Soil carbon dioxide fluxes to atmosphere: the role of rainfall over CO₂ transport

Isabelle Delsarte, Grégory Cohen, Marian Momtbrun, Patrick Höhener, Olivier Atteia

► To cite this version:

Isabelle Delsarte, Grégory Cohen, Marian Momtbrun, Patrick Höhener, Olivier Atteia. Soil carbon dioxide fluxes to atmosphere: the role of rainfall over CO₂ transport. *Applied Geochemistry*, 2021, 127, pp.104854. 10.1016/j.apgeochem.2020.104854 . hal-03087039

HAL Id: hal-03087039

<https://hal-amu.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03087039>

Submitted on 5 Jan 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Soil carbon dioxide fluxes to atmosphere: the role of rainfall to control CO₂ transport

Isabelle DELSARTE^{1*}, Grégory COHEN¹, Marian MOMTBRUN¹, Patrick Höhener² and

Olivier ATTEIA¹

¹ EA 4592 G&E, Bordeaux INP, 1 allée F. Daguin, 33607 Pessac, France

² Aix-Marseille Université - CNRS, Laboratoire Chimie Environnement UMR 7376, 3 place Victor Hugo, 13331 Marseille, France

*isabelle.delsarte@bordeaux-inp.fr

Abstract

In order to observe the relationships between the temporal variations of CO₂ surface fluxes and the CO₂ soil gas transport in soil profile before and during rainfall events, two experiments were conducted in a controlled natural environment at different time periods. These experiments consisted in injecting pure CO₂ in a lysimeter at 160 cm depth and simulating heavy rainfall event at its surface for 2 weeks. During the whole experiments, CO₂ soil gas concentrations and surface fluxes were continuously monitored. These measurements showed that the flux measured through the flux chamber were consistent with the concentration profiles. During simulated rainfall events, the concentrations and fluxes showed a clear change linked to the presence of water on the top of the water profile. The results clearly show a significant decrease of CO₂ flux to atmosphere induced by rainfall infiltration and consequential wash-out of the CO₂ present in the soil.

Keywords: CO₂ concentration, soil CO₂ flux, rainfall, soil gas concentration and fluxes monitoring

1. Introduction

The soil is the interface between the different environmental compartments (lithosphere, the atmosphere...), where fluxes of water, particles and gas are constantly exchanged. Due to past and current human activities, the composition of these fluxes was significantly altered, that imposes a threat to the environment and human health. During the last decades, special attention has been paid to gas exchanges at the soil-atmosphere interface. Indeed, the need to understand and monitor gas fluxes is ubiquitous in many areas of human activity. For example, on the carbon capture and storage sites, the monitoring of CO₂ fluxes is necessary to detect and quantify eventual leakages to the environment (Bernardo and Vries, 2011; Beaubien et al., 2013; Schroder et al., 2016; Elío et al., 2016). Following landfill gas emissions across the surface of landfills is also essential. Indeed, the landfill gas is ranked as the third highest source of global anthropogenic methane emissions (Yang et al., 2015) and contributes also to large CO₂ emissions. Another example concerns the contaminated sites, where measurement soil gas fluxes are often required as part of human health risk assessment of the site or when implementing a risk-based corrective approach (Hers et al., 2004).

Gas flux at the soil-atmosphere interface, can be directly measured using flux chambers methods (Bornemann, 1920; Klenbusch, 1986). These techniques are based on the measurement of the compound concentration increase inside an open-bottom chamber set up on the soil surface. The gas flux is then calculated by relating the concentration increase during a given time to the chamber volume and the concerned soil surface area. Due to the low cost of this non-intrusive method which is easy to set up, it has been widely used (Cotel et al., 2015; Elío et al., 2016; Jassal et al., 2005; Matthias et al., 1980; Norman et al., 1997; Reinhart et al., 1992; Rochette and Hutchinson, 2005; Viveiros et al., 2008). Indeed, this technique allows to carry out *in situ* measurements quickly and on a large number of points compared to other techniques (Schroder et al., 2016).

However, due to the soil heterogeneity resulting from the spatial and temporal variability of the physico-chemical soil properties such as moisture, the instantaneous fluxes measured in practice do not allow to easily determine the long term transport of vapours to the atmosphere (Bekele et al., 2014). Several authors observed seasonal variations of gas surface fluxes or soil gas concentrations (Elío et al., 2013; Kim et al., 2019). Indeed, these researchers observed the dependence of CO₂ fluxes with soil moisture variations which are likely to govern soil gas transport processes. Petersen et al. (1996) and Choi et al. (2005) observed that trichloroethene (TCE) gas-phase diffusive fluxes at soil surface were also sensitive to soil-water content modifications. Moisture content in the subsurface modifies the pore volume available for gas transport (Risk et al., 2002; Tillman and Smith, 2004; Palaia et al., 2018). Moisture content impacts the transport of gas phase in the soil by modifying soil tortuosity as well as the effective diffusivity and the dissolved quantity of the concerned compound in the aqueous phase (Conant et al., 1996; Hers et al., 2000; Jassal et al., 2005). In the literature, there is still an ongoing discussion about the different formulae used to link soil water content to the effective tortuosity (Hers et al., 2000; Werner et al., 2004). The heterogeneous distribution of soil moisture content has also a direct effect on subsurface gas concentration profile (Shen et al., 2013). Wetter soil layers could therefore have different effects such as reducing the gas diffusion from the source to the atmosphere or, conversely, increasing surface fluxes. It was also shown that rainfall duration, intensity, frequency and spatial variability has direct influence on gas fluxes (Fa et al., 2015; Lelli and Raco, 2017; Ma et al., 2012; Seo et al., 2020; Tommasone Pascale et al., 2015). In their study, Viveiros et al. (2008) showed that depending on the intensity of the rainfall, the soil CO₂ fluxes are different. Tommasone Pascale et al. (2015) observed the influence of rainfall events on soil radon (²²²Rn) concentration and concluded that time evolution of soil ²²²Rn activities are markedly dependent on the rainfall history of the site.

While there is a general agreement on the importance of soil water content, there has been, to our knowledge, limited quantitative analysis related to its influence (Hers et al., 2000; Oh et al., 2019; Shen et al., 2013). Even if some field and / or numerical studies have considered some temporal effects on soil gas transport, a full explanation of the influence of rainfall events on soil gas concentrations and fluxes is still not available (Viveiros et al., 2008; Lewicki et al., 2009; Shen et al., 2012). However, understanding how these short and/or long-term variations modify soil gas transport processes is of major importance for precisely quantify long term gas fluxes at monitoring sites.

Therefore, the main objective of this study is to understand the relationships between the temporal variations of gas surface fluxes and the soil gas transport in soil profile before and during rainfall events. To this end, two experiments were conducted in a controlled natural environment. These experiments consisted in injecting pure CO₂ in a lysimeter and simulating rainfall event at its surface. During the whole experiments, CO₂ soil gas concentrations and surface fluxes were continuously monitored. The impact of natural rainfall events of different intensities and frequencies on CO₂ fluxes at the soil-atmosphere interface were also observed.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Lysimeter description

The experiments were conducted in a lysimeter, a controlled natural environment (Figure 1). This lysimeter was set up in August 2014. Soil digging was conducted thanks to a mechanical shovel which removed and separated sequentially 50 cm depth soils layers until 1.85 m depth. The retention tank ($l \times w \times h = 1.35 \times 1.35 \times 0.8$ m) was then set-up. At the bottom of the tank, a grid was added allowing an easier water recovery. Moreover, a gooseneck system, connected to the bottom of the retention tank allows the control of the piezometric level and the quantification of outflowing water. After the set-up of the retention tank, the soil was manually put back in place backward in order to respect as much as possible the original soil

98 configuration. Each soil layer of 10 cm height was compacted. In the centre of lysimeter, six
 99 gas probes were set up during this backfill, placing them at specific depths (0.4, 0.8, 1.0, 1.2,
 100 1.4 and 1.6 m depth) (Figure 1). To avoid vertical preferential paths, their tubes were placed in
 101 the ground horizontally until the manhole. Thus, the soil removed during the lysimeter
 102 installation was returned to respect as much as possible its initial structure. The soil matrix is
 103 an alluvial sand from the Aquitaine basin (France). Moreover, the soil does not contain calcite
 104 (<1%) over the entire vertical profile of the lysimeter and the CEC capacity varies from 15
 105 mmol_c/kg at 20 cm to 1-2 at 1 m depth.

Figure 1. General description of the lysimeter. A- Vertical section of the lysimeter: a grid rested on the bottom of the tank and allowed the porous medium to be separated from the water. The black dots represent the location of the gas probes. B- Automated measurement system for continuous monitoring of CO₂ concentrations in the soil. C- Schematic of passive flux chamber used to determine surfaces fluxes. D- Horizontal section of the lysimeter: the blue and grey dots represents the location of the piezometer and the tubes used for artificial the rainfall event, respectively.

2.2. Hydrological properties of porous media

2.2.1. Determination of soil porosity and water content by soil coring

The initial water content, the residual water saturation and the porosity of the porous medium were experimentally determined. Soil cores were taken from the experimental plot next to the lysimeter at 0.2, 0.5 and 1.0 m depth. The sampling tool consists in a sampling tube on which is added a corer (S x L: 11.95 x 14.8 cm²). A pilot hole is previously made with a manual auger to the desired depth. The tube is then driven into the ground either directly or with a sledgehammer. Soil cores were first slowly saturated with tap water for 24 h before being placed in the oven at 105°C for 24 h (Wilke, 2005). At every step, soil cores were weighted.

2.2.2. Transient water content measurement

Soil moisture content was determined by using moisture probes (120 cm; Drill & Drop Probe, SDI-12, Sentek) composed by ten moisture sensors. Thus, soil moisture was measured every 10 cm from 7 to 97 cm depth. To avoid preferential gas flow and damage of gas sample probes, this probe was set up 20 cm next to the lysimeter (Figure 1). The soil matrix at this emplacement is the same as the one inside the lysimeter. The soil moisture probes were calibrated *in situ* by an analysis of their temporal signal variations with respect to the cumulative amount of water infiltrated during the artificial rainfall event.

2.3. CO₂ soil gas concentration measurements

CO₂ soil gas concentrations were continuously monitored with the use of a custom automated system. This automated system is composed of a micro-GC (CP-4900, Varian Inc.), a system controller (M3 Essential extensibles, Crouzet) and a solenoid valve (EMHMA-CE, Vici Valco) directly connected to the five soil gas probes (0.4, 0.8, 1.0, 1.2 and 1.4 m depth) (Figure 1). The micro-GC is equipped with a PPQ column to separate CO₂. The general relative uncertainty for the quantification of CO₂ with this method is less than 5%. Tubes of 2.50 m

with an inner diameter of 0.5 mm were used to connect each gas probe to the automated system. For each analysis, a gas sample of 70 mL was collected from the soil by micro-GC pumping system. The dead volumes of the gas tubes were taken under consideration to determine the optimal sampling volume.

2.4. Gas flux monitoring at the soil surface using a flux chamber

A Passive Flux Chamber (PFC) (50 x 50 x 3.5 cm (L x W x H)) was used to monitor CO₂ gas fluxes at the centre of the lysimeter surface (Figure 1). A sealed pumping system with a flowrate of about 500 mL min⁻¹ allows gas circulation from the accumulation chamber to the detector and its homogenization inside the PFC. The CO₂ concentrations were measured with a CO₂ probe (GMT222 Vaisala) placed in the PFC gas circulation system. To correct the CO₂ probe values, an intercomparison with the micro-GC was realized. This step was realized on several CO₂ concentrations (Information is available in the Supplementary information).

The soil surface CO₂ gas fluxes (F_{CO_2} in g m⁻² min⁻¹) were calculated during the transient state of gas transfer in the flux chamber headspace as follows (Matthias et al. 1980):

$$F_{CO_2} = \frac{V_{ch}}{A_{ch}} \times \frac{dC}{dt} \quad (1)$$

Where dC (g m⁻³) is the variation of the CO₂ vapour concentration in the chamber during dt (min), V_{ch} (m³) is the net volume of the chamber, and A_{ch} (m²) the covered soil surface area.

Based on the principle of gas accumulation within the chamber, the initial slope of the measured gas concentration-time curve is generally used to quantify the time derivative of Eq. (1) (Cotel et al. 2015).

Uncertainties in the experimental CO₂ mass fluxes measured with this flux chamber were calculated according to the method used by Cotel et al. (2015). Thus, uncertainties in the flux measurements were determined using a total derivative expansion for correlated variables of F_{CO_2} :

$$\frac{\Delta F_{CO_2}}{F_{CO_2}} = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\Delta(dC/dt)}{dC/dt}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\Delta V_{ch}}{V_{ch}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\Delta A_{ch}}{A_{ch}}\right)^2} \quad (2)$$

Considering uncertainties of 5%, 4% and 8% for CO₂ detector measurements, PFC section and volume, respectively, the total uncertainty in the measured fluxes is about 10.25%.

2.5.Experimental conditions

The same experiment was realized at two different times of the year, in February and October 2019. The timeline of both experiments is presented in Figure 2. For each experiment, the CO₂ injection began at day 0. When the CO₂ concentration gradient was stabilized, an artificial rainfall event was realized at 8.6 d for the 1st experiment and at 6 d for the second (cf. 2.5.2). For the 2nd experiment, a natural rainfall event followed the artificial one at 9 d. During the experiments, the atmospheric pressure varied between 1018 and 1031 hPa for the 1st experiment and between 992 and 1023 hPa for the 2nd experiment.

Figure 2. Timelines of the experiment realized in February 2019 (A) and in October 2019 (B).

2.5.1. Gas injection conditions

The gas injection was conducted with a bottle of CO₂ (99.7% Air Liquide) equipped with a flow controller set at about 0.3 L.min⁻¹. The gas was injected inside the retention tank at 160 cm depth of the lysimeter for 2 weeks.

2.5.2. Artificial rainfall event

For the two experiments, an intense rainfall event of about 100 mm of tap water was simulated during respectively 6 h and 2 h. The rainfall event was conducted in the centre of the lysimeter over a surface of 0.82×0.82 m (0.67 m²) leading to a total of 69 L. On this surface, 23 tubes (inner diameter: 8 cm; H: 15 cm) were placed regularly on a regular mesh (Figure 1) and pressed 2 cm deep. These tubes allowed the homogeneous injection of tap water in soil (12 x 250 mL / tube). The water was recovered at the outlet of the lysimeter through the gooseneck system (Figure 1). During the 2nd experiment, the same amount of water was injected in the centre of the lysimeter and an equivalent artificial rainfall event was also realized around the moisture probe. The rainfall event around the latter was conducted over a surface of 0.63×0.63 m leading to a total of 42 L. Given the proximity of the probe to the lysimeter, approximately 50% of the quantity of water injected could be collected at the outlet of the lysimeter, i.e. the equivalent of 90 L.

2.6. Calculation of the CO₂ mass balance

The domain considered for determining the approximate mass balance is the surface covered by the artificial rainfall event (0.672 m²) across a depth of 80 cm, equivalent to a volume of 538 L. This domain is divided over depth in 16 equal subdomains ($l \times w \times h = 82 \times 82 \times 5$ cm). Each subdomain was characterised by the porosity, soil moisture content, gas phase volume as well as CO₂ soil concentrations in aqueous and gaseous phase.

According to porosities determined by soil coring method, a porosity of 0.33 was considered for the subdomains located between 0 to 0.5 m depth and 0.29 for the others located between 0.5 to 0.8 m depth. Soil moisture content of each subdomains was estimated based on soil moisture profile data allowing to calculated water phase volume ($V_{aqueous\ phase}$):

$$V_{aqueous\ phase} = \theta_{water} \times V_{subdomain} \quad (3)$$

195 Where θ_{water} (-) is the volumetric soil water content and $V_{subdomain}$ (L) is the volume of the
196 subdomain.

197 The gas phase volume was then calculated as follows:

$$198 \quad V_{gaseous\ phase} = (\theta - \theta_{water}) \times V_{subdomain} \quad (4)$$

199 Where θ (-) is the total connected porosity.

200 CO_2 mass in the gaseous phase in each subdomain was determined based on CO_2 profiles
201 data (Figure 5) and linear interpolation method. Assuming that in the soil the equilibrium
202 between aqueous and gaseous phase was instantaneous, Henry's law was used to calculate the
203 CO_2 mass in the aqueous phase ($m_{aqueous\ phase}$):

$$204 \quad m_{aqueous\ phase} = (C_{gaseous\ phase} \times H^{cc}) \times V_{aqueous\ phase} \quad (5)$$

205 Where, H^{cc} is the dimensionless Henry solubility (C_a/C_g). According to Sander et al. (2011) the
206 H^{cc} value is 0.818 at 25°C.

207 However, the H^{cc} value can change according to the buffering capacity (or alkalinity) of
208 soil water which is the water capacity for solutes it contains to react with and neutralize acid.
209 Thus, in contact with water, H_2O (l) and CO_2 (g) form a carbonic acid molecule H_2CO_3 (aq)
210 according to the carbonation reaction:

212 Where $H_2CO_3^*$ represents the total concentration of dissolved CO_2 and H_2CO_3 .

213 As H_2CO_3 (aq) is an acid, it reacts to form a bicarbonate ion HCO_3^- (aq) and a solvated
214 proton H_3O^+ (aq):

216 Then:

218 The previous reactions increase the apparent solubility of CO₂. These dissolutions can
219 also be increased in presence of calcite. However, the Bernard calcimeter method showed that
220 the level of calcite in the soil studied was inferior to the quantification level (0.1%) (Rodier,
221 1976). Thus, from the alkalinity, pH and CO₂ added in the media, an apparent Henry constant
222 (H_{app}^{cc}) can be calculated. Before and during the CO₂ injection (at steady state), alkalinity
223 measurements were realized by titration method (Table 1) on the water recovered at the outlet
224 of the lysimeter (Rodier, 1976). Alkalinity at 0.4 m and 0.8 m was estimated based on CO₂
225 concentration profile at steady state (Figure 5) and alkalinity in the outflowing water using a
226 linear interpolation (Table 1). According to this method, the average value of H_{app}^{cc} estimated is
227 1.151 at 15°C.

228 Table 1. Parameters of the water recovered at the outlet of the lysimeter before and during the
229 CO₂ injection at steady state.

Experiment		at 0 d	At steady state		
Depth (m)		1.85	1.85	0.8	0.4
Soil	CO ₂ gas concentration (% Vol CO ₂)	0.30	99.70	20.73	4.55
	CO ₂ gas concentration added ^a	/	99.40	20.43	4.25
Aqueous phase	pH	7.39	6.41		
	Alkalinity (mol L ⁻¹)	0.0034	0.0256	/	/
	H ₂ CO ₃ concentration (mol L ⁻¹) ^a	0.0004	0.0259	/	/
	HCO ₃ ⁻ concentration added (mol L ⁻¹) ^b	/	0.0222 ^a	0.0046	0.0009
	H ₂ CO ₃ concentration added (mol L ⁻¹) ^c	/	0.0255 ^b	0.0052	0.0011

230 ^a $10^{(pKa \times \log([HCO_3^-]) - pH)}$ with pKa = 6.415 at 15°C

231 ^b $[HCO_3^-]_{added} = ([HCO_3^-]_{at\ steady\ state} - [HCO_3^-]_{at\ 0\ d}) \times \% \ CO_2\ gas\ concentration\ added$

232 ^c $[H_2CO_3^*]_{added} = ([H_2CO_3^*]_{at\ steady\ state} - [H_2CO_3^*]_{at\ 0\ d}) \times \% \ CO_2\ gas\ concentration\ added$

233

3. Results

3.1. Artificial rainfall event monitoring

Figure 3 shows the evolution of soil moisture content as a function of depth at different periods: before and during the artificial rainfall event. For the 2nd experiment, the initial soil moisture content was different than for the 1st experiment (Figure 3).

Figure 3. Spatial variation along vertical profile for soil moisture during and after the artificial rainfall event in February 2019 (A) and October 2019 (B) experiments.

Indeed, initial moisture content was in average of 0.097 for the February experiment and 0.12 for the 2nd experiment. Even if, water content varies in function of the depth, a consistent evolution of the profiles was observed during and after the rainfall event.

Figure 4 presents the cumulative outflow of water recovered at the outlet of the lysimeter. Two days after the artificial rainfall event, only 50% of the water amount injected was collected for the 1st experiment while this value was 92% for the 2nd experiment for the same duration. This difference may be linked to initial soil moisture content which was higher during the 2nd experiment (Figure 3).

Figure 4. Cumulative outflow obtained during and after the artificial rainfall event in February 2019 (A) and October 2019 (B). The artificial rainfall events are highlighted with a grey area. The dotted lines indicate a data acquisition problem.

3.2. Soil CO₂ concentrations

Figure 5 presents the evolution of CO₂ soil gas concentrations as a function of depth at different periods during the gas injection, until CO₂ profile stabilization. Measures were realized before the CO₂ injection for baseline data. The CO₂ profiles obtained were like that presented on Figure 5 at day 0 with a low CO₂ content ≈ 0.3 vol %. During the injection, CO₂ content between 0.4 and 1.4 m depth respectively increased until 5 and de making the CO₂ produced by the soil respiration negligible.

The CO₂ concentration at 0 m depth corresponds to the atmospheric concentration of CO₂. For the first experiment, the CO₂ stabilization in the soil occurred about 4 days after the injection began (Figure 5-A). For the second experiment, the stabilization occurred later, about 5-6 days after the injection started. Indeed, even if the overall profile seems to be stable at day 4, CO₂ concentration at 0.4 m depth still varied after day 4 in the 2nd injection (Figure 5-B). Moreover, during the injection, a change of slope at 0.8 m depth was observed. Due to its density, CO₂ gas (1.83 instead of 1.21 kg m⁻³ for air), may have accumulated in the lysimeter, *i.e.* between 1.05 and 1.85 m depth, and the concentrations at 0.8 m may be influenced by dense CO₂ flowing laterally from the lysimeter to the surrounding soil. This may explain the change

of CO₂ concentration slope observed at 0.8 and 0.4 m. Indeed, compared to diffusion, the density effect can be neglected only for very low concentrations. Thus, the interpretation of obtained results focused above all on the first 0.8 m of the lysimeter.

Figure 5. Evolution of CO₂ concentration profile at different period during the CO₂ injection in February 2019 (A) and in October 2019 (B). For A and B, the figure on the right is the inset of the figure on the left.

The temporal evolution of CO₂ soil gas concentrations is presented in Figure 6. In the left part of each graph, the increase of CO₂ soil concentrations is clearly observed during the beginning of the injection. The CO₂ gas concentrations at 0.4 and 0.8 m depth respectively increased to 80 and 380 g m⁻³ for the February experiment and to 50 and 230 g m⁻³ for the 2nd experiment. The grey part of graphs related to rainfall events will be described below.

Figure 6. Times series for CO₂ soil gas concentrations measured at 0.4 (blue dots) and 0.8 m (orange dots) depth, in the centre of the lysimeter during the CO₂ injection in February 2019 (A) and in October 2019 (B). The artificial and natural rainfall events are underlined by a grey and blue area, respectively.

After the artificial rainfall event, the CO₂ profiles showed a significant modification linked to the presence of water at the top of the lysimeter. In fact, a clear decrease of CO₂ gas concentrations was observed, especially at 0.8 m depth (Figure 6 and 7). During the 1st experiment, the CO₂ concentration at this depth decreased rapidly from 388 to 65 g m⁻³. This minimum CO₂ concentration was measured 14 h after the beginning of the rainfall event and represents a 5.9-fold decrease (Figure 7). Then, CO₂ concentrations increased and reached their previous concentrations after two days. For the 2nd experiment, the CO₂ minimum concentration was reached faster than for the 1st experiment. Indeed, the CO₂ concentration at this depth decreased rapidly from 240 to 42 g m⁻³. This minimum CO₂ concentration was measured 4 h after the beginning of the rainfall event and represents a 5.6-fold decrease. Then, the CO₂ profiles returned to the steady state after 2.75 and 2 days for 1st and 2nd experiment, respectively (Figure 7).

The CO₂ gas concentrations variations can be analysed in relation with soil moisture content change for the second rainfall event (Figure 3). The highest soil moisture contents were observed at 6.17 d when the CO₂ gas concentration at 0.8 m depth was the lowest. Moreover,

the moisture content profile turned back to steady state after 2 days as for CO₂ concentration profile (Figure 3 and 7).

Figure 7. Evolution of CO₂ concentration profile at different period after the rainfall event, at 9 d for February 2019 (A) and at 6.08 d for October 2019 (B). For A and B, the figure on the right is the inset of the figure on the left.

3.3. CO₂ soil surface fluxes

The temporal evolution of CO₂ fluxes at lysimeter surface are presented in Figure 8. For the 1st experiment, the measured CO₂ fluxes increased until a stabilization around 35 mg m⁻² min⁻¹ which occurred about 5 days after injection began. For the 2nd experiment, the measured CO₂ fluxes increase until about 40 mg m⁻² min⁻¹. The fluxes measured across the surface were greatly inferior compared to the injected CO₂ flux because part of injected CO₂ escapes laterally and another part accumulates at depth.

After the artificial rainfall events, a significant decrease of CO₂ fluxes was noticed for both experiments. They dropped from 35 to below 10, and from 40 to 1 mg m⁻² min⁻¹ for 1st and 2nd experiment (Figure 8), respectively. After these events, the CO₂ fluxes previously obtained at steady state were not reached again, while the soil CO₂ concentrations reached back their original values (Figure 7).

Figure 8. Times series of CO₂ soil surface fluxes, in the center of the lysimeter during the CO₂ injection in February 2019 (A) and in October 2019 (B). The artificial rainfall events are highlighted with a grey area.

3.4. CO₂ mass balance

To understand the influence of rainfall events on surface CO₂ gas fluxes, an approximate mass balance was calculated for both experiments. This mass balance is based on CO₂ profiles data obtained at the steady state (at 8.5 d and 6 d for event 1 and 2, respectively) and after the artificial rainfall events (at 9.22 d for event 1 and at 6.17 and 6.34 d for event 2) (Table 2), considering the surface covered by the artificial rainfall event (0.67 m²) across a depth of 80 cm. CO₂ mass in the aqueous phase was calculated with a standard H^{cc} value (Sander et al., 2011) and H_{app}^{cc} determined according to the alkalinity data.

316 Table 2. Estimated mass balance between the end of steady state of CO₂ profile and the end of
317 the artificial rainfall event.

Zone characteristics						
Area considered (m ²)			0.672			
Investigated volume (0 to 0.8 m depth) (L)			538			
Pore volume ^a (0 to 0.8 m depth) (L)			170.18			
Media	Experiment	1st		2nd		
		At steady state	After artificial rainfall event	At steady state	After artificial rainfall event	
		at 8.5 d	at 9.22 d	at 6 d	at 6.17 d	at 6.34 d
Soil	Volume of soil gaseous phase (L)	118.31	46.46	105.59	33.65	89.57
	Volume of the soil aqueous phase (L)	51.87	123.72	64.59	136.53	80.61
	CO ₂ mass in the gaseous phase (g)	16.55	1.82	9.99	1.3	4.16
	CO ₂ mass in the aqueous phase with H ^{cc} = 0.818 (g)	6.70	3.92	4.97	4.96	4.17
	CO ₂ mass in the aqueous phase with H ^{cc} = 1.151 (g)	9.43	5.52	6.99	6.98	5.86
Interface soil/air	CO ₂ Flux (mg m ⁻² min ⁻¹)	29.4 ± 3.8	5.69 ± 0.74	39.9 ± 5.19	0.79 ± 0.1	4.8 ± 0.62
	CO ₂ flow (g min ⁻¹)	0.020	0.004	0.027	0.0005	0.003
Mass Balance ^c		1st		2nd		
		9.22 d - 8.5 d		6.17 d - 6 d		6.34 d - 6.17 d
Soil	Δ CO ₂ mass in the gaseous phase (g)	-14.73		-8.69		2.86
	Δ CO ₂ mass in the aqueous phase with H ^{cc} = 0.818 (g)	-2.78		-0.01		-0.79
	Δ CO ₂ mass in the aqueous phase with H ^{cc} = 1.151 (g)	-3.91		-0.01		-1.12
Interface soil/air	Δ CO ₂ mass (g)	16.59 ± 2.16		6.48 ± 0.84		0.66 ± 0.9

318 ^a Determined according to CO₂ concentration profile at steady state

319 ^b Determined according to CO₂ concentration profile after the artificial rainfall event

320

321 During the 1st experiment, at steady state (8.5 d), the considered soil volume contained
322 between 23.25 and 29.95 g of CO₂ with 16.55 g gaseous phase and between 6.70 and 13.40 g
323 in aqueous phase. After the artificial rainfall event, at 9.22 d, the total CO₂ mass contained in
324 considered soil volume decreased drastically. Indeed, the soil only contained between 5.74 and
325 9.61 g (about 3.6 times less than at steady state) with 1.82 g gaseous phase and between
326 3.92 and 7.79 g in aqueous phase. According to this mass balance, the mass of CO₂ lost in the
327 gas phase between 8.5 and 9.22 d would have been moved to the atmosphere at the top of the
328 investigated volume. In fact, according to CO₂ flux measurements, the CO₂ amount emitted at
329 the soil/air interface during this period was 16.59 ± 2.16 g, corresponding rather well to the
330 mass of CO₂ lost in the gas phase of about 14.73 g (Table 2). Concerning, the CO₂ amount in
331 aqueous phase between these two states, it did not increase significantly, even if the quantity of

water injected at the soil surface (about 69 L) was localised in the investigated volume. Indeed, the volume of the soil aqueous phase was 51.9 L at 8.5 d and 123.7 L at 9.22 d.

The same observations were done for the 2nd experiment. Indeed, CO₂ mass decreased after the artificial rainfall event (6.17 d) by a factor of 2.1. The CO₂ amount in aqueous phase did not significantly vary. The mass balance also shows that the mass of CO₂ lost in the gas phase between 6.0 and 6.17 days is equivalent to the one lost at the top of the lysimeter. After day 6.34 of this 2nd experiment, a return at steady state conditions is observed (11 d) (Figure 7). Indeed, the water added begun to flow out of the investigated volume and the CO₂ mass in the gaseous phase begun to increase. A decrease, between 0.79 and 1.57 g of CO₂ in the aqueous phase is observed (Table 2).

3.5. Influence of natural rainfall events

The temporal evolution of precipitations and soil moisture content after the 2nd rainfall event are presented in Figure 9. The rainfall events modify directly soil moisture content even during a light and short-term rain. However, the depth of soil moisture modification varies according to the rainfall intensity and duration. For example, during the light and short-term rains between 20 and 22 d, a little increase of soil moisture could be only observed at 0.07 m depth whereas during the light and longer-term rainfall events (18 d - 19 d), the water contents were modified at 0.07 and 0.37 m depth (Figure 9-C and D). During the heavy natural rainfall events highlighted in blue (Figure 9-C), soil moisture increased at every depth.

Figure 9. For the October experiment, times series of (A) CO₂ soil gas concentrations measured at 0.4 (solid line) and 0.8 m (short dash) depth, (B) CO₂ soil surface fluxes, in the centre of the lysimeter, (C) precipitation, the heavy rain are highlighted, (D) relative soil moisture at 0.07, 0.37 and 0.77 m depth and (E) outflow of water recorded during natural rainfall events from 8 d to 22 d of the October experiment. The data obtained after the artificial rainfall event are highlighted in grey.

357

358 The evolution of CO₂ soil gas concentrations and CO₂ fluxes at lysimeter surface during

359 natural rainfall events are also shown in Figure 9. The evolution of CO₂ fluxes showed a

360 relationship with the relative soil moisture (Figure 9-B, C and D) The CO₂ fluxes can be

361 analysed between day 13 and 17 where enough measurements could be done (Figure 9-B).

362 Between day 13 and 15, the effect of the heavy rainfall identified through the high water content

seem to lead to very low values of CO₂ fluxes (below 1 mg m⁻² min⁻¹), despite the still high CO₂ concentrations in the soil. These values are even lower than the one observed during or after the artificial event. This may be linked to the higher water content than during the artificial event period. During a short period, at day 15, some values of significant fluxes, close to the one after the artificial rainfall event, are observed (≈ 17.5 mg m⁻² min⁻¹). They occur in a period where the soil water content decreases and reaches values close to the one observed after the rainfall event. However, when the water content increases again, the fluxes become negligible again. Despite few values a similar behaviour could be observed at day 21 and 22 where a decrease of water content seems to lead to high CO₂ fluxes values.

4. Discussion

4.1. Soil CO₂ diffusivities

During the artificial rainfall event, the increase of soil moisture content impacted CO₂ soil gas fluxes. The Figure 10 shows the good accordance between CO₂ fluxes measurements and CO₂ concentration gradients calculated between 0 and 0.4 m depth at the beginning of the CO₂ injection until steady state.

Figure 10. Relationship between CO₂ fluxes measurements and CO₂ concentration gradients (0 - 0.4 m depth) during February experiment (A) and October experiment (B).

According to first Fick law, the CO₂ flux (F_{CO_2}) and CO₂ concentration are related through the effective diffusion coefficient (D_e):

381 $F = D_e \times \frac{dC}{dz}$ (6)

382 Even if atmospheric pressure varied during the experiments, Atteia and Höhener (2010)
 383 showed that advective fluxes play a significant role only when the water saturation is very close
 384 one, which never occur during the experiment.

385 Therefore, the experimental D_e can be calculated using eq. 6 and results from Figure 10. For
 386 both experiment, D_e was calculated at steady state (8.5 and 6.0 d) and after the rainfall event
 387 (9.22 and 6.17 d) on the first 40 centimetres (Table 3). The experimental D_e were compared to
 388 the one predicted by classical empirical formulae in Table 3. Indeed, D_e can be estimated with
 389 the molecular diffusivity of CO_2 in air and an empirical tortuosity factors (τ) which was
 390 determined in function of gas-phase (Θ_g) and total (Θ) porosity. τ was estimated according to
 391 the relationships of Moldrup (2000) $\tau = \Theta_g^{2.5}/\Theta$, Millington and Quirk (1961) $\tau = \Theta_g^{10/3}/\Theta^2$,
 392 Millington (1959) $\tau = \Theta_g^{7/3}/\Theta^2$ and Penman (1940) $\tau = 0.66 \times \Theta_g$. These calculations were
 393 based on the experimental measurements (Figure 3).

394 Table 3. Effect of soil air-filled porosity on the measured effective diffusion coefficient and
 395 comparison with values calculated by empirical methods.

Experiment		1st		2nd	
		At steady state	After artificial rainfall event	At steady state	After artificial rainfall event
Soil moisture content (0 to 0.4 m depth) (-)		0.09	0.24	0.13	0.245
Experimental D_e ($\text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$)		$2.35 \times 10^{-6} \pm 2.4 \times 10^{-7}$	$9.48 \times 10^{-7} \pm 9.7 \times 10^{-8}$	$4.66 \times 10^{-6} \pm 4.8 \times 10^{-7}$	$9.30 \times 10^{-8} \pm 9.5 \times 10^{-9}$
Estimated D_e^a ($\text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$)	Moldrup et al. (2000)	1.19×10^{-6}	2.57×10^{-7}	7.53×10^{-7}	8.87×10^{-8}
	Millington and Quirk (1961)	1.1×10^{-6}	4.17×10^{-8}	5.97×10^{-7}	3.45×10^{-8}
	Millington (1959)	4.57×10^{-6}	4.63×10^{-7}	2.99×10^{-6}	4.05×10^{-7}
	Penman (1940)	2.20×10^{-6}	8.26×10^{-7}	1.83×10^{-6}	7.80×10^{-7}

396 ^a Free-air diffusion coefficient used for calculation were $D_{\text{air}} \text{CO}_2 = 1.39 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ (Pritchard and Currie, 1982)

397
 398 As expected, D_e decreases with the increase of soil moisture content (Hers et al., 2000;
 399 Jassal et al., 2005). According to the 1st experiment results, at steady state (8.5 and 6 d), D_e was

about $2.35 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ and decreased drastically after the artificial rainfall event (9.22 d) to $9.48 \times 10^{-7} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$. The same observation can be done for the 2nd experiment.

Overall, the comparisons between experimental and calculated D_e indicate that the Penman and Millington (1959) relationships provide correct estimates. Indeed, the D_e were similar or close by a factor of 0.55 to 2.55.

An exception was found for the estimated D_e , during the second experiment (after artificial rainfall event), where the estimated D_e calculated with the Moldrup relationship seemed approaching to experimental value with D_e of $8.87 \times 10^{-8} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ and $9.30 \times 10^{-8} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$, respectively.

Hers et al. (2000) also observed a difference of the same order of magnitude between the measured and predicted values. They obtained a good comparison between the measured gas-phase tortuosity factor and the one predicted using the Millington and Quirk relationship with measured tortuosity factors about twice the predicted values.

These differences could be partly explained by the uncertainties in the experimental measures on the CO₂ flux, soil moisture contents and soil CO₂ concentrations.

4.2. Influence of rainfall events

Few studies, to our knowledge, tried understanding the impacts of rainfall events on the CO₂ leakages to the environment and more particularly their influence on the CO₂ diffusion along soil profile and CO₂ fluxes (Oh et al., 2019; Seo et al., 2020). Understanding mechanisms is however crucial to advance modelling approaches to simulate CO₂ flux surfaces under changing environmental conditions.

4.2.1. Artificial rainfall event

After the artificial rainfall events, soil moisture content firstly increased while a significant decrease of soil CO₂ concentrations and CO₂ fluxes was observed. After this, CO₂

concentrations and soil water contents reached back the steady state values at approximately 2 days. The recovery process was longer for CO₂ fluxes. However, for both experiments, the return to the steady state of CO₂ fluxes was not observed. During the 1st experiment, it is possible that the measurement was stopped before the end of the recovery step. For the 2nd experiment, the heavy natural rainfall prevented the observation of the return to steady state.

A similar behaviour was observed by Lewicki et al. (2009) and Tommasone Pascale al. (2015). During a CO₂ release experiment, Lewicki et al. (2009) observed a decrease of CO₂ concentration which could have been partially due to changes in soil physical properties associated with significant rainfall events (10 – 20 mm). However, this effect of precipitations was not observed on the CO₂ fluxes. Tommasone Pascale al. (2015) studied the effect of rainstorm events on ²²²Rn activity in soil, and observed an immediate drop in ²²²Rn activities by several orders of magnitude after rainfall events. At the end of precipitation, soil ²²²Rn activities did not appear to recover rapidly, at least for a time span of about a couple of days after storm ending. Tommasone Pascale et al (2015) shared the hypothesis given by Garcia-Vindas and Monnin (2005) stating that the immediate drop in ²²²Rn activities following rainfall events are attributed to the dissolution of ²²²Rn into the infiltrated water. This step consists in the “wash-out step” during which rainfall water infiltrates into the pore network and progressively washes out the radon, likely transferring to lower levels of the profile. Besides the different chemical behaviour of ²²²Rn and CO₂ (e.g. production and decay), the present study seems to support this hypothesis. Indeed, a clear decrease of the total CO₂ mass was observed after the artificial rainfall event (Table 1).

In the mass balance calculations, the loss of CO₂ in the considered volume was like the loss measured at the soil surface. This implies that there is no entering flux of CO₂ from the source located below 80 cm while it is still providing a flux of CO₂. One potential explanation, which is already cited by Viveiros et al. (2008), is that during a significant rainfall event the

soil gas is blocked below the infiltrated water. In that case, there could be a significant advective downward soil gas flux that would prevent the arrival of high CO₂ gas from the source.

Concerning the slow recovery stage of gas concentrations, there was no explication or hypothesis established in the literature at our knowledge. The results showed that the CO₂ profiles went overall back to steady state after 2.37 days from the beginning of rainfall event for the 1st experiment and 1.87 days for the 2nd experiment (Figure 7). However, observation data indicate that depending on depth CO₂ concentrations were not exactly back to steady state at the same time. For example, during the 1st experiment, CO₂ concentration at 0.8 m depth was back to steady state after about 2.46 and after 4.3 d at 0.4 m depth. The longer of recovery time lag at shallow depth may explain the slow recovery process of CO₂ flux. It would have been interesting to follow the temporal evolution of CO₂ concentrations at different depths between the surface and 0.4 m depth to confirm the time lag effect.

4.2.2. Influence of natural rainfall events

During the 2nd experiment, different intensities of precipitation impacted CO₂ fluxes differently. The low-amplitude rainfall events and short-lived (estimated at less than 1-2 mm) cause a temporary mere wetting of the first centimetres of the ground surface which does not or barely affects soil CO₂ concentrations and flux. On the contrary, significant rainfall events (higher than 2 mm) appear to produce a clear decrease of CO₂ fluxes, owing by increase of soil moisture content in deeper. Tommasone Pascale et al (2015) also observed the modifications of ²²²Rn activities deriving from significant rainfall depend on rainfall duration, persistency, and intensity.

5. Conclusion

The effect of rainfall events on soil gas flux was experimentally studied with lysimeter experiments. Rainfall and soil moisture have caused significant modifications in soil CO₂

concentrations and flux during both experiments. During persistent and significant rainfall, the results clearly show a significant decrease of CO₂ flux to atmosphere induced by rainfall infiltration and consequential wash-out of the CO₂ present in the soil. After rainfall events, the recovery processes of soil CO₂ concentrations and fluxes were found to be very slow after the end of the artificial rainfall. Moreover, it can be expected that the temporal evolution of soil CO₂ concentrations is markedly dependent on the rainfall history of the site (total rainfall intensity, frequency and duration, intervals between rainfall events...) and the soil hydrodynamic properties. It should be noted that these experiments simulated conditions with high CO₂ concentrations like conditions encountered at CO₂ storage sites or petroleum-contaminated sites with high degradation rates. The conclusions can perhaps not be generalized to other sites with low CO₂ concentrations, e.g. in arid climates where water infiltration could stimulate respiration. In the present case, respiration in the vadose zone was assumed to be low and independent on moisture content.

Complementary studies are needed to understand and take into account all parameters that drive CO₂ diffusion along soil profile and CO₂ fluxes at the soil-atmosphere interface. Understanding these mechanisms is crucial in order to advance modelling approaches to predict CO₂ surfaces flux under changing environmental conditions.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank the partner companies of the INNOVASOL consortium which permitted to realize this research project.

- Atteia, O., Höhener, P., 2010. Semianalytical Model Predicting Transfer of Volatile Pollutants from Groundwater to the Soil Surface. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 44, 6228–6232. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es903477f>
- Beaubien, S.E., Jones, D.G., Gal, F., Barkwith, A.K.A.P., Braibant, G., Baubron, J.-C., Ciotoli, G., Graziani, S., Lister, T.R., Lombardi, S., Michel, K., Quattrocchi, F., Strutt, M.H., 2013. Monitoring of near-surface gas geochemistry at the Weyburn, Canada, CO₂-EOR site, 2001–2011. *Int. J. Greenh. Gas Control*, The IEAGHG Weyburn-Midale CO₂ Monitoring and Storage Project 16, S236–S262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2013.01.013>
- Bekele, D.N., Naidu, R., Chadalavada, S., 2014. Influence of spatial and temporal variability of subsurface soil moisture and temperature on vapour intrusion. *Atmos. Environ.* 88, 14–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.01.053>
- Bernardo, C., Vries, D.F. de, 2011. Permanent shallow subsoil CO₂ flux chambers for monitoring of onshore CO₂ geological storage sites. *Int. J. Greenh. Gas Control*, The 5th Trondheim Conference on CO₂ Capture, Transport and Storage 5, 565–570. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2010.05.011>
- Bornemann, F., 1920. Kohlensäure und Pflanzenwachstum. *Mitt. Dtsch. Landwirtsch.-Ges.* 35:363.
- Choi, J.-W., Smith, J.A., 2005. Geoenvironmental Factors Affecting Organic Vapor Advection and Diffusion Fluxes from the Unsaturated Zone to the Atmosphere under Natural Conditions. *Environ. Eng. Sci.* 22, 95–108. <https://doi.org/10.1089/ees.2005.22.95>
- Conant, B.H., Gillham, R.W., Mendoza, C.A., 1996. Vapor Transport of Trichloroethylene in the Unsaturated Zone: Field and Numerical Modeling Investigations. <https://doi.org/10.1029/95WR02965>
- Cotel, S., Schaefer, G., Sylvie, T., Marzougui-Jaafar, S., Gay, G., Razakarisoa, O., 2015. Evaluation of VOC fluxes at the soil-air interface using different flux chambers and a quasi-analytical approach. *Water. Air. Soil Pollut.* 226. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11270-015-2596-y>
- Elío, J., Nisi, B., Ortega, M.F., Mazadiego, L.F., Vaselli, O., Grandia, F., 2013. CO₂ soil flux baseline at the technological development plant for CO₂ injection at Hontomin (Burgos, Spain). *Int. J. Greenh. Gas Control* 18, 224–236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2013.07.013>
- Elío, J., Ortega, M.F., Nisi, B., Mazadiego, L.F., Vaselli, O., Caballero, J., Chacón, E., 2016. A multi-statistical approach for estimating the total output of CO₂ from diffuse soil degassing by the accumulation chamber method. *Int. J. Greenh. Gas Control* 47, 351–363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2016.02.012>
- Fa, K.-Y., Liu, J.-B., Zhang, Y.-Q., Wu, B., Qin, S.-G., Feng, W., Lai, Z.-R., 2015. CO₂ absorption of sandy soil induced by rainfall pulses in a desert ecosystem. *Hydrol. Process.* 29, 2043–2051. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.10350>
- Garcia-Vindas, J.R., Monnin, M.M., 2005. Radon concentration measurements in the presence of water and its consequences for Earth sciences studies. *Radiat. Meas.* 39, 319–322. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radmeas.2004.06.014>
- Hers, I., Li, L., Hannam, S., 2004. Evaluation of soil gas sampling and analysis techniques at a former petrochemical plant site. *Environ. Technol.* 25, 847–860. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09593330.2004.9619377>

- Hers, I., Zapf-Gilje, R., Li, L., Atwater, J., 2000. Measurement of in Situ Gas-Phase Diffusion Coefficients. *Environ. Technol.* 21, 631–640. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09593330.2000.9618948>
- Jassal, R., Black, A., Novak, M., Morgenstern, K., Nesic, Z., Gaumont-Guay, D., 2005. Relationship between soil CO₂ concentrations and forest-floor CO₂ effluxes. *Agric. For. Meteorol.* 130, 176–192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2005.03.005>
- Kim, J., Yu, S., Yun, S.-T., Kim, K.-H., Kim, J.-H., Shinn, Y.-J., Chae, G., 2019. CO₂ leakage detection in the near-surface above natural CO₂-rich water aquifer using soil gas monitoring. *Int. J. Greenh. Gas Control* 88, 261–271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2019.06.015>
- Klenbusch, M., 1986. Measurement of Gaseous Emission Rates From Land Surfaces Using an Emission Isolation Flux Chamber: User's Guide. US Environ. Prot. Agency Wash. DC EPA6008-86008.
- Lelli, M., Raco, B., 2017. A reliable and effective methodology to monitor CO₂ flux from soil: The case of Lipari Island (Sicily, Italy). *Appl. Geochem.* 85, 73–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeochem.2017.08.004>
- Lewicki, J.L., Hilley, G.E., Dobeck, L., Spangler, L., 2009. Dynamics of CO₂ fluxes and concentrations during a shallow subsurface CO₂ release. *Environ. Earth Sci.*
- Ma, J., Zheng, X.-J., Li, Y., 2012. The response of CO₂ flux to rain pulses at a saline desert. *Hydrol. Process.* 26, 4029–4037. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.9204>
- Matthias, A.D., Blackmer, A.M., Bremner, J.M., 1980. A Simple Chamber Technique for Field Measurement of Emissions of Nitrous Oxide from Soils. *J. Environ. Qual.* 9, 251–256. <https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq1980.00472425000900020017x>
- Millington, R.J., 1959. Gas Diffusion in Porous Media. *Science* 130, 100–102. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.130.3367.100-a>
- Millington, R.J., Quirk, J.P., 1961. Permeability of porous solids. *Trans. Faraday Soc.* 57, 1200–1207. <https://doi.org/10.1039/TF9615701200>
- Moldrup, P., Olesen, T., Gamst, J., Schjønning, P., Yamaguchi, T., Rolston, D.E., 2000. Predicting the Gas Diffusion Coefficient in Repacked Soil Water-Induced Linear Reduction Model. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 64, 1588–1594. <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj2000.6451588x>
- Norman, J.M., Kucharik, C.J., Gower, S.T., Baldocchi, D.D., Crill, P.M., Rayment, M., Savage, K., Striegl, R.G., 1997. A comparison of six methods for measuring soil-surface carbon dioxide fluxes. *J. Geophys. Res. Atmospheres* 102, 28771–28777. <https://doi.org/10.1029/97JD01440>
- Oh, Y.Y., Yun, S.T., Yu, S., Kim, H.J., Jun, S.C., 2019. A novel wavelet-based approach to characterize dynamic environmental factors controlling short-term soil surface CO₂ flux: Application to a controlled CO₂ release test site (EIT) in South Korea. *Geoderma* 337, 76–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2018.09.017>
- Palaia, T., Jimmo, A., Mahler, N., Molinari, C., Clements, L., 2018. Technical measurement guidance for LNAPL natural source zone depletion. CRC CARE Tech. Rep. No 44 254. <https://doi.org/10.1089/ees.2005.22.95>
- Penman, H.L., 1940. Gas and vapour movements in the soil: I. The diffusion of vapours through porous solids. *J. Agric. Sci.* 30, 437–462. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021859600048164>
- Petersen, L.W. (Danish I. of P. and S.S., El-Farhan, Y.H., Moldrup, P., Rolston, D.E., Yamaguchi, T., 1996. Transient diffusion, adsorption, and emission of volatile organic vapors in soils with fluctuating low water contents. *J. Environ. Qual. USA.*
- Reinhart, D.R., Cooper, D.C., Walker, B.L., 1992. Flux Chamber Design and Operation for the Measurement of Municipal Solid Waste Landfill Gas Emission Rates. *J. Air Waste Manag. Assoc.* 42, 1067–1070. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10473289.1992.10467053>

- Risk, D.A., Kellman, L.M., Beltrami, H., 2002. Soil CO₂ production and surface flux at four climate observatories in eastern Canada. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001GB001831>
- Rochette, P., Hutchinson, G., 2005. Measurement of Soil Respiration in situ: Chamber Techniques. Publ. USDA-ARS UNL Fac.
- Rodier, J., 1976. L'analyse de l'eau. Eaux naturelles, eaux résiduaires, eaux de mer., Dunod Tech, Bordas, Paris. ed.
- Sander, S.P., Friedl, R.R., Barker, J.R., Abbatt, J.P.D., Burkholder, J.B., Friedl, R.R., Golden, D.M., Huie, R.E., Kolb, C.E., Kurylo, M.J., Moortgat, G.K., Orkin, V.L., Wine, P.H., 2011. Chemical Kinetics and Photochemical Data for Use in Atmospheric Studies Evaluation No. 17. JPL Publ. 10–6, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, 684.
- Schroder, I.F., Zhang, H., Zhang, C., Feitz, A.J., 2016. The role of soil flux and soil gas monitoring in the characterisation of a CO₂ surface leak: A case study in Qinghai, China. *Int. J. Greenh. Gas Control* 54, 84–95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2016.07.030>
- Seo, D.H., Han, W.S., Park, E., Jeong, J., Oh, Y.-Y., Kim, H.-J., Yoo, G., Jun, S.-C., Yun, S.-T., 2020. Analyses and numerical evaluation of integrated time-series monitoring datasets including CO₂ concentration and fluxes at controlled CO₂ release site in South Korea. *J. Hydrol.* 590, 125213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.125213>
- Shao, H., Ussiri, D.A.N., Patterson, C.G., Locke, R.A., II, Wang, H., Taylor, A.H., Cohen, H.F., 2019. Soil gas monitoring at the Illinois Basin – Decatur Project carbon sequestration site. *Int. J. Greenh. Gas Control* 86, 112–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2019.04.012>
- Shen, R., Pennell, K.G., Suuberg, E.M., 2013. Influence of Soil Moisture on Soil Gas Vapor Concentration for Vapor Intrusion. *Environ. Eng. Sci.* 30, 628–637. <https://doi.org/10.1089/ees.2013.0133>
- Shen, R., Pennell, K.G., Suuberg, E.M., 2012. A numerical investigation of vapor intrusion--the dynamic response of contaminant vapors to rainfall events. *Sci. Total Environ.* 437, 110–120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2012.07.054>
- Smith, J.A., Tisdale, A.K., Cho, H.J., 1996. Quantification of Natural Vapor Fluxes of Trichloroethene in the Unsaturated Zone at Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 30, 2243–2250. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es950610c>
- Tillman, F.D., Smith, J.A., 2004. Design and laboratory testing of a chamber device to measure total flux of volatile organic compounds from the unsaturated zone under natural conditions. *J. Contam. Hydrol.* 75, 71–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconhyd.2004.04.005>
- Tommason Pascale, F., Carbone, P., De Francesco, S., Cuoco, E., Tedesco, D., 2015. Rainstorm-induced soil ²²²Rn concentration spikes observed in Southern Italy. *Environ. Earth Sci.* 73, 8177–8187. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-014-3976-0>
- Viveiros, F., Ferreira, T., Cabral Vieira, J., Silva, C., Gaspar, J.L., 2008. Environmental influences on soil CO₂ degassing at Furnas and Fogo volcanoes (São Miguel Island, Azores archipelago). *J. Volcanol. Geotherm. Res., Volcanic Flows and Falls* 177, 883–893. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2008.07.005>
- Werner, D., Grathwohl, P., Höhener, P., 2004. Review of Field Methods for the Determination of the Tortuosity and Effective Gas-Phase Diffusivity in the Vadose Zone. *Vadose Zone J.* 3, 1240–1248. <https://doi.org/10.2136/vzj2004.1240>
- Wilke, B.-M., 2005. Determination of Chemical and Physical Soil Properties, in: Margesin, R., Schinner, F. (Eds.), *Monitoring and Assessing Soil Bioremediation, Soil Biology*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 47–95. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-28904-6_2
- Yang, L., Chen, Z., Zhang, X., Liu, Y., Xie, Y., 2015. Comparison study of landfill gas emissions from subtropical landfill with various phases: A case study in Wuhan, China.

643 J. Air Waste Manag. Assoc. 65, 980–986.
644 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10962247.2015.1051605>
645