. K. (2012). Partitioning behavior of organic
852 contaminants in carbon storage environments: a critical review. *Environmental Science and*
853 *Technology*, 47(1), 37-54.

854 Burnside, N. M., Shipton, Z. K., Dockrill, B., & Ellam, R. M. (2013). Man-made versus natural
855 CO₂ leakage: A 400 ky history of an analogue for engineered geological storage of
856 CO₂. *Geology*, 41(4), 471-474.

857 Cahill, A. G., & Jakobsen, R. (2013). Hydro-geochemical impact of CO₂ leakage from geological
858 storage on shallow potable aquifers: A field scale pilot experiment. *International Journal of*
859 *Greenhouse Gas Control*, 19, 678-688.

860 Cahill, A. G., Marker, P., & Jakobsen, R. (2014). Hydrogeochemical and mineralogical effects of
861 sustained CO₂ contamination in a shallow sandy aquifer: A field-scale controlled release
862 experiment. *Water Resources Research*, 50(2), 1735-1755.

863 Carroll, S., Hao, Y., & Aines, R. (2009). Transport and detection of carbon dioxide in dilute
864 aquifers. *Energy Procedia*, 1(1), 2111-2118.

865 Chen, F., Yang, Y., Ma, Y., Hou, H., Zhang, S., & Ma, J. (2016). Effects of CO₂ leakage on soil
866 bacterial communities from simulated CO₂-EOR areas. *Environmental Science: Processes &*
867 *Impacts*, 18(5), 547-554.

868 Chen, F., Zhang, W., Ma, J., Yang, Y., Zhang, S., & Chen, R. (2017). Experimental study on the
869 effects of underground CO₂ leakage on soil microbial consortia. *International Journal of*
870 *Greenhouse Gas Control*, 63, 241-248.

871 Choi, B. Y. (2019). Potential impact of leaking CO₂ gas and CO₂-rich fluids on shallow
872 groundwater quality in the Chungcheong region (South Korea): A hydrogeochemical
873 approach. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 84, 13-28.

874 Cihan, A., Birkholzer, J. T., & Bianchi, M. (2015). Optimal well placement and brine extraction
875 for pressure management during CO₂ sequestration. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas*
876 *Control*, 42, 175-187.

877 Cui, G., Zhang, L., Tan, C., Ren, S., Zhuang, Y., & Enechukwu, C. (2017). Injection of
878 supercritical CO₂ for geothermal exploitation from sandstone and carbonate reservoirs: CO₂–
879 water–rock interactions and their effects. *Journal of CO₂ Utilization*, 20, 113-128.

880 de Miera, L. E. S., Arroyo, P., de Luis Calabuig, E., Falagán, J., & Ansola, G. (2014). High-
881 throughput sequencing of 16S RNA genes of soil bacterial communities from a naturally occurring
882 CO₂ gas vent. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 29, 176-184.

883 Derakhshan-Nejad, Z., Sun, J., Yun, S. T., & Lee, G. (2019). Potential CO₂ intrusion in near-
884 surface environments: a review of current research approaches to geochemical
885 processes. *Environmental geochemistry and health*, 1-26.

886 Druckenmiller, M. L., & Maroto-Valer, M. M. (2005). Carbon sequestration using brine of
887 adjusted pH to form mineral carbonates. *Fuel Processing Technology*, 86(14-15), 1599-1614.

888 Duan, B., Zhang, Y., Xu, G., Chen, J., Paquette, A., & Peng, S. (2015). Long-term responses of
889 plant growth, soil microbial communities and soil enzyme activities to elevated CO₂ and
890 neighbouring plants. *Agricultural and forest meteorology*, 213, 91-101.

891 Famiglietti, J. S. (2014). The global groundwater crisis. *Nature Climate Change*, 4(11), 945.

892 Farquhar, S. M., Pearce, J. K., Dawson, G. K. W., Golab, A., Sommacal, S., Kirste, D., ... &
893 Golding, S. D. (2015). A fresh approach to investigating CO₂ storage: Experimental CO₂–water–
894 rock interactions in a low-salinity reservoir system. *Chemical Geology*, 399, 98-122.

895 Feitz, A., Jenkins, C., Schacht, U., McGrath, A., Berko, H., Schroder, I., Noble, R., Kuske, T.,
896 George, S., Heath, C., Zegelin, S., Curnow, S., Zhang, H., Sirault, X., Jimenez-Berni, J., Hortle,
897 A., (2014). An assessment of near surface CO₂ leakage detection techniques under Australian
898 conditions. *Energy Procedia* 63, 3891-3906.

899 Figueroa, J. D., Fout, T., Plasynski, S., McIlvried, H., and Srivastava, R. D. (2008). Advances in
900 CO₂ capture technology—the US Department of Energy's Carbon Sequestration
901 Program. *International journal of greenhouse gas control*, 2(1), 9-20.

902 Flude, S., Johnson, G., Gilfillan, S. M., & Haszeldine, R. S. (2016). Inherent tracers for carbon
903 capture and storage in sedimentary formations: composition and applications. *Environmental*
904 *science & technology*, 50(15), 7939-7955.

905 Frerichs, J., Oppermann, B. I., Gwosdz, S., Möller, I., Herrmann, M., & Krüger, M. (2013).
906 Microbial community changes at a terrestrial volcanic CO₂ vent induced by soil acidification and
907 anaerobic microhabitats within the soil column. *FEMS microbiology ecology*, 84(1), 60-74.

908 Fritz, B., Jacquot, E., Jacquemont, B., Baldeyrou-Bailly, A., Rosener, M., & Vidal, O. (2010).
909 Geochemical modelling of fluid–rock interactions in the context of the Soultz-sous-Forêts
910 geothermal system. *Comptes Rendus Geoscience*, 342(7-8), 653-667.

911 Gal, F., Brach, M., Braibant, G., Bény, C., & Michel, K. (2012). What can be learned from natural
912 analogue studies in view of CO₂ leakage issues in Carbon Capture and Storage applications?
913 Geochemical case study of Sainte-Marguerite area (French Massif Central). *International Journal*
914 *of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 10, 470-485.

915 Gal, F., Michel, K., Pokryszka, Z., Lafortune, S., Garcia, B., Rouchon, V., ... & Radilla, G. (2014).
916 Study of the environmental variability of gaseous emanations over a CO₂ injection pilot—
917 Application to the French Pyrenean foreland. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas*
918 *Control*, 21, 177-190.

919 Gal, F., Proust, E., Humez, P., Braibant, G., Brach, M., Koch, F., ... & Girard, J. F. (2013). Inducing
 920 a CO₂ leak into a shallow aquifer (CO₂FieldLab EUROGIA+ project): Monitoring the CO₂ plume
 921 in groundwaters. *Energy Procedia*, 37, 3583-3593.

922 Gasparini, A., Credo, A., Grandia, F., Garcia, D. A., & Bruno, J. (2015). Experimental and
 923 numerical modeling of CO₂ leakage in the vadose zone. *Greenhouse Gases: Science and*
 924 *Technology*, 5(6), 732-755.

925 Gaus, I. (2010). Role and impact of CO₂–rock interactions during CO₂ storage in sedimentary
 926 rocks. *International journal of greenhouse gas control*, 4(1), 73-89.

927 Guodong, C. U. I., Shaoran, R. E. N., Zhang, L., Bo, R. E. N., Zhuang, Y., Xin, L. I., ... & Zhang,
 928 P. (2016). Formation water evaporation induced salt precipitation and its effect on gas production
 929 in high temperature natural gas reservoirs. *Petroleum Exploration and Development*, 43(5), 815-
 930 824.

931 Guyant, E., Han, W. S., Kim, K. Y., Park, M. H., & Kim, B. Y. (2015). Salt precipitation and
 932 CO₂/brine flow distribution under different injection well completions. *International Journal of*
 933 *Greenhouse Gas Control*, 37, 299-310.

934 Harvey, O. R., Qafoku, N. P., Cantrell, K. J., Lee, G., Amonette, J. E., & Brown, C. F. (2012).
 935 Geochemical implications of gas leakage associated with geologic CO₂ storage: A qualitative
 936 review. *Environmental science & technology*, 47(1), 23-36.

937 He, W., Yoo, G., Moonis, M., Kim, Y., & Chen, X. (2019). Impact assessment of high soil CO₂
 938 on plant growth and soil environment: a greenhouse study. *PeerJ*, 7, e6311.

939 Herzog, H. J. (2001). Peer reviewed: what future for carbon capture and sequestration?.
 940 *Environmental Science and Technology*

941 Hu, L., Bayer, P., & Brauchler, R. (2016). Detection of carbon dioxide leakage during injection in
 942 deep saline formations by pressure tomography. *Water Resources Research*, 52(7), 5676-5686.

943 Humez, P., Lagneau, V., Lions, J., & Negrel, P. (2013). Assessing the potential consequences of
 944 CO₂ leakage to freshwater resources: A batch-reaction experiment towards an isotopic tracing
 945 tool. *Applied geochemistry*, 30, 178-190.

946 Jenkins, C., Chadwick, A., & Hovorka, S. D. (2015). The state of the art in monitoring and
 947 verification—ten years on. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 40, 312-349.

948 Jin, M., Ribeiro, A., Mackay, E., Guimarães, L., & Bagudu, U. (2016). Geochemical modelling of
 949 formation damage risk during CO₂ injection in saline aquifers. *Journal of Natural Gas Science
 950 and Engineering*, 35, 703-719.

951 Jones, D. G., Beaubien, S. E., Blackford, J. C., Foekema, E. M., Lions, J., De Vittor, C., ... &
 952 Queirós, A. M. (2015). Developments since 2005 in understanding potential environmental
 953 impacts of CO₂ leakage from geological storage. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas
 954 Control*, 40, 350-377.

955 Ju, Y., Beaubien, S. E., Lee, S. S., Kaown, D., Hahm, D., Lee, S., ... & Lee, K. K. (2019).
 956 Application of natural and artificial tracers to constrain CO₂ leakage and degassing in the K-
 957 COSEM site, South Korea. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 86, 211-225.

958 Kharaka, Y. K., Cole, D. R., Hovorka, S. D., Gunter, W. D., Knauss, K. G., & Freifeld, B. M.
 959 (2006). Gas-water-rock interactions in Frio Formation following CO₂ injection: Implications for
 960 the storage of greenhouse gases in sedimentary basins. *Geology*, 34(7), 577-580.

961 Kharaka, Y. K., Thordsen, J. J., Hovorka, S. D., Nance, H. S., Cole, D. R., Phelps, T. J., & Knauss,
 962 K. G. (2009). Potential environmental issues of CO₂ storage in deep saline aquifers: Geochemical
 963 results from the Frio-I Brine Pilot test, Texas, USA. *Applied Geochemistry*, 24(6), 1106-1112.

964 Kharaka, Y. K., Thordsen, J. J., Kakouros, E., Ambats, G., Herkelrath, W. N., Beers, S. R., ... &
 965 Trautz, R. C. (2010). Changes in the chemistry of shallow groundwater related to the 2008
 966 injection of CO₂ at the ZERT field site, Bozeman, Montana. *Environmental Earth
 967 Sciences*, 60(2), 273-284.

968 Kharaka, Y., Thordsen, J., Abedini, A., Beers, S., & Thomas, B. (2017). Changes in the chemistry
 969 of groundwater reacted with CO₂: Comparison of laboratory results with the ZERT field
 970 pilot. *Procedia Earth and Planetary Science*, 17, 241-244.

971 Kim, C. Y., Han, W. S., Park, E., Jeong, J., & Xu, T. (2018). CO₂ leakage-induced contamination
 972 in shallow potable aquifer and associated health risk assessment. *Geofluids*, 2018.

973 Kim, J., Yu, S., Yun, S. T., Kim, K. H., Kim, J. H., Shinn, Y. J., & Chae, G. (2019). CO₂ leakage
 974 detection in the near-surface above natural CO₂-rich water aquifer using soil gas
 975 monitoring. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 88, 261-271.

976 Kim, M., Sell, A., & Sinton, D. (2013). Aquifer-on-a-Chip: understanding pore-scale salt
 977 precipitation dynamics during CO₂ sequestration. *Lab on a Chip*, 13(13), 2508-2518.

978 Kim, Y. J., He, W., Ko, D., Chung, H., & Yoo, G. (2017a). Increased N₂O emission by inhibited
 979 plant growth in the CO₂ leaked soil environment: Simulation of CO₂ leakage from carbon capture
 980 and storage (CCS) site. *Science of the Total Environment*, 607, 1278-1285.

981 Kirsch, K., Navarre-Sitchler, A. K., Wunsch, A., & McCray, J. E. (2014). Metal release from
 982 sandstones under experimentally and numerically simulated CO₂ leakage
 983 conditions. *Environmental science & technology*, 48(3), 1436-1442.

984 Klusman, R. W. (2003). Rate measurements and detection of gas microseepage to the atmosphere
 985 from an enhanced oil recovery/sequestration project, Rangely, Colorado, USA. *Applied*
 986 *Geochemistry*, 18(12), 1825-1838.

987 Klusman, R. W. (2011). Comparison of surface and near-surface geochemical methods for
 988 detection of gas microseepage from carbon dioxide sequestration. *International Journal of*
 989 *Greenhouse Gas Control*, 5(6), 1369-1392.

990 Krüger, M., Jones, D., Frerichs, J., Oppermann, B. I., West, J., Coombs, P., ... & Strutt, M. (2011).
 991 Effects of elevated CO₂ concentrations on the vegetation and microbial populations at a terrestrial
 992 CO₂ vent at Laacher See, Germany. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 5(4), 1093-
 993 1098.

994 Krüger, M., West, J., Frerichs, J., Oppermann, B., Dictor, M. C., Jouliand, C., ... & May, F. (2009).
 995 Ecosystem effects of elevated CO₂ concentrations on microbial populations at a terrestrial CO₂
 996 vent at Laacher See, Germany. *Energy Procedia*, 1(1), 1933-1939.

997 Lassen, R. N., Sonnenborg, T. O., Jensen, K. H., & Looms, M. C. (2015). Monitoring CO₂ gas-
 998 phase migration in a shallow sand aquifer using cross-borehole ground penetrating
 999 radar. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 37, 287-298.

1000 Lee, K. K., Lee, S. H., Yun, S. T., & Jeon, S. W. (2016). Shallow groundwater system monitoring
 1001 on controlled CO₂ release sites: a review on field experimental methods and efforts for CO₂
 1002 leakage detection. *Geosciences Journal*, 20(4), 569-583.

1003 Lewicki, J. L., Birkholzer, J., & Tsang, C. F. (2007). Natural and industrial analogues for leakage
 1004 of CO₂ from storage reservoirs: identification of features, events, and processes and lessons
 1005 learned. *Environmental Geology*, 52(3), 457.

1006 Lie, K. A., Nilsen, H. M., Andersen, O., & Møyner, O. (2016). A simulation workflow for large-
 1007 scale CO₂ storage in the Norwegian North Sea. *Computational Geosciences*, 20(3), 607-622.

1008 Lions, J., Devau, N., De Lary, L., Dupraz, S., Parmentier, M., Gombert, P., & Dictor, M. C. (2014).
 1009 Potential impacts of leakage from CO₂ geological storage on geochemical processes controlling
 1010 fresh groundwater quality: a review. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 22, 165-
 1011 175.

1012 Little, M. G., & Jackson, R. B. (2010). Potential impacts of leakage from deep CO₂
 1013 geosequestration on overlying freshwater aquifers. *Environmental science & technology*, 44(23),
 1014 9225-9232.

1015 Liu, D., Agarwal, R., Li, Y., & Yang, S. (2019). Reactive transport modeling of mineral
 1016 carbonation in unaltered and altered basalts during CO₂ sequestration. *International Journal of*
 1017 *Greenhouse Gas Control*, 85, 109-120.

1018 Lu, J., Partin, J. W., Hovorka, S. D., & Wong, C. (2010). Potential risks to freshwater resources as
 1019 a result of leakage from CO₂ geological storage: a batch-reaction experiment. *Environmental*
 1020 *Earth Sciences*, 60(2), 335-348.

1021 Ma, J., Zhang, W., Zhang, S., Zhu, Q., Feng, Q., & Chen, F. (2017). Short-term effects of CO₂
 1022 leakage on the soil bacterial community in a simulated gas leakage scenario. *PeerJ*, 5, e4024.

1023 Male, E. J., Pickles, W. L., Silver, E. A., Hoffmann, G. D., Lewicki, J., Apple, M., ... & Burton,
 1024 E. A. (2010). Using hyperspectral plant signatures for CO₂ leak detection during the 2008 ZERT
 1025 CO₂ sequestration field experiment in Bozeman, Montana. *Environmental Earth Sciences*, 60(2),
 1026 251-261.

1027 McIntosh, J. C., Hendry, M. J., Ballentine, C., Haszeldine, R. S., Mayer, B., Etiope, G., ... &
1028 Stalker, L. (2018). A Critical Review of State-of-the-Art and Emerging Approaches to Identify
1029 Fracking-Derived Gases and Associated Contaminants in Aquifers. *Environmental science &*
1030 *technology*, 53(3), 1063-1077.

1031 McMahon, P. B., & Chapelle, F. H. (2008). Redox processes and water quality of selected principal
1032 aquifer systems. *Groundwater*, 46(2), 259-271.

1033 Michael, K., Golab, A., Shulakova, V., Ennis-King, J., Allinson, G., Sharma, S., & Aiken, T.
1034 (2010). Geological storage of CO₂ in saline aquifers—A review of the experience from existing
1035 storage operations. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 4(4), 659-667.

1036 Miri, R., and Hellevang, H. (2016). Salt precipitation during CO₂ storage—A
1037 review. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 51, 136-147.

1038 Molari, M., Guilini, K., Lott, C., Weber, M., de Beer, D., Meyer, S., ... & Cibic, T. (2018). CO₂
1039 leakage alters biogeochemical and ecological functions of submarine sands. *Science*
1040 *advances*, 4(2), eaao2040.

1041 Moni, C., & Rasse, D. P. (2014). Detection of simulated leaks from geologically stored CO₂ with
1042 ¹³C monitoring. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 26, 61-68.

1043 Moonis, M., He, W., Kim, Y., & Yoo, G. (2017). Effect of potential CO₂ leakage from carbon
1044 capture and storage sites on soil and leachate chemistry. *KSCE Journal of Civil*
1045 *Engineering*, 21(5), 1640-1647.

1046 Moonis, M., He, W., Kim, Y., & Yoo, G. (2017). Effect of potential CO₂ leakage from carbon
1047 capture and storage sites on soil and leachate chemistry. *KSCE Journal of Civil*
1048 *Engineering*, 21(5), 1640-1647.

1049 Morales, S. E., & Holben, W. E. (2013). Functional response of a near-surface soil microbial
1050 community to a simulated underground CO₂ storage leak. *PloS one*, 8(11), e81742.

1051 Muller, N., Qi, R., Mackie, E., Pruess, K., & Blunt, M. J. (2009). CO₂ injection impairment due
1052 to halite precipitation. *Energy procedia*, 1(1), 3507-3514.

1053 Myers, M., Stalker, L., Pejicic, B., & Ross, A. (2013). Tracers—Past, present and future applications
1054 in CO₂ geosequestration. *Applied Geochemistry*, 30, 125-135.

1055 Navarre-Sitchler, A. K., Maxwell, R. M., Siirila, E. R., Hammond, G. E., & Lichtner, P. C. (2013).
1056 Elucidating geochemical response of shallow heterogeneous aquifers to CO₂ leakage using high-
1057 performance computing: Implications for monitoring of CO₂ sequestration. *Advances in Water*
1058 *Resources*, 53, 45-55.

1059 Newmark, R. L., Friedmann, S. J., & Carroll, S. A. (2010). Water challenges for geologic carbon
1060 capture and sequestration. *Environmental management*, 45(4), 651-661.

1061 Nicot, J. P. (2008). Evaluation of large-scale CO₂ storage on fresh-water sections of aquifers: An
1062 example from the Texas Gulf Coast Basin. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas*
1063 *Control*, 2(4), 582-593.

1064 Nooraiepour, M., Fazeli, H., Miri, R., & Hellevang, H. (2018, October). Salt Precipitation During
1065 Injection of CO₂ into Saline Aquifers: Lab-on-Chip Experiments on Glass and Geomaterial
1066 Microfluidic Specimens. In *14th Greenhouse Gas Control Technologies Conference*
1067 *Melbourne* (pp. 21-26).

1068 Oh, J., Kim, K. Y., Han, W. S., Kim, T., Kim, J. C., & Park, E. (2013). Experimental and numerical
1069 study on supercritical CO₂/brine transport in a fractured rock: Implications of mass transfer,
1070 capillary pressure and storage capacity. *Advances in Water Resources*, 62, 442-453.

1071 Oppermann, B. I., Michaelis, W., Blumenberg, M., Frerichs, J., Schulz, H. M., Schippers, A., ...
1072 & Krüger, M. (2010). Soil microbial community changes as a result of long-term exposure to a
1073 natural CO₂ vent. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 74(9), 2697-2716.

1074 Ott, H., de Kloe, K., Taberner, C., Marcelis, F., Wang, Y., & Makurat, A. (2010, October).
1075 Rock/fluid interaction by injection of supercritical CO₂/H₂S: Investigation of dry-zone formation
1076 near the injection well. In *International Symposium of the Society of Core Analysts, Halifax, Nova*
1077 *Scotia, Canada*.

1078 Ott, H., Snippe, J., De Kloe, K., Husain, H., & Abri, A. (2013). Salt precipitation due to SC-gas
1079 injection: single versus multi-porosity rocks. *Energy Procedia*, 37, 3319-3330.

1080 Pan, L., Oldenburg, C. M., Pruess, K., & Wu, Y. S. (2011). Transient CO₂ leakage and injection
 1081 in wellbore-reservoir systems for geologic carbon sequestration. *Greenhouse Gases: Science and*
 1082 *Technology*, 1(4), 335-350.

1083 Patil, R. H., Colls, J. J., & Steven, M. D. (2010). Effects of CO₂ gas as leaks from geological
 1084 storage sites on agro-ecosystems. *Energy*, 35(12), 4587-4591.

1085 Pearce, J. K., Law, A. C., Dawson, G. K., & Golding, S. D. (2015). SO₂–CO₂ and pure CO₂
 1086 reactivity of ferroan carbonates at carbon storage conditions. *Chemical Geology*, 411, 112-124.

1087 Person, M., Banerjee, A., Rupp, J., Medina, C., Lichtner, P., Gable, C., ... & Bense, V. (2010).
 1088 Assessment of basin-scale hydrologic impacts of CO₂ sequestration, Illinois basin. *International*
 1089 *Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 4(5), 840-854.

1090 Peter, A., Lamert, H., Beyer, M., Hornbruch, G., Heinrich, B., Schulz, A., Geistlinger, H.,
 1091 Schreiber, B., Dietrich, P., Werban, U. and Vogt, C., (2012). Investigation of the geochemical
 1092 impact of CO₂ on shallow groundwater: design and implementation of a CO₂ injection test in
 1093 Northeast Germany. *Environmental Earth Sciences*, 67(2), 335-349.

1094 Peter, A., Lamert, H., Beyer, M., Hornbruch, G., Heinrich, B., Schulz, A., ... & Vogt, C. (2012).
 1095 Investigation of the geochemical impact of CO₂ on shallow groundwater: design and
 1096 implementation of a CO₂ injection test in Northeast Germany. *Environmental Earth*
 1097 *Sciences*, 67(2), 335-349.

1098 Peysson, Y., André, L., & Azaroual, M. (2014). Well injectivity during CO₂ storage operations in
 1099 deep saline aquifers—Part 1: Experimental investigation of drying effects, salt precipitation and
 1100 capillary forces. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 22, 291-300.

1101 Pezard, P. A., Denchik, N., Lofi, J., Perroud, H., Henry, G., Neyens, D., ... & Levannier, A. (2016).
 1102 Time-lapse downhole electrical resistivity monitoring of subsurface CO₂ storage at the Maguelone
 1103 shallow experimental site (Languedoc, France). *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas*
 1104 *Control*, 48, 142-154.

1105 Pruess, K., & Müller, N. (2009). Formation dry-out from CO₂ injection into saline aquifers: 1.
 1106 Effects of solids precipitation and their mitigation. *Water Resources Research*, 45(3).

1107 Rillard, J., Loisy, C., Le Roux, O., Cerepi, A., Garcia, B., Noirez, S., ... & Bertrand, C. (2015).
 1108 The DEMO-CO₂ project: A vadose zone CO₂ and tracer leakage field experiment. *International*
 1109 *Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 39, 302-317.

1110 Rillard, J., Pourret, O., Censi, P., Inguaggiato, C., Zuddas, P., Toulhoat, P., ... & Brusca, L. (2019).
 1111 Behavior of rare earth elements in an aquifer perturbed by CO₂ injection: Environmental
 1112 implications. *Science of the total environment*, 687, 978-990.

1113 Ringrose, P. S., Mathieson, A. S., Wright, I. W., Selama, F., Hansen, O., Bissell, R., ... & Midgley,
 1114 J. (2013). The In Salah CO₂ storage project: lessons learned and knowledge transfer. *Energy*
 1115 *Procedia*, 37, 6226-6236.

1116 Roberts, J. J., & Stalker, L. (2017). What have we learned about CO₂ leakage from field injection
 1117 tests?. *Energy Procedia*, 114, 5711-5731.

1118 Roberts, J. J., & Stalker, L. (2017). What have we learned about CO₂ leakage from field injection
 1119 tests?. *Energy Procedia*, 114, 5711-5731.

1120 Scherf, A. K., Zetzl, C., Smirnova, I., Zettlitzer, M., & Vieth-Hillebrand, A. (2011). Mobilisation
 1121 of organic compounds from reservoir rocks through the injection of CO₂—comparison of baseline
 1122 characterization and laboratory experiments. *Energy Procedia*, 4, 4524-4531.

1123 Shao, H., Qafoku, N. P., Lawter, A. R., Bowden, M. E., & Brown, C. F. (2015). Coupled
 1124 geochemical impacts of leaking CO₂ and contaminants from subsurface storage reservoirs on
 1125 groundwater quality. *Environmental science & technology*, 49(13), 8202-8209.

1126 Shao, H., Ussiri, D. A., Patterson, C. G., Locke II, R. A., Wang, H., Taylor, A. H., & Cohen, H. F.
 1127 (2019). Soil gas monitoring at the Illinois Basin–Decatur Project carbon sequestration
 1128 site. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 86, 112-124.

1129 Shukla, R., Ranjith, P., Haque, A., & Choi, X. (2010). A review of studies on CO₂ sequestration
 1130 and caprock integrity. *Fuel*, 89(10), 2651-2664.

1131 Siirila, E. R., & Maxwell, R. M. (2012). A new perspective on human health risk assessment:
 1132 Development of a time dependent methodology and the effect of varying exposure
 1133 durations. *Science of the Total Environment*, 431, 221-232.

1134 Siirila, E. R., Navarre-Sitchler, A. K., Maxwell, R. M., & McCray, J. E. (2012). A quantitative
 1135 methodology to assess the risks to human health from CO₂ leakage into groundwater. *Advances*
 1136 *in Water Resources*, 36, 146-164.

1137 Smith, K. L., Steven, M. D., Jones, D. G., West, J. M., Coombs, P., Green, K. A., ... & Beaubien,
 1138 S. E. (2013). Environmental impacts of CO₂ leakage: recent results from the ASGARD facility,
 1139 UK. *Energy Procedia*, 37, 791-799.

1140 Smith, K. L., Steven, M. D., Jones, D. G., West, J. M., Coombs, P., Green, K. A., ... & Beaubien,
 1141 S. E. (2013). Environmental impacts of CO₂ leakage: recent results from the ASGARD facility,
 1142 UK. *Energy Procedia*, 37, 791-799.

1143 Smyth, R. C., Hovorka, S. D., Lu, J., Romanak, K. D., Partin, J. W., Wong, C., & Yang, C. (2009).
 1144 Assessing risk to fresh water resources from long term CO₂ injection—laboratory and field
 1145 studies. *Energy Procedia*, 1(1), 1957-1964.

1146 Spangler, L. H., Dobeck, L. M., Repasky, K. S., Nehrir, A. R., Humphries, S. D., Barr, J. L., ... &
 1147 Benson, S. M. (2010). A shallow subsurface controlled release facility in Bozeman, Montana,
 1148 USA, for testing near surface CO₂ detection techniques and transport models. *Environmental*
 1149 *Earth Sciences*, 60(2), 227-239.

1150 Stalker, L., Boreham, C., Perkins, E., (2009). A review of tracers in monitoring CO₂ breakthrough:
 1151 properties, uses, case studies, and novel tracers. AAPG Studies in Geology Carbon Dioxide
 1152 Sequestration in Geological media Vol. 59. pp. 595–608.

1153 Strokal, M., Spanier, J. E., Kroeze, C., Koelmans, A. A., Flörke, M., Franssen, W., ... & Wada, Y.
 1154 (2019). Global multi-pollutant modelling of water quality: scientific challenges and future
 1155 directions. *Current opinion in environmental sustainability*, 36, 116-125.

1156 Tang, Y., Yang, R., & Kang, X. (2018). Modeling the effect of water vaporization and salt
 1157 precipitation on reservoir properties due to carbon dioxide sequestration in a depleted gas
 1158 reservoir. *Petroleum*, 4(4), 385-397.

1159 Tian, D., Ma, X., Zha, L., Wu, Y., Zou, X., & Hou, X. (2013). Review of impact of CO₂ leakage
 1160 from geologic storage on near-surface terrestrial ecological system. *Journal of Ecology and Rural*
 1161 *Environment*, 29(2), 137-145.

1162 Torp, T. A., & Gale, J. (2004). Demonstrating storage of CO₂ in geological reservoirs: The
 1163 Sleipner and SACS projects. *Energy*, 29(9-10), 1361-1369.

1164 Trautz, R.C., Pugh, J.D., Varadharajan, C., Zheng, L., Bianchi, M., Nico, P.S., Spycher, N.F.,
 1165 Newell, D.L., Esposito, R.A., Wu, Y. and Dafflon, B., (2012). Effect of dissolved CO₂ on a
 1166 shallow groundwater system: A controlled release field experiment. *Environmental science &*
 1167 *technology*, 47(1), 298-305.

1168 Van der Meer, L. G. H. (1992). Investigations regarding the storage of carbon dioxide in aquifers
 1169 in the Netherlands. *Energy Conversion and management*, 33(5-8), 611-618.

1170 van der Zwaan, B., & Gerlagh, R. (2009). Economics of geological CO₂ storage and
 1171 leakage. *Climatic change*, 93(3-4), 285-309.

1172 Varadharajan, C., Tinnacher, R. M., Pugh, J. D., Trautz, R. C., Zheng, L., Spycher, N. F., ... &
 1173 Nico, P. S. (2013). A laboratory study of the initial effects of dissolved carbon dioxide (CO₂) on
 1174 metal release from shallow sediments. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 19, 183-
 1175 211.

1176 Viswanathan, H., Dai, Z., Lopano, C., Keating, E., Hakala, J. A., Scheckel, K. G., ... & Pawar, R.
 1177 (2012). Developing a robust geochemical and reactive transport model to evaluate possible sources
 1178 of arsenic at the CO₂ sequestration natural analog site in Chimayo, New Mexico. *International*
 1179 *Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 10, 199-214.

1180 Wainwright, H. M., Finsterle, S., Zhou, Q., & Birkholzer, J. T. (2013). Modeling the performance
 1181 of large-scale CO₂ storage systems: A comparison of different sensitivity analysis
 1182 methods. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 17, 189-205.

1183 Wang, G., Qafoku, N. P., Lawter, A. R., Bowden, M., Harvey, O., Sullivan, C., & Brown, C. F.
 1184 (2016). Geochemical impacts of leaking CO₂ from subsurface storage reservoirs to an unconfined
 1185 oxidizing carbonate aquifer. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 44, 310-322.

1186 Wang, S., & Jaffe, P. R. (2004). Dissolution of a mineral phase in potable aquifers due to CO₂
 1187 releases from deep formations; effect of dissolution kinetics. *Energy conversion and*
 1188 *management*, 45(18-19), 2833-2848.

1189 Wei, Y., Maroto-Valer, M., & Steven, M. D. (2011). Environmental consequences of potential
1190 leaks of CO₂ in soil. *Energy Procedia*, 4, 3224-3230.

1191 West, J. M., Jones, D. G., Annunziatellis, A., Barlow, T. S., Beaubien, S. E., Bond, A., ... &
1192 Gemeni, V. (2015). Comparison of the impacts of elevated CO₂ soil gas concentrations on selected
1193 European terrestrial environments. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 42, 357-
1194 371.

1195 West, J. M., Pearce, J. M., Coombs, P., Ford, J. R., Scheib, C., Colls, J. J., ... & Steven, M. D.
1196 (2009). The impact of controlled injection of CO₂ on the soil ecosystem and chemistry of an
1197 English lowland pasture. *Energy Procedia*, 1(1), 1863-1870.

1198 Wilkin, R. T., & DiGiulio, D. C. (2010). Geochemical impacts to groundwater from geologic
1199 carbon sequestration: controls on pH and inorganic carbon concentrations from reaction path and
1200 kinetic modeling. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 44(12), 4821-4827.

1201 Wilson, E. J., Friedmann, S. J., & Pollak, M. F. (2007). Research for deployment: Incorporating
1202 risk, regulation, and liability for carbon capture and sequestration.

1203 Wu, Y., Ma, X., Li, Y. E., & Wan, Y. F. (2014). The impacts of introduced CO₂ flux on
1204 maize/alfalfa and soil. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 23, 86-97.

1205 Wunsch, A., Navarre-Sitchler, A. K., Moore, J., & McCray, J. E. (2014). Metal release from
1206 limestones at high partial-pressures of CO₂. *Chemical Geology*, 363, 40-55.

1207 Xiao, T., McPherson, B., Pan, F., Esser, R., Jia, W., Bordelon, A., & Bacon, D. (2016). Potential
1208 chemical impacts of CO₂ leakage on underground source of drinking water assessed by
1209 quantitative risk analysis. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 50, 305-316.

1210 Xie, J., Zhang, K., Hu, L., Pavelic, P., Wang, Y., & Chen, M. (2015b). Field-based simulation of
1211 a demonstration site for carbon dioxide sequestration in low-permeability saline aquifers in the
1212 Ordos Basin, China. *Hydrogeology Journal*, 23(7), 1465-1480.

1213 Xie, J., Zhang, K., Hu, L., Wang, Y., & Chen, M. (2015a). Understanding the carbon dioxide
1214 sequestration in low-permeability saline aquifers in the Ordos Basin with numerical
1215 simulations. *Greenhouse Gases: Science and Technology*, 5(5), 558-576.

1216 Yamamoto, H., Zhang, K., Karasaki, K., Marui, A., Uehara, H., & Nishikawa, N. (2009).
 1217 Numerical investigation concerning the impact of CO₂ geologic storage on regional groundwater
 1218 flow. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 3(5), 586-599.

1219 Yang, X., Lassen, R. N., Jensen, K. H., & Looms, M. C. (2015). Monitoring CO₂ migration in a
 1220 shallow sand aquifer using 3D crosshole electrical resistivity tomography. *International Journal*
 1221 *of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 42, 534-544.

1222 Yang, Y. M., Dilmore, R. M., Mansoor, K., Buscheck, T. A., & Bromhal, G. S. (2019). Integration
 1223 of wellbore pressure measurement and groundwater quality monitoring to enhance detectability of
 1224 brine and CO₂ leakage. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 85, 143-155.

1225 Zhang, F., Song, Y., Li, C., Zhang, S., Lyu, C., & Fan, K. (2019). The Impact of Indigenous
 1226 Microorganisms on the Mineral Corrosion and Mineral Trapping in the SO₂ Co-injected CO₂-
 1227 Saline-Sandstone Interaction. *Geomicrobiology Journal*, 36(2), 110-122.

1228 Zhao, R., Cheng, J., & Zhang, K. (2012). CO₂ plume evolution and pressure buildup of large-scale
 1229 CO₂ injection into saline aquifers in Sanzhao Depression, Songliao Basin, China. *Transport in*
 1230 *porous media*, 95(2), 407-424.

1231 Zhao, X., Deng, H., Wang, W., Han, F., Li, C., Zhang, H., & Dai, Z. (2017). Impact of naturally
 1232 leaking carbon dioxide on soil properties and ecosystems in the Qinghai-Tibet plateau. *Scientific*
 1233 *reports*, 7(1), 3001.

1234 Zheng, L., & Spycher, N. (2018). Modeling the potential impacts of CO₂ sequestration on shallow
 1235 groundwater: The fate of trace metals and organic compounds before and after leakage
 1236 stops. *Greenhouse Gases: Science and Technology*, 8(1), 161-184.

1237 Zheng, L., Apps, J. A., Zhang, Y., Xu, T., & Birkholzer, J. T. (2009). On mobilization of lead and
 1238 arsenic in groundwater in response to CO₂ leakage from deep geological storage. *Chemical*
 1239 *geology*, 268(3-4), 281-297.

1240 Zheng, L., Apps, J.A., Spycher, N., Birkholzer, J.T., Kharaka, Y.K., Thordsen, J., Beers, S.R.,
 1241 Herkelrath, W.N., Kakouros, E. and Trautz, R.C., (2012). Geochemical modeling of changes in
 1242 shallow groundwater chemistry observed during the MSU-ZERT CO₂ injection
 1243 experiment. *International journal of greenhouse gas control*, 7, 202-217.

1244 Zheng, L., Spycher, N., Bianchi, M., Pugh, J. D., Varadharajan, C., Tinnacher, R. M., ... & Trautz,
1245 R. C. (2016). Impacts of elevated dissolved CO₂ on a shallow groundwater system: Reactive
1246 transport modeling of a controlled-release field test. *Chemical Geology*, 447, 117-132.

1247 Zhou, Q., & Birkholzer, J. T. (2011). On scale and magnitude of pressure build-up induced by
1248 large-scale geologic storage of CO₂. *Greenhouse Gases: Science and Technology*, 1(1), 11-20.

1249 Zhou, Q., Birkholzer, J. T., Mehnert, E., Lin, Y. F., & Zhang, K. (2010). Modeling basin-and
1250 plume-scale processes of CO₂ storage for full-scale deployment. *Groundwater*, 48(4), 494-514.

1251 Ziogou, F., Gemeni, V., Koukoulzas, N., De Angelis, D., Libertini, S., Beaubien, S. E., ... &
1252 Barlow, T. S. (2013). Potential environmental impacts of CO₂ leakage from the study of natural
1253 analogue sites in Europe. *Energy Procedia*, 37, 3521-3528.

1254 Zoback, M. D., & Gorelick, S. M. (2012). Earthquake triggering and large-scale geologic storage
1255 of carbon dioxide. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(26), 10164-10168.



DSPACE

<https://dspace.org/>

Leakage of CO₂ from geological storage and its impacts on fresh soil–water systems: a review

Gupta, Pankaj Kumar; Yadav, Basant

2020-03-03

Elsevier

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-020-08203-7>

Gupta PK, Yadav B. (2020) Leakage of CO₂ from geological storage and its impacts on fresh soil–water systems: a review. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, Volume 27, April 2020, pp. 12995-13018