**DOI**: 10.16285/j.rsm.2017.S1.021

# CO<sub>2</sub>地质封存泄漏研究进展

谢 健<sup>1</sup>,魏 宁<sup>2</sup>,吴礼舟<sup>1,3</sup>,张可霓<sup>4</sup>,许 模<sup>1,3</sup>

(1. 成都理工大学 环境与土木工程学院,四川 成都610059;2. 中国科学院武汉岩土力学研究所,湖北 武汉430071;

3. 成都理工大学 地质灾害防治与地质环境保护国家重点实验室,四川 成都 610059;4. 同济大学 机械与能源工程学院,上海 200092)

摘 要: $CO_2$ 地质封存(GCS)是一项将  $CO_2$ 注入并且永久封存于地下含水层或废弃油气储层等地质体内的  $CO_2$  减排技术。由于场地地质条件和人类开发活动导致的不确定性,注入储层的  $CO_2$  可通过泄漏废弃井、断层或裂缝以及盖层的"薄弱带"等途径发生泄漏。基于对国内外文献的广泛调研,综述了 GCS 泄漏及封存安全的研究进展。 $CO_2$  沿钻井泄漏一般是因为化学或力学作用导致  $CO_2$  沿钻井环空水泥、井筒桥塞或围岩破碎带发生泄漏。 $CO_2$  注入储层可能导致盖层破裂,激活原本闭合的断层或断层面滑动。 $CO_2$  沿断层/裂缝泄漏主要受有效渗透率、裂缝开度等因素影响。盖层泄漏的方式可归纳为渗透泄漏、扩散泄漏和沿裂隙泄漏 3 种。 $CO_2$  透过盖层的扩散泄漏对于大时空尺度  $CO_2$  地质封存泄漏评估不应忽视。 $CO_2$  泄漏通常会导致受影响的含水层内地下水的 PH 值减小、盐度升高、离子增多等地球化学响应,甚至存在自由态  $CO_2$ 。含水层内流体压力和地球化学特征可用于有效监测封存  $CO_2$ 、咸水与其他流体的泄漏。GCS 泄漏研究目前还十分有限,我国尤其缺乏泄漏的定量研究。

关 键 词: $CO_2$  捕集和封存(CCS);  $CO_2$  地质封存(GCS); 泄漏; 封存安全; 咸水层

中图分类号:TU 473.1 文献标识码:A 文章编号:1000 - 7598 (2017) 增1 - 0181 - 08

## Progress in leakage study of geological CO<sub>2</sub> storage

XIE Jian<sup>1</sup>, WEI Ning<sup>2</sup>, WU Li-zhou<sup>1,3</sup>, ZHANG Ke-ni<sup>4</sup>, XU Mo<sup>1,3</sup>

(1. College of Environment and Civil Engineering, Chengdu University of Technology, Chengdu, Sichuan 610059 China;

- 2. Institute of Rock and Soil Mechanics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Wuhan, Hubei 430071, China;
- 3. State Key Laboratory of Geohazard Prevention and Geoenvironment Protection, Chengdu University of Technology, Chengdu, Sichuan 610059, China;
  - 4. School of Mechanical and Energy Engineering, Tongji University, Shanghai 200092, China)

**Abstract:** Geological CO<sub>2</sub> storage(GCS) is a technology for carbon emission-cut, by injecting anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> for long-term storage into underground aquifers or depleted hydrocarbon reservoirs. Because of the uncertainties induced by geological site condition and human activities, injecting CO<sub>2</sub> into the reservoir may lead to leakage through abandoned wells, faults, fractures, and the "weak zones" in the caprock. A comprehensive review on GCS-associated leakage and safety issues was made, based on an extensive investigation of both domestic and international literature. Leakage from a wellbore may occur through the annulus cement, well plugs or the fracture zone of the contact rocks, due to chemical corrosion and/or mechanical failure. Injecting massive amount of CO<sub>2</sub> into reservoirs may induce fractures in the seal, activation of potential faults and their slip. Leakage of CO<sub>2</sub> along faults/fractures is mainly affected by factors such as the effective permeability and fracture aperture. Leakage through the caprock can be seepage, diffusive or one that occurs through fissures. The diffusive leakage through the caprock should not be neglected when assessing leakage for large-scale GCS projects. Leakage of CO<sub>2</sub>/brine into the overlying aquifer causes its variation in geochemistry such as a lower pH, higher salinity, more ions, or even the presence of free CO<sub>2</sub>. Monitoring of pressure and sampling in the overlying aquifer can be effective to identify CO<sub>2</sub> leakage from the underlying reservoir. Research on GCS-associated leakage is very limited, with a particular lack of quantitative studies in China.

Keywords: CO<sub>2</sub> capture and storage(CCS); geological CO<sub>2</sub> storage(GCS); leakage; safety of storage; saline aquifer

# 1 引 言

CO<sub>2</sub>捕集和封存(CCS)是一项将化石燃料发

电厂等企业产生的 $CO_2$ 捕集起来,运输并注入筛选的地质体内,以实现与大气隔离的永久 $CO_2$ 封存技术。 $CO_2$ 地质封存(GCS)是CCS中技术成熟度最

收稿日期:2017-02-25

基金项目:国家自然科学基金项目(No.41672282)。

This work was supported by the National Natural Scientific Foundation (41672282).

第一作者简介:谢健,男,1978 年生,博士,讲师,主要从事地下多相流数值模拟方面的研究工作。 E-mail: ljfok@sina.cn

高、最具有直接减排效果的技术,现阶段确定的主要地质封存储层有废弃油气田、煤层和深部咸水层三类。由于深部咸水层的水一般不能作为饮用水,且分布广泛、总体储存容量大,利用深部咸水层进行GCS被认为最具潜力<sup>[1]</sup>。国际上已开展了不同规模的GCS项目,如挪威的Sleipner项目<sup>[2]</sup>和Snohvit项目<sup>[3]</sup>、加拿大的Weyburn项目<sup>[4]</sup>、阿尔及利亚的Salah项目<sup>[5]</sup>以及德国的Ketzin项目<sup>[6]</sup>等。2011年5月至2015年4月中国的神华集团在鄂尔多斯盆地陈家村场地成功实施的30万吨CO<sub>2</sub>咸水层封存(以下称"神华CCS项目")是我国首个纯公益且全流程示范的煤基CO<sub>2</sub>咸水层封存项目<sup>[7-9]</sup>。

随着GCS项目在世界各地的广泛开展,其技术 的安全性和泄漏风险越来越引起关注[10]。2011年1 月11日,加拿大萨斯喀彻温省的一对夫妇召开新闻 发布会声称Weyburn GCS项目封存地下的CO2已经 泄漏到自家的农场,引起公众媒体和科学界对GCS 安全性的高度关注[11]。由于场地地质条件和人类开 发活动导致的不确定性,注入储层的CO2一般可通 过3种途径发生泄漏,即泄漏井、断层或裂缝以及 盖层的"薄弱带"(局部高渗带)<sup>[12-15]</sup>。GCS项目 的安全评估必须全面调查场地可能存在的泄漏途 径,分析CO2沿这些潜在泄漏途径发生逃逸的机制, 评估泄漏发生的概率(风险),预测泄漏发生的可能 后果,最后提出避免或阻止泄漏发生的措施。尤其 是大规模GCS项目, CO2羽体及污染物在储层中的 扩散范围可能很大,这种情况下CO。通过上述3种途 径发生泄漏的机会更大。

# 2 CO<sub>2</sub>沿钻井泄漏

CO<sub>2</sub>沿钻井迁移常常是GCS场地的主要泄漏途径<sup>[15-16]</sup>,是由于许多适合GCS的地层往往位于油气开发相对集中的区域,场地附近可能存在大量废弃油气井(泄漏风险相对较高),即使不位于油气开发区域,对于大规模GCS项目或低渗场地,也可能需要咸水抽汲井或降压井,区内的各种钻井可能贯穿盖层而成为GCS项目泄漏的通道。

CO<sub>2</sub>沿钻井泄漏一般是因为化学或力学作用导致CO<sub>2</sub>沿钻井环空水泥、井筒桥塞或围岩破碎带发生泄漏<sup>[13, 17-18]</sup>。化学作用是由于当地下水中CO<sub>2</sub>含量超过2%时对套管和环空水泥具有弱腐蚀性,CO<sub>2</sub>含量大于6%时则具有强腐蚀性。力学作用一般因为CO<sub>2</sub>注入引起温度降低或注入压力过大,导致套管收缩或水泥环开裂、密封性丧失而致<sup>[19-20]</sup>。CO<sub>2</sub>沿废弃井泄漏有诸多文献<sup>[21-23]</sup>采用解析法/半解析法

进行了定量研究,通过解析或半解析模型预测CO。 羽体的扩散范围,计算CO2到达泄漏井的时间和沿 废弃井泄漏的速率,估计泄漏CO2羽体在上覆含水 层中的扩散范围。由于解析法或半解析法无法考虑 CO<sub>2</sub>在泄漏井中因迅速膨胀导致的温度变化等复杂 过程,应用受限。为此,GCS的泄漏很多借助数值 模拟进行研究诸如加拿大阿尔伯塔的天然气泄漏场 地、德国Altmark天然气田EGR项目的CO2沿废弃井 泄漏模拟等<sup>[24]</sup>。数值解和解析解都表明,CO<sub>2</sub>泄漏 存在一个最大泄漏速率,到达最大泄漏速率后泄漏 速率减小。对于场地地质条件和废弃井数据导致的 泄漏不确定性,目前主要运用蒙特卡罗方法,将泄 漏井的有效渗透率、泄漏点埋深等作为模型不确定 性,对大量随机实现模型进行运算,以分析泄漏发 生的概率和可能的最大泄漏速率,在这方面的研究 有Kopp等<sup>[25-27]</sup>。

## 3 CO2 沿断层/裂缝泄漏

向深部咸水层大规模注入 $CO_2$ 会导致地层压力过高和应力状态发生改变,可能使盖层产生裂缝,激活原本闭合的断层或断层面滑动。 $CO_2$ 沿断层/裂缝泄漏的研究主要关注泄漏的动态过程和机理<sup>[28-34]</sup>、泄漏的影响因素<sup>[35]</sup>、泄漏风险和后果<sup>[36]</sup>。研究的方法可概括为解析法、半解析法<sup>[37-39]</sup>和数值模拟法<sup>[13, 40-42]</sup>。 $CO_2$ 泄漏的影响因素研究通常采用模型敏感性分析实现。现有研究表明, $CO_2$ 沿断层/裂缝泄漏主要受有效渗透率、裂缝开度、岩层非均质性、 $CO_2$ 注入深度等因素影响,其中渗透率通常是影响 $CO_2$ 和咸水泄漏速率的最敏感因素<sup>[41, 43-47]</sup>。

## 4 CO2透过盖层泄漏

GCS的有效性和可持续性关键取决于上覆盖层的密封完整性,与盖层的岩性(主要是泥质含量)、韧性、盖层厚度、连续性及分布面积有关<sup>[15]</sup>。盖层泄漏的方式可归纳为渗透泄漏、扩散泄漏和沿裂隙泄漏<sup>[13, 15, 48]</sup> 3种。由于盖层通常以泥质含量高、沉积厚度大为特点,一般研究中均假设盖层不可渗透。故此泄漏的研究也多假设泄漏集中发生在被研究的断层或泄漏井处。然而,在两种情况下CO<sub>2</sub>透过盖层本身的泄漏不应忽略:(1)盖层渗透率相对较高,意味着盖层也许发育离散裂隙或小裂缝,此时CO<sub>2</sub>很可能透过盖层既发生渗透泄漏也发生扩散泄漏,前者发生在裂缝网络中,而后者发生在盖层基质中<sup>[49–50]</sup>。(2)盖层比较完整且渗透率低,但储层压力高且消散慢,问题涉及尺度大。有研究表明,尽

管盖层渗透率极低,但储层咸水在高压条件下仍然会以十分缓慢的"扩散"方式向上覆或下伏含水层泄漏。扩散泄漏的速率通常非常小,然而对于跨越数千年时间尺度和数十公里空间尺度的GCS项目,这部分泄漏仍占有显著量级<sup>[51]</sup>。Birkholzer等<sup>[52]</sup>证实了扩散泄漏可能会导致封存地质体内大量CO<sub>2</sub>损失。

### 5 CO2泄漏危害

CO<sub>2</sub>/咸水泄漏的最直接后果是进入上覆含水层,导致 GCS 场地地下水污染。关于这方面研究,国内外已有大量文献进行报道<sup>[53-61]</sup>,采用的研究方法多为室内试验或试验与数值模拟相结合,总体来看,目前基于实际 GCS 场地的这方面研究还较欠缺,主要来自 Sleipner 和德国 Ketzin 等场地的有限报道<sup>[62-63]</sup>。国内学者主要利用 TOUGHREACT 或PHREEQC 软件对神华 CCS 场地和江汉盆地等 CCS 备选场地进行了泄漏假设模拟和影响因素分析<sup>[64-65]</sup>,研究结论可大致归纳为:CO<sub>2</sub>泄漏通常会导致上覆含水层地下水 pH 值减小、盐度升高、矿物溶解、迁移和再沉淀、吸附/解吸、离子增多、微量元素释放(重金属迁移)、含水层氧化还原环境发生改变等地球化学响应;可能导致浅部地层及地表环境的剧烈变化,影响浅层及地表的生态系统。

此外,如果场地盖层较少或完整性差而泄露位置又较浅, $CO_2$ 可能继续上升至土壤层甚至逸散至地表大气中。土壤中 $CO_2$ 浓度升高会改变土壤中微生物的生物量含量(通常呈现出先促进后抑制的规律)植物叶片光合作用、蒸腾作用,植株根系、土壤呼吸、土壤化学性质及肥力等 $[^{66-68]}$ 。

#### 6 泄漏监测

泄漏监测是分析管理GCS风险的基础,对其进行理论研究有助于监测并布置方案设计。目前世界上几个大型封存项目的监测均采用三维或四维地震监测 $CO_2$ 羽体 $^{[69]}$ 。然而,羽体监测的缺点是并不具有事先预见性,从泄漏防范角度而言意义有限。由于 $CO_2$ 注入引起的储层压力扰动范围比 $CO_2$ 羽体扩散范围大很多,监测上覆地层流体压力和地球化学特征被证明是泄漏监测的有效手段 $^{[70]}$ 。由于储层成水受注入 $CO_2$ 驱替,首先沿泄漏通道向上覆含水层泄漏,因此监测上覆含水层压力的变化可以预先获得 $CO_2$ 泄漏的信号 $^{[71]}$ 。

通过监测压力变化侦测CO<sub>2</sub>或储层咸水泄漏有诸多解析解研究<sup>[39,70,72-76]</sup>,研究的基本思路是采用解析法建立流体压力变化和泄漏速率的相关关系,

从而定量评估储层流体的可能泄漏特征。这些方法并不能有效地监测盖层扩散泄漏,除非盖层的渗透率非常高 $^{[49]}$ 。另一些学者则采用数值模拟手段对GCS项目的 $CO_2$ 泄漏监测进行研究,分析影响泄漏和压力变化的敏感因素。Park等 $^{[77]}$ 对 $Sleipner场地的研究显示,对上覆地层的压力监测可至少提前<math>60\ d$ 预测 $CO_2$ 泄漏的发生。此外,国内一些学者对GCS安全性监测也进行了定性的理论总结和方法探索 $^{[15,78-79]}$ 。

## 7 现有研究不足之处

目前有关 GCS 封存安全和泄漏风险研究存在 以下几方面的问题:

- (1)我国现有 CCS 研究主要集中在选址方法<sup>[80-81]</sup>、注入封存模拟<sup>[82-85]</sup>、环境影响监测<sup>[15,86-87]</sup>、水岩化学反应<sup>[88-89]</sup>等方面,关于 GCS 封存安全和泄漏风险方面的定量研究十分有限,多数停留在介绍、综述国外研究成果和理论,缺少这一课题的专门定量研究。
- (2)考虑大量废弃井泄漏的 GCS 数值模拟研究十分有限。对于能源开发历史较长的油气盆地,区内往往分布着成百上千、甚至上万个钻孔,这些钻孔如缺乏有效监管,其泄漏风险并不可知。对于这类情况的泄漏诊断和风险评估,解析法固然是一种途径,这对于数值模拟而言计算负荷上仍存在较大挑战。然而,解析解不可避免地存在缺点,即必须进行一系列理想化假设(如储层均质假设),因此对于地质条件复杂的场地,解析法未必能够达到理想效果。基于精细地质模型与并行优化算法的高性能数值模拟是解决该问题的重要途径。
- (3) 现有 CO<sub>2</sub> 地质封存的泄漏研究普遍假设 或简化断层、裂缝或泄漏井的条件<sup>[75,90]</sup>。实际中这 些井、裂缝或断层的情况复杂的多。对断层、裂缝 等精细刻画的 GCS 储层模型目前少有报道。
- (4)考虑盖层扩散泄漏的长期风险评估有待更多研究。现有泄漏研究绝大部分只考虑CO<sub>2</sub>/咸水沿钻井或断层等泄漏通道发生"集中"泄漏,然而对于时空尺度都很大的GCS项目,透过盖层的长期"扩散"泄漏仍需考虑。
- (5)全面考虑多种封存机制的GCS安全和风险评估仍需深入。 $CO_2$ 在储层中的封存通过4种机制得以实现,即构造封存、毛细封存(残余气封存)、溶解封存和矿物封存 $[^{91}]$ 。只有少数学者 $[^{92-93}]$ 从封存机制角度评价 $CO_2$ 泄漏的潜在风险,这些研究也往往只考虑一种或两种封存机制。

- (6)基于实际深部咸水层GCS工程的泄漏影响研究有限。有关 $CO_2$ 泄漏对上覆地层的地球化学影响,相当一部分研究是基于室内或场地浅层含水层的注气试验,基于实际场地的 $CO_2$ 泄漏过程以及泄漏对深部含水层的影响研究较少。
- (7)全面考虑多过程耦合的GCS风险研究有待发展。现有GCS力学研究大量关注GCS的多相流体渗流、反应溶质渗流、流固(水力-力学)耦合过程,而对渗流-热力-化学-力学多过程耦合效应对GCS过程及密封性的影响关注非常有限。
- (8) GCS泄漏的风险预测与管理研究还十分有限。GCS安全不仅依赖注入前对封存场地的全面调查和注入开始后的储层管理,还依赖于泄漏预测及泄漏发生后完备的风险管理措施。无论CO<sub>2</sub>泄漏前的储层干预还是泄漏后的修复研究均十分有限。

### 8 结 语

 $CO_2$ 泄漏关系到GCS项目的设计和维护,也对当地的健康、安全和环境都可能构成威胁。 $CO_2$ 一旦泄漏,要对其进行干预必然会增加CCS运营商和有关单位的成本。我国深部咸水层有巨大的 $CO_2$ 封存潜力,然而,我国目前在GCS领域研究基础仍相对薄弱,加之我国地质条件复杂、地表生态环境脆弱和人口经济条件复杂,GCS项目的风险可能高于其它国家,导致我国GCS项目的大规模实施面临困难和挑战。当前急需针对我国GCS示范或备选场地的特征,尽快开展相应的科学研究和技术储备,总结和发展出一套全面论证GCS项目安全性的理论体系、评估方法和风险管理体系。特别是2015年刚结束注入的神华CCS项目,其封井后的后续监测和风险评估仍十分重要,是确保 $CO_2$ 被长期安全有效地封存于地下的有效措施。

#### 参考文献

- [1] EBIGBO A, CLASS H, HELMIG R. CO<sub>2</sub> leakage through an abandoned well: Problem-oriented benchmarks[J]. **Computers & Geosciences**, 2007, 11: 103 115.
- [2] TORP TA, GALE J. Demonstrating storage of CO<sub>2</sub> in geological reservoir: The Sleipner and SACS projects[J]. Energy, 2004, 29: 1361 - 1369.
- [3] HANSEN O, GILDING D, NAZARIAN B, et al. Snøhvit: The history of injecting and storing 1 Mt CO<sub>2</sub> in the Fluvial Tubåen Fm[J]. **Energy Procedia**, 2013, 37: 3565 3573.

- [4] WHITE D J, BURROWES G, DAVIS T, et al. Greenhouse gas sequestration in abandoned oil reservoirs: the international energy agency Weyburn pilot project[J]. GSA Today, 2004, 14: 4 - 10.
- [5] RINGROSE P S, MATHIESON A S, WRIGHT I W, et al. The in Salah CO<sub>2</sub> storage project: Lessons learned and knowledge transfer[J]. **Energy Procedia**, 2013, 37: 6226 - 6236.
- [6] LIEBSCHER A, MOLLER F, BANNACH A, et al. Injection operation and operational pressure–temperature monitoring at the CO<sub>2</sub> storage pilot site Ketzin, Germany — Design, results, recommendations[J]. Inter- national Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control, 2013, 15: 163 -173.
- [7] WU X Z. Shenhua Group's carbon capture and storage (CCS) demonstration[J]. Mining Report, 2014, 150: 8184
- [8] ZHANG K, XIE J, LI C, et al. A full chain CCS demonstration project in northeast Ordos Basin, China: Operational experience and challenges[J]. International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control, 2016, 50: 218 230.
- [9] 吴秀章. 中国二氧化碳捕集与地质封存首次规模化探索[M]. 北京: 科学出版社, 2013.
  WU Xiu-zhang. Carbon dioxide capture and geological storage—The first massive exploration in China[M]. Beijing: Science Press, 2013.
- [10] CONINCK D E H. Advocacy for carbon capture and storage could arouse distrust[J]. **Nature**, 2010, 463: 293
- [11] BOYD A D, LIU Y, STEPHENS J C, et al. Controversy in technology innovation: Contrasting media and expert risk perceptions of the alleged leakage at the Weyburn carbon dioxide storage demonstration project[J]. International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control, 2013, 14: 259 - 269.
- [12] 任韶然, 李德祥, 张亮, 等. 地质封存过程中泄漏途径及风险分析[J]. 石油学报, 2014, 35(3): 591 601.

  REN Shao-ran, LI De-xiang, ZHANG Liang, et al. Leakage pathways and risk analysis of carbon dioxide in geologic storage[J]. **Acta Petrolei Sinica**, 2014, 35(3): 591 601.
- [13] VIALLE S, DRUHAN J L, MAHER K. Multi-phase flow simulation of CO<sub>2</sub> leakage through a fractured caprock in response to mitigation strategies[J]. **International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control**, 2016, 44: 11 - 25.

[14] 吴江莉, 马俊杰. 浅议 CO<sub>2</sub> 地质封存的潜在风险[J]. 环境科学导刊, 2012, 31(6): 89 - 93.

WU Jiang-li, MA Jun-jie. A discussion about potential risks of geological storage of CO<sub>2</sub>[J]. **Environmental Science Survey**, 2012, 31(6): 89 - 93.

[15] 张森琦, 刁玉杰, 程旭学, 等. 二氧化碳地质储存逃逸

- 通道及环境监测研究[J]. 冰川冻土, 2010, 32(6): 1251 1260.

  ZHANG Sen-qi, DIAO Yu-jie, CHENG Xu-xue, et al. CO<sub>2</sub> geological storage leakage routes and environment monitoring[J]. **Journal of Glaciology and Geocryology**, 2010, 32(6): 1251 1260.
- [16] KOORNNEEF J, RAMIREZ A, TURKENBURG W, et al. The environmental impact and risk assessment of CO<sub>2</sub> capture, transport and storage—An evaluation of the knowledge base[J]. **Prog. Energ. Combust.**, 2012, 38(1): 62 86.
- [17] BAI M, REINICKE K M. Numerical simulation of  ${\rm CO_2}$  leakage through abandoned wells during  ${\rm CO_2}$  underground storage[M]//Clean Energy Systems in the Subsurface. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer, 2013: 197 210.
- [18] ORLIC B. Some geomechanical aspects of geological CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration[J]. KSCE J. Civ. Eng., 2009, 13(4): 225 - 232.
- [19] LI B, GUO B Y, LI H, et al. An analytical solution to simulate the effect of cement/formation stiffness on well integrity evaluation in carbon sequestration projects[J]. J. Nat. Gas Sci. Eng., 2015, 27: 1092 - 1099.
- [20] TAKASE K, BARHATE Y, HASHIMOTO H, et al. Cement-sheath wellbore integrity for CO<sub>2</sub> injection and storage wells[C]//SPE Oil and Gas India Conference and Exhibition. Mumbai, India: [s. n.]. 2010.
- [21] NORDBOTTEN J M, CELIA M A, BACHU S. Analytical solutions for leakage rates through abandoned wells[J]. **Water Resources Research**, 2004, 40(4): 1035 1042.
- [22] NORDBOTTEN J M, CELIA M A, BACHU S. Injection and storage of CO<sub>2</sub> in deep saline aquifers: Analytical solution for CO<sub>2</sub> plume evolution during injection[J]. Transport Porous Med, 2005, 58(3): 339 - 360.
- [23] NORDBOTTEN J M, CELIA M A, BACHU S, et al. Semianalytical solution for CO<sub>2</sub> leakage through an abandoned well[J]. Environ. Sci. Technol., 2005, 39(2): 602 - 611.
- [24] PAWAR R J, WATSON T L, GABLE CW. Numerical simulation of CO<sub>2</sub> leakage through abandoned wells: model for an abandoned site with observed gas migration

- in Alberta, Canada[J]. **Energy Procedia**, 2009, 1: 3625 3632.
- [25] KOPP A, BINNING P J, JOHANNSEN K, et al. A contribution to risk analysis for leakage through abandoned wells in geological CO<sub>2</sub> storage[J]. Adv. Water Resour., 2010, 33(8): 867 879.
- [26] NOGUES J P, COURT B, DOBOSSY M, et al. A methodology to estimate maximum probable leakage along old wells in a geological sequestration operation[J]. International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control, 2012, 7: 39 - 47.
- [27] TAO Q, BRYANT S L. Well permeability estimation and CO<sub>2</sub> leakage rates[J]. **International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control**, 2014, 22: 77 87.
- [28] OLDENBURG C M. Joule-Thomson cooling due to CO<sub>2</sub> injection into natural gas reservoirs[J]. Energ. Convers Manage, 2007, 48(6): 1808 1815.
- [29] PRUESS K. Leakage of CO<sub>2</sub> from geologic storage: Role of secondary accumulation at shallow depth[J]. International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control, 2008, 2(1): 37 - 46.
- [30] PRUESS K. Modeling CO<sub>2</sub> leakage scenarios, including transitions between super- and sub-critical conditions, and phase change between liquid and gaseous CO<sub>2</sub>[J]. **Energy Procedia**, 2011, 4: 3754 3761.
- [31] LU C, SUN Y, BUSCHECK TA, et al. Uncertainty quantification of CO<sub>2</sub> leakage through a fault with multiphase and nonisothermal effects[J]. **Greenh. Gases.**, 2012, 2: 445 459.
- [32] PRUESS K. On CO<sub>2</sub> fluid flow and heat transfer behavior in the subsurface, following leakage from a geologic storage reservoir[J]. **Environ Geol.**, 2008, 54(8): 1677 1686.
- [33] PRUESS K. Integrated modeling of CO<sub>2</sub> storage and leakage scenarios including transitions between superand subcritical conditions, and phase change between liquid and gaseous CO<sub>2</sub>[J]. **Greenh Gases**, 2011, 1(3): 237 247.
- [34] PREISIG M, PREVOST J H. Coupled multi-phase thermo-poromechanical effects. Case study: CO<sub>2</sub> injection at In Salah, Algeria[J]. International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control, 2011, 5(4): 1055 - 1064.
- [35] 郑菲,施小清,吴吉春,等. 苏北盆地盐城组咸水层 CO<sub>2</sub> 地质封存泄漏风险的全局敏感性分析[J]. 高校地质学报,2012,18(2):232 238.
  - ZHENG Fei, SHI Xiao-qing, WU Ji-chun, et al. Global sensitivity analysis of leakage risk for CO<sub>2</sub> geological sequestration in the saline aquifer of Yancheng Formation

- in Subei Basin[J]. **Geological Journal of China Universities**, 2012, 18(2): 232 238.
- [36] 郑菲,施小清,吴吉春,等. 深部咸水层 CO<sub>2</sub> 地质封存数值模拟参数的全局敏感性分析:以苏北盆地盐城组为例[J]. 吉林大学学报(地球科学版), 2014, 44(1): 310-318.
  - ZHENG Fei, SHI Xiao-qing, WU Ji-chun, et al. Global parametric sensitivity analysis of numerical simulation for CO<sub>2</sub> geological sequestration in saline aquifers: A case study of Yancheng Formation in Subei Basin[J]. **Journal of Jilin University(Earth Science Edition)**, 2014, 44(1): 310 318.
- [37] SELVADURAI A P S. Fluid leakage through fractures in an impervious caprock embedded between two geologic aquifers[J]. **Adv. Water Resour.**, 2012, 41: 76 83.
- [38] TAO Q, ALEXANDER D, BRYANT S L. Development and field application of model for leakage of CO<sub>2</sub> along a fault[J]. **Energy Procedia**, 2013, 37: 4420 4427.
- [39] ZAHASKY C, BENSON S M. A simple approximate semi-analytical solution for estimating leakage of carbon dioxide through faults[J]. Enrgy. Proced., 2014, 63: 4861 - 4874.
- [40] OLDENBURG C M, JORDAN P D, NICOT J P, et al. Leakage risk assessment of the In Salah CO<sub>2</sub> storage project: Applying the certification framework in a dynamic context[J]. **Energy Procedia**, 2011, 4: 4154 4161.
- [41] DENG H, STAUFFER PH, DAI Z, et al. Simulation of industrial-scale CO<sub>2</sub> storage: Multi-scale heterogeneity and its impacts on storage capacity, injectivity and leakage[J]. **International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control**, 2011, 7: 202 217.
- [42] SINGH A, DELFS J O, GORKE U J, et al. Toward physical aspects affecting a possible leakage of geologically stored CO<sub>2</sub> into the shallow subsurface[J]. **Acta Geotech.**, 2014, 9: 81 86.
- [43] LU C, SUN Y, BUSCHECK T A, et al. Uncertainty quantification of CO<sub>2</sub> leakage through a fault with multiphase and nonisothermal effects[J]. **Greenh. Gases**, 2012, 2: 445 459.
- [44] BRYANT S L, LAKSHMINARASIMHAN S, POPE G A. Buoyancy-dominated multiphase flow and its effect on geological sequestration of CO<sub>2</sub>[J]. **SPE Journal**, 2008, 13: 447 454.
- [45] CELIA M A, NORDBOTTEN J M, COURT B, et al. Field-scale application of a semi-analytical model for estimation of CO<sub>2</sub> and brine leakage along old wells[J].

- **International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control**, 2011, 5(2): 257 269.
- [46] JUNG N H, HAN W S, HAN K, et al. Regional-scale advective, diffusive, and eruptive dynamics of CO<sub>2</sub> and brine leakage through faults and wellbores[J]. **J. Geophys Res-Sol Ea.**, 2015, 120(5): 3003 3025.
- [47] TAO Q, CHECKAI D, HUERTA N, et al. An improved model to forecast CO<sub>2</sub> leakage rates along a wellbore[J]. Energy Procedia, 2011, 4: 5385 - 5391.
- [48] OLDENBURG C M, LEWICKI J L. On leakage and seepage of CO<sub>2</sub> from geologic storage sites into surface water[J]. **Environ. Geol.**, 2006, 50(5): 691 705.
- [49] WANG Z, SMALL M J. A Bayesian approach to CO<sub>2</sub> leakage detection at saline sequestration sites using pressure measurements[J]. International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control, 2014, 30: 188 196.
- [50] WANG J G, JU Y, GAO F, et al. A simple approach for the estimation of CO<sub>2</sub> penetration depth into a caprock layer[J]. Journal of Rock Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering, 2016, 8: 75 - 86.
- [51] CIHAN A, BIRKHOLZER J T, ZHOU Q L. Pressure buildup and brine migration during CO<sub>2</sub> storage in multilayered aquifers[J]. Ground Water, 2013, 51(2): 252 - 267.
- [52] BIRKHOLZER JT, ZHOU QL, TSANG CF. Large-scale impact of CO<sub>2</sub> storage in deep saline aquifers: A sensitivity study on pressure response in stratified systems[J]. Int. J. Greenh Gas Con., 2009, 3(2): 181 -194
- [53] BACON D H, QAFOKU N P, DAI Z, et al. Modeling the impact of carbon dioxide leakage into an unconfined, oxidizing carbonate aquifer[J]. International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control, 2015, 44: 290 -299.
- [54] CAHILL A G, JAKOBSEN R. Hydro-geochemical impact of CO<sub>2</sub> leakage from geological storage on shallow potable aquifers: A field scale pilot experiment[J]. International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control, 2013, 19: 678 - 688.
- [55] KHARAKA Y K, THORDSEN J J, KAKOUROS E, et al. Changes in the chemistry of shallow groundwater related to the 2008 injection of CO<sub>2</sub> at the ZERT field site, Bozeman, Montana[J]. **Environ Earth. Sci.**, 2010, 60(2): 273 284.
- [56] LITTLE M G, JACKSON R B. Potential impacts of leakage from deep CO<sub>2</sub> geosequestration on overlying freshwater aquifers[J]. **Environ Sci. Technol.**, 2010,

- 44(23): 9225 9232.
- [57] LU J M, PARTIN J W, HOVORKA S D, et al. Potential risks to freshwater resources as a result of leakage from CO<sub>2</sub> geological storage: a batch-reaction experiment[J]. Environ Earth Sci., 2010, 60(2): 335 - 348.
- [58] NAVARRE-SITCHLER A K, MAXWELL R M, SIIRILA E R, et al. Elucidating geochemical response of shallow heterogeneous aquifers to CO<sub>2</sub> leakage using high-performance computing: Implications for monitoring of CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration[J]. **Adv. Water Resour.**, 2013, 53: 45 55.
- [59] TRAUTZ R C, PUGH J D, VARADHARAJAN C, et al. Effect of dissolved CO<sub>2</sub> on a shallow groundwater system: A controlled release field experiment[J]. Environ Sci. Technol., 2013, 47(1): 298 - 305.
- [60] YANG Q, MATTER J, STUTE M, et al. Groundwater hydrogeochemistry in injection experiments simulating CO<sub>2</sub> leakage from geological storage reservoir[J]. International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control, 2014, 26: 193 - 203.
- [61] ZHENG L G, SPYCHER N, VARADHARAJAN C, et al. On the mobilization of metals by CO<sub>2</sub> leakage into shallow aquifers: exploring release mechanisms by modeling field and laboratory experiments[J]. **Greenh. Gases**, 2015, 5(4): 403 418.
- [62] FISCHER S, LIEBSCHER A, WANDREY M, et al. CO<sub>2</sub>-brine-rock interaction-First results of long-term exposure experiments at in situ P-T conditions of the Ketzin CO<sub>2</sub> reservoir[J]. **Chem. Erde-Geochem.**, 2010, 70: 155 164.
- [63] REMPEL K U, LIEBSCHER A, HEINRICH W, et al. An experimental investigation of trace element dissolution in carbon dioxide: Applications to the geological storage of CO<sub>2</sub>[J]. Chem. Geol., 2011, 289: 224 - 234.
- [64] 姜玲. CO<sub>2</sub>地质储存对地下水的环境影响研究——以江 汉盆地为例[D]. 武汉: 中国地质大学. 2010. JIANG Ling. Environmental impacts on groundwater of CO<sub>2</sub> geologic storage — A case study of Jianghan Basin[D]. Wuhan: China University of Geosciences. 2010.
- [65] 程凯. 储层二氧化碳泄漏对浅部含水层水质的影响研究[D]. 长春: 吉林大学. 2013.

  CHENG Kai. Impacts of reservoir CO<sub>2</sub> leakage on groundwater quality in shallow aquifers[D]. Changchun: Jilin University. 2013.
- [66] 吴江莉. 高浓度 $CO_2$ 对 $C_3$ 作物生长发育的影响研究[D]. 西安: 西北大学, 2013: 72 73.

- WU Jiang-li. Impacts of high-concentration  $CO_2$  on the growth and development of  $C_3$  crops[D]. Xi'an: Northwest University, 2013: 72 73.
- [67] 王莎. 高浓度CO<sub>2</sub>对土壤微生物的影响研究[D]. 西安: 西北大学, 2014: 70 - 71. WANG Sha. Impacts of high-concentration CO<sub>2</sub> on the soil bacterias[D]. Xi'an: Northwest University, 2014: 70 - 71.
- [68] 聂莉娟, 马俊杰, 赵雪峰, 等. 模拟CCS技术CO<sub>2</sub>泄漏对C<sub>3</sub>、C<sub>4</sub>作物土壤化学性质的影响[J]. 水土保持学报, 2015, 29(5): 200 205.

  NIE Li-juan, MA Jun-jie, ZHAO Xue-feng, et al. Effects of simulation CO<sub>2</sub> leakage of CCS on soil chemical properties under C<sub>3</sub> and C<sub>4</sub> crops[J]. **Journal of Soil and Water Conservation**, 2015, 29(5): 200 205.
- [69] 郝艳军,杨顶辉. 二氧化碳地质封存问题和地震监测研究进展[J]. 地球物理学进展, 2012, 27(6): 2369 2383.

  HAO Yan-jun, YANG Ding-hui. Research progress of carbon dioxide capture and geological sequestration problem and seismic monitoring research[J]. **Progress in Geophysics**, 2012, 27(6): 2369 2383.
- [70] NOGUES J P, NORDBOTTEN J M, CELIA M A. Detecting leakage of brine or CO<sub>2</sub> through abandoned wells in a geological sequestration operation using pressure monitoring wells[J]. Energy Procedia, 2011, 4: 3620 3627.
- [71] REVEILLERE A, ROHMER J. Managing the risk of CO<sub>2</sub> leakage from deep saline aquifer reservoirs through the creation of a hydraulic barrier[J]. Energy Procedia, 2011, 4: 3187 3194.
- [72] CHABORA E R, BENSON S M. Brine displacement and leakage detection using pressure measurements in aquifers overlying CO<sub>2</sub> storage reservoirs[J]. **Greenhouse Gas Control Technologies**, 2009, 9 1(1): 2405 2412.
- [73] PARK Y C, HUH D G, PARK C H. A pressure-monitoring method to warn CO<sub>2</sub> leakage in geological storage sites[J]. **Environ. Earth. Sci.**, 2012, 67(2): 425 433.
- [74] SUN A Y, NICOT J P. Inversion of pressure anomaly data for detecting leakage at geologic carbon sequestration sites[J]. **Adv. Water Resour.**, 2012, 44: 20 29.
- [75] WANG H, REN Y Q, JIA J H, et al. A probabilistic collocation Eulerian-Lagrangian localized adjoint method on sparse grids for assessing CO<sub>2</sub> leakage through wells in randomly heterogeneous porous media[J]. Comput. Method. Appl. M., 2015, 292: 35 - 53.

- [76] WEI N, LI X, WANG Y, et al. Geochemical impact of aquifer storage for impure CO<sub>2</sub> containing O<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>: Tongliao field experiment[J]. Applied Energy, 2015, 145: 198 - 210.
- [77] PARK Y C, HUH D G, PARK C H. A sensitivity study of pressure monitoring to detect fluid leakage from geological CO<sub>2</sub> storage site[J]. Energy Procedia, 2013, 37: 4207 - 4214.
- [78] LIU X, ZHANG S, YAN A, et al. Design on early warning system of CO2 sequestration leakage based on Web GIS and WSN[M]//Geo-Informatics in Resource Management and Sustainable Ecosystem. Berlin: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013: 407 - 413.
- [79] MA D, DENG J, ZHANG Z. CO<sub>2</sub> leakage identification in geosequestration based on real time correlation analysis between atmospheric O<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub>[J]. Chinese Journal of Chemical Engineering, 2014, 22(6): 634 - 642.
- [80] 李小春, 刘延锋, 白冰, 等. 中国深部咸水含水层 CO<sub>2</sub> 储存优先区域选择[J]. 岩石力学与工程学报, 2006, 25(5): 963 - 968. LI Xiao-chun, LIU Yan-feng, BAI Bing, et al. Ranking and screening of CO2 saline aquifer storage zones in China[J]. Chinese Journal of Rock Mechanics and Enigneering, 2006, 25(5): 963 - 968.
- [81] WEI N, LI X, WANG Y, et al. A preliminary sub-basin scale evaluation framework of site suitability for onshore aquifer-based CO<sub>2</sub> storage in China[J]. International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control, 2013, 12: 231 -246.
- [82] LIC, ZHANGKN, WANGYS, et al. Experimental and numerical analysis of reservoir performance for geological CO<sub>2</sub> storage in the Ordos Basin in China[J]. International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control, 2016, 45: 216 - 232.
- [83] 柯怡兵, 李义连, 张炜, 等. 岩盐沉淀对咸水层二氧化 碳地质封存注入过程的影响研究:以江汉盆地为例[J]. 地质科技情报, 2012, 31(3): 109 - 115. KE Yi-bing, LI Yi-lian, ZHANG Wei, et al. Impact of halite precipitation on CO<sub>2</sub> injection into saline aquifers: A case study of Jianghan basin[J]. Geological Science and Technology Information, 2012, 31(3): 109 - 115.
- [84] XIE J, ZHANG K, HU L, et al. Field-based simulation of a demonstration site for carbon dioxide sequestration in low-permeability saline aquifers in the Ordos Basin, China[J]. Hydrogeol J., 2015, 23(7): 1465 - 1480.
- [85] ZHAO R, CHENG J, ZHANG K. CO2 plume evolution and pressure buildup of large-scale CO2 injection into

- saline aquifers in Sanzhao Depression, Songliao Basin, China[J]. Transport Porous Med., 2012, 95(2): 407 -424.
- [86] 李琦, 刘桂臻, 张建, 等. 二氧化碳地质封存环境监测 现状及建议[J]. 地球科学进展, 2013, 28(6): 718 - 727. LI Qi, LIU Gui-Zhen, ZHANG Jian, et al. Status and suggestion of environmental monitoring for CO<sub>2</sub> geological storage[J]. Advances in Earth Science, 2013, 28(6): 718 - 727.
- [87] 赵学亮, 郭建强, 史云, 等. 二氧化碳地质储存动态监 测研究[J]. 环境监控与预警, 2011, 3(6): 4 - 7. ZHAO Xue-liang, GUO Jian-qiang, SHI Yun, et al. Research on carbon dioxide geological storage dynamic Environmental monitoring[J]. Monitoring Forwarning, 2011, 3(6): 4 - 7.
- [88] 杨国栋、李义连、马鑫、等、绿泥石对 CO>-水-岩石相 互作用的影响[J]. 地球科学—中国地质大学学报, 2014, 39(4): 462 - 472. YANG Guo-dong, LI Yi-lian, MA Xin, et al. Effect of chlorite on CO<sub>2</sub>-water-rock interaction[J]. Earth Science-Journal of China University of Geosciences, 2014, 39(4): 462 - 472.
- [89] 胡丽莎, 常春, 于青春. 鄂尔多斯盆地山西组地下咸水 CO2溶解能力[J]. 地球科学—中国地质大学学报, 2012, 37(2): 301 - 306. HU Li-sha, CHANG Chun, YU Qing-chun. CO2 solubility in Shanxi Formation water of Ordos Basin[J]. Earth Science-Journal of China University of Geosciences, 2012, 37(2): 301 - 306.
- [90] SHI M. Characterizing heterogeneity in low-permeability strata and its control on fluid flow and solute transport by thermohaline free convection[R]. Austin: University of Texas. 2005.
- [91] BENSON S M, COOK P J. Underground geological storage of carbon dioxide[M]//Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Special Report on Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005: 195 - 276.
- [92] NGHIEM L, YANG C, SHRIVATAVA V, et al. Optimization of residual gas and solubility trapping for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in saline aquifers[C]// SPE Reservoir Simulation Symposium. Texas: [s. n.], 2009.
- [93] SAADATPOOR E, BRYANT S L, SEPEHRNOORI K. CO<sub>2</sub> leakage from heterogeneous storage formations[C]// 2010 SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition. Florence, Italy: [s. n.], 2010: 19 - 22.