



research into impacts & safety in CO₂ storage



A Guide to Impacts of Potential Leaks from CO₂ Storage

Jonathan Pearce
BGS




research into impacts & safety in CO₂ storage

Talk outline

- Rationale and motivation
- Concepts
- Impacts in marine environments
- Impacts in terrestrial environments
- Conclusions
- Recommendations

Rationale

- With appropriate characterisation, design, construction and monitoring leakages from storage sites are unlikely
- RISCS has examined credible scenarios for leakage.
- However it will be necessary for operators to demonstrate they have considered potential impacts, have mitigated the risks and are capable of appropriate monitoring and remediation.
- RISCS is producing a Impacts of Potential Leaks from CO₂ Storage




Motivation

- What to consider when appraising potential impacts in the event of leakage from a storage site
- How to evaluate the potential impacts at the various stages of a storage project development: design stage, construction, operation, post-injection and to enable transfer of site liability to the competent authority
- Options for directly assessing the potential scales (temporal and areal, realistic leakage ranges (fluxes, masses)) and ecosystem responses
- Options for identifying, predicting and verifying the nature of impacts


RISCs research into impacts & safety in CO₂ storage

Leakage patterns


a. Point emission at surface (e.g. leaking well)




b. Arrays of point emissions at surface (e.g. multiple linear pathways in a fault zone)



c. Diffuse emission at surface caused by diffuse leakage from depth (unclear how could occur)



d. Diffuse emission at surface caused by one or more linear leakage paths at depth, but dispersion of CO₂ in shallow unconsolidated sediments (more likely than c.).



5


RISCs research into impacts & safety in CO₂ storage

Marine impacts

Marine response summarised (1)

Chemical/physical response

- pH shift/acidification
- No oxygen depletion
- Area affected proportionate to the leakage flux
- Efficient mixing reduces impact



01/05/2014

Final meeting, Nov 2013, Paris

Marine response summarised (2)

Microbial response (increasing primary producers)

- Rapid planktonic/microbial response
- Benthic cyanobacteria



01/05/2014

Final meeting, Nov 2013, Paris

Marine response summarised (3)

Macro faunal response

- Increased energy need to maintain homeostasis
- Shell erosion
- Different sensitivity of species (calcifiers \rightleftharpoons prim. producers)
- Early life stages more sensitive





01/05/2014

Final meeting, Nov 2013, Paris

Marine response summarised (4)

Community response

- Depends on exposure vs duration
- Benthic community shifts can be expected (10 wks at pH <7.5)
- Higher sensitivity expected at less favourable conditions




01/05/2014


Final meeting, Nov 2013, Paris

Suggestions for Site characterisation

- Year round pH measurements
- Identification of potentially sensitive species / structures / functions
- Characterise the composition of the benthic community
- Characterise the age distribution of long living bivalves



01/05/2014



Final meeting, Nov 2013, Paris




Ocean quahog
(*Arctica islandica*)


Suggestions for monitoring (1)

Chemical/physical

- pH measurements (+ O₂ and T)
- Detection of CO₂ bubble streams
- Changes in chl-a/primary production in the water column?





01/05/2014



Suggestions for monitoring (2)

Biological

- Development of algal/cyanobacteria mats
Reduced settlement of juvenile bivalves
- Signs of erosion on bivalve and gastropod shells
- Behavioural responses ?



01/05/2014

Final meeting, Nov 2013, Paris

Suggestions for remediation

- **Stop the leak asap**
- Prevent bottom disturbing fisheries
- Trust on nature's high recovery potential



01/05/2014

Final meeting, Nov 2013, Paris

Consequences for site selection

- Locations with limited water mixing or risk for stratification
 - Higher exposure levels
 - Reduced re-colonisation capacity
- Ecosystems substantially depended on calcifying organisms
 - Corals, shell fish beds
 - Structure and function
- Ecosystems under pressure
 - By natural stressors, e.g. low salinity, oxygen depletion,
 - By anthropogenic (pollutants) stressors (heavy metals!)

Terrestrial impacts

Methods



Our approach:

- To develop different leakage scenario and reference environment to provide context for experiment and modelling
- To conduct:
 - Studies at experimental sites in Norway and the UK
 - Lab experiments in Norway
 - Field observations in Greece
- To compare results with:
 - previous studies (e.g. Latera, Laacher See) → CO2GeoNet, CO2ReMoVe
 - Results from other projects (CO2 Field Lab, COOLTRANS)
- To provide input for modelling, experimental design and to extend scope of research

17

Studied sites and experiments

18




Process of CO₂ dispersion in unsaturated soil and atmosphere

21


ASGARD 2012

Continuous measurements:

- Meteorological parameters
- Soil gas and flux
- Close correspondence between flux and concentration
- No clear association with specific meteorological event



ASGARD 2011



Diurnal cycles:

- Turbulent mixing during the day
- Photosynthesis interruption at night

23


Leaking CO₂ within the soil-atmosphere continuum

Results

- It was possible to track the injected CO₂ in the soil-canopy-atmosphere continuum
- Leakage was localised and was diluted quickly in the atmosphere
- Isotopic labelling allow to identify 3 zones of CO₂ transfers in soil

Grimsrud Farm, Norway

24



RISC5 research into impacts & safety in CO₂ storage

Effects of CO₂ leakage on Crops

25

RISC5 CO₂ impact on plant Health

60 x 60 cm grid sampling pattern

Hyperspectral monitoring

Agricultural stress index = fct (NDVI, PRI, WBI)

NDVI → Chlorophyll (Photosynthesis)
PRI → Carotenoid pigment (Light use efficiency)
WBI → Water content

- CO₂ leakage had a stress effect on the oats crop which was visible on the oats spectral signature

significantly correlated (P<0.001)

CO₂ flux (ml.m⁻².min⁻¹)

Control

- Agricultural stress index → Good indicator for CO₂ stressed vegetation

26

ASGARD: 2012 results



Autumn sown barley

Stress signs visible after **two weeks** of gassing

- Yellowing of the leaves
- Bare patch in the high gas zone



Autumn sown oil seed rape (Canola)


No visible symptoms

Oppose 2010 results with spring sown OSR


- Purple discoloration / 7 days of gassing

→ Difference of root system establishment²⁷

Biomass of Barley 2012



Biomass of oilseed rape 2012



28

RISCs ASGARD: Crop biomass summary



	Oilseed rape (Spring)	Oilseed rape (Autumn)	Barley (Spring)	Barley (Autumn)	Beetroot
Plant / Stem no.	↔	↔	↓	↓	↔
Height	↓	↔	↓	↓	
Stem dry weight	↓	↔	↓	↓	
Pod / Grain no.	↓	↓	↓	↓	
Leaf dry weight	↓				↓

29

RISCs research into impacts & safety in CO₂ storage

Effects of CO₂ leakage on pastures

30



Conclusions – CO₂ impacts on Pasture

CO ₂ concentration	Plant coverage	Microbiology
Below 10%	Little change.	None observed.
15-20%	Grass coverage increasing.	
Above 20%	Grasses predominant. Indicator plants appearing (dicots!).	Increase in microbial activity.
20-50%		Microbial community changes in natural sites.
Above 50%	Decreasing vegetation. Bare patches.	Acidophilic, anaerobic communities (methane and SRB).

- **Not climate specific.**
- **Unknown impacts on soil fertility.**
- **Microbiological community changes not seen in pristine sites.**

33

Overall conclusions for terrestrial impacts

- Impacts spatially limited - small effect on overall yield with implications for monitoring
- Fertilisation effects may counteract the impact
- Effects are due to soil gas accumulation rather than atmospheric [CO₂] (rapid dispersion in atmosphere)
- Impact mostly caused by high [CO₂], but is also caused by the low soil [O₂] resulting from replacement by CO₂
- Impact only above ~10% CO₂ at 20 cm
- Effects rapid (1-4 weeks), recovery and impact on long-term fertility less clear

34

Overall conclusions for terrestrial impacts

- Different species sensitivity (better bioindicators or indicator species)
- Plant development stage and timing of exposure important
- Effects blurred by seasonal/annual factors
- Effects can be used for monitoring
(limitations → effect could be seasonal and not CO₂-specific)
- Impacts appear to be manageable & small compared with other climatic/meteorological factors or pests

35

Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions

- Leakage is of low probability if site selection, characterisation and storage project design are undertaken correctly.
- Our research (& others) indicates that there are no reasons why storage could not take place in any of the environments that have been studied.
- Potential impacts will be further reduced by careful site selection and monitoring.

Conclusions

- Current evidence would suggest that if leaks were to occur they would tend to be localised.
- Impacts from CO₂ leakage are expected to be relatively small compared to impacts caused by other stressors.
- The scale of the likely impacts means that they are considered manageable both by the ecosystem and by relevant stakeholders (operators and regulators).



Conclusions

- Onshore:
 - For some environments certain species may indicate the scale of an impact and the efficacy of any remediation.
 - Monitoring technologies have been developed and tested that allow the impacts of CO₂ in terrestrial environments to be assessed.
- Offshore
 - Natural recovery in dynamic marine systems is expected to be rapid i.e. within one 'growing cycle'.
 - The timing and duration of the exposure will influence the scale of the impact.




Conclusions

- Leaks may have a cumulative, additional impact on ecosystems already stressed by other factors.
- Marginal systems might have larger negative responses than systems that are not as stressed.
- In terrestrial systems, replanting of crops should be possible in affected areas once leakage has ceased, as no long term effects are expected.
 - Longer term recovery of pasture land has not been evaluated.

Recommendations

- Potential impacts that might arise from a leak must be evaluated.
- Evaluation of risks of leakage and potential impacts should be undertaken at each site.
- Designated reference sites, both onshore and offshore, could provide ongoing baseline data against which storage sites can be compared.
 - Sites managed via joint industry initiatives may enable a smaller number of reference sites to be used by several storage projects.



Recommendations

- Monitoring a number of parameters allows separation of natural variations from leakage
 - nitrogen, oxygen and isotopic contents of soil gas
 - temperature and oxygen in marine systems
- Baselines are fundamental to demonstrating site performance.
 - Account for full range of natural variation, which may occur over more than one year.
 - Changes due to other external factors should also be taken into account.
- Affected areas will be small in size and will occur in very localised areas (up to a few 10s m²)
 - Groups of these seeps might occur along fault zones.
 - Monitoring must be able to detect leaks at these scales in large areas.

c. Diffuse emission at surface caused by one or more linear leakage paths at depth, but dispersion of CO₂ in shallow unconsolidated sediments

