

The Role of Salt Tectonics in the Energy Transition: An Overview and Future Challenges

Oliver B. Duffy *¹, Michael R. Hudec ¹, Frank Peel ¹, Gillian Apps ¹, Alex Bump ¹, Lorena Moscardelli ¹, Tim P. Dooley ¹, Naiara Fernandez ^{1,2}, Shuvajit Bhattacharya ¹, Ken Wisian ¹, Mark W. Shuster ¹

¹Bureau of Economic Geology, Jackson School of Geosciences, The University of Texas at Austin, University Station, Box X, Austin, Texas, 78713-8924, USA | ²Helmholtz Centre Potsdam, GFZ German Research Centre for Geosciences, Potsdam, Germany

Abstract In this paper we examine the role salt tectonics can play in a number of key energy transition technologies, namely, energy storage as gas in salt caverns (e.g. hydrogen and compressed air), CO₂ storage, and geothermal energy. For each of these technologies we explore: i) fundamental concepts and driving forces; ii) how and why the properties of salt are of importance; and iii) the key salt-related technical challenges, potential future research directions, and technical approaches needed for large-scale development. We highlight how salt-bearing basins offer vast potential for development throughout the energy transition including, but not limited to: i) the likely demand for thousands of new hydrogen storage caverns inside salt bodies by 2050; ii) a likely early focus for porous media CO₂ storage sites in basins strongly influenced by salt tectonics; and iii) enhanced geothermal energy potential in and around salt bodies. Effective exploitation of these resources will require a deeper understanding of the internal composition, geometry, and evolution of salt structures and their surrounding sediments, and potentially the development of more predictive models of salt tectonic behaviour. Critically, we see the need to integrate learnings of salt tectonics gained in the academic, mining, solution mining, and oil and gas communities, and apply a fresh perspective to answer research questions of relevance to the energy transition. Developing this new understanding will help optimise design, reduce geotechnical risk, and improve efficiency for energy transition technologies, thus indicating a strong future demand for salt tectonic research.

Executive Editor:
Tony Doré

Associate Editor:
Frank Zwaan
Technical Editor:
Mohamed Gouiza

Reviewers:
L. Muniz Pichel
Sian Evans

Submitted:
19 July 2022
Accepted:
12 December 2022
Published:
20 February 2023

1 Introduction

The properties of salt (the term ‘salt’ refers to rocks composed mainly of evaporite minerals, especially halite) have long been exploited in the search for hydrocarbons, with its fundamental properties influencing all of the key petroleum play elements (e.g., *Kirkland and Eva, 1981; Mello et al., 1995; Warren, 2006; Jackson and Hudec, 2017*). For example, salt is i) thermally conductive, meaning it quickly removes heat from underlying source rocks and allows source rocks below the typical oil window to remain productive in very deep traps (e.g., *Mello et al., 1995*); ii) mobile, such that salt-related deformation generates a myriad of trapping locations and styles within salt-bearing basins, whereas the structural deformation modifies topography and bathymetry and therefore influences the distribution of syn-deformational reservoirs (e.g., *Seni and Jackson, 1983; Hodgson et al., 1992; Rowan and Weimer, 1998; Gee and Gawthorpe, 2006; Winker and Booth, 2000; Cumberpatch et al., 2021*); and iii) self-healing and crystalline meaning it is in most cases impermeable to pore water, hydrocarbons, and gases, and thus typically forms an

ideal seal, to such an extent that 14 of the world’s 25 largest oil fields are sealed by salt (*Warren, 2006*) (Figure 1). The sealing behaviour of salt has also been exploited to store oil, gases, and wastes in underground salt caverns (e.g., *Gillhaus and Horvath, 2008*). These characteristics have driven the pursuit of salt tectonic knowledge over the past century (e.g., see summaries in *Jackson, 1997; Jackson and Hudec, 2017*).




Figure 1 – Salt structures and their influence on petroleum system elements (*Jackson and Hudec, 2017*). Reproduced with permission of Cambridge University Press through PLSclear.

Current ambitions to decarbonize energy systems

*✉ oliver.duffy@beg.utexas.edu

to reduce the harmful effects of anthropogenic global warming will require a combination of reducing fossil fuel consumption and carbon dioxide emissions, along with the ambitiously technological goal of capturing and sequestering as much carbon dioxide as possible (Figure 2). Within this framework, a number of technologies have been proposed to help the transition to a stable, safe, low carbon energy economy, these include, but are not limited to: (i) widespread use of carbon capture from industrial processes and subsequent sequestration within the subsurface; (ii) upscaling of hydrogen production and usage requiring upscaling of subsurface hydrogen storage; (iii) wider use of geothermal energy (e.g., *Ringrose and Meckel, 2019; Stephenson et al., 2019; Hashemi et al., 2021; Shuster et al., 2021; Tester et al., 2021; Crotogino, 2022; Lankof et al., 2022; Muhammed et al., 2022*).

Critically, the properties of salt that make it such a valuable element in oil and gas exploration are also important to these energy transition technologies. For example, an understanding of salt properties and behaviour is critical for seasonal and/or strategic subsurface storage with high efficiency of recoverability (e.g. hydrogen, hydrocarbons and compressed air), and long-term sequestration where recoverability is not desired (CO₂ storage and waste disposal). Storage may be within the salt itself (e.g. salt caverns and intra-salt repositories for hydrogen or hydrocarbons) or within the sediments around the salt in traps generated by salt tectonics. Furthermore, understanding the thermal properties of salt and how the geometry of salt bodies may focus heat flow is important given that salt-bearing basins may be particularly prospective for geothermal energy (e.g., *Tester et al., 2007; Moeck, 2014; Daniilidis and Herber, 2017; Raymond et al., 2022*). In light of this, we explore the role salt tectonics can play in the energy transition. We specifically address the fundamental concepts and driving forces for aspects salt may influence in the energy transition including: (i) storage inside salt domes; (ii) CO₂ storage in salt basins; (iii) and geothermal exploration. For each of these fields we outline our perspective on the key salt-related technical challenges, potential future research directions, and technical approaches needed. Overall, we find that if salt is to be fully exploited and to play a significant role in the energy transition, there will be strong future demand for salt tectonic research, albeit, with a shift in focus.

2 Storage in Salt Caverns

2.1 Salt Caverns Overview and Potential Future Demand

2.1.1 Salt Caverns Basics

Salt caverns are man-made voids in the subsurface created by the process of solution mining from domal or bedded salt deposits. In this process, low salinity water is pumped down a borehole that penetrates the salt, the water dissolves the salt, and the

resulting brine is pumped to the surface, leaving a cavern (Figure 3). Salt caverns are typically developed at between 400 and 2000 m depth, with caverns in domal salt commonly 300-500 m tall, 50-100 m in diameter, and with a volume of 500,000 m³ (e.g., *Crotogino, 2016; Warren, 2016; Michalski et al., 2017; Muhammed et al., 2022*). Caverns dissolved into bedded salts typically have lower heights and are smaller than those in domal salt (e.g., 100,000-300,000 m³; *Plaat, 2009; Matos et al., 2019*), with heights restricted by the thickness of the soluble halite-rich units within lithologically heterogeneous bedded salt sequences (*Foh et al., 1979; Bruno and Dusseault, 2002; Han et al., 2007*) (Figure 4).

Caverns created by salt dissolution have commonly been created as an incidental byproduct of solution mining of salt, where the salt content of the extracted brine is recovered by surface evaporation. Solution caverns have also been created intentionally for storage of hazardous waste, hydrocarbons, compressed air, or hydrogen (e.g., *Wassman, 1983; Dusseault and Davidson, 1999; Gillhaus and Horvath, 2008; Warren, 2016, 2017*). The primary function of solution caverns that are created as a byproduct of solution mining is to optimise salt recovery, so the resulting cavity may not have suitable geometry or stability for storage purposes. For example, they may be too large, or may extend to the edge of the salt and intersect the surrounding country rock. In contrast, solution caverns created for storage must be engineered for the purpose (e.g., *Plaat, 2009; Cyran, 2020*). This means maintaining a stable size and shape, not intersecting the boundaries of the salt body, and not prone to leak for appropriate timescales (Figure 4). Notably, the required timescales for safe containment vary markedly, being 30-50 yrs (for storing hydrogen and hydrocarbons) to ~1,000,000 years (for safe disposal of some nuclear wastes; *Gibb, 1999; Warren, 2017*).

A set of solution caverns within a single salt body is termed a cavern field, and as of 2008, >90% of known cavern fields in domal salt were located in the US Gulf Coast and the Southern Permian Basin (Central Poland, Netherlands, and North Germany) (*Gillhaus and Horvath, 2008*). Perhaps the best known storage caverns are those that comprise the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) along the Texas and Louisiana Gulf Coast, which were formed by the US Government in the 1970's to store oil in case of interrupted supply. Today, the SPR consists of 61 salt caverns at four locations, with a current authorised storage capacity of 714 million barrels (<https://www.energy.gov/fecm/strategic-petroleum-reserve-9>).

2.1.2 Salt Caverns and the Emerging Hydrogen Economy

Much attention is focused on balancing the need to transition to clean, renewable sources of energy with the need to meet global energy demand. Wind-sourced power varies with, and is limited by, seasonal and short-term weather; solar power is daylight-




Figure 2 – Projections of global emissions to 2050 and the projected role of varying technologies in reducing global emissions from Stated Policies Scenario down to Sustainable Development Scenario (*National Petroleum Council, 2019; IEA, 2019a*).




Figure 3 – Examples of the solution mining process that creates salt caverns and influence on cavern geometry: **(i)** a broadly cylindrical cavern tends to develop when direct brine circulation is used. Low salinity water is injected through the tubing string deep into the cavern and brine is withdrawn through the annular space between the final casing and the tubing string; and **(ii)** a wide-topped cavern develops if reverse circulation is used. Low salinity water enters the cavity through the annulus near the cavern top and brine is withdrawn through the tubing string. In both direct and reverse circulation, a fluid blanket protects the cavern roof (*Warren, 2016*). Reproduced with permission of Springer Nature.




Figure 4 – Schematic (not to scale) sketches showing **a)** geotechnically favourable and **b)** less favourable settings for solution cavern development (after *Gillhaus et al., 2006*).

dependent so that it varies diurnally as well as seasonally. Neither source can be ramped up to match fluctuations in energy demand, so some means must be found to balance supply and demand (*Heinemann et al., 2021*). The issue of curtailment and intermittency of renewable energy is a costly one and a major obstacle to deploying renewable energy solutions at scale, in the United Kingdom alone wind energy intermittency cost the government £274 million in 2020 (*Wallace et al., 2021*). One solution is to find a way to store renewable-sourced power in the form of potential energy that can be released on demand.

Using hydrogen (H₂) to transport and store energy is a simple and technically feasible approach for balancing these intermittent supply and demand challenges at a large scale (e.g., *Gahleitner, 2013; Crotogino, 2016; Tarkowski, 2019; Mouli-Castillo et al., 2021; Muhammed et al., 2022*). During periods of higher than required output from wind or solar sources, the excess power can be used to electrolyze water and produce 'green' hydrogen (e.g., *Crotogino, 2016*). In addition, hydrogen can be produced either by steam methane reforming or autothermal reforming of natural gas, termed 'blue' hydrogen if coeval sequestration of carbon dioxide occurs, and 'grey' hydrogen if not. Hydrogen produced by any of these methods can be stored and used for energy generation later, or as chemical feedstock. However, the low density of hydrogen (0.089 kg/m³ at standard temperature and pressure) and the significantly lower energy potential per unit volume of hydrogen when compared to natural gas (about one-third), means that to store energy at a scale sufficient to meet demands (terawatt-hour range) requires large volumes of hydrogen, and a vast upscaling of subsurface storage availability (e.g., *Hashemi et al., 2021; Shuster et al., 2021; Crotogino, 2022; Lankof et al., 2022; Muhammed et al., 2022*).

Potential sites proposed for large-scale hydrogen storage in the subsurface include salt caverns, depleted reservoirs, saline aquifers, or hard-rock lined caverns (e.g., *Lord et al., 2014; Bünger et al., 2016; Tarkowski, 2019; Zivar et al., 2021; Crotogino, 2022; Muhammed et al., 2022*). Of these, salt caverns are currently the only proven option, with caverns in three salt domes in the Texas Gulf Coast, and in the bedded salt at Teeside in the UK, proving salt caverns can safely store hydrogen for decades (e.g., *Stone et al., 2009; Panfilov, 2016; Crotogino et al., 2018; Tarkowski, 2019*). However, hydrogen storage in these facilities is mainly strategic to guarantee feed stock for refineries and fertiliser production, necessitating low frequency injection and withdrawal cycles. Hydrogen storage, for the purposes of abating renewable energy intermittency for example, may require higher frequency injection and withdrawal cycles (aka. several cycles per year) and even though this is theoretically feasible there is limited operational data to inform us about the effects that these high rates of hydrogen injection and withdrawal cycles might have on the integrity of salt caverns and

associated subsurface infrastructure.

Despite these data limitations, it is estimated that salt caverns might be ideal for hydrogen storage as: (i) up to 10 cycles of injection and withdrawal per year might be possible at fast injection and withdrawal rates, meaning the approach is ideal for short- and medium-term storage (e.g., *Tarkowski, 2019*); (ii) cavern shape and size can be customised, and can be stable for significant periods of time (*Lord et al., 2014; Crotogino, 2022*); (iii) hydrogen loss by leakage is estimated to be minimal, due to the sealing nature of evaporites (low permeability to gas) even though this might be variable depending on specific characteristics of the salt formation (*Crotogino et al., 2010; Lord et al., 2014; Warren, 2017; Matos et al., 2019*); (iv) the injection rate of hydrogen into salt caverns is not strongly dependent of complex multiphase flow phenomena (*Wallace et al., 2021*); (v) salt is typically inert to hydrogen (although impurities in salt may not be and this aspect needs further research) and conversion of any water to brine reduces potential for bacterial activity (e.g., *Bünger et al., 2016; Wallace et al., 2021; Crotogino, 2022*); and (vi) the proportion of cushion gas required is moderate compared to reservoir storage (*Bünger et al., 2016*). One of the main drawbacks to salt cavern storage is finding an economic and ecologically-friendly way to utilise or dispose of the brines extracted during leaching (e.g., *Crotogino, 2022*). Suggestions for brine uses include salt (NaCl) mining, geothermal and hydrocarbon operations along with lithium extraction, with the latter being an intriguing opportunity given the demand for electric vehicle batteries (*Kukla et al., 2019*).

Although the technology needed for storage of hydrogen in salt caverns is proven at a small scale, implementation as the basis for energy transition will require vast upscaling. One estimate suggests that 700 million metric tonnes of hydrogen could be used globally in 2050 if strong climate policies are enforced to limit global warming to 1.5°C (*BloombergNEF, 2020*). To store 20% of this annual hydrogen demand would require 14,000 salt caverns to be developed, at a cost of \$637 billion (*BloombergNEF, 2020; ENTSOE et al., 2021*). We now outline how salt tectonic research will be required for the safe and optimised development of salt caverns in a range of salt settings globally.

2.2 Role of Salt Tectonics in Large-Scale Development of Salt Cavern Hydrogen Storage

2.2.1 Overview of Heterogeneity in Salt Diapirs

Salt diapirs are rarely homogeneous bodies of halite, more typically they are heterogeneous bodies that may contain a range of evaporite minerals, other lithologies, internal structures, fluids and gases, colours, textures, that are influenced by the original paleoenvironment and complex internal salt flow

Table 1 – Classification of heterogeneities within salt bodies that may present challenges to engineering in salt

Depositional Heterogeneities	Non-depositional Heterogeneities		
	Post-depositional Compositional Changes	Post-depositional Physical Alteration	Anthropogenic Heterogeneities
Evaporite intervals: • evaporative carbonate • gypsum/anhydrite • halite • bittern salts	Inclusions: • igneous intrusions • entrained country rock (sutures, stoped sub-salt blocks, encased minibasins)	Deformation: • faults • shear zones • fractures • joints	Excavations and mines Boreholes Existing solution caverns
Non-evaporite intervals: • sand • shale • biogenic carbonate	Chemical alteration: • solution residue (e.g., caprocks) • products of other chemical reactions (e.g., sulphate reduction by hydrocarbons)	Recrystallization zones Mylonitization (smaller grains)	In-situ waste and storage: • chemical waste • radioactive waste • munitions • preserved valuable objects
Syn-depositional igneous: • lavas • ashes	Natural fluids: • brines • hydrocarbons		Migrated anthropogenic fluids: • brines • hydrocarbons • dissolved hazardous waste
Fluids and gases trapped during deposition			




Figure 5 – Cross-section through a German salt diapir showing heterogeneous nature with a range of lithologies and flamelike folds (after Richter-Bernburg, 1970; Hofrichter, 1980; Jackson and Hudec, 2017). Reproduced with permission of ZDGG.

patterns (e.g., Kupfer, 1976; Hofrichter, 1980; Talbot and Jackson, 1987; Jackson and Talbot, 1989; Kupfer, 1990; Koyi, 2001; Chemia et al., 2009; Loeff and Rautman, 2010a,b; Van Gent et al., 2011; Jackson et al., 2015; Rowan et al., 2019) (Figures 5 and 6). We divide intra-diapir heterogeneities into two main types: depositional heterogeneities, those that developed as the evaporite sequence was deposited (halite, anhydrite, bittern salts, carbonates, clastics, ashes, and




Figure 6 – Evidence of heterogeneities inside salt diapirs: (i) Section through a time-migrated seismic cross-section across Liam diapir in the Santos Basin (offshore Brazil) showing marked variations of seismic reflectivity within the salt sequence, the development of complex folding and flaps, and the intrusion of older salts into younger salt as a sheet. (ii) Physical model showing similar relationships as in (i) (Dooley et al., 2015).

lavas) (column 1 on Table 1), and remaining non-depositional heterogeneities that are atypical of the salt mass (columns 2-4 on Table 1). Many of the intra-diapir heterogeneities in Table 1 have previously been classified as anomalous salt, a term widely used in the salt mining and solution mining communities and which has no genetic connotation (e.g.,

Kupfer, 1976, 1990; Neal and Magorian, 1997; Loeff and Rautman, 2010a,b; Loeff, 2017; Warren, 2017). However, we prefer not to use this terminology in this paper, for two reasons. First, many features termed anomalous salt are not actually composed of salt (e.g. igneous rocks, entrained country rock, encased minibasins, sutures etc). Second, the term anomalous salt was defined based on observations of US Gulf Coast salt diapirs, with the most prevalent usage of the term in the literature also referring this setting (e.g., *Kupfer, 1976, 1990; Kupfer et al., 1998; Loeff and Rautman, 2010a,b; Loeff, 2017*). This can cause problems as features (particularly evaporite lithologies) that are anomalous on the US Gulf Coast may be perfectly normal inside salt domes in other basins. We therefore refrain from using anomalous salt and instead use our subdivision of intra-salt heterogeneities (Table 1).

Given the need to vastly upscale the number of salt caverns that store hydrogen (or hydrogen as part of a mixture) globally, we see a fundamental need to better understand—even predict—the distribution of heterogeneities within salt diapirs, and the salt tectonic processes that control these heterogeneities, for four key reasons. First, improved predictability will be key for the development phase where well design will depend on prognosis of intra-salt heterogeneities that can impact well integrity and safety. Encountering unexpected heterogeneities during drilling can lead to dangerous pressures, washout and loss of circulation, and wells can be damaged by shearing or buckling if directions and rates of salt flow (which occur on human timescales) are incorrectly predicted (e.g., *Loeff and Rautman, 2010a; Kukla et al., 2011; Weijermars et al., 2013, 2014; Strozyk, 2017; Warren, 2017*) (Figure 7). Second, predicting the likely distribution of heterogeneities in salt stocks can help ensure the safe placement of salt caverns, which ideally will be located in relatively homogeneous halite, where properties and stresses are predictable, and where leakage is less likely (e.g., *Koyi, 2001; Gillhaus and Horvath, 2008; Warren, 2016, 2017; Pichat, 2022*) (Figure 8). Third, modelling the final geometries of leached caverns, and hence safely designing cavern fields, requires an understanding of the likely distribution of intra-stock lithologies and other heterogeneities as cavern geometry is highly sensitive to spatial variations in solubility (e.g., *Wilke et al., 2001; Cartwright and Ratigan, 2005; Rautman and Lord, 2007; Czapowski et al., 2009; Loeff and Rautman, 2010a,b; Warren, 2016; Cyran, 2020*) (Figure 9). Fourth, maintaining the required purity of stored hydrogen requires an understanding of what lithologies and mineralogical alterations will outcrop on cavern walls since hydrogen can be highly reactive to some minerals such as anhydrite which may form contaminants such as H₂S that also pose a significant safety issue (e.g., *Panfilov, 2016; Portarapillo and Di Benedetto, 2021*).

2.2.2 The Origin, Nature and Distribution of Heterogeneities in Salt Diapirs

We now present an overview of the state of knowledge regarding the origin and distribution of different types of heterogeneities in salt diapirs outlined in Table 1.

Depositional Heterogeneities: A salt sequence accumulates through precipitation of salts from seawater, and a variety of evaporite lithologies are expected to develop (e.g., *Usiglio, 1849*). In sequence of precipitation, and in order of increasing solubility, these are most commonly carbonates, gypsum, halite, and bittern salts (potash), although the exact salts that precipitate are determined by local controls (e.g., *Borchert and Muir, 1964; Kirkland and Evans, 1973; Schreiber, 1988; Warren, 2006; Bqbel and Schreiber, 2014; Jackson and Hudec, 2017*). The salts, as well as any deposited clastics, develop compositional layering in an evaporite sequence that can contain weak (halite and bittern salts) and strong layers (anhydrites, carbonates, and clastics) and a range of viscosities (e.g., *Rowan et al., 2019; Pichat, 2022*) (Figure 10). Some evaporite sequences, such as the Louann salt in the Gulf of Mexico, are almost entirely halite and thus contain minimal depositional compositional layering (e.g., *Salvador, 1991; Rowan et al., 2019*). For example, it is believed that onshore US Gulf Coast salt stocks are composed of 92-99% halite and containing only minor anhydrite and sylvite (e.g., *Haas et al., 1981; Kupfer, 1989, 1990*). In contrast, many evaporite sequences are more heavily layered and compositionally heterogeneous, containing higher proportions of non-halite lithologies and termed layered evaporite sequences or 'LES', e.g. Zechstein Supergroup, Northwest Europe; Ariri Formation, Offshore Brazil; Ara Group, Oman; and the Kungurian salt of the Precaspian Basin, Kazakhstan, amongst others (e.g., *Rowan et al., 2019*) (Figure 10). As salt begins to flow, stronger and weaker layers (if present) within the evaporite sequence can be deformed, entrained, and incorporated into salt diapirs (e.g., *Escher and Kuenen, 1928; Talbot and Jackson, 1987; Koyi, 2001; Chemia et al., 2008; Van Gent et al., 2011; Rowan et al., 2019*) (Figures 11 and 12). An understanding of the mechanical properties and stratigraphy of the undeformed evaporite sequence is therefore critical before attempting to unravel the complex internal deformation within salt diapirs (Figure 12).

A bewildering array of geometries exist inside salt diapirs – best exemplified by the mapped structures in the salt mines of Germany (e.g., *Hofrichter, 1980; Richter-Bernburg, 1980; Mayrhofer, 1983; Schachl, 1987*) (Figure 5). Thankfully, some fundamental principles of intra-diapir processes are well-understood, largely thanks to physical and numerical modeling studies (e.g., *Escher and Kuenen, 1928; Talbot and Jackson, 1987; Koyi, 2001; Dooley et al., 2015*), observations from well-exposed natural examples (e.g., *Jackson et al., 1990; Burliga, 2014*), and from 3-D seismic-




Figure 7 – Complex salt flow and shearing during drilling highlights importance of understanding the origin and distribution of shear zones. BSZ =Boundary Shear Zone (modified from *Looff and Rautman, 2010a*).




Figure 8 – Example showing how salt caverns are preferentially located away from shear zones and intra-salt heterogeneities in the Benthe salt dome, Germany (original work by *Richter-Bernburg, 1972; Gillhaus and Horvath, 2008*).




Figure 9 – Examples showing preferred planes of cavern dissolution and anomalous cavern geometries developed due to presence of intra-salt heterogeneities in Barbers Hill salt dome, US Gulf Coast (from *Looff, 2017*) (original images from *Cartwright and Ratigan, 2005; Ratigan, 2009*).

based studies where intra-salt structure can be well-imaged (e.g., *Escher and Kuenen, 1928; Van Gent et al., 2011; Fiduk and Rowan, 2012; Jackson et al., 2015*). *Escher and Kuenen (1928)* demonstrated that, to the first order, any depositional heterogeneities (typically layering) inside diapirs can be broadly conformable with the salt-sediment interface, forming a high relief sheath anticline. This sheath and associated secondary folds develop in a manner akin to a horizontal tablecloth drawn upward through a horizontal napkin ring (e.g., *Jackson and Hudec, 2017*, see also Figures 11 and 12). Compositional layers become constricted as they enter the lower portion of the diapir, resulting in radial folds with upright axial traces that plunge steeply outwards, and as these structures rise in the narrow stock, they tighten and transition into more-or-less vertically plunging curtain folds (e.g., *Stier, 1914; Richter-Bernburg, 1955; Talbot and Jackson, 1987; Jackson and Hudec, 2017*) (Figure 11). In nature however, this useful conceptual framework is complicated by the influence of: i) multiple generations of folds inside salt diapirs, some of which exist in the salt prior to entering the diapir, ii) progressive 3-D strain, and iii) vorticity and streams developed in the flowing salt (e.g., *Talbot and Jackson, 1987; Jackson and Talbot, 1989; Talbot and Pohjola, 2009; Van Gent et al., 2011; Burliga, 2014; Fuchs et al., 2015; Jackson*

and Hudec, 2017). See section 8.3 in *Jackson and Hudec (2017)* for a review.

To shed light on, and ultimately predict, how any depositional heterogeneities deform and are distributed in salt diapirs, we should focus attention on the following research questions:

- Which evaporite sequences, or parts of evaporite sequences contain original and significant depositional heterogeneities, and which do not (e.g., *Pichat, 2022*)?
- How are different fold styles distributed inside salt diapirs (*Richter, 1980; Jackson and Talbot, 1989; Callot et al., 2006; Van Gent et al., 2011; Burliga, 2014; Jackson et al., 2015*)?
- How does the geometry and shape of a pillow or diapir influence the style and distribution of deformed depositional heterogeneities (*Callot et al., 2006*)?
- How does the mechanical stratigraphy (i.e. number, thickness, and distribution of strong and weak layers) within the initial salt sequence influence the final distribution of deformed depositional heterogeneities (*Koyi, 2001; Callot et al., 2006; Chemia et al., 2008; Dooley et al., 2015; Jackson et al., 2015; Rowan et al., 2019*) (Figures 6 and 12)?
- How do boundary conditions (e.g. sedimentation rates, erosion rates, and tectonic deformation), and location within the salt basin influence the style of deformation, and distribution of deformed depositional heterogeneities in salt diapirs (*Chemia et al., 2008; Davison et al., 2017; Rowan et al., 2019*)?

Answering these types of questions will require access to good maps and digital datasets (e.g. Li-Dar and sonar) from salt mines and caverns, together with high-quality borehole-calibrated 3-D seismic data. Hypotheses derived from analyses of such datasets and placing them into a regional geological and salt tectonic context, should be tested in a new generation of physical and numerical models (e.g., Figure 6). However, a combination of: i) the highly-contorted and sub-vertical nature of depositional heterogeneities (layering) inside diapirs; and ii) the fact that existing seismic surveys are not designed to image cap rock or the insides of salt diapirs but instead the stratigraphy surrounding the salt bodies for the purposes of oil and gas exploration, means that our capacity to visualise intra-salt deformation using conventional seismic methods is very limited. Advanced reprocessing techniques, such as reverse time migration have proven useful for imaging salt diapirs (in particular for a better delineation of the salt sediment interface) (*Thompson and Looff, 2021*), however, these techniques are computationally intensive, costly and time consuming. Ideally, new 3-D seismic surveys, both onshore and offshore, will be designed in the future with acquisition parameters




Figure 10 – Simplified representative examples of stratigraphic columns from Layered Evaporite Sequences (LES's) world-wide: **(a)** Ariri Fm., offshore Santos Basin, Brazil (adapted from *Gamboa et al.*, 2008); **(b)** Ara Gp., onshore Oman (adapted from *Peters et al.*, 2003); **(c)** Zechstein Gp. from the Dutch portion of the Southern Permian Basin (adapted from *Van Adrichem Boogaert and Kouwe*, 1994); **(d)** Kungurian salt from the central region of the Precaspian Basin, Kazakhstan (adapted from *Gralla and Marsky*, 2000); **(e)** Messinian evaporites from the Levant Basin, eastern Mediterranean (adapted from *Feng et al.*, 2016). (a) and (e) are constrained from wells, whereas the others are more schematic; ages spans and interval thicknesses are not equivalent in the different examples. Labels on the sides of panels (b), (c), and (e) refer to well-established intra-salt intervals defined in the literature. From *Rowan et al.* (2019) with only colours modified.




Figure 11 – Salt flow (black arrows) and 3-D stresses (white arrows) associated with the evolution of a salt pillow containing a competent intrasalt unit (yellow). As salt flows into the pillow there is radial extension (boudinage) beneath the depocentres and radial contraction (folds) in the pillow core. In addition, tangential constrictional folding develops due to convergent flow into the pillow. From *Rowan et al.* (2019) with only colours modified.




Figure 12 – Cross section through a physical model showing the deformation that occurs as minibasins sink into a ‘Layered Evaporite Sequence’. The initial ‘Layered Evaporite Sequence’ is shown (top right) with halite equivalent in pink and interbedded sand equivalents shown as dark blue, red, grey, and light blue. Minibasins simply subsided into the horizontally-bedded ‘Layered Evaporite Sequence’ resulting in intense deformation and folding as the layers within the sequence are incorporated into the diapir.

to target shallow intra-salt features. Alternatively, vintage seismic could be revisited using unconventional reprocessing methods such as machine learning and artificial intelligence algorithms to try to improve intra-salt imaging but this is still an area where more fundamental research is needed. In addition, wider use of a fuller range of geophysical tools including but not limited to magnetotelluric, electromagnetic, borehole-based electrical resistivity tomography, radar and petrophysical tools such as triple-combo wireline logs and high-resolution image logs will likely play an important role in the characterization of intra-salt architectures (Thompson and Loeff, 2021, 2022).

Non-depositional Heterogeneities: In this work, non-depositional heterogeneities comprise structures, inclusions, textures, and colours that are atypical of the salt mass, and that do not relate to the initial deposition of the salt sequence (e.g., Kupfer, 1976, 1990; Loeff and Rautman, 2010a,b; Loeff, 2017; Warren, 2017) (Table 1; Figure 13). In broad terms, non-depositional heterogeneities are associated with lithologic impurities, shearing within the salt, fluid entry into the salt, or some combination of all (e.g., Loeff and Rautman, 2010b,a; Loeff, 2017; Warren, 2017; Cyran, 2020). Furthermore, degradation of salt quality (e.g. increased permeability) at or near non-depositional heterogeneities can allow fluids to leak into the diapir and is a major source of short- and long-term problems associated with man-made salt caverns (Warren, 2016, 2017). In general, non-depositional heterogeneities should be evaluated




Figure 13 – Structural map of the Belle Island Salt Mine (Louisiana, USA). Shows two masses of salt (‘salt spines’) separated by what were interpreted as boundary shear zones that are now incorporated in the salt. Regions of atypical ‘dark’ salt are associated with gas bursts, slabbing mine roof, leakage and relative instability. Note the internal complexity and heterogeneous nature of the salt (after Kupfer, 1974). Reproduced with permission of the Gulf Coast Association of Geological Societies.

and avoided if deemed especially problematic during the solution mining or cavern storage operations.

Structures classified as non-depositional heterogeneities include joints, fractures, voids, faults, and shear zones (e.g., *Kupfer, 1990*). These form due to near surface strain and internal deformation of varying types in the diapir. Care must be taken to differentiate natural jointing from mining-induced joints, with the latter not classified as non-depositional heterogeneities (*Kupfer, 1990*). Natural jointing is rare, and when present continuous in nature, whereas the locations of mining-induced joints may be predictable with respect to mining operations (*Kupfer, 1990*).

Shear zones in particular have been interpreted inside salt diapirs, largely in US Gulf Coast diapirs (e.g., *Balk, 1953; Muehlberger and Clabaugh, 1968; Kupfer, 1974, 1976, 1990*) (Figure 13). It is widely accepted that some shear zones, termed external shear zones, form by differential salt movement near the edge of a diapir, and are expressed as a sheath of highly-strained salt along the diapir periphery (e.g., *Balk, 1953; Kupfer, 1976, 1990; Jackson et al., 1990; Loeff, 2017*) (Figure 13). In contrast, the origin and distribution of shear zones located further into the body of a diapir are more controversial, as many heterogeneities previously termed 'shear zones' (sensu *Kupfer, 1976*) show no direct evidence of shear (*Kupfer, 1990; Kupfer et al., 1998*) but given that salt can be self-healing one must wonder if evidence of shearing might be elusive to find with time after deformation (Figure 13) (see also *Warren, 2017*). Interpretations of these features vary significantly, often depending on the salt basin being studied (e.g. U.S. Gulf Coast versus northwestern Europe), with schools of thought advocating that these "suspect intra-salt shear zones" represent; i) boundary shear zones (or internal shear zones), that bound smaller masses of salt within the diapir termed 'spines' that rise independently in an upward piston-like manner (e.g., *Kupfer, 1976*); ii) shear zones around the edges of inclusions within the diapir (*Kupfer, 1990*); iii) evidence of toroidal flow and folding within the diapir (*Talbot and Jackson, 1987, 1989; Kupfer, 1990*).

Inclusions classified as non-depositional heterogeneities can include: i) igneous rocks intruded into evaporite sequences and then subsequently incorporated into diapirs, or intruded directly into a pre-existing diapir (e.g., *Schwerdtner and Clark, 1967; Davison et al., 2017; Martín-Martín et al., 2017; Magee et al., 2021*); ii) rocks that were initially below, beside or above the diapir and which have been entrained into the diapir (e.g., *Fernandez et al., 2017*); and iii) any fluids and gases generated during burial, or which may have subsequently migrated into the diapir (*Knauth et al., 1980; Jackson and Hudec, 2017*).

Textures classified as non-depositional heterogeneities, include coarse-grained, extremely friable, extremely hard, and poikiloblastic salt (*Kupfer, 1976, 1990; Loeff, 2017; Warren, 2017*). Notably, salt textures vary between different locations within salt di-

apirs (e.g. sub-vertical stems versus sub-horizontal overhangs), so some spatial context is required when distinguishing 'normal' and 'anomalous' textures (e.g., *Kupfer, 1990; Warren et al., 2008*). A major source of the atypical textures is likely to be a result of dissolution and recrystallization of salt.

To deepen our understanding of the origin and distribution of non-depositional heterogeneities inside diapirs, we see a need for research addressing the following questions:

- How and why do shear zones form in salt diapirs and where might we expect them to occur (e.g., *Kupfer, 1976; Rautman et al., 2010; Jackson et al., 2015; Loeff, 2017; Duffy et al., 2022*)?
- Do salt 'spines' exist as currently defined, and if so, what processes influence their geometry and evolution (*Kupfer, 1976; Talbot and Jackson, 1987; Kupfer, 1989; Talbot and Jackson, 1989; Jackson and Hudec, 2017*)?
- How and where do inclusions become incorporated into salt diapirs (e.g., *Talbot and Jackson, 1987; Kupfer, 1989; Talbot and Jackson, 1989; Davison et al., 2017; Martín-Martín et al., 2017; Jackson and Hudec, 2017; Kernén, 2019*)?
- How, why, where, and when do fluids enter salt diapirs (e.g., *Knauth et al., 1980; Loeff and Rautman, 2010a,b; Loeff, 2017; Warren, 2017*)?
- How does late-stage tectonic deformation influence the nature and distribution of non-depositional heterogeneities (e.g., *Davison et al., 2017*)?
- Does the initial composition of the salt or tectonic setting influence the development and distribution of non-depositional heterogeneities?
- Can we reconcile differences in terminology used to describe non-depositional intra-salt heterogeneities, and interpretations of their origin, that differ between salt basins (e.g. US Gulf Coast versus northwestern Europe)?

Addressing these questions will require similar data and approaches as outlined in the previous section "Depositional Heterogeneities". However, in addition to study of borehole-calibrated seismic and other geophysical data, together with numerical and physical modelling to understand structural processes, we also envisage wider use of microstructural analysis to constrain the properties, deformation mechanisms, and likely recent boundary conditions experienced by diapiric salt (e.g., *Urai et al., 1986; Carter et al., 1993; Loeff, 2000; Warren et al., 2008; Mansouri et al., 2019; Cyran, 2021; Tãmaş et al., 2021*). Furthermore, use of geochemical approaches applied to mine and well bore samples will help constrain the origin, composition, and potentially the age, of fluids and gases in salt domes, and how these relate to the distribution and nature of non-depositional heterogeneities (e.g., *Knauth et al., 1980*).

2.3 Salt Caverns: Research Outlook

Salt bodies have been used for several decades as repositories of a variety of fluids from hydrocarbons and hydrogen to waste disposal. Today, a pressing urgency associated with the need for rapid decarbonization of our energy systems clearly points to salt formations as a subsurface resource that will play an important role to develop a viable hydrogen economy. We can think of salt caverns storing hydrogen as subsurface mega-batteries that will play a crucial role as part of the new hydrogen economy. The salt mining industry has accumulated decades of operational knowledge that coupled with modern salt tectonic concepts can help accelerate our capacity to predict intra-salt heterogeneities and better plan for the placing, design, construction and safe operation of salt caverns. Even though hydrogen storage is currently ongoing in some salt formations, research is still needed to fully understand the full complexity of salt body architecture and composition and their potential to interact with hydrogen.

3 Salt-Related CO₂ Storage in Salt-Bearing Basins

3.1 Principles of CO₂ Storage and Relevance in Salt-Bearing Basins

Anthropogenic CO₂ emissions are currently 35 gigatons (Gt) per year (IPCC, 2021). In order to limit climate change to 1.5 °C, net emission needs to be reduced to zero (IPCC, 2022). While there is as yet no consensus on how this will be achieved, it is clear that it will require a combination of mitigation methods. Different analyses come up with different contributions from the various mitigation measures available, but commonly, they show about one third of the total reduction in CO₂ emissions coming from energy efficiency gains, another third from substituting non-carbon-emitting energy sources (e.g. wind and solar) for fossil energy sources, and the final third from everything else, including carbon capture and storage (CCS) (e.g., Pacala and Socolow, 2004; IPCC, 2014; IEA, 2019b) (Figure 2). Without CCS, the possible paths to Net Zero shrink dramatically, the costs more than double, and getting to Net Zero relies heavily on global behaviour change (IPCC, 2014). CCS is applicable across a broad spectrum of emissions sources, but it is most valuable where nothing else works well. Specifically, it can be used to mitigate the process emissions associated with production of cement, steel, petrochemicals, ethanol and hydrogen, among others. It can be applied to existing combustion-driven power plants to create low-carbon dispatchable power for those times when wind and solar sources are inadequate (e.g., calm nights). Added to Direct Air Capture or biofuel combustion, it can even remove existing atmospheric carbon (sometimes referred to as negative emissions). In short, in our view CCS is the multi-tool of climate change mitigation—flexible, available immediately,

proven and permanent.

At present, the global rate of CO₂ storage in CCS facilities is approximately 30 megatons (Mt) per year, i.e. about two orders of magnitude less than required for its projected role in climate change mitigation (Global CCS Institute, 2021). Estimates of total ultimate global storage capacity carry significant uncertainty but both global and regional assessments suggest that there is enough capacity for hundreds of years' worth of emissions (Halland et al., 2011; Bentham et al., 2014; IPCC, 2014; DOE NETL, 2015; Trevino and Meckel, 2017). The limitations are not technical or geological, but economic, regulatory and public acceptance.

At its most basic, CO₂ storage requires only a reservoir with sufficient injectivity and capacity to take the projected emissions stream, and a confining system capable of retaining the injected CO₂. Storage efficiency is maximised by storing CO₂ in a dense phase (either liquid or supercritical fluid), which requires a reservoir typically more than 800m below the top of the water column (e.g., Ringrose, 2020) (e.g. Figure 14). Similarly, the need for pressure space to accommodate injection suggests focusing on hydrostatic or under-pressured reservoirs (Figure 14).

Unlike petroleum accumulating at equilibrium conditions on geologic time, CO₂ storage requires CO₂ injection at industrial rates. The result is that not all of the reservoir volume will be exploited (i.e. sweep efficiency is highly imperfect), pore water displacement is a concern, and pressure buildup tends to be the ultimate limit on injection (e.g., Bert van der Meer and Yavuz, 2009; Ganjdanesh and Hosseini, 2018; Ringrose, 2020) (Figure 15). Other contrasts between CO₂ storage and petroleum systems are: 1) injection volume is limited in CO₂ storage—unlike a good source rock that might generate sufficient petroleum to saturate all migration paths, injected CO₂ would seem unlikely to migrate far; and 2) the goal of CO₂ storage is sequestration and thus success does not require CO₂ to remain recoverable, concentrated or even mobile. Indeed, storage is most secure when the injected CO₂ is none of those. Dissolution, capillary trapping, mineral trapping, and sub-economic buoyant traps along the CO₂ migration route are all viable storage, in addition to the large buoyant traps at the end of the migration path familiar to the petroleum industry (Figures 15 and 16) (e.g., Nilsen et al., 2015; Sharma and Van Gent, 2018; Singh et al., 2021; Ulfah et al., 2022). What is considered migration loss in petroleum systems is ultra-secure storage from the perspective of CO₂ storage. The same factors that hinder petroleum recovery serve to enhance storage security.

Deliberately seeking migration loss by injecting CO₂ downdip is a viable strategy that opens large volumes of the subsurface for CO₂ storage, not just the volumes within closure (e.g., Bergmo et al., 2009; Williams et al., 2013; Sundal et al., 2015; Ringrose, 2020; Ulfah et al., 2022) (Figure 16). Without restriction to buoyant traps, all of the storage window is potentially avail-




Figure 14 – Geology of the northern Gulf of Mexico shown in line of section (location of section shown on inset map). The band of saturated colour is the pressure window within which supercritical CO₂ can be stored. This interval is between 800 m below top of the water table/sea surface (the minimum depth for supercritical CO₂) and the top of geologic over-pressure as defined by Burke et al. (2012) (after Bump et al., 2021).




Figure 15 – Schematic diagram showing the distribution of CO₂ near an injection well and CO₂ trapping mechanisms. Low-permeability units prevent the upward migration of the supercritical CO₂ plume (stratigraphic trapping). Residual trapping occurs as some CO₂ is left behind as disconnected droplets at the trailing edge of the plume. As CO₂ interacts with pore waters, some of it will dissolve (solubility trapping) and over longer timescales (e.g. 1000s of years) CO₂ may also react with the host rock, and precipitate as solid carbonate minerals (mineral trapping). Note that structural trapping can also occur as in oil and gas traps. The difference in this diagram is that structural trapping is intended as a backstop to retain any CO₂ that is not arrested in migration. Vertical exaggeration x50. Reprinted (adapted with colours modified) with permission from (Bourg et al., 2015). Copyright 2015 American Chemical Society.

able for CO₂ injection and sequestration. That said, the details of the injection and confining intervals are critical to predicting the spread of the plume and de-risking containment. Ideally, injection would create a compact plume, offering cost-effective leasing and monitoring. Similarly, an ideal site would have low structural relief and a large aquifer connection, such that pressure would dissipate quickly post-injection and leave the CO₂ effectively immobile with minimal column height beneath a robust confining zone.

It is possible for some depleted oil and gas fields to be repurposed for CO₂ storage (e.g., Le Gallo et al., 2002; Agartan et al., 2018). However, suitable fields may not be available where storage is needed. Depleted fields have the advantage that the geological components of a CO₂ storage play (reservoir, trap, seal) are proven, subsurface control data already exist, and some existing infrastructure may be repurposable. However, existing wells within a depleted field constitute a potential risk to long-term storage, by leakage through faulty cement plugs to surface or to shallow aquifers (e.g., Nicot, 2009; Watson and Bachu, 2009; Zhang and Bachu, 2011). Depending on the number and condition of existing wells, the costs of review and remediation may far outweigh the advantages of historical reservoir performance data and potentially re-usable infrastructure.

Given this background, why are salt basins and salt tectonic research of value? The key here is that the economics of CO₂ storage are marginal, and most of the cost is in the capture and transport (Global CCS Institute, 2021). Minimising transport distance is highly desirable. Prime CO₂ storage sites must thus be close to major industrial CO₂ emissions areas, and where high quality data, infrastructure, proven reservoirs and seals (as constrained from prior hydrocarbon exploration activity), willing regulators, and public acceptance exist. Given these requirements, two of the most suitable basins for large scale CO₂ storage worldwide are the northwestern Gulf of Mexico and the North Sea, both of which are current focal points




Figure 16 – Example of salt-influenced CO₂ storage play concept in salt withdrawal synclines that may have high suitability for containment. CO₂ is injected at high rates into porous sands deposited near the syncline axis. In concept, connection to a large aquifer allows dissipation of injection pressure and therefore enables long-term injection. CO₂ migrates laterally (green plume), driven by injection pressure and buoyancy. As it migrates, CO₂ is arrested by capillary trapping, dissolution and baffling associated with any stratigraphic heterogeneities. The process is similar to migration loss in hydrocarbons and may be sufficient to arrest the entire plume, depending on injected volumes and stratigraphic architecture (see *Ulfah et al., 2022*).

for CO₂ storage evaluation and development (*Global CCS Institute, 2021*). Critically, the geology of these settings is strongly influenced by salt - the Louann Salt in the US Gulf of Mexico, and the Zechstein Supergroup in the North Sea (e.g. Figure 14). As petroleum geoscientists working these basins have already discovered, accurate predictions of reservoir architecture and potential seal risks depend on understanding the interactions of mobile salt with the depositional systems and subsequent structural deformation. This knowledge provides a sound basis which can now be applied to understand CO₂ storage sites in salt basins. As experience with CO₂ storage grows, other relationships may be discovered (e.g., *Roelofse et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2022*) and as deployment grows and the CO₂ storage industry spreads (or transport costs fall), other salt basins may also become attractive storage targets.

A question relevant to the role of salt tectonics in CO₂ storage is: could CO₂ be stored widely in solution caverns at a large-scale as is proposed for H₂ storage? The simple answer here is no, for several reasons. First, the volumes of CO₂ that need to be sequestered to mitigate climate change are orders of magnitude greater than the total potential capacity in salt cav-

erns (e.g., *Bennaceur, 2014*). Second, solution mining of caverns is expensive, especially compared to injection into naturally porous media such as a sandstone reservoir. Use of solution caverns is economically viable for energy gas storage (H₂ or CH₄) because the same cavern volume can be used repeatedly, and the cost of initial cavern creation is distributed across all the cycles of filling and depletion, with new revenue generated by each cycle. In contrast, CO₂ is stored only once with no intention of future extraction, so all the development cost must be borne by one fill cycle, and there is no further revenue. Moreover, gas stored in salt caverns remains entirely recoverable (or leakable, depending on perspective) due to the lack of opportunity for dissolution and mineral trapping, an advantage for temporary storage and a liability for permanent sequestration. Third, the very factors that make salt caverns good for short-term gas storage, create unnecessary risks for long-term CO₂ sequestration. The ability of caverns to retain injected fluids in a mobile, highly pressured state means that they can be removed from the cavern rapidly and with very high recovery efficiency: this is ideal where storage is temporary and recovery is important, e.g. for energy gas (H₂ or CH₄). By contrast, it is potentially dis-

astrous if the storage is meant to be permanent—in the event of containment breach, CO₂ stored in a cavern can leak rapidly and completely. Salt moves and on the millennial timescale required for CO₂ storage, that creates a serious liability. Overall, with possible exceptions where no other CO₂ storage options are available (e.g., *da Costa et al., 2019; Goulart et al., 2020; da Costa et al., 2020*) (e.g. AM da Costa et al., 2019; Goulart et al., 2020; PVM da Costa et al., 2020) it would seem preferable to reserve the caverns for short-term, limited volume gas storage (H₂, hydrocarbons etc) and focus CO₂ storage on the sediments between salt bodies.

3.2 Key Technical Challenges to CO₂ Storage in Porous Reservoirs in Salt-Bearing Basins: Developing CO₂ Storage Plays

Fully exploiting the CO₂ storage potential in salt-bearing basins such as the Gulf of Mexico and North Sea will require a deeper understanding of the interactions between salt tectonics and CO₂ storage plays. There is a wealth of existing research on the influence salt has on the structural, stratigraphic and sedimentary evolution of basins. Many of the existing interpretation methods, data analyses, maps, and modelling approaches can be applied, adapted and developed further to meet the challenges associated with developing and monitoring CO₂ storage sites in salt-bearing basins. A key starting point will be to re-frame the existing knowledge of how salt tectonics influences petroleum systems, and, where feasible, apply those to CO₂ storage systems. Play-Based Exploration is a widely used approach in the petroleum industry (e.g., *Fraser, 2010; Hawie et al., 2016; Lockhart et al., 2018*) and is now being adapted for CO₂ storage (*Bump et al., 2021*). We now present our view of the key technical challenges to be addressed within a play element framework as all petroleum play elements, with the exception of source rock quality, are applicable to CO₂ storage, providing proxies for injectivity, capacity, and containment potential (e.g., *Bump et al., 2021*).

3.2.1 Salt Tectonic Influence on Reservoir

CO₂ storage reservoirs must balance multiple requirements. On one hand, the need for injection at industrial rates favours thick, clean sands with well-connected pore space and large pressure compartments. On the other hand, CO₂ storage efficiency is closely related to sweep efficiency, and storage improves with the addition of reservoir heterogeneity, due to the development of microtraps along the migration pathway (e.g., *Krishnamurthy et al., 2017; Trevisan et al., 2017*). Reservoir heterogeneity, in the form of layered reservoir sequences with sharp permeability contrasts, can also contribute to confinement of CO₂ and displaced brines (*Lindeberg, 1997; Oldenburg, 2008; Nordbotten et al., 2009; Sharma et al., 2017*). Identifying prospective CO₂ storage reser-

voirs requires an understanding of reservoir deposition, which, in salt-bearing basins can be strongly controlled by salt tectonics (e.g., *Hodgson et al., 1992; Rowan and Weimer, 1998; Winker and Booth, 2000; Mayall et al., 2010; Oluboyo et al., 2014; Doughty-Jones et al., 2017; Jackson et al., 2020; Howlett et al., 2021*).

Salt movement influences topography, the nature and distribution of depositional systems, and thus the distribution of facies and heterogeneities. Importantly, the distribution and quality of sands and depositional elements in different salt tectonic settings such as salt withdrawal synclines, isolated minibasins, expulsion rollovers, peripheral synclines around turtle structures, salt-detached ramp syncline basins, will vary throughout salt tectonic evolution and new research will be undertaken on the often complex relationship between sedimentary processes (sediment flux, deposition, erosion) and salt movement (uplift and subsidence patterns through time), with CO₂ storage in mind. In each salt tectonic setting, it will be important to constrain how the interactions have contributed to the reservoir architecture and heterogeneity, and thus the available pressure space for CO₂ (i.e. the connected reservoir volume available for dissipation of injection pressure). Research questions can be framed in the context of salt withdrawal synclines, a likely early focus for CO₂ storage, in part because they are located away from the more oil and gas prone structural highs (e.g. Figure 16).

A number of questions may be explored in salt withdrawal synclines. First, how do depositional elements vary in salt-withdrawal synclines in different depositional environments, and how does salt movement influence this variability? As an example, shallow marine and deepwater systems respond differently to the presence of structural topography. A diapir crest in some shallow water settings may have very good, highly connected reservoirs across it, and between withdrawal synclines, as a result of wave action winnowing sediment over the elevated area. In deepwater however, where sand is carried in sediment gravity flows, those flows will travel preferentially in the topographic lows, leaving the salt diapir crest often devoid of sand.

Second, how can palaeo-topography be reconstructed in salt withdrawal basins? The evolution of palaeo-topography in a salt withdrawal basin is a function of the balance between subsidence and uplift and sediment flux to, and through, the basin (e.g., *Prather et al., 2012; Christie et al., 2021*). Successfully reconstructing palaeo-topography requires an understanding of where the salt has moved in three dimensions through time. In the case of minibasins, recent studies have shown how minibasins exhibit complex subsidence and rotation histories as a result of, amongst others: tectonic shortening, interactions with base-salt relief, translation down salt-detached slopes, and mechanical interactions with other minibasins (e.g., *Rowan and Vendeville, 2006*;

Callot et al., 2016; Pichel et al., 2018; Fernandez et al., 2020; Jackson et al., 2020; Duffy et al., 2021). Such processes will have significant implications and thus should be constrained when reconstructing mini-basin palaeo-topography. In general, reconstructing palaeo-topography is required to address exactly where reservoirs are deposited so as to: i) quantify and predict the larger connected pore volume in salt withdrawal synclines, so that pressure dissipation and injection capacity can be accurately predicted; and ii) predict permeability architecture in salt-withdrawal synclines, which impact migrations of CO₂ and displaced brines.

Third, where are stratal pinchouts located in salt withdrawal synclines? Where stratal dips are present, as in salt withdrawal synclines, significant CO₂ migration is possible, depending on the volume injected and the permeability architecture of the injection zone (e.g. Figure 16). In our view, it may not be necessary to know the precise migration path, but it is important to assure that there will be no material impact (e.g., contamination of fresh water aquifers or producing hydrocarbon fields). Structural and stratigraphic traps up-dip of the injection point can be part of that assurance. Stratal pinchouts are common features in salt withdrawal settings, particularly in deep-water, and thus future work should aim to develop tectono-stratigraphic models that advance our understanding of their distribution in different salt withdrawal settings in space and through time, and hence predict their influence on CO₂ storage.

Overall, the focus of most recent literature on reservoir development in salt-bearing basins has been on deepwater clastic systems, driven by deep-water hydrocarbon exploration (e.g., Mayall et al., 2010; Giles and Rowan, 2012; Oluboyo et al., 2014; Cumberpatch et al., 2021). However, the economics of CO₂ storage favours short CO₂ transport distances, shifting the focus to present-day shallow water and onshore areas, where the reservoir targets for CO₂ storage may be shallow marine and continental rather than deep water deposits. Returning research attention to the influence of salt tectonic processes on reservoir development in these environments with the addition of modern seismic and well data, analysis and concepts, will yield new insight that may prove important for CO₂ storage. The same is true for carbonate reservoir systems, where the best reservoir permeabilities may be developed over palaeo-highs, because of the original depositional setting (e.g. reefs) and post-depositional modification (eg. karst formation).

3.2.2 Influence of Salt Tectonics on Trap Formation, Migration Routes, and Seal Integrity

Salt tectonic processes generate complex structures with stratal dips that change rapidly through time and space, influencing migration routes and trap development. Salt-related structural features can be a




Figure 17 – Example of a salt-influenced CO₂ storage play concept that may pose a containment risk. Steeply-dipping strata on the right flank of the diapir is likely to be structurally and stratigraphically complicated and may be over-pressured as a result of the connection to deeper aquifers (centroid effect). Low effective stress would make it not viable for injection and geologic complexity would render it unattractive to an operation that can choose where to inject.

positive for CO₂ storage, mostly by helping to constrain the migration direction of the injected CO₂ and thus simplifying the monitoring process. However, there are also containment risks associated with these structures. For example, in the deepwater Gulf of Mexico, where recent and Pleistocene deposition rates were extremely high (Galloway et al., 2011), shallow CO₂ storage traps associated with reservoirs in steeply-dipping strata that extend from shallow in the section down into the base of salt withdrawal basins require caution and should be carefully examined, if not avoided entirely (Figure 17). In these shallow traps, a combination of tall column heights and overpressure caused by hydraulic connectivity to rapidly and deeply-buried sediments at the base of salt withdrawal synclines may mean the traps have already reached lithostatic pressures and failed, or be close to lithostatic pressures, and therefore likely fail with the addition of injected CO₂; a significant containment risk (Figure 17).

In a similar line, halokinetic sequences ('unconformity-bound packages of thinned and folded strata adjacent to passive diapirs'), as described in a range of depositional environments (Giles and Rowan, 2012; Hearon et al., 2014; Poprawski et al., 2016; Pichel and Jackson, 2020; Roca et al., 2021) may influence CO₂ migration routes and impact containment risk. These near diapir features are typically stacked into either tabular or tapered composite halokinetic sequences, with stratal upturns that extend up the diapir flank, which are prone to fracturing, folding and faulting (e.g., Giles and Rowan, 2012; Hearon et al., 2014; Pichel and Jackson, 2020). Potential research questions related to these features include:

- Are halokinetic unconformity-bounded sequences and their associated deformation zones sites of potential leakage?
- Should CO₂ storage projects seek to avoid them, or can the risks be sufficiently mitigated to open that geology for CO₂ storage?
- Alternatively, can halokinetic sequences provide stacked stratigraphic trap opportunities?

In all cases, the devil is in the detail of salt movement in three dimensions and through time, and a structural-stratigraphic approach undertaken using cross-discipline techniques of seismic interpretation and detailed log interpretation should yield predictive models for trapping and seal integrity questions.

3.2.3 Influence of Faulting and Fracturing Around Salt Structures and Implications for Trapping and Seal Risk

In some cases, the presence of reusable infrastructure or other surface constraints will favour CO₂ storage near salt. In such cases, long-reach wells may be used to inject the CO₂ down-dip, well away from the salt body so as to reduce the immediate containment risk posed by steep dips and potentially tall columns, near-diapir faults, fractures, and wells. However, injected CO₂ is likely to migrate back towards the diapir and eventually towards these sources of potential containment risk (e.g. Figure 16). Therefore, for CO₂ storage using near-salt infrastructure to be feasible fundamental work must focus on constraining near salt leakage risk. To mitigate that risk, work must focus on constraining: i) the character and pressure characteristics of the down-dip reservoir; ii) the geometry, nature, extent, and distribution of near-salt faults and fractures and their potential for reactivation or growth after injection; iii) the likely seal potential of near-salt faults, fractures, and even the salt-sediment interface; and iv) the distribution of stress and pore pressure variations (e.g. steep dips) around salt bodies. This opens a number of possible research questions to be addressed:

- Is there a difference in the reactivation potential and containment risk between different salt-related fault families such as crestal faults, key-stone faults, radial faults etc, and regional tectonic faults (e.g., *Zhang et al., 2022*)?
- Do the growth styles and the displacement histories of different salt-related fault types influence containment risk?
- Where are fracture systems most likely to develop around salt bodies and how might these respond to CO₂ injection and influence CO₂ storage potential?
- How will CO₂-rich fluids interact with salt and could any physical or chemical reactions compromise long-term trap stability?

Notably, seismic imaging beside and above salt

bodies is often poor and may complicate the task, thus improvements in seismic imaging in near salt settings are required. Developing the required datasets will require significant interpretation expertise, use of structural analogues, along with physical and numerical modelling to fill the gap. In the meantime, in our view CCS is likely to simply avoid such geology.

3.2.4 CO₂ Storage Play Types in Salt-Bearing Basins

An ultimate goal will be to reimagine petroleum play concepts and develop a range of new CO₂ storage play concepts. We envisage a systematic analysis of how common CO₂ play risk elements vary in different salt settings and basins (e.g. simple vs layered evaporite sequences); and how the development of salt tectonic structures, including turtles, megafaults, salt withdrawal minibasins, salt sheets, welds, sutures, faults, halokinetic sequences, etcetera, impact CO₂ migration, container size and integrity. Ultimately, updated and targeted structural-stratigraphic models of salt movement through time in different settings will allow us to quantify risk (Figures 16 and 18). This will require an interdisciplinary approach and integration of seismic, field data, well data, and insights from modelling approaches.

An example of a salt-related CO₂ storage play concept is one developed for salt withdrawal syncline settings (*Ulfah et al., 2022*) (Figure 16). In petroleum systems, conventional, producible accumulations are found in buoyant traps, often located on structural highs. Clearly those same traps could work for CO₂ storage, but the goal of sequestration opens the door to other trapping mechanisms (dissolution, pore throat trapping, and local capillary trapping) and potentially injecting into synclines, seeking high-injectivity sands at the well location and migration loss as CO₂ moves up-dip (e.g., *Ulfah et al., 2022*). Petroleum exploration has catalogued a wide variety of salt-related plays and offers a valuable analog for CO₂ storage. However CO₂ storage differs from petroleum production, with different goals, boundary conditions and timescale and therefore different requirements for success. In our view, the era of CO₂ storage is only just beginning and new play concepts are inevitable. As ever though, accurate geologic prediction in salt-bearing basins will require an understanding of salt properties and dynamics and their influence on depositional systems and structural styles.

4 Potential for Geothermal Energy in Salt-Bearing Basins

4.1 Fundamental Principles in Geothermal Energy

Exploration for geothermal energy has traditionally focused at or near plate tectonic margins (e.g. California, Pacific Ring of Fire, Iceland), above intra-plate




Figure 18 – Example of a salt-influenced CO₂ storage play concept that may pose a containment risk. Sands encased in shales within a turtle anticline geometry may be highly prospective for oil and gas, yet for CO₂ storage the pressurised sands may restrict CO₂ injection into the crest, and there may be difficulty in accessing pore space down-dip of the anticline crest.

thermal hotspots (e.g. Hawaii), or in areas of active or recent tectonics where geothermal gradients are high (e.g. East African Rift) (Moeck, 2014; Daniilidis and Herber, 2017). These are high-enthalpy, convection-dominated geothermal systems where heat is efficiently transported upwards by circulating fluids that migrate along permeable pathways (Moeck, 2014). In contrast, less attention has focused on sedimentary basins located away from plate margins, where neither asthenospheric anomalies or significant crustal extension occur. In these low-to-medium enthalpy settings, geothermal plays are controlled by conductive processes (e.g., Moeck, 2014; Scheck-Wenderoth et al., 2014; Daniilidis and Herber, 2017; Raymond et al., 2022).

The high costs associated with drilling and completion have proven a barrier to the exploitation of geothermal energy in low-to-medium enthalpy systems where deeper drilling is typically required than in tectonically-active systems (e.g., Barbier, 2002; Johnston et al., 2011; Beckers et al., 2014). However, the social-political demand for renewable energy, plus technological advancements in three key areas has stimulated interest in exploiting geothermal resources from low-to-medium enthalpy settings (e.g., Tester et al., 2007; Moeck, 2014). First, advancements in drilling technology such as directional drilling, and a general trend towards more efficient drilling processes may reduce the costs associated with drilling significant distances (e.g., Johnston et al., 2011). Second, Enhanced or Engineered Geothermal Systems (EGS) have been developed whereby fluid injection and hydraulic fracturing is used to increase the porosity and permeability of reservoirs, thus higher flow rates and greater thermal productivity from reservoirs (e.g., Gringarten et al., 1975; Williams et al., 2011; Breede et al., 2013; Huenges, 2016; Gischig et al., 2020). Third, Advanced Geothermal Systems (AGS) have been engineered with closed or semi-closed loop sys-




Figure 19 – Thermal conductivity of rock salt compared to other lithologies Warren (2016). Reproduced with permission of Springer Nature.

tems containing a working fluid (water, possibly supercritical CO₂) that is heated solely by conduction through the pipe (e.g., Holmes et al., 2021; Malek et al., 2021, 2022). AGS has the advantage of not requiring a porous and permeable reservoir near the heat source (e.g., Malek et al., 2022). In addition, many of the sedimentary basins contain abundant subsurface data, knowledge, and existing infrastructure due to oil and gas activities (e.g., Gulf Coast, USA; Zechstein-influenced portion of Northwest Europe). Utilising low-to-medium enthalpy geothermal systems can be used to electrify rigs, thereby, immediately reducing carbon footprint at wellsites as well as increase the asset life of the marginal fields.

Of particular interest here is that potential may exist where stratigraphic intervals with high thermal conductivity, such as salt, locally enhance the geothermal gradient at shallower depths, thereby reducing required drilling depths (e.g., Daniilidis and Herber, 2017) (Figures 19 and 20). Salt has a higher thermal conductivity (>6 W m⁻¹ K⁻¹ at 20 °C; Haas et al., 1981) than the surrounding sediments (2–3 W m⁻¹ K⁻¹ at 20 °C; Clauser, 2011), meaning heat is preferentially channeled through the salt, raising temperatures above the salt, and lowering them immediately below the salt, with implications for both geothermal resources and maturation of hydrocarbons (e.g., Selig and Wallick, 1966; O'Brien and Lerche, 1984; Ku-




Figure 20 – Effect of salt bodies of varying geometries on steady-state temperature distributions. Salt bodies are encased in shale and have axisymmetric geometry. a) shows an example with no salt present. Temperatures above salt are typically elevated, temperatures below salt are depressed, and temperatures adjacent to salt are dependent on salt geometry (colours modified from *Mello et al., 1995*).

mar, 1989; Nagihara et al., 1992; Mello et al., 1995; Petersen and Lerche, 1995; Norden and Foster, 2006; Daniilidis and Herber, 2017) (Figures 19 and 20). Borehole-based measurements and predictions from numerical models have determined positive temperature anomalies at the top of salt structures that range between 15–35 °C (e.g., *Selig and Wallick, 1966; Geertsma, 1971; Vizgirda et al., 1985; Daniilidis and Herber, 2017*). Importantly, the majority of this research was either focused largely on maturation of petroleum systems (e.g., *Mello et al., 1995; Lerche and Petersen, 2017*) or was conducted in the 1970's and 1980's when technological limitations meant low-to-medium enthalpy geothermal systems were not economically viable. In light of new technologies, recent attention has focused on the role of salt in the geothermal prospectivity of sedimentary basins, with temperatures >150 °C suitable for conventional brine production-based geothermal exploration (e.g., *Tester et al., 2007; Daniilidis and Herber, 2017; Raymond et al., 2022*). Recent advances indicate that using CO₂ as a working fluid or secondary fluid for geothermal heat production can lower the required temperature down to 100 °C or less, making such systems much more economically feasible in the long-term (e.g., *Biagi et al., 2015*). In terms of usage, geothermal plays above crests of shallow salt structures may be of sufficient temperatures for use in district heating networks (e.g., *Norden and Foster, 2006; Noack et al., 2010; Daniilidis and Herber, 2017; Raymond et al., 2022*). In contrast, deeper portions of salt basins (>3 km) may have higher tem-

peratures and, particularly if stimulated by EGS, productivity rates sufficient for power production (e.g., *Tester et al., 2007; Moeck, 2014*).

4.2 Role of Salt Tectonics in Optimising Geothermal Energy in Salt-Bearing Basins

Exploiting the geothermal potential in salt-bearing basins will require integration of salt tectonic understanding with geothermal modelling to constrain which parts of which salt-bearing basins are sweet spots for geothermal energy, and why. In our view, the key technical challenges regarding the geothermal prospectivity of salt-bearing basins involve deepening our understanding of how and why temperature distribution is influenced by: i) the 3D geometry of salt bodies and their salt tectonic context; ii) the potential for non-uniform transmission of heat through salt bodies; and iii) interaction of fluids with faults, fractures and permeable beds around salt bodies. We now identify our perspective on the key challenges to be addressed relating to each of these aspects in turn.

Many numerical geothermal models developed to examine the impact of salt on the distribution of heat in the subsurface often simplify salt bodies such that they are: i) abstract (i.e. removed from salt tectonic context); ii) composed purely of halite; iii) 2-D or have simple cylindrical shapes, and iv) have thermal conductivities that do not change with depth (e.g., *O'Brien*

and Lerche, 1984; Mello et al., 1995; Cedeño et al., 2019) (e.g. Figure 20). Studies with these simplifications provide a strong body of evidence, backed up by observations from natural salt-bearing basins, that temperatures generally increase above salt structures (e.g., Selig and Wallick, 1966; Geertsma, 1971; Vizgirda et al., 1985; Kumar, 1989; Mello et al., 1995; Petersen and Lerche, 1996; Daniilidis and Herber, 2017; Lerche and Petersen, 2017) (Figure 20). However, if we are to efficiently screen for the most prospective geothermal energy sites, we see the need to compare different salt-bearing basins and explore how a range of 3D salt geometries and salt tectonic scenarios as well as salt composition influence containment of heat and temperature distributions. For example:

- Are there differences in the geothermal energy potential around different styles of stocks, walls, and sheets (e.g., Mello et al., 1995; Petersen and Lerche, 1996; Lerche and Petersen, 2017)?
- Are diapirs that are directly sourced from mother salt more prospective than diapirs sourced from allochthonous sheets, if so why?
- How important is the depth to the source salt layer on temperature distributions?
- How and why do different types of welds influence temperature distributions?
- To what extent does the configuration, connectivity, and spacing of salt bodies influence temperature distributions (e.g., Cedeño et al., 2019)? Of interest here is the potential for surface-breaking diapirs to quickly leak heat out of a system, and the potential for mutual interference effects between salt structures within an array (e.g., Mello et al., 1995; Cedeño et al., 2019).

Kumar (1989) presents temperature distribution maps at different depths above Louisiana salt domes showing remarkably complex thermal patterns, typically superimposed on a general trend of increasing temperature towards the diapir (Figure 21). These maps raise two fundamental questions: i) what is causing these complex second-order temperature anomalies above and around salt structures (see also Kumar, 1977)?; and ii) are these second-order temperature anomalies seen in different salt-bearing basins and above different types of salt structure?

A first hypothesis is that the second-order thermal anomalies are related to features and processes from outside of the diapirs. This line of enquiry opens up a further series of research questions.

- How does the presence, geometry, and distribution of permeable beds in the sediments vary around salt diapirs and how does this influence temperature distributions (e.g., Scheck-Wenderoth et al., 2014)?
- How and why do overpressure and local hydrological processes vary around salt structures and




Figure 21 – Isotherm maps (interpolated from measurement point marked by black dots) showing temperature distributions above Louisiana (US Gulf Coast) salt diapirs. Temperatures shown are in degrees Fahrenheit. Dashed lines indicate contours of the depth of the top salt surface (in ft). **a)** temperature distribution at the 10,000 ft level at the Plum Bob salt dome. **b)** temperature distribution at the 10,000 ft level at the Jefferson Island salt dome. **c)** temperature distribution at the 10,000 ft level at the Bayou des Allemands salt dome. In general temperatures increase over the diapirs. However, there is significant second-order variability in temperatures, the origins of which remain unclear and merit further research (Kumar, 1989, colours modified). Reproduced with permission of the Gulf Coast Association of Geological Societies.

how does this influence temperature distributions (e.g., *Scheck-Wenderoth et al.*, 2014)?

- How do different fault and fracture networks, that develop above and adjacent to salt for various reasons at different stages of salt rise and possible fall (e.g. radial faults, crestal faults, and faults related to regional tectonics), influence fluid flow and the distribution of heat around salt structures (e.g., *Kumar*, 1977, 1989; *Lueck et al.*, 2022)?

Addressing the latter of these questions, along with developing a deep understanding of what can be notoriously complex in-situ stress fields around salt bodies (e.g., *Fredrich et al.*, 2003; *Dusseault et al.*, 2004; *Luo et al.*, 2012; *Nikolinakou et al.*, 2012) will be critical if EGS technology (hydraulic stimulation) is to be safely applied to geothermal reservoir sediments near salt structures. Understanding of fault and fracture origins and distributions, and in-situ stress fields will help estimate the potential for fault reactivation and minimise induced seismicity if brine-based geothermal approaches are implemented (*Moeck et al.*, 2009; *Moeck and Backers*, 2011; *Moeck*, 2012, 2014).

A second hypothesis is that the patterns are the result of non-uniform transmission of heat through salt bodies. Entertaining this hypothesis opens up a range of research questions. For example, could the composition of the salt and the distribution of compositional variations in salt bodies significantly influence how heat is transmitted through salt (e.g. halite-dominated compositionally-homogeneous salt versus compositionally-heterogeneous salt)? Key to this question is the finding different evaporite minerals have different thermal conductivities at ambient conditions, with halite ($5.80 \pm 0.10 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}$), anhydrite ($5.39 \pm 0.13 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}$), and dolomite ($4.92 \pm 0.11 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}$) having significantly higher thermal conductivities than gypsum ($1.64 \pm 0.24 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}$) (*Pauselli et al.*, 2021) (see also Figure 19). Do the internal dynamics of salt flow, or the presence, size and proportion of heterogeneities within diapirs influence temperature distributions? Could fast-moving streams of salt identified in certain parts of domes (e.g., *Dooley et al.*, 2009; *Fernandez et al.*, 2020) influence temperature distributions? Intriguingly, *Kumar* (1989) noted a correlation between the spatial distribution of temperature anomalies above a salt diapir and the inferred location of salt 'spines' at the Jefferson Island salt dome. We believe this correlation merits further investigation, both at that location and in other salt bodies worldwide.


Addressing many of the questions outlined in this section will require a range of approaches and application of existing knowledge and concepts derived from hydrocarbon exploration and production. First, detailed mapping of the 3-D geometry of natural salt structures as well as the geometry and distribution of associated faults is needed. This work will require analysis of a range of subsurface data types (seis-

mic, borehole geophysics, gravity, resistivity, electromagnetic). The resulting maps, when tied to regional geology and evaporite stratigraphy, will enhance understanding of the internal composition and kinematics of the salt structures, which may then be related to temperature distributions constrained from borehole bottom hole temperatures or heat flow measurements. Second, geomechanical modelling, coupled with detailed structural maps, will be required to predict the likely distribution and nature of faults, fractures, and in-situ stresses around salt bodies, and to reduce the risk of induced seismicity during well completion. Third, the derived maps and observations can then be integrated into numerical geothermal models to determine the degree of impact on temperature distributions. Allied to these approaches, there is need for fundamental research examining the thermal conductivities of different evaporite minerals under in situ conditions and ascertaining implications for geothermal exploration (e.g., *Petersen and Lerche*, 1996; *Cyran*, 2020; *Raymond et al.*, 2022).

5 Summary and Conclusions

We have outlined the importance of salt tectonics to a range of energy transition technologies and have highlighted some of the key technical challenges to their successful development at scale in salt basins. Any salt-bearing basin may potentially offer a combination of: i) storage sites inside the salt (e.g. hydrogen and compressed air in salt caverns); ii) storage sites in the porous media surrounding the salt (CO₂ storage, storage of waste brines); and iii) natural resources in the salt and surrounding sediments (geothermal energy, oil and gas, lithium potential) that are also likely to be required for exploitation, to varying degrees, throughout the energy transition (Figure 22). These occur at a range of depths, with storage caverns between 400–2000m, CO₂ storage between ~800 m and the top of overpressure, and hydrocarbons and geothermal resources at a range of depths (Figure 22). Effectively exploiting these resources will require a deeper understanding of the composition, geometry, and evolution of salt structures and their surrounding sediments, as well as placing the areas of interest into basinal context (Figure 22). We see potential for problem solving by reframing and applying knowledge and data gained from many decades of petroleum exploration and mining in salt-bearing basins to energy transition issues.

When seeking to exploit the natural resources in salt-bearing basins and deploy energy transition technologies it is essential to consider the following core points. First, each salt basin is unique, they will vary according to factors including the tectonic boundary conditions, and the nature and thickness of the original evaporite stratigraphy. Second, salt diapirs are not simply cylindrical masses of homogeneous halite. In nature, diapirs are highly hetero-



geneous bodies that exhibit a wide range of internal compositions, geometries, behaviours (e.g. Figure 22). Likewise, the stratal geometries observed in the sediments that surround salt diapirs are also highly variable (e.g. Figure 22). Ultimately, each salt-bearing basin and each salt structure will have its own risk profile for the deployment of the different energy transition technologies based on its geological character. Salt tectonic understanding will help optimise design, reduce geotechnical risk, and improve efficiency for energy transition technologies.

Importantly, more than one energy transition technology may be viable for exploitation at a given salt diapir or within a salt basin, and thus there may be competition for resources (Figure 22). It is important that subsurface and at-surface resources are utilised sustainably (e.g. Griffioen et al., 2014). As such, determining which resource is preferentially exploited in a given setting will require careful consideration of social, economic, and environmental implications at a range of scales (e.g., Griffioen et al., 2014). In addition, where multiple technologies exploit resources in close proximity to one another, there are also likely to be synergies between the industries that should be explored (e.g. sharing data, infrastructure and knowledge).

Overall, we emphasise that this overview is by no means an all-encompassing view. We hope this work will elicit conversation and insights from those with different perspectives on salt-related themes, particularly: geomechanics, rheology, microstructure, geochemistry, bedded salt geology, nuclear waste disposal, and the use of solution mining brines in lithium extraction processes (see also Kukla et al., 2019). Much research remains to be done.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the State of Texas Advanced Resource Recovery (STARR) at the Bureau of Economic Geology for funding this work. We thank Christopher A-L Jackson, Juan Soto, and Kurt Looff for constructive discussions, along with Nancy Cottingham for figure drafting. We also thank reviewers Sian Evans and Leonardo Pichel for their helpful comments, along with editor Frank Zwaan for his suggested edits and smooth handling of the manuscript.

Author contributions

All authors contributed to conceptualization of ideas, thoughts on pertinent directions for salt tectonic research on energy transition issues, along with writing and editing of the manuscript, to varying degrees.

Data availability

This contribution is a research review, no new data were used.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Peer review

This publication was peer-reviewed by Leonardo Muniz Pichel and Sian Evans. The full peer-review report can be found here: <https://tektonika.online/index.php/home/article/view/11/6>

Copyright notice

© Author(s) 2023. This article is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited, and any changes made are indicated.

Where possible, permissions were obtained by the authors to reproduce figures from existing literature.

References

- Agartan, E., M. Gaddipati, Y. Yip, B. Savage, and C. Ozgen (2018), CO₂ storage in depleted oil and gas fields in the gulf of mexico, *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 72, 38–48, doi: 10.1016/j.ijggc.2018.02.022.
- Babel, M., and B. C. Schreiber (2014), 9.17 - geochemistry of evaporites and evolution of seawater, in *Treatise on Geochemistry (Second Edition)*, edited by H. D. Holland and K. K. Turekian, pp. 483–560, Elsevier, Oxford, doi: 10.1016/B978-0-08-095975-7.00718-X.
- Balk, R. (1953), Salt structure of jefferson island salt dome, iberia and vermilion parishes, louisiana, *AAPG bulletin*, 37, doi: 10.1306/5ceadda3-16bb-11d7-8645000102c1865d.
- Barbier, E. (2002), Geothermal energy technology and current status: an overview, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 6(1), 3–65, doi: 10.1016/S1364-0321(02)00002-3.
- Beckers, K. F., M. Z. Lukawski, B. J. Anderson, M. C. Moore, and J. W. Tester (2014), Levelized costs of electricity and direct-use heat from enhanced geothermal systems, *Journal of Renewable and Sustainable Energy*, 6(1), 013,141, doi: 10.1063/1.4865575.
- Bennaceur, K. (2014), Chapter 26 - CO₂ capture and sequestration, in *Future Energy (Second Edition)*, edited by T. M. Letcher, pp. 583–611, Elsevier, Boston, doi: 10.1016/B978-0-08-099424-6.00026-0.
- Bentham, M., T. Mallows, J. Lowndes, and A. Green (2014), CO₂ STORAGE evaluation database (CO₂ stored). the UK's online storage atlas, *Energy Procedia*, 63, 5103–5113, doi: 10.1016/j.egypro.2014.11.540.
- Bergmo, P. S., E. Lindeberg, F. Riis, and W. T. Johansen (2009), Exploring geological storage sites for CO₂ from norwegian gas power plants: Johansen formation, *Energy Procedia*, 1(1), 2945–2952, doi: 10.1016/j.egypro.2009.02.070.
- (Bert) van der Meer, L. G. H., and F. Yavuz (2009), CO₂ storage capacity calculations for the dutch subsurface, *Energy Procedia*, 1(1), 2615–2622, doi: 10.1016/j.egypro.2009.02.028.

- Biagi, J., R. Agarwal, and Z. Zhang (2015), Simulation and optimization of enhanced geothermal systems using CO₂ as a working fluid, *Energy*, 86, 627–637, doi: 10.1016/j.energy.2015.04.020.
- BloombergNEF (2020), New energy outlook 2020, *Tech. rep.*, BloombergNEF.
- Borchert, H., and R. O. Muir (1964), *Salt deposits: the origin, metamorphism and deformation of evaporites*, Van Nostrand.
- Bourg, I. C., L. E. Beckingham, and D. J. DePaolo (2015), The nanoscale basis of CO₂ trapping for geologic storage, *Environmental science & technology*, 49(17), 10,265–10,284, doi: 10.1021/acs.est.5b03003.
- Breede, K., K. Dzebisashvili, X. Liu, and G. Falcone (2013), A systematic review of enhanced (or engineered) geothermal systems: past, present and future, *Geothermal Energy*, 1(1), 4, doi: 10.1186/2195-9706-1-4.
- Bruno, M. S., and M. B. Dusseault (2002), Geochemical analysis of pressure limits for thin bedded salt caverns, in *Spring 2002 Meeting*.
- Bump, A. P., S. D. Hovorka, and T. A. Meckel (2021), Common risk segment mapping: Streamlining exploration for carbon storage sites, with application to coastal texas and louisiana, *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 111, 103,457, doi: 10.1016/j.ijggc.2021.103457.
- Bünger, U., J. Michalski, F. Crotagino, and O. Kruck (2016), Large-scale underground storage of hydrogen for the grid integration of renewable energy and other applications, in *Compendium of Hydrogen Energy*, edited by M. Ball, A. Basile, and T. N. Veziroğlu, pp. 133–163, Woodhead Publishing, Oxford, doi: 10.1016/B978-1-78242-364-5.00007-5.
- Burke, L. A., S. A. Kinney, R. F. Dubiel, and J. K. Pitman (2012), Regional map of the 0.70 psi/ft pressure gradient and development of the regional geopressure-gradient model for the onshore and offshore gulf of mexico basin ..., *GCAGS Journal*, 1, 97–106.
- Burliga, S. (2014), Heterogeneity of folding in zechstein (upper permian) salt formations in the kłodawa salt structure, central poland, *Geological Quarterly*, 58(3).
- Callot, J. P., J. Letouzey, and C. Rigollet (2006), Stringers evolution in salt diapirs, insight from analogue models, in *AAPG International Conference and Exhibition*.
- Callot, J.-P., J.-F. Salel, J. Letouzey, J.-M. Daniel, and J.-C. Ringenbach (2016), Three-dimensional evolution of salt-controlled minibasins: Interactions, folding, and megaflap development, *AAPG Bulletin*, 100(9), 1419–1442, doi: 10.1306/03101614087.
- Carter, N. L., S. T. Horseman, J. E. Russell, and J. Handin (1993), Rheology of rocksalt, *Journal of Structural Geology*, 15(9), 1257–1271, doi: 10.1016/0191-8141(93)90168-A.
- Cartwright, M. J., and J. L. Ratigan (2005), Case history—solution mining a cavern that intersects a plane of preferred dissolution, in *Proc. SMRI Fall Meeting*.
- Cedeño, A., L. A. Rojo, N. Cardozo, L. Centeno, and A. Escalona (2019), The impact of salt tectonics on the thermal evolution and the petroleum system of confined rift basins: Insights from basin modeling of the nordkapp basin, norwegian barents sea, *Geosciences Journal*, 9(7), 316, doi: 10.3390/geosciences9070316.
- Chemia, Z., H. Koyi, and H. Schmeling (2008), Numerical modelling of rise and fall of a dense layer in salt diapirs, *Geophysical Journal International*, 172(2), 798–816, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-246X.2007.03661.x.
- Chemia, Z., H. Schmeling, and H. Koyi (2009), The effect of the salt viscosity on future evolution of the gorleben salt diapir, germany, *Tectonophysics*, 473(3), 446–456, doi: 10.1016/j.tecto.2009.03.027.
- Christie, D. N., F. J. Peel, G. M. Apps, and D. s. Stanbrook (2021), Forward modelling for structural stratigraphic analysis, offshore sureste basin, mexico, *Frontiers of Earth Science in China*, 9, doi: 10.3389/feart.2021.767329.
- Clauser, C. (2011), Thermal storage and transport properties of rocks, II: thermal conductivity and diffusivity, in *Encyclopedia of Solid Earth Geophysics*, edited by H. Gupta, 2 ed., pp. 1431–1448, Springer Netherlands Dordrecht, doi: 10.1007/978-90-481-8702-7_67.
- Crotogino, F. (2016), Larger scale hydrogen storage, in *Storing Energy*, edited by T. M. Letcher, pp. 411–429, Elsevier, Oxford, doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-803440-8.00020-8.
- Crotogino, F. (2022), Large-scale hydrogen storage, in *Storing Energy (Second Edition)*, edited by T. M. Letcher, pp. 613–632, Elsevier, doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-824510-1.00003-9.
- Crotogino, F., S. Donadei, U. Bünger, and H. Landinger (2010), Large-scale hydrogen underground storage for securing future energy supplies, in *18th World hydrogen energy conference*, vol. 78, pp. 37–45, core.ac.uk.
- Crotogino, F., G.-S. Schneider, and D. J. Evans (2018), Renewable energy storage in geological formations, *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part A: Journal of Power and Energy*, 232(1), 100–114, doi: 10.1177/0957650917731181.
- Cumberpatch, Z. A., I. A. Kane, E. L. Soutter, D. M. Hodgson, C. A.-L. Jackson, B. A. Kilhams, and Y. Poprawski (2021), Interactions between deep-water gravity flows and active salt tectonics, *Journal of Sedimentary Research*, 91(1), 34–65, doi: 10.2110/jsr.2020.047.
- Cyran, K. (2020), Archives of mining sciences, *Archives of Mining Sciences*, 65(2), 363–398, doi: 10.24425/AMS.2020.133198.
- Cyran, K. (2021), The influence of impurities and fabrics on mechanical properties of rock salt for underground storage in salt caverns—a review, *Archives of Mining Sciences*, 66(2), 155–179, doi: 10.24425/ams.2021.137454.
- Czapowski, G., H. Tomassi-Morawiec, J. Tadych, Ł. Grzybowski, and T. Szyrak (2009), Wykształcenie i tektonika utworów solnych cechsztynu w wysadzie solnym góra koło inowrocławia w świetle wyników kompleksowych badań geochemiczno-litologicznych w profilach wybranych otworów wiertniczych, *Przegląd Geologiczny*, 57(6), 494–503.
- da Costa, A. M., P. V. M. Costa, A. C. O. Miranda, M. B. R. Goulart, O. D. Udebhulu, N. F. F. Ebecken, R. C. Azevedo, S. M. de Eston, G. de Tomi, A. B. Mendes, J. R. Meneghini, K. Nishimoto, C. Mueller Sampaio, C. Brandão, and A. Breda (2019), Experimental salt cavern in offshore ultra-deep water and well design evaluation for CO₂ abatement, *International Journal of Mining Science and Technology*, 29(5), 641–656, doi: 10.1016/j.ijmst.2019.05.002.
- da Costa, P. V. M., A. M. da Costa, J. R. Meneghini, K. Nishimoto, C. M. Sampaio, G. Assi, E. Malta, M. B. R. Goulart, A. Bergsten, O. D. Udebhulu, R. C. Azevedo, S. M. de Eston, G. de Tomi, N. F. F. Ebecken, L. P. Rosa, A. C. O. Miranda, C. Brandão, and A. Breda (2020), Parametric study and geomechanical design of ultra-deep-water offshore

- salt caverns for carbon capture and storage in brazil, *International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences*, 131, 104,354, doi: 10.1016/j.ijrmmms.2020.104354.
- Daniilidis, A., and R. Herber (2017), Salt intrusions providing a new geothermal exploration target for higher energy recovery at shallower depths, *Energy*, 118, 658–670, doi: 10.1016/j.energy.2016.10.094.
- Davison, I., P. Barreto, and A. J. M. Andrade (2017), Loulé: the anatomy of a squeezed diapir, algarve basin, southern portugal, *Journal of the Geological Society*, 174(1), 41–55, doi: 10.1144/jgs2016-035.
- DOE NETL (2015), Carbon storage atlas, <https://www.netl.doe.gov/coal/carbon-storage/strategic-program-support/natcarb-atlas>, accessed: NA-NA-NA.
- Dooley, T. P., M. P. A. Jackson, and M. R. Hudec (2009), Inflation and deflation of deeply buried salt stocks during lateral shortening, *Journal of Structural Geology*, 31(6), 582–600, doi: 10.1016/j.jsg.2009.03.013.
- Dooley, T. P., M. P. A. Jackson, C. A.-L. Jackson, M. R. Hudec, and C. R. Rodriguez (2015), Enigmatic structures within salt walls of the santos Basin—Part 2: Mechanical explanation from physical modelling, *Journal of Structural Geology*, 75, 163–187, doi: 10.1016/j.jsg.2015.01.009.
- Doughty-Jones, G., M. Mayall, and L. Lonergan (2017), Stratigraphy, facies, and evolution of deep-water lobe complexes within a salt-controlled intraslope minibasin, *AAPG bulletin*, 101(11), 1879–1904, doi: 10.1306/01111716046.
- Duffy, O. B., T. P. Dooley, M. R. Hudec, N. Fernandez, C. A.-L. Jackson, and J. I. Soto (2021), Principles of shortening in salt basins containing isolated minibasins, *Basin Research*, 33(3), 2089–2117, doi: 10.1111/bre.12550.
- Duffy, O. B., L. Moscardelli, M. R. Hudec, T. P. Dooley, F. Peel, K. Loeff, G. Apps, and M. W. Shuster (2022), Potential controls on the origin, nature and distribution of shear zones in salt stocks: salt tectonic insights with a solution mining perspective, in *Solution Mining Research Institute, Technical Conference*, researchgate.net.
- Dusseault, M. B., and B. C. Davidson (1999), Design and management of salt solution caverns for toxic waste disposal, *Journal of Canadian Petroleum Technology*, 38(12), doi: 10.2118/99-12-03.
- Dusseault, M. B., V. Maury, F. Sanfilippo, and F. J. Santarelli (2004), Drilling around salt: risks, stresses, and uncertainties, in *Gulf Rocks 2004, the 6th North America Rock Mechanics Symposium (NARMS)*, onepetro.org.
- ENTSOG, GIE, and Hydrogen Europe (2021), How to transport and store hydrogen - facts and figures, *Tech. rep.*, ENTSOG, GIE, and Hydrogen Europe.
- Escher, B. G., and P. H. Kuenen (1928), Experiments in connection with salt domes, *Leidse Geologische Mededelingen*, 3(1), 151–182.
- Feng, Y. E., A. Yankelzon, J. Steinberg, and M. Reshef (2016), Lithology and characteristics of the messinian evaporite sequence of the deep levant basin, eastern mediterranean, *Marine geology*, 376, 118–131, doi: 10.1016/j.margeo.2016.04.004.
- Fernandez, N., O. B. Duffy, M. R. Hudec, M. P. A. Jackson, G. Burg, C. A.-L. Jackson, and T. P. Dooley (2017), The origin of salt-encased sediment packages: Observations from the SE precaspian basin (kazakhstan), *Journal of Structural Geology*, 97, 237–256, doi: 10.1016/j.jsg.2017.01.008.
- Fernandez, N., M. R. Hudec, C. A.-L. Jackson, T. P. Dooley, and O. B. Duffy (2020), The competition for salt and kinematic interactions between minibasins during density-driven subsidence: observations from numerical models, *Petroleum Geoscience*, 26(1), 3–15, doi: 10.1144/petgeo2019-051.
- Fiduk, J. C., and M. G. Rowan (2012), Analysis of folding and deformation within layered evaporites in blocks BM-S-8 & -9, santos basin, brazil, *Geological Society, London, Special Publications*, 363(1), 471–487, doi: 10.1144/SP363.22.
- Foh, S., M. Novil, E. Rockar, and P. Randolph (1979), Underground hydrogen storage. final report. [salt caverns, excavated caverns, aquifers and depleted fields], *Tech. rep.*, Office of Scientific and Technical Information (OSTI), doi: 10.2172/6536941.
- Fraser, A. J. (2010), A regional overview of the exploration potential of the middle east: a case study in the application of play fairway risk mapping techniques, *Geological Society, London, Petroleum Geology Conference Series*, 7(1), 791–800, doi: 10.1144/0070791.
- Fredrich, J. T., D. Coblentz, A. F. Fossum, and B. J. Thorne (2003), Stress perturbations adjacent to salt bodies in the deepwater gulf of mexico, in *SPE annual technical conference and exhibition*, onepetro.org.
- Fuchs, L., H. Koyi, and H. Schmeling (2015), Numerical modeling of the effect of composite rheology on internal deformation in down-built diapirs, *Tectonophysics*, 646, 79–95, doi: 10.1016/j.tecto.2015.01.014.
- Gahleitner, G. (2013), Hydrogen from renewable electricity: An international review of power-to-gas pilot plants for stationary applications, *International journal of hydrogen energy*, 38(5), 2039–2061, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhydene.2012.12.010.
- Galloway, W. E., T. L. Whiteaker, and P. Ganey-Curry (2011), History of cenozoic north american drainage basin evolution, sediment yield, and accumulation in the gulf of mexico basin, *Geosphere*, 7(4), 938–973, doi: 10.1130/GES00647.1.
- Gamboa, L. A. P., M. A. P. Machado, D. P. Da Silveira, J. T. R. De Freitas, S. R. P. Da Silva, W. Mohriak, P. Szatmari, and S. Anjos (2008), Evaporitos estratificados no atlântico sul: interpretação sísmica e controle tectono-estratigráfico na bacia de santos, *Sal: Geologia E Tectônica. Beca Edições, São Paulo, Brasil*.
- Ganjdanesh, R., and S. A. Hosseini (2018), Development of an analytical simulation tool for storage capacity estimation of saline aquifers, *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 74, 142–154, doi: 10.1016/j.ijggc.2018.04.017.
- Gee, M. J. R., and R. L. Gawthorpe (2006), Submarine channels controlled by salt tectonics: Examples from 3D seismic data offshore angola, *Marine and Petroleum Geology*, 23(4), 443–458, doi: 10.1016/j.marpetgeo.2006.01.002.
- Geertsma, J. (1971), Finite-element analysis of shallow temperature anomalies, *Geophysical Prospecting*, 19(4), 662–681, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2478.1971.tb00909.x.
- Gibb, F. G. F. (1999), High-temperature, very deep, geological disposal: a safer alternative for high-level radioactive waste?, *Waste Management*, 19(3), 207–211, doi: 10.1016/S0956-053X(99)00050-1.
- Giles, K. A., and M. G. Rowan (2012), Concepts in halokinetic-sequence deformation and stratigraphy, *Geological Society, London, Special Publications*, 363(1), 7–31, doi: 10.1144/SP363.2.

- Gillhaus, A., and P. L. Horvath (2008), Compilation of geological and geotechnical data of worldwide domal salt deposits and domal salt cavern fields, *Solution Mining Research Institute and KBB*.
- Gillhaus, A., F. Crotogino, D. Albes, and L. Van Sambeek (2006), Compilation and evaluation of bedded salt deposit and bedded salt cavern characteristics important to successful cavern sealing and abandonment, *Solution Mining Research*.
- Gischig, V. S., D. Giardini, F. Amann, M. Hertrich, H. Krietsch, S. Loew, H. Maurer, L. Villiger, S. Wiemer, F. Bethmann, B. Brixel, J. Doetsch, N. G. Doonechaly, T. Driesner, N. Dutler, K. F. Evans, M. Jalali, D. Jordan, A. Kittilä, X. Ma, P. Meier, M. Nejati, A. Obermann, K. Plenkers, M. O. Saar, A. Shakas, and B. Valley (2020), Hydraulic stimulation and fluid circulation experiments in underground laboratories: Stepping up the scale towards engineered geothermal systems, *Geomechanics for Energy and the Environment*, 24, 100,175, doi: 10.1016/j.gete.2019.100175.
- Global CCS Institute (2021), Global status of CCS 2021: CCS accelerating to net zero, *Tech. rep.*, Global CCS Institute.
- Goulart, M. B. R., P. V. M. d. Costa, A. M. d. Costa, A. C. O. Miranda, A. B. Mendes, N. F. F. Ebecken, J. R. Meneghini, K. Nishimoto, and G. R. S. Assi (2020), Technology readiness assessment of ultra-deep salt caverns for carbon capture and storage in brazil, *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 99, 103,083, doi: 10.1016/j.ijggc.2020.103083.
- Gralla, P., and J. Marsky (2000), Seismic reveals new eastern precaspian target, *Oil and Gas Journal*, 98(05), 86–89.
- Griffioen, J., J. van Wensem, J. L. M. Oomes, F. Barends, J. Breunese, H. Bruining, T. Olsthoorn, A. J. M. Stams, and A. E. C. van der Stoel (2014), A technical investigation on tools and concepts for sustainable management of the subsurface in the netherlands, *The Science of the total environment*, 485-486, 810–819, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.02.114.
- Gringarten, A. C., P. A. Witherspoon, and Y. Ohnishi (1975), Theory of heat extraction from fractured hot dry rock, *Journal of geophysical research*, 80(8), 1120–1124, doi: 10.1029/jb080i008p01120.
- Haas, J. L., J. Lorenz, M. A. Clynne, R. W. Potter, III, and C. M. Schafer (1981), Geology, mineralogy, and some geophysical and geochemical properties of salt deposits, *Tech. rep.*, US Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards.
- Halland, E. K., W. T. Johansen, and F. Riis (2011), CO₂ storage atlas norwegian north sea, *Tech. rep.*, Norwegian Petroleum Directorate.
- Han, G., M. Bruno, K. Lao, J. Young, and L. Dorfmann (2007), Gas storage and operations in single-bedded salt caverns: Stability analyses, *SPE Production & Operations*, 22(03), 368–376, doi: 10.2118/99520-pa.
- Hashemi, L., M. Blunt, and H. Hajibeygi (2021), Pore-scale modelling and sensitivity analyses of hydrogen-brine multiphase flow in geological porous media, *Scientific reports*, 11(1), 8348, doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-87490-7.
- Hawie, N., M. Dubille, N. Guyomar, G. Maury, V. Thomas, O. Vidal, V. Carayon, L. Cuiilhe, G. Al-Sahlan, S. Al-Ali, A. Al-Khamis, and M. Dawwas Al-Ajmi (2016), Innovative and integrated multi-disciplinary workflow for mature basins exploration: The arabian platform case study, in *Day 3 Wed, November 09, 2016*, SPE, doi: 10.2118/183193-ms.
- Hearon, T. E., IV, M. G. Rowan, K. A. Giles, and W. H. Hart (2014), Halokinetic deformation adjacent to the deepwater auger diapir, garden banks 470, northern gulf of mexico: Testing the applicability of an outcrop-based model using subsurface data, *Interpretation*, 2(4), SM57–SM76, doi: 10.1190/int-2014-0053.1.
- Heinemann, N., J. Alcalde, J. M. Miocic, S. J. T. Hangx, J. Kallmeyer, C. Ostertag-Henning, A. Hassanpoury-ouzband, E. M. Thaysen, G. J. Strobel, C. Schmidt-Hattenberger, K. Edlmann, M. Wilkinson, M. Bentham, R. Stuart Haszeldine, R. Carbonell, and A. Rudloff (2021), Enabling large-scale hydrogen storage in porous media – the scientific challenges, *Energy & environmental science*, 14(2), 853–864, doi: 10.1039/D0EE03536J.
- Hodgson, N. A., J. Farnsworth, and A. J. Fraser (1992), Salt-related tectonics, sedimentation and hydrocarbon plays in the central graben, north sea, UKCS, *Geological Society, London, Special Publications*, 67(1), 31–63, doi: 10.1144/GSL.SP.1992.067.01.03.
- Hofrichter, E. (1980), Problems of final storage of radioactive waste in salt formations, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Geologischen Gesellschaft*, 131(2), 409–430, doi: 10.1127/zdgg/131/1980/409.
- Holmes, M., M. Toews, J. Jenkins, and N. Sepulveda (2021), Multilateral Closed-Loop geothermal systems as a Zero-Emission Load-Following resource, in *2021 Geothermal Rising Conference: Using the Earth to Save the Earth*, GRC 2021, pp. 25–52, eavor.com.
- Howlett, D. M., R. L. Gawthorpe, Z. Ge, A. Rotevatn, and C. A.-L. Jackson (2021), Turbidites, topography and tectonics: Evolution of submarine channel-lobe systems in the salt-influenced kwanza basin, offshore angola, *Basin Research*, 33(2), 1076–1110, doi: 10.1111/bre.12506.
- Huenges, E. (2016), Enhanced geothermal systems: Review and status of research and development, in *Geothermal Power Generation*, edited by R. DiPippo, pp. 743–761, Woodhead Publishing, doi: 10.1016/B978-0-08-100337-4.00025-5.
- IEA (2019a), World energy outlook, *Tech. rep.*, International Energy Agency.
- IEA (2019b), Exploring clean energy pathways: The role of CO₂ storage, *Tech. rep.*, International Energy Agency.
- IPCC (2014), Mitigation of climate change, *Tech. rep.*, Contribution of working group III to the fifth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change.
- IPCC (2021), Climate change 2021: The physical science basis, *Tech. rep.*, Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, doi: 10.1017/9781009157896.
- IPCC (2022), Climate change 2022: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability, *Tech. rep.*, Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, doi: 10.1017/9781009325844.
- Jackson, C. A.-L., M. P. A. Jackson, M. R. Hudec, and C. R. Rodriguez (2015), Enigmatic structures within salt walls of the santos Basin—Part 1: Geometry and kinematics from 3D seismic reflection and well data, *Journal of Structural Geology*, 75, 135–162, doi: 10.1016/j.jsg.2015.01.010.
- Jackson, C. A.-L., O. B. Duffy, N. Fernandez, T. P. Dooley, M. R. Hudec, M. P. A. Jackson, and G. Burg (2020), The stratigraphic record of minibasin subsidence, precaspian basin, kazakhstan, *Basin Research*, 32(4), 739–763, doi: 10.1111/bre.12393.
- Jackson, M. P. A. (1997), Conceptual breakthroughs in salt tectonics: A historical review, 1856-1993, *Tech. Rep.* 246,

- Bureau of Economic Geology, University of Texas at Austin.
- Jackson, M. P. A., and M. R. Hudec (2017), *Salt Tectonics: Principles and Practice*, Cambridge University Press.
- Jackson, M. P. A., and C. J. Talbot (1989), Anatomy of mushroom-shaped diapirs, *Journal of Structural Geology*, 11(1), 211–230, doi: 10.1016/0191-8141(89)90044-8.
- Jackson, M. P. A., R. R. Cornelius, C. H. Craig, A. Gansser, J. Stöcklin, and C. J. Talbot (1990), Salt diapirs of the great kavir, central iran, in *Geological Society of America Memoirs*, Memoir - Geological Society of America, pp. 1–150, Geological Society of America, doi: 10.1130/mem177-p1.
- Johnston, I. W., G. A. Narsilio, and S. Colls (2011), Emerging geothermal energy technologies, *KSCE Journal of Civil Engineering*, 15(4), 643–653, doi: 10.1007/s12205-011-0005-7.
- Kernen, R. A. (2019), Origin and characterization of intrasalt Non-Halite lithologies of the neoproterozoic patawarta diapir, central flinders ranges, south australia, Ph.D. thesis, University of Texas at El Paso.
- Kirkland, D. W., and R. Eva (1981), Source-rock potential of evaporitic environment, *AAPG bulletin*, 65(2), 181–190, doi: 10.1306/2f91979c-16ce-11d7-8645000102c1865d.
- Kirkland, D. W., and R. Evans (1973), *Marine evaporites: origin, diagenesis, and geochemistry*, vol. 404, Hutchinson Ross Publishing Company.
- Knauth, L. P., M. B. Kumar, and J. D. Martinez (1980), Isotope geochemistry of water in gulf coast salt domes, *Journal of geophysical research*, 85(B9), 4863, doi: 10.1029/jb085ib09p04863.
- Koyi, H. A. (2001), Modeling the influence of sinking anhydrite blocks on salt diapirs targeted for hazardous waste disposal, *Geology*, 29(5), 387–390, doi: 10.1130/0091-7613(2001)029<0387:MTIOSA>2.0.CO;2.
- Krishnamurthy, P. G., L. Trevisan, and T. Meckel (2017), Understanding the effects small scale heterogeneity on buoyancy driven CO₂ migration for capillary trapped storage capacity estimation, *Energy Procedia*, 114, 4954–4960, doi: 10.1016/j.egypro.2017.03.1637.
- Kukla, P., J. Urai, and F. Strozyk (2019), New frontiers in salt research, in *AAPG Annual Convention and Exhibition*.
- Kukla, P. A., L. Reuning, S. Becker, J. L. Urai, and J. Schoenherr (2011), Distribution and mechanisms of overpressure generation and deflation in the late neoproterozoic to early cambrian south oman salt basin, *Geofluids*, 11(4), 349–361, doi: 10.1111/j.1468-8123.2011.00340.x.
- Kumar, M. B. (1977), Geothermal and geopressure patterns of bayou carlin-lake sand area, south louisiana: Implications, *AAPG bulletin*, 61, doi: 10.1306/c1ea3bf9-16c9-11d7-8645000102c1865d.
- Kumar, M. B. (1989), Geothermal patterns of louisiana salt domes, *Gulf Coast Association of Geological Societies Transactions*, 39, 159–170.
- Kupfer, D. H. (1974), Shear zones in the gulf coast salt delineate spines of movement, *Gulf Coast Association of Geological Societies Transactions*, 24, 197–209.
- Kupfer, D. H. (1976), Shear zones inside gulf coast salt stocks help to delineate spines of movement, *AAPG bulletin*, 60, doi: 10.1306/c1ea387a-16c9-11d7-8645000102c1865d.
- Kupfer, D. H. (1989), Internal kinematics of salt diapirs: DISCUSSION, *AAPG bulletin*, 73, doi: 10.1306/44b4a2a3-170a-11d7-8645000102c1865d.
- Kupfer, D. H. (1990), Anomalous features in the five islands salt stocks, louisiana, *Gulf Coast Association of Geological Societies Transactions*, 40, 425–437.
- Kupfer, D. H., B. E. Lock, and P. R. Schank (1998), Anomalous zones within the salt at weeks island, louisiana, *Gulf Coast Association of Geological Societies Transactions*, 48, 181–191.
- Lankof, L., K. Urbańczyk, and R. Tarkowski (2022), Assessment of the potential for underground hydrogen storage in salt domes, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 160, 112,309, doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2022.112309.
- Le Gallo, Y., P. Couillens, and T. Manai (2002), CO₂ sequestration in depleted oil or gas reservoirs, in *SPE International Conference on Health, Safety and Environment in Oil and Gas Exploration and Production*, SPE, doi: 10.2118/74104-ms.
- Lerche, I., and K. Petersen (2017), *Salt and sediment dynamics*, CRC Press.
- Lindeberg, E. (1997), Escape of CO₂ from aquifers, *Energy Conversion & Management*, 38, S235–S240, doi: 10.1016/S0196-8904(96)00275-0.
- Lockhart, D. A., E. Riel, M. Sanders, A. Walsh, G. T. Cooper, and M. Allder (2018), Play-based exploration in the southern cooper basin: a systematic approach to exploration in a mature basin, *The APPEA journal*, 58(2), 825, doi: 10.1071/aj17138.
- Loeff, K. M. (2000), Geologic and microstructural evidence of differential salt movement at weeks island salt dome, iberia parish, louisiana, *Gulf Coast Association of Geological Societies Transactions*, 50, 543–555.
- Loeff, K. M. (2017), The impact of anomalous salt and boundary shear zones on salt cavern geometry, cavern operations, and cavern integrity, in *SMRI Spring Meeting*.
- Loeff, K. M., and C. Rautman (2010a), Salt spines, boundary shear zones and anomalous salts: their characteristics, detection and influence on salt dome storage caverns, in *SMRI Spring Technical Conference*, researchgate.net.
- Loeff, K. M., and C. Rautman (2010b), Inferring the geologic significance and potential impact of salt fabric and anomalous salt on the development and long-term operation of salt storage caverns on gulf coast salt domes, in *SMRI Spring Technical Conference*, pp. 26–27, researchgate.net.
- Lord, A. S., P. H. Kobos, and D. J. Borns (2014), Geologic storage of hydrogen: Scaling up to meet city transportation demands, *International journal of hydrogen energy*, 39(28), 15,570–15,582, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhydene.2014.07.121.
- Lueck, L. R., M. P. Fischer, N. J. Williams, K. Drost, J. P. Dodd, and D. M. Chew (2022), A two-stage, fault-controlled paleofluid system at the southern termination of the gypsum valley salt wall, paradox basin, colorado, USA, *Basin Research*, 34(3), 1020–1054, doi: 10.1111/bre.12649.
- Luo, G., M. A. Nikolinakou, P. B. Flemings, and M. R. Hudec (2012), Geomechanical modeling of stresses adjacent to salt bodies: Part 1—uncoupled models, *AAPG bulletin*, 96(1), 43–64, doi: 10.1306/04111110144.
- Magee, C., L. M. Pichel, A. L. Madden-Nadeau, C. A.-L. Jackson, and W. Mohriak (2021), Salt-magma interactions influence intrusion distribution and salt tectonics in the santos basin, offshore brazil, *Basin Research*, 33(3), 1820–1843, doi: 10.1111/bre.12537.
- Malek, A. E., B. Adams, E. Rossi, H. O. Schiegg, and M. O. Saar (2021), Electric power generation, specific capital

- cost, and specific power for advanced geothermal systems (AGS), in *46th Annual Stanford Geothermal Workshop (SGW 2021)*, ETH Zurich, doi: 10.3929/ETHZ-B-000467172.
- Malek, A. E., B. M. Adams, E. Rossi, H. O. Schiegg, and M. O. Saar (2022), Techno-economic analysis of advanced geothermal systems (AGS), *Renewable Energy*, 186, 927–943, doi: 10.1016/j.renene.2022.01.012.
- Mansouri, H., D. J. Prior, R. Ajalloeian, and R. Elyaszadeh (2019), Deformation and recrystallization mechanisms inferred from microstructures of naturally deformed rock salt from the diapiric stem and surface glaciers of a salt diapir in southern iran, *Journal of Structural Geology*, 121, 10–24, doi: 10.1016/j.jsg.2019.01.005.
- Martín-Martín, J. D., J. Vergés, E. Saura, M. Moragas, G. Mes-sager, V. Baqués, P. Razin, C. Grélaud, M. Malaval, R. Jous-siaume, E. Casciello, I. Cruz-Orosa, and D. W. Hunt (2017), Diapiric growth within an early jurassic rift basin: The tazoult salt wall (central high atlas, morocco), *Tectonics*, 36(1), 2–32, doi: 10.1002/2016tc004300.
- Matos, C. R., J. F. Carneiro, and P. P. Silva (2019), Overview of Large-Scale underground energy storage technologies for integration of renewable energies and criteria for reservoir identification, *Journal of Energy Storage*, 21, 241–258, doi: 10.1016/j.est.2018.11.023.
- Mayall, M., L. Lonergan, A. Bowman, S. James, K. Mills, T. Primmer, D. Pope, L. Rogers, and R. Skeene (2010), The response of turbidite slope channels to growth-induced seabed topography, *AAPG bulletin*, 94(7), 1011–1030, doi: 10.1306/01051009117.
- Mayrhofer, H. (1983), World reserves of mineable potash salts based on structural analysis, in *Proceedings of the 6th International Symposium on Salt*, vol. 1, The Salt Institute Alexandria, USA.
- Mello, U. T., G. D. Karner, and R. N. Anderson (1995), Role of salt in restraining the maturation of subsalt source rocks, *Marine and Petroleum Geology*, 12(7), 697–716, doi: 10.1016/0264-8172(95)93596-V.
- Michalski, J., U. Bünger, F. Crotogino, S. Donadei, G.-S. Schneider, T. Pregger, K.-K. Cao, and D. Heide (2017), Hydrogen generation by electrolysis and storage in salt caverns: Potentials, economics and systems aspects with regard to the german energy transition, *International journal of hydrogen energy*, 42(19), 13,427–13,443, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhydene.2017.02.102.
- Moeck, I. (2012), Iterative development of stress models for deep geothermal reservoirs, in *74th EAGE Conference and Exhibition incorporating EUROPEC 2012*, EAGE Publications BV, Netherlands, doi: 10.3997/2214-4609.20148184.
- Moeck, I., and T. Backers (2011), Fault reactivation potential as a critical factor during reservoir stimulation, *First Break*, 29(1789), doi: 10.3997/1365-2397.2011014.
- Moeck, I., G. Kwiątek, and G. Zimmermann (2009), Slip tendency analysis, fault reactivation potential and induced seismicity in a deep geothermal reservoir, *Journal of Structural Geology*, 31(10), 1174–1182, doi: 10.1016/j.jsg.2009.06.012.
- Moeck, I. S. (2014), Catalog of geothermal play types based on geologic controls, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 37, 867–882, doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2014.05.032.
- Mouli-Castillo, J., K. Edlmann, E. Thaysen, and J. Scafidi (2021), Enabling large-scale offshore wind with underground hydrogen storage, *First Break*, 39(6), 59–62, doi: 10.3997/1365-2397.fb2021044.
- Muehlberger, W. R., and P. S. Clabaugh (1968), Internal structure and petrofabrics of gulf coast salt domes, in *Diapirism and Diapirs*, vol. 153, pp. 90–98, American Association of Petroleum Geologists, doi: 10.1306/m8361c6.
- Muhammed, N. S., B. Haq, D. Al Shehri, A. Al-Ahmed, M. M. Rahman, and E. Zaman (2022), A review on underground hydrogen storage: Insight into geological sites, influencing factors and future outlook, *Energy Reports*, 8, 461–499, doi: 10.1016/j.egy.2021.12.002.
- Nagihara, S., J. G. Sclater, L. M. Beckley, E. William Behrens, and L. A. Lawver (1992), High heat flow anomalies over salt structures on the texas continental slope, gulf of mexico, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 19(16), 1687–1690, doi: 10.1029/92GL00976.
- National Petroleum Council (2019), Meeting the dual Challenge—A roadmap to At-Scale deployment of carbon capture, use, and storage, *Tech. rep.*, National Petroleum Council.
- Neal, J. T., and T. R. Magorian (1997), Geologic site characterization (GSC) principles derived from storage and mining projects in salt, with application to environmental surety, *Environmental geology*, 29(3), 165–175, doi: 10.1007/s002540050115.
- Nicot, J.-P. (2009), A survey of oil and gas wells in the texas gulf coast, USA, and implications for geological sequestration of CO₂, *Environmental geology*, 57(7), 1625–1638, doi: 10.1007/s00254-008-1444-4.
- Nikolinakou, M. A., G. Luo, M. R. Hudec, and P. B. Flemings (2012), Geomechanical modeling of stresses adjacent to salt bodies: Part 2—poroelastoplasticity and coupled overpressures, *AAPG bulletin*, 96(1), 65–85, doi: 10.1306/04111110143.
- Nilsen, H. M., K.-A. Lie, and O. Andersen (2015), Analysis of CO₂ trapping capacities and long-term migration for geological formations in the norwegian north sea using MRST-co2lab, *Computers & geosciences*, 79, 15–26, doi: 10.1016/j.cageo.2015.03.001.
- Noack, V., Y. Cherubini, M. Scheck-Wenderoth, B. Lewerenz, T. Höding, A. Simon, and I. Moeck (2010), Assessment of the present-day thermal field (NE german Basin)—Inferences from 3D modelling, *Geochemistry: Exploration, Environment, Analysis*, 70, 47–62, doi: 10.1016/j.chemer.2010.05.008.
- Nordbotten, J. M., D. Kavetski, M. A. Celia, and S. Bachu (2009), Model for CO₂ leakage including multiple geological layers and multiple leaky wells, *Environmental science & technology*, 43(3), 743–749, doi: 10.1021/es801135v.
- Norden, B., and A. Foster (2006), Thermal conductivity and radiogenic heat production of sedimentary and magmatic rocks in the northeast german basin, *AAPG bulletin*, 90(6), 939–962, doi: 10.1306/01250605100.
- O'Brien, J. J., and I. Lerche (1984), The influence of salt domes on paleotemperature distributions, *Geophysics*, 49(11), 2032–2043, doi: 10.1190/1.1441614.
- Oldenburg, C. M. (2008), Screening and ranking framework for geologic CO₂ storage site selection on the basis of health, safety, and environmental risk, *Environmental geology*, 54(8), 1687–1694, doi: 10.1007/s00254-007-0947-8.
- Oluboyo, A. P., R. L. Gawthorpe, K. Bakke, and F. Hadler-Jacobsen (2014), Salt tectonic controls on deep-water turbidite depositional systems: Miocene, southwestern lower congo basin, offshore angola, *Basin Research*, 26(4), 597–620, doi: 10.1111/bre.12051.
- Pacala, S., and R. Socolow (2004), Stabilization wedges:

- solving the climate problem for the next 50 years with current technologies, *Science*, 305(5686), 968–972, doi: 10.1126/science.1100103.
- Panfilov, M. (2016), Underground and pipeline hydrogen storage, in *Compendium of Hydrogen Energy*, edited by R. B. Gupta, A. Basile, and T. N. Veziroğlu, pp. 91–115, Woodhead Publishing, doi: 10.1016/B978-1-78242-362-1.00004-3.
- Pauselli, C., G. Gola, G. Ranalli, P. Mancinelli, F. Trippetta, P. Ballirano, and M. Verdoya (2021), Thermal conductivity of triassic evaporites, *Geophysical Journal International*, 227(3), 1715–1729, doi: 10.1093/gji/ggab293.
- Peters, J. M., J. B. Filbrandt, J. P. Grotzinger, M. J. Newall, M. W. Shuster, and H. A. Al-Siyabi (2003), Surface-piercing salt domes of interior north oman, and their significance for the ara carbonate ‘stringer’ hydrocarbon play, *GeoArabia*, 8(2), 231–270, doi: 10.2113/geoarabia0802231.
- Petersen, K., and I. Lerche (1995), Stress, strain, and fracturing around self-consistent models of salt and sediments, in *Offshore Technology Conference*, OTC, doi: 10.4043/7640-ms.
- Petersen, K., and I. Lerche (1996), Temperature dependence of thermal anomalies near evolving salt structures: importance for reducing exploration risk, *Geological Society, London, Special Publications*, 100(1), 275–290, doi: 10.1144/GSL.SP.1996.100.01.18.
- Pichat, A. (2022), Stratigraphy, paleogeography and depositional setting of the K-Mg salts in the zechstein group of Netherlands—Implications for the development of salt caverns, *Minerals*, 12(4), 486, doi: 10.3390/min12040486.
- Pichel, L. M., and C. A.-L. Jackson (2020), Four-dimensional variability of composite halokinetic sequences, *Basin Research*, 32(6), 1277–1299, doi: 10.1111/bre.12428.
- Pichel, L. M., F. Peel, C. A.-L. Jackson, and M. Huuse (2018), Geometry and kinematics of salt-detached ramp syncline basins, *Journal of Structural Geology*, 115, 208–230, doi: 10.1016/j.jsg.2018.07.016.
- Plaat, H. (2009), Underground gas storage: Why and how, *Geological Society, London, Special Publications*, 313(1), 25–37, doi: 10.1144/SP313.4.
- Poprawski, Y., C. Basile, E. Jaillard, M. Gaudin, and M. Lopez (2016), Halokinetic sequences in carbonate systems: An example from the middle albian bakio breccias formation (basque country, spain), *Sedimentary geology*, 334, 34–52, doi: 10.1016/j.sedgeo.2016.01.013.
- Portarapillo, M., and A. Di Benedetto (2021), Risk assessment of the Large-Scale hydrogen storage in salt caverns, *Energies*, 14(10), 2856, doi: 10.3390/en14102856.
- Prather, B. E., C. Pirmez, and C. D. Winker (2012), Stratigraphy of Linked Intraslope Basins: Brazos–Trinity System Western Gulf of Mexico, in *Application of the Principles of Seismic Geomorphology to Continental Slope and Base-of-Slope Systems: Case Studies from SeaFloor and Near-Sea Floor Analogues*, SEPM Society for Sedimentary Geology, doi: 10.2204/IODP.proc.
- Ratigan, J. (2009), Liquefied gas storage in salt caverns at mont belvieu, texas, USA, in *9th World Salt Symposium*.
- Rautman, C., and A. Lord (2007), Sonar atlas of caverns comprising the U.S. strategic petroleum reserve. volume 2, big hill site, texas, *Tech. rep.*, Sandia National Laboratories (SNL), doi: 10.2172/1028903.
- Rautman, C. A., K. M. Loeff, and K. M. Loeff (2010), A Three-Dimensional geometric model of the bayou choctaw salt dome southern louisiana using 3-D seismic data, in *Solution Mining Research Institute SPRING TECHNICAL CONFERENCE*, SAND2010-1900C, osti.gov.
- Raymond, J., H. Langevin, F.-A. Comeau, and M. Malo (2022), Temperature dependence of rock salt thermal conductivity: Implications for geothermal exploration, *Renewable Energy*, 184, 26–35, doi: 10.1016/j.renene.2021.11.080.
- Richter, B. (1980), Salt tectonics interior structures of salt bodies, *Bulletin des centres de recherches exploration-production Elf-Aquitaine*, 4(1), 373–393.
- Richter-Bernburg, G. (1955), A stratigraphy of german zechstein deposits, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Geologischen Gesellschaft*, 105(4), 843–854, doi: 10.1127/zdgg/105/1955/843.
- Richter-Bernburg, G. (1970), Geologische voraussetzungen für die anlage von Rohöl-Speichern in Salz-Kavernen, *Zs. OEL*, 8, 209–212.
- Richter-Bernburg, G. (1972), *Geology of Saline Deposits: Géologie Des Dépôts Salins*, Unesco.
- Richter-Bernburg, G. (1980), Salt tectonics, interior structures of salt bodies, *Bulletin des centres de recherches exploration-production Elf-Aquitaine*.
- Ringrose, P. (2020), *How to Store CO2 Underground: Insights from early-mover CCS Projects*, Springer International Publishing, doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-33113-9.
- Ringrose, P. S., and T. A. Meckel (2019), Maturing global CO2 storage resources on offshore continental margins to achieve 2DS emissions reductions, *Scientific reports*, 9(1), 17,944, doi: 10.1038/s41598-019-54363-z.
- Roca, E., O. Ferrer, M. G. Rowan, J. A. Muñoz, M. Butille, K. A. Giles, P. Arbués, and M. de Matteis (2021), Salt tectonics and controls on halokinetic-sequence development of an exposed deepwater diapir: The bakio diapir, Basque-Cantabrian basin, pyrenees, *Marine and Petroleum Geology*, 123, 104,770, doi: 10.1016/j.marpetgeo.2020.104770.
- Roelofse, C., T. M. Alves, J. Gafeira, and K. O. Omosanya (2019), An integrated geological and GIS-based method to assess caprock risk in mature basins proposed for carbon capture and storage, *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 80, 103–122, doi: 10.1016/j.ijggc.2018.11.007.
- Rowan, M. G., and B. C. Vendeville (2006), Foldbelts with early salt withdrawal and diapirism: Physical model and examples from the northern gulf of mexico and the flinders ranges, australia, *Marine and Petroleum Geology*, 23(9), 871–891, doi: 10.1016/j.marpetgeo.2006.08.003.
- Rowan, M. G., and P. Weimer (1998), Salt-sediment interaction, northern green canyon and ewing bank (offshore louisiana), northern gulf of mexico, *AAPG bulletin*, 82(5), 1055–1082.
- Rowan, M. G., J. L. Urai, J. C. Fiduk, and P. A. Kukla (2019), Deformation of intrasalt competent layers in different modes of salt tectonics, *Solid earth*, 10(3), 987–1013, doi: 10.5194/se-10-987-2019.
- Salvador, A. (1991), Origin and development of the Gulf of Mexico basin, in *The Gulf of Mexico Basin*, Geological Society of America, doi: 10.1130/DNAG-GNA-J.389.
- Schachl, E. (1987), Kali-und steinsalzbergwerk Niedersachsen-Riedel der kali und salz AG, schachtanlage riedel. zechsteinstratigraphie und innenbau des salzstockes ..., in *Int Symp Zechstein*.
- Scheck-Wenderoth, M., M. Cacace, Y. P. Maystrenko,

- Y. Cherubini, V. Noack, B. O. Kaiser, J. Sippel, and L. Björn (2014), Models of heat transport in the central european basin system: Effective mechanisms at different scales, *Marine and Petroleum Geology*, 55, 315–331, doi: 10.1016/j.marpetgeo.2014.03.009.
- Schreiber, B. C. (1988), Subaqueous evaporite deposition, in *Evaporites and Hydrocarbons*, edited by B. C. Schreiber, pp. 182–255, Columbia University Press, doi: 10.7312/schr91060-005.
- Schwerdtner, W. M., and A. R. Clark (1967), STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS MOKKA FIORD AND SOUTH FIORD DOMES, AXEL HEIBERG ISLAND, CANADIAN ARCTIC, *Canadian journal of earth sciences*, 4(6), 1229–1245, doi: 10.1139/e67-082.
- Selig, F., and G. C. Wallick (1966), Temperature distribution in salt domes and surrounding sediments, *Geophysics*, 31(2), 346–361, doi: 10.1190/1.1439777.
- Seni, S. J., and M. P. A. Jackson (1983), Evolution of salt structures, east texas diapir province, part 1: Sedimentary record of halokinesis, *AAPG bulletin*, 67, doi: 10.1306/03b5b731-16d1-11d7-8645000102c1865d.
- Sharma, S., and D. Van Gent (2018), The australian south west hub project: Developing confidence in migration assisted trapping in a saline aquifer—understanding uncertainty boundaries through scenarios that stress the models, in *14th Greenhouse Gas Control Technologies Conference Melbourne*, pp. 21–26.
- Sharma, S., D. Van Gent, M. Burke, and L. Stelfox (2017), The australian south west hub project: Developing a storage project in unconventional geology, *Energy Procedia*, 114, 4524–4536, doi: 10.1016/j.egypro.2017.03.1569.
- Shuster, M. W., S. Bhattacharya, I. J. Duncan, P. Eichhubl, S. A. Hosseini, F. Javadpour, J. P. Kipper, N. Lin, J.-P. Nicot, and B. Ren (2021), Hydrogen infrastructure expansion requires realistic framework, *Oil and Gas Journal*, 119(5).
- Singh, M., A. Chaudhuri, M. R. Soltanian, and P. H. Stauffer (2021), Coupled multiphase flow and transport simulation to model CO₂ dissolution and local capillary trapping in permeability and capillary heterogeneous reservoir, *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 108, 103,329, doi: 10.1016/j.ijggc.2021.103329.
- Stephenson, M. H., P. Ringrose, S. Geiger, M. Bridden, and D. Schofield (2019), Geoscience and decarbonization: current status and future directions, *Petroleum Geoscience*, 25(4), 501–508, doi: 10.1144/petgeo2019-084.
- Stier, K. (1914), *Strukturbild des Benthers Salzgebirges*, Riemerschneider.
- Stone, H. B. J., I. Veldhuis, and R. N. Richardson (2009), Underground hydrogen storage in the UK, *Geological Society, London, Special Publications*, 313(1), 217–226, doi: 10.1144/SP313.13.
- Strozyk, F. (2017), The internal structure of the zechstein salt and related drilling risks in the northern netherlands, in *Permo-Triassic Salt Provinces of Europe, North Africa and the Atlantic Margins*, edited by J. I. Soto, J. F. Flinch, and G. Tari, pp. 115–128, Elsevier, doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-809417-4.00006-9.
- Sundal, A., R. Miri, T. Ravn, and P. Aagaard (2015), Modelling CO₂ migration in aquifers; considering 3D seismic property data and the effect of site-typical depositional heterogeneities, *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 39, 349–365, doi: 10.1016/j.ijggc.2015.05.021.
- Talbot, C. J., and M. P. A. Jackson (1987), Internal kinematics of salt diapirs, *AAPG bulletin*, 71, doi: 10.1306/703c7df9-1707-11d7-8645000102c1865d.
- Talbot, C. J., and M. P. A. Jackson (1989), Internal kinematics of salt diapirs: REPLY, *AAPG bulletin*, 73(7), 946–950, doi: 10.1306/44b4a2ad-170a-11d7-8645000102c1865d.
- Talbot, C. J., and V. Pohjola (2009), Subaerial salt extrusions in iran as analogues of ice sheets, streams and glaciers, *Earth-Science Reviews*, 97(1), 155–183, doi: 10.1016/j.earscirev.2009.09.004.
- Tămaș, D. M., A. Tămaș, J. Barabasch, M. G. Rowan, Z. Schleder, C. Krézsek, and J. L. Urai (2021), Low-angle shear within the exposed mânăzlești diapir, romania: Salt decapitation in the eastern carpathians fold-and-thrust belt, *Tectonics*, 40(6), doi: 10.1029/2021tc006850.
- Tarkowski, R. (2019), Underground hydrogen storage: Characteristics and prospects, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 105, 86–94, doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2019.01.051.
- Tester, J. W., B. J. Anderson, A. S. Batchelor, D. D. Blackwell, R. DiPippo, E. M. Drake, J. Garnish, B. Livesay, M. C. Moore, K. Nichols, S. Petty, M. N. Toksoz, R. W. Veatch, R. Baria, C. Augustine, E. Murphy, P. Negraru, and M. Richards (2007), Impact of enhanced geothermal systems on US energy supply in the twenty-first century, *Philosophical transactions. Series A, Mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences*, 365(1853), 1057–1094, doi: 10.1098/rsta.2006.1964.
- Tester, J. W., K. F. Beckers, A. J. Hawkins, and M. Z. Lukawski (2021), The evolving role of geothermal energy for decarbonizing the united states, *Energy & environmental science*, 14(12), 6211–6241, doi: 10.1039/D1EE02309H.
- Thompson, C. J., and K. M. Loeff (2021), Quantification of seismic imaging accuracy using reverse time migration at white castle salt dome, iberville parish, louisiana, in *Solution Mining Research Institute Fall Technical Conference*.
- Thompson, C. J., and K. M. Loeff (2022), VSP versus surface seismic for imaging of salt domes, in *Solution Mining Research Institute Spring Technical Conference*.
- Trevino, R. H., and T. A. Meckel (2017), Geological CO₂ sequestration atlas of miocene strata, offshore texas state waters, *Tech. rep.*, Bureau of Economic Geology.
- Trevisan, L., R. Pini, A. Cihan, J. T. Birkholzer, Q. Zhou, A. González-Nicolás, and T. H. Illangasekare (2017), Imaging and quantification of spreading and trapping of carbon dioxide in saline aquifers using meter-scale laboratory experiments, *Water resources research*, 53(1), 485–502, doi: 10.1002/2016wr019749.
- Ulfah, M., S. Hosseini, S. Hovorka, A. Bump, S. Bakhshian, and D. Dunlap (2022), Assessing impacts on pressure stabilization and leasing acreage for CO₂ storage utilizing oil migration concepts, *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 115, 103,612, doi: 10.1016/j.ijggc.2022.103612.
- Urai, J. L., C. J. Spiers, H. J. Zwart, and G. S. Lister (1986), Weakening of rock salt by water during long-term creep, *Nature*, 324(6097), 554–557, doi: 10.1038/324554a0.
- Usiglio, M. J. (1849), Études sur la composition de l'eau de la méditerranée et sur l'exploitation des sels qu'elle contient, *Annales Chim. Phys., Ser 3*, 27, 172–191.
- Van Adrichem Boogaert, H. A., and W. F. P. Kouwe (1994), Stratigraphic nomenclature: section H-Upper cretaceous and danian (chalk group), *Mededelingen Rijks Geologische Dienst*, 50.
- Van Gent, H., J. L. Urai, and M. de Keijzer (2011), The

- internal geometry of salt structures – a first look using 3D seismic data from the zechstein of the netherlands, *Journal of Structural Geology*, 33(3), 292–311, doi: 10.1016/j.jsg.2010.07.005.
- Vizgirda, J., J. J. O'Brien, and I. Lerche (1985), Thermal anomalies on the flanks of a salt dome, *Geothermics*, 14(4), 553–565, doi: 10.1016/0375-6505(85)90006-9.
- Wallace, R. L., Z. Cai, H. Zhang, K. Zhang, and C. Guo (2021), Utility-scale subsurface hydrogen storage: UK perspectives and technology, *International journal of hydrogen energy*, 46(49), 25,137–25,159, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhydene.2021.05.034.
- Warren, J. K. (2006), *Evaporites: Sediments, Resources and Hydrocarbons*, Springer Science & Business Media.
- Warren, J. K. (2016), *Evaporites: A Geological Compendium*, Springer.
- Warren, J. K. (2017), Salt usually seals, but sometimes leaks: Implications for mine and cavern stabilities in the short and long term, *Earth-Science Reviews*, 165, 302–341, doi: 10.1016/j.earscirev.2016.11.008.
- Warren, J. K., J. L. Urai, Z. Schlöder, C. J. Spiers, P. A. Kukla, M. Mohr, M. Scheck-Wenderoth, Y. Maystrenko, C. Hübscher, M. Hansen, S. Mazur, F. Magri, R. Littke, S. Rodon, and U. Bayer (2008), Salt dynamics, in *Dynamics of Complex Intracontinental Basins: The Central European Basin System*, edited by R. Littke, U. Bayer, D. Gajewski, and S. Nelskamp, pp. 248–344, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-85085-4_5.
- Wassman, T. (1983), Cavity utilization in the netherlands, in *Sixth International Symposium on Salt*.
- Watson, T. L., and S. Bachu (2009), Evaluation of the potential for gas and CO₂ leakage along wellbores, *SPE Drilling & Completion*, 24(01), 115–126, doi: 10.2118/106817-pa.
- Weijermars, R., M. P. A. Jackson, and A. van Harmelen (2013), Closure of open wellbores in creeping salt sheets, *Geophysical Journal International*, 196(1), 279–290, doi: 10.1093/gji/ggt346.
- Weijermars, R., M. P. A. Jackson, and T. P. Dooley (2014), Quantifying drag on wellbore casings in moving salt sheets, *Geophysical Journal International*, 198(2), 965–977, doi: 10.1093/gji/ggu174.
- Wilke, F., C. Hellberg, and O. Bornemann (2001), Geological interpretation of domal salt structures in the north european zechstein formation: Influence on cavern development, in *SMRI Technical Paper, Fall 2001 Meeting*.
- Williams, C. F., M. J. Reed, and A. F. Anderson (2011), Updating the classification of geothermal resources, in *Thirty-Sixth Workshop on Geothermal Reservoir Engineering*, energy.gov.
- Williams, J. D. O., M. Bentham, M. Jin, G. Pickup, E. Mackay, D. Gammer, and A. Green (2013), The effect of geological structure and heterogeneity on CO₂ storage in simple 4-way dip structures; a modeling study from the UK southern north sea, *Energy Procedia*, 37, 3980–3988, doi: 10.1016/j.egypro.2013.06.297.
- Winker, C. D., and J. R. Booth (2000), Sedimentary dynamics of the salt-dominated continental slope, gulf of mexico: Integration of observations from the seafloor, near-surface, and deep subsurface, in *Deep-Water Reservoirs of the World: 20th Annual*, pp. 1059–1086, SOCIETY OF ECONOMIC PALEONTOLOGISTS AND MINERALOGISTS, doi: 10.5724/gcs.00.15.1059.
- Zhang, M., and S. Bachu (2011), Review of integrity of existing wells in relation to CO₂ geological storage: What do we know?, *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 5(4), 826–840, doi: 10.1016/j.ijggc.2010.11.006.
- Zhang, Q., T. M. Alves, and M. A. C. Martins-Ferreira (2022), Fault analysis of a salt minibasin offshore espírito santo, SE brazil: Implications for fluid flow, carbon and energy storage in regions dominated by salt tectonics, *Marine and Petroleum Geology*, 143, 105,805, doi: 10.1016/j.marpetgeo.2022.105805.
- Zivar, D., S. Kumar, and J. Foroozesh (2021), Underground hydrogen storage: A comprehensive review, *International journal of hydrogen energy*, 46(45), 23,436–23,462, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhydene.2020.08.138.