

On the mobilization of metals by CO₂ leakage into shallow aquifers: exploring release mechanisms by modeling field and laboratory experiments

[Liang Zheng](#), [Nicolas Spycher](#), [Charuleka Varadharajan](#), [Ruth M. Tinnacher](#), [John D. Pugh](#), [Marco Bianchi](#), [Jens Birkholzer](#), [Peter S. Nico](#), [Robert C. Trautz](#)

First published: 23 April 2015

<https://doi.org/10.1002/ghg.1493>

Abstract

The dissolution of CO₂ in water leads to a pH decrease and a carbonate content increase in affected groundwater, which in turn can drive the mobilization of metals from sediments. The mechanisms of metal release postulated in various field and laboratory studies often differ. Drawing primarily on previously published results, we examine contrasting metal mobilization behaviors at two field tests and in one laboratory study, to investigate whether the same mechanisms could explain metal releases in these different experiments. Numerical modeling of the two field tests reveals that fast Ca-driven cation exchange (from calcite dissolution) can explain the release of most major and trace metal cations at both sites, and their parallel concentration trends. The dissolution of other minerals reacting more slowly (superimposed on cation exchange) also contributes to metal release over longer time frames, but can be masked by fast ambient groundwater velocities. Therefore, the magnitude and extent of mobilization depends not only on metal-mineral associations and sediment pH buffering characteristics, but also on groundwater flow rates, thus on the residence time of CO₂-impacted groundwater relative to the rates of metal-release reactions. Sequential leaching laboratory tests modeled using the same metal-release concept as postulated from field experiments show that both field and laboratory data can be explained by the same processes. The reversibility of metal release upon CO₂ degassing by de-pressurization is also explored using simple geochemical models, and shows that the sequestration of metals by resorption and re-precipitation upon CO₂ exsolution is quite plausible and may warrant further attention.

Introduction

CO₂ emissions from the burning of fossil fuels have become a serious concern because of their impact on climate. As a result, CO₂ capture followed by geologic storage (CCS) into deep saline aquifers is considered an important potential mitigation measure for climate change. Over the last decade, many studies have been undertaken to assess the feasibility and safety of CO₂ geologic storage, with an emphasis primarily on hydrological, geochemical, and mechanical processes affecting deep injection and containment in storage reservoirs. A smaller number of studies have been undertaken to assess the impacts of potential CO₂ leakage from deep storage reservoirs on the quality of overlying freshwater aquifers (see review papers Lemieux¹ and Harvey *et al.*,² and references therein). Observations from these studies are summarized below, and provide background to evaluations presented later about the chemical processes potentially responsible for observed mobilization of metals at two field sites previously investigated by the authors.

Observations from laboratory experiments

Due to their low cost and relative ease of operation, several laboratory batch and column experiments have been conducted to investigate the mobilization of trace elements in response to CO₂ intrusion into potable groundwater. Typically, these experiments³⁻¹¹ have involved the release of CO₂ into a pre-equilibrated water-rock environment, followed by monitoring of the geochemical changes in the aqueous phase.

Smyth *et al.*³ and Lu *et al.*⁴ presented laboratory batch experiments exposing aquifer materials from the Texas Gulf Coast region to elevated levels of CO₂. Two different types of responses were observed in these studies: Type I cations (Ca, Mg, Si, K, Sr, Mn, Ba, Co, B, and Zn) displayed a rapidly increasing concentration at the start of CO₂ injection that became steady before the end of the experiment, whereas Type II cations (Fe, Al, Mo, U, V, As, Cr, Cs, Rb, Ni, and Cu) showed an initial concentration increase at the start of CO₂ injection, followed by a decrease to values lower than levels prior to injection. Little and Jackson⁵ performed laboratory experiments of CO₂ infiltration for more than 300 days on samples from different freshwater aquifers. While increases in the concentration of alkali and alkaline earth metals were quite consistent in most of their experiments, increases in trace element concentrations were observed only in some samples. Wei *et al.*⁶ reacted gaseous CO₂ with soil sampled in the vadose zone, at a depth around 0.1 m below the surface for three days, and observed increases in Mg, K, Al, Cr, Mn, Fe, and Pb concentrations ranging from 50% to 500%, depending on the metal and moisture content of the soil. Their study demonstrates that CO₂ leakage could mobilize trace metals not only from an aquifer, but also from the vadose zone. Viswanathan *et al.*⁷ conducted a batch experiment to specifically test the leaching of As from samples collected at the Chimayo, New Mexico, a natural analog site, aiming to shed light on the high concentrations of As observed in a few wells with elevated levels of natural CO₂.¹² They observed a sharp increase of As concentrations as soon as pH dropped, but then a slow decrease in concentrations (although pH remained low, suggesting that H-driven desorption leads to the release of As). Humez *et al.*⁸ conducted a water-mineral-CO₂ batch experiment with samples taken from the Albian aquifer in the Paris Basin (France). They observed an increase in concentrations of Ca, Si, Na, Al, B, Co, K, Li, Mg, Mn, Ni, Pb, Sr, Zn, a decline in Fe and Be concentrations, and no changes for Cl and SO₄ after initial CO₂ influx. Varadharajan *et al.*⁹ conducted a series of sequential leaching tests with sediments from a shallow groundwater formation in Mississippi, USA. Constituents that were mobilized were As, Ba, Ca, Fe, Ge, Mg, Mn, Na, Ni, Si, Sr, Zn, which are largely consistent with the Type I cations reported by Lu *et al.*⁴ Wunsch *et al.*¹⁰ reacted rock samples from three limestone aquifers with 0.01–1 bar CO₂ for up to 40 days, and found increasing concentrations of Ca, Mg, Sr, Ba, Tl, U, Co, As and Ni from the dissolution of mostly calcite and to a lesser extent pyrite. Researchers from the same group (Kirsch *et al.*¹¹) reacted sandstone samples with CO₂ under similar conditions for 27 days, showing a rapid increase in major (Ca, Mg) and trace (As, Ba, Cd, Fe, Mn, Pb, Sr, U) elements, which was attributed to the dissolution of calcite.

Together, these experiments analyzed various types of sediments (e.g. essentially carbonate-free in Varadharajan *et al.*⁹ vs. carbonate-dominated in Wunsch *et al.*¹⁰) in a variety of conditions in terms of redox state (e.g. reducing in Varadharajan *et al.*⁹ vs. oxidizing in Little and Jackson⁵), pressure conditions (e.g. 4 bars in Varadharajan *et al.*⁹ vs. atmospheric pressure in most batch experiments, e.g. Humez *et al.*⁸), and reaction times ranging from a couple days,⁶ tens of days,⁸⁻¹¹ to hundreds of days.⁵ Although this wide range of

experimental conditions with various sediment types resulted in different dissolved metal concentration responses, one common observation found in these experiments was the rapid increase in alkali and alkaline earth metals, including Na, K, Ca, Mg, Sr, and Ba. As will be discussed later in this paper, these increases, often displaying parallel concentration trends, could be explained by ion exchange.

Observations from field tests

Although laboratory experiments facilitate the understanding of the potential impact of CO₂ on groundwater, they cannot accurately represent *in situ* conditions. For example, pre-equilibration of synthetic solutions³ or DI water⁴ with sediments, unwanted oxidation during the experiment,⁵ or neglecting the transport of groundwater and CO₂ can lead to laboratory conditions that do not adequately represent field conditions. Field tests are therefore desirable, even though experimental conditions in the field cannot be controlled as tightly as in the laboratory. Several field tests have been conducted recently. Peter *et al.*¹³ reported on a field site where CO₂ was injected through three wells for a period of 10 days into an aquifer at a depth of 18 m in Northeast Germany. Water samples from downgradient monitoring wells showed a moderate increase in Ca, K, Mg, and Fe (~15% to 40%), and a significant increase in Al, Si, Mn (~120% to 180%) in comparison with baseline groundwater. An increase in the dissolved concentrations of heavy metals was also noted. Gahill and Jakobsen¹⁴ also reported a field scale pilot test in which CO₂ gas was injected at 5–10 m depth into an unconfined aquifer in Denmark for two days, with monitoring of water geochemistry for more than 100 days. In addition to a one-unit drop in pH and a two-fold increase in electrical conductivity (EC), increases in major and trace element concentrations were ~260% and 320% for Ca and Mg, respectively, ~50% for Na and Si, as well as ~730%, 370%, 330% and 160% for Al, Ba, Sr, and Zn, respectively.

Groundwater quality was also monitored at the CO₂-Field Lab test site in Southern Norway.¹⁵ This test consisted of a 6-day injection of CO₂ into a shallow glacio-fluvial aquifer at a depth of 20 m, followed by about a week of post-injection monitoring at various depths using multiple observation wells. A significant increase in dissolved Ca and Si concentration was observed at some locations, in addition to a strong pH drop and alkalinity increase. However, the sediment heterogeneity and mixing of seawater with fresh water at this site complicated the interpretation of the test results. Most recently, a single-well push-pull test was conducted in a shallow aquifer at Cranfield, Mississippi.¹⁶ In this case, the mobilization and/or retardation of major and trace elements were quantified using a mixing model to evaluate the concentration trends observed during the test. Although mobilization of major cations and most trace metals was confirmed by this field test, the observed changes in the dissolved concentrations of major and trace elements could not be used to pinpoint CO₂ leakage because of the wide spatiotemporal variability in background groundwater compositions at the test site. The ZERT (Zero Emissions Research and Technology) field test in Montana, USA,^{17, 18} and a field test conducted in Mississippi¹⁹ are two other field experiments that revealed the mobilization of dissolved metals upon introduction of CO₂ into groundwater. These two tests are the focus of this paper and will be discussed later in more details.

In general, observations from both field and laboratory experiments show an increase in the dissolved concentrations of major and trace elements upon CO₂ release. However, there appears to be two noticeable

differences between the results of field and laboratory tests. First, the rise in concentrations of dissolved constituents observed during field tests is typically much less pronounced than in laboratory experiments – field tests show increases of about an order of magnitude or less, compared to levels prior to CO₂ injection (20% to 700% in the studies cited above), whereas orders-of-magnitude increases have been observed in laboratory tests. Second, increases in trace element concentrations, especially those of environmental relevance such as As, Pb, Ba, and Cd, are more frequently reported in laboratory tests than in field tests. Potential reasons for these differences are investigated in the present study.

Objectives of present study

In this paper, we use numerical models to investigate two issues regarding the impact of CO₂ leakage into groundwater: (i) the chemical processes leading to the mobilization of metals and (ii) the potential reversibility of these processes upon CO₂ exsolution, which would occur if deep CO₂-saturated groundwater migrated (or was pumped) to shallow depths. Our objectives are first to compare previous and new modeling results for two different field tests and one laboratory study, to determine whether the same mechanisms could explain the mobilization of metals in these experiments. Another objective is to bring up the subject of metal release reversibility, which has not been given much attention in the literature. Our investigations on reversibility are limited to the use of simple models to illustrate the concept, with the goal to stimulate interest in this topic for further studies.

Numerical models have been used to perform generic evaluations of the potential impact of CO₂ leakage on the water quality of shallow aquifers,[20-24](#) to identify potential issues such as the leaching out of organic compounds at depth by supercritical CO₂ and their release in shallow aquifers,[25](#) and to interpret laboratory experiments,[7](#), [10](#), [11](#) as well as field tests,[19](#), [26](#) to understand the underlying transport and chemical processes that control the mobilization of major and trace elements upon CO₂ dissolution in groundwater. By integrating modeling efforts with real data sets from field and laboratory experiments, conceptual models of metal release can be tested, and their application to different field settings and/or experimental conditions can be evaluated.

Here, we examine the contrasting metal-mobilization behavior at the Montana State University-Zero Emissions Research and Technology (MSU-ZERT) field test in Montana,[17](#) and a field test conducted in Plant Daniel, Mississippi,[19](#) with the goal to advance our understanding of water-quality changes that may occur due to CO₂ intrusion/influx under different hydrologic and geochemical settings. We compare results of previous and new modeling investigations by our group at the field scale. We then also model sequential leaching laboratory tests performed on sediments collected at the site in Mississippi⁹ to evaluate whether the metal-release concepts developed based on the field data is consistent with the laboratory study.

Reactive processes

As postulated on the basis of laboratory tests,[4](#) and revealed through simulations of laboratory experiments^{7, 8, 10, 11} and field tests,[19](#), [26](#) the chemical processes leading to the release of metals in

aquifers impacted by CO₂ can be summarized as follows. The dissolution of CO₂ in water produces carbonic acid, which decreases pH and increases the dissolved carbonate content in impacted groundwater:



In pure water, the dissolution of CO₂ at pressure >5 bars yields a pH near 3.5; however, in natural systems the pH drop is not as pronounced (values typically near or above 5) because of buffering by various reactions. For example, at the Frio deep CO₂ injection test site,[27](#) injection of supercritical CO₂ at pressures ~150 bar into a deep sandstone aquifer resulted in pH dropping from about 6.5 to 5.7. Under totally different conditions in shallow sandy gravels, a few meters below the ground surface at the MSU-ZERT site,[17](#) the pH decreased from around 7 to 6 after injection of gaseous CO₂ through a horizontal pipe at 2–2.3 m deep. A more significant pH decrease, from about 8 to 5.1, was observed at the Mississippi site[19](#) upon injection of groundwater carbonated at pressure near 4 bar into a confined, poorly buffered formation predominantly containing sandy sediments.


The decrease in groundwater pH upon carbonation can release metals (M) by the dissolution of minerals, most particularly carbonates and sulfides:



Adsorption-desorption reactions are also expected to play an important role in metal mobilization, and also in buffering pH in the absence of significant amounts of fast-reacting carbonate minerals:



Competitive sorption with bicarbonate ions (e.g. As, Se) could also release metal oxyanions:



In addition, metals released by the above reactions (e.g. Ca) may trigger exchange reactions that then cause the further release of other metals into solution:



These reactive processes were investigated by numerical modeling at both the MSU-ZERT[26](#) and Mississippi test sites,[19](#) as discussed below.

Modeling interpretations of field tests

In the MSU-ZERT field experiment,[17](#) gaseous CO₂ was injected for about one month into a horizontal pipe located about a meter below the water table of a very shallow freshwater aquifer, under natural (steep)

hydraulic gradient conditions. Sediments beneath this site consisted primarily of Cenozoic alluvial sandy gravel deposits. The groundwater composition was monitored prior to, during, and (for about a week) following injection. Rain fell on several occasions over this shallow test site, leaving a relatively small time window (about 10 days) during which the groundwater composition was unaffected by rainfall during injection.[17](#)

The second study was conducted in Mississippi[19](#) (hereafter referred to as the Mississippi site). This field test was driven in part by the need for an experiment over longer time frames, under better geochemically constrained conditions, and into a deeper (~50 m) geologic formation than at the MSU-ZERT site. The sediments at this test site consist primarily of Cenozoic deltaic/near-shore marine, poorly consolidated sands interbedded with clays. In this experiment, groundwater from a confined hydrostratigraphic interval was pumped and carbonated above ground, then re-injected into the same interval (in a dipole, closed loop system) to simulate leakage of CO₂ from a deep storage reservoir into an overlying aquifer. Injection of carbonated groundwater at this site lasted for about 5 months, preceded by an extensive monitoring period of background conditions (13 months, including 2 months of pumping without carbonation) and followed by a post-injection monitoring period of about 10 months.

In both studies, the groundwater quality was monitored using dedicated monitoring wells installed up- and downgradient from the injection location (groundwater samples for analyses of trace metals were filtered, prior to acidification, at 0.1 µm in the MSU-ZERT test and 0.2 µm in the Mississippi experiment, to minimize possible colloidal materials). Sediments at both sites were also characterized to determine metal-sediment associations and to help understand key reactive processes resulting from carbonation of the groundwater. Results from both these studies indicated a significant pH decrease upon carbonation (by ~0.8 pH units at the MSU-ZERT site, and ~3 pH units at the Mississippi site), accompanied by the release of primarily alkali and alkaline earth metals, Fe, and a few other trace elements (the concentrations of these dissolved species did not exceed national regulatory drinking water standards).

Zheng *et al.*[26](#) ran modeling analyses to interpret the groundwater quality response to CO₂ injection at the MSU-ZERT site. It was determined that a dynamic reactive-transport model could not be well constrained because only a short period of the test was unaffected by rainfall, and fast, gaseous CO₂ migration in the vadose zone appeared to have contributed to the groundwater response to CO₂ injection. For these reasons, geochemical modeling analyses were conducted instead, examining groundwater chemistry as a function of pH and P_{CO_2} , independently of time. The geochemical modeling analyses were supplemented with principal component (statistical) analyses of the groundwater chemistry data, which suggested a correlated response to carbonation for alkali and alkaline earth metals, and another different correlated response for trace metals forming oxyanions (e.g. As, Se). Based on these investigations, Zheng *et al.*[26](#) suggested that at this site, groundwater carbonation drove calcite dissolution, which resulted in the release of Ca, which in turn drove exchange reactions with most major and trace metal cations. The release of Fe was attributed to the dissolution of reactive Fe minerals (presumably ferrihydrite and/or fougurite 'green rust'), and the release of anions (As, Se) to competitive adsorption of carbonate. Both field data[17](#) and modeling results[26](#) showed a progressive increase in metal concentrations with a pH decrease (and alkalinity increase), and a quick return to background concentrations after the injection stopped.

The longer test period and extensive data set collected during the Mississippi field experiment¹⁹ allowed for the development of 1D, 2D, and 3D reactive transport models of this field experiment, drawing on extensive hydrogeologic and geochemical characterization efforts, including detailed investigations of mineral-sediment associations by wet chemistry methods, spectroscopic analyses, and laboratory CO₂ leaching experiments.^{9, 19} A horizontal 2D reactive transport model was presented in Trautz *et al.*¹⁹

At the Mississippi site, the pH drop (by ~3 units) upon carbonation was initially accompanied by a pulse-like increase in the concentration of major cations (Ca, Na, Mg, K) and some trace metals (e.g. Ba, Fe, Sr, Mn) (Fig. 1). Initial reactive transport simulations¹⁹ showed that this behavior could be reproduced by processes similar to those postulated for the MSU-ZERT site, namely Ca from calcite dissolution driving exchange reactions with alkali and alkaline earth metals, and dissolution of Fe sulfides releasing Fe. However, one important difference between these test sites is the abundance of calcite at the MSU-ZERT site, compared to the rare occurrence of this mineral at the Mississippi site, where it was found only in minute quantities, well below conventional XRD and TIC-TOC detection limits. Our previous modeling analyses¹⁹ showed that fast and complete dissolution of a limited amount of calcite could explain the observed pulse-like behavior of dissolved Ca concentrations, and of other cations by exchange with Ca (Fig. 1). Modeling also showed that fast desorption could be an alternative process, yielding pulse-like concentration trends for Ca, Fe, and other cations.




Figure 1

[Open in figure viewer](#)
[PowerPoint](#)

pH (left) and breakthrough of Ca, Sr, Mn, Ba, Cr, and Fe at about 5 m from a carbonated groundwater injection well; model predictions (lines) compared to observations (symbols) (data reported in Trautz *et al.*¹⁹).

After publication of our initial results¹⁹, post-injection monitoring at the Mississippi site revealed that the pulse-like response of dissolved metals observed during injection was followed by slow-rising concentrations of alkali and alkaline earth metals starting almost immediately after the end of the injection period (Fig. 2). Also, the pH remained depressed at all monitoring wells after the pump was turned off. This finding is different from observations at the MSU-ZERT site, where the groundwater composition and pH quickly returned to ambient background conditions after the injection of CO₂ was stopped.¹⁷ The contrasting behavior at these

two sites may be explained by the differences in regional hydraulic gradient and pH buffering capacity at these sites. The abundance of carbonate minerals (buffering pH) and steep hydraulic gradient at the MSU-ZERT site are favorable conditions for a quick pH rebound and fast return to background concentrations of dissolved species after CO₂ injection. In contrast, the hydraulic gradient at the Mississippi site is small, and sediments have a low buffering capacity. Thus, it is suggested that once injection ended, the return to slow groundwater velocities (thus increasing residence time) and persisting low pH provided conditions favoring continued (and increased) reactions between sediments and groundwater.




Figure 2

[Open in figure viewer](#)
[PowerPoint](#)

Observed (symbols) and modeled concentration time profiles (lines) for Ca on the left and Ba on the right. Model results are shown for a base-case considering only the presence of fast-dissolving calcite in a limited amount, and three other cases with added slow dissolution of plagioclase at different rates as shown ($\text{mol s}^{-1} \text{kg}_w^{-1}$). See text.

To test this hypothesis, further modeling analyses were performed as part of the present study. Simple reactive transport models were constructed using the same setup and mineralogical, thermodynamic and kinetic data as implemented in our initial investigations¹⁹ (Appendix [Appendix A](#)). In these new simulations, sediment-bound metals were included in the form of both (i) a fast-reacting but limited pool, yielding a pulse-like response to a pH drop (as in initial simulations¹⁹) but also (ii) a slow-reacting but essentially unlimited pool, yielding rising dissolved metal concentrations only upon decreased groundwater velocities, after the injection was ended. Such conceptualization combines the initial fast pulsing behavior reported earlier¹⁹, together with transport-limited kinetic dissolution trends (e.g. Johnson *et al.*²⁸) that are strongly dependent on groundwater residence times, and only noticeable when the groundwater velocity is slow relative to reaction rates or inversely, when reaction rates are fast relative to the groundwater velocity.

In the present study we applied this concept to the Mississippi test experiment, by modeling the fast dissolution of a limited amount of calcite, superimposed with the slow dissolution of plagioclase (ubiquitous in the sediments). Four simulations were run: a base-case that considers the fast-reacting Ca pool (calcite) but no slow-reacting pool (no plagioclase, as in our previous model¹⁹) and three other cases with the addition of plagioclase dissolution, at a different rate for each case. Results show (Fig. 2) that when the slow dissolution of plagioclase is added in the simulations, both the observed short- and long-term concentration trends of Ca can

be reproduced fairly well (Fig. 2), with the slow rise in Ca concentration becoming noticeable only during the post-injection period when groundwater velocities returned to small values (essentially stagnant hydraulic gradient < 0.0001 in this case). By Ca-driven cation exchange, the observed parallel trend of Ba concentrations (and other cations as well) is also well reproduced (Fig. 2).

These simulations convey the importance of considering groundwater residence time when interpreting the results of field experiments and/or assessing the potential impact of CO₂ release at a particular site. The slow dissolution of minerals (by carbonic acid from CO₂ dissolution) is likely to present more of a potential concern (and be more noticeable) at sites where the regional groundwater flow rate is low. Also, the fact that most laboratory experiments to investigate CO₂ impacts on groundwater are conducted under “batch” (stagnant) conditions may explain why the release of metals observed in these experiments is generally much more noticeable than in the field, where groundwater is seldom stagnant.

Modeling interpretation of laboratory experiments

We report here on the modeling of sequential leaching tests⁹ conducted on two sandy sediment samples collected from the injection interval at the Mississippi field site¹⁹ (these sequential leaching tests were conducted to supplement the field test and evaluate possible screening procedures⁹). The goal of this modeling effort was to determine whether the same geochemical processes simulated to reproduce the field test results could also explain the results of these laboratory experiments. To set the stage for this modeling investigation, before discussing its results, we first summarize below the experimental procedure followed by Varadharajan *et al.*⁹ (readers are referred to their paper for more details).

Summary of experimental approach

In the experiments carried out by Varadharajan *et al.*,⁹ synthetic groundwater solutions were initially brought into contact with sandy sediments that were air-dried in a glove box. The solutions were allowed to equilibrate with the sediments, then subsequently sampled and replaced with fresh groundwater at time intervals of 1, 4, 11, and 25 days after the start of each experiment. Two different types of experiments were used to distinguish between pH-driven and carbonate-driven metal-release reactions. The first setup involved pressurized reactor cells (at pressure ~ 4 bar) that were filled with synthetic groundwater solutions saturated with CO₂, hereafter referred to as the ‘CO₂-saturated’ system. The second setup used vials that were filled with pH-amended, synthetic groundwater solutions equilibrated with a CO₂-free atmosphere at atmospheric pressure, and acidified with HCl to evaluate metal release driven by pH effects alone. These experiments are hereafter referred to as the ‘pH-amended’ system. The solid:solution ratio was maintained at 1:4.5 in the CO₂-saturated case, and 1:4 in the pH-amended case. Synthetic groundwater was prepared with a composition similar to groundwater at the Mississippi field site, 6.4 mM NaHCO₃, 0.7 mM NaCl, 0.1 mM KCl, 0.1 mM CaCl₂, and 0.3 mM Na-acetate; no trace elements were added to the solution.

Modeling approach and results

The numerical model was designed to mimic experimental procedure as closely as possible. The water-sediment system was modeled as a 'batch' system with a total volume of 1 L. The solution (synthetic groundwater) was numerically reacted with the sediments and subsequently withdrawn and replenished with fresh solution at the prescribed periods of time (1, 4, 11, and 25 days) to match the experimental procedure. The same synthetic groundwater composition and solid-to-solution ratios were assumed as in the actual experiments. The chemical reactions and reactive processes considered in the model were the same as those used for modeling the Mississippi field test (Appendix [Appendix A](#)).

The same geochemical conceptual model, as adopted to simulate the MSU-ZERT and Mississippi field tests (as presented earlier) was used to model the laboratory experiments; it is thus postulated that the drop in pH induces the dissolution of calcite, and that the resulting increase in Ca concentration subsequently triggers a series of cation exchange reactions, leading to an increase in the concentrations of alkaline earth cations. The values of two key model input parameters, the volume fraction of calcite and its specific surface area, were modified from the values adopted to model the field test in order to match the experimental data. The volume fraction of calcite was changed from 0.0086% (calibrated after the field test data) to 0.0073% in the CO₂-saturated case, and 0.0096% for the pH-amended case (calibrated after the laboratory test data), which are essentially insignificant changes that could easily be attributed to heterogeneity or measurement uncertainty. However, the dissolution of calcite had to be accelerated by increasing the calcite specific surface area by two orders of magnitude (Eqn (A1)). Such an increase is within the range typical of the discrepancy observed between field- and laboratory-scale rates (e.g. Zhu²⁹). For example, Yang *et al.*¹⁶ also mentioned that reaction rates estimated from batch experiments using sediments from their test site were generally higher than those observed in the field push-pull test. The use of a larger calcite surface area when modeling the laboratory experiments can also be justified by the fact that the unconsolidated sediments in the reactor cells were well-stirred to ensure good mixing and maximize the surface area available for reactions. Figures 3 and 4 show the sensitivity of calculated Ca and Sr concentrations to the volume fraction and specific surface area of calcite, indicating the need to change both the volume fraction of calcite and its specific surface area to match the measured Ca and Sr concentrations.




Figure 3

[Open in figure viewer](#)
[PowerPoint](#)

Measured Ca and Sr concentration (symbols) for the “pH-amended” experiment, and model results (lines) using different combination of parameters (calcite volume fraction, V; specific surface area, A; and the latter increased a hundred-fold, 100*A). Solute concentrations represent net changes after the subtraction of respective background concentrations measured in sediment-free controls, and normalized for solid weights (negative values represent uptake by the sediments). All concentration

values are averages of duplicate samples; error bars for the laboratory data represent propagated standard errors based on analytical standard deviations and duplicate samples.




Figure 4

[Open in figure viewer](#)
[PowerPoint](#)

Measured Ca and Sr concentrations (symbols) for the “CO₂-saturated” experiment and models results (lines) using different combinations of parameters. See caption of Figure 3 for additional information.

An alternative conceptual model proposed by other studies^{4, 10, 11} is based on impurities that may be present in carbonate minerals being the source of metals released when sediments are reacted with carbonated water. To test this concept, we removed Sr from the list of exchangeable cations, and instead included 1.5 mol% Sr impurity to calcite, an amount that was calibrated to match the experimental results (in doing so, we also recomputed the equilibrium constant for Sr-calcite by assuming an ideal solid solution between calcite and strontianite). Figure 5 shows that calcite with 1.5% Sr impurity leads to a reasonably good fit of the measured data, although the concept of calcite dissolution plus cation exchange²⁶ adopted in the aforementioned models seems to perform slightly better in terms of capturing the temporal changes. Nevertheless, considering the large uncertainties exhibited by the data, this modeling exercise is unable to distinguish which concept is more plausible.




Figure 5

[Open in figure viewer](#)
[PowerPoint](#)

Measured Sr concentration (symbols) for “CO₂-saturated” and “pH-amended” experiment and the corresponding simulated concentration (lines) using different conceptual models: pure calcite dissolution plus cation exchange²⁶ (C+C) and dissolution of Sr-bearing calcite (C+I).

The question of reversibility

It is well known that the exsolution of CO₂ from groundwater increases the water pH (reverse of Reactions 1 and 2) and thus is likely to result in immobilization metals by reversing Reactions 3 to 8. Examples of mineral precipitation upon CO₂ exsolution include the treatment of ferruginous groundwater by pressure-driven CO₂ degassing,³⁰ and the observation of dolomite precipitation upon CO₂ exsolution (in this case thermally driven exsolution) during a CO₂-dolomite reaction experiment.³¹ In fact, some metallic ore deposits are known to have formed due to the pH rise driven by exsolution of CO₂ (and other acid gases) upon depressurization and boiling when metal-loaded thermal waters ascend to the surface.³² Furthermore, many naturally carbonated mineral spring waters are of excellent (drinking) quality with respect to priority pollutant metal concentrations.³³ Therefore, a logical question to raise is whether the mobilization of metals at depth, by CO₂-saturated water could be mitigated when groundwater ascends toward the surface and progressively depressurizes, leading to CO₂ exsolution.

To help illustrate this process in the context of shallow groundwater aquifers, we conducted numerical experiments using simple geochemical simulations (Appendix [Appendix B](#)). In the first stage, the CO₂-driven ($P_{\text{CO}_2} \sim 5$ bar) dissolution of FeS and trace-metal-bearing (Ba, Pb, Ni) calcite was simulated, accompanied by desorption of cations (Fe⁺², Ni⁺², Ba⁺², and Pb⁺²) from a sorbent arbitrarily modeled as iron hydroxide (ferrihydrite). In a second stage, the depressurization of this system was simulated down to atmospheric P_{CO_2} levels, leading to re-sorption and re-precipitation of trace metal-bearing calcite and also siderite. The degassing stage was conducted with water in contact with the minerals and sorbent considered (i.e., solution with sediments), and then repeated without contact with minerals or sorbent (i.e., with sediments removed from the solution). The same initial general geochemical conditions as observed at the Mississippi field test site were assumed, including the input water composition reported by Trautz *et al.*,¹⁹ yielding a pH drop from ~ 8 to ~ 5.6 upon CO₂ pressurization (Fig. [6](#)). However, it should be emphasized that these simulations were not intended as predictions of the Mississippi field test, and are only meant to illustrate the effect of CO₂ degassing in a generic, mostly qualitative manner.




Figure 6

[Open in figure viewer](#)
[PowerPoint](#)

Illustration of numerical experiments of CO₂ pressurization and depressurization, with resulting pH shown (see Appendix 8 for details on initial conditions).

Results are examined independently of time by plotting pH and aqueous metal concentrations as a function of CO₂ pressure for the cases considered (Fig. 7). Upon degassing of CO₂, the concentrations of metals and pH return close to their original values, except for Ni in the case without sediments. This is because in this example, the behavior of Ni is dominated by sorption/desorption, whereas the concentrations of the other metals are mostly controlled by dissolution/precipitation. Removing the sediment in this case obviously prevents Ni from re-sorbing upon CO₂ degassing. In contrast, the concentration of Fe upon pressurization with CO₂ is controlled by the dissolution of FeS followed by siderite precipitation, which is not initially present but allowed to form. The concentrations of other metals (including Pb on Fig. 7) are dominated by the dissolution and re-precipitation of metal-bearing calcite, assuming reversibility in the partitioning of trace elements, for simplicity. Upon degassing, without sediments present, there is no precursor surface area for precipitation, which allows for a certain amount of supersaturation to be reached until precipitation occurs (through a scheme approximating nucleation implemented into the TOUGHREACT code³⁵). This causes a discontinuous pH curve and unsymmetrical behavior between the CO₂ dissolution and exsolution stages (Fig. 7), but as would be expected, all paths for metals controlled by precipitation/dissolution eventually return close to their starting points. These somewhat simplistic simulations illustrate how the system behavior upon depressurization depends on the differences between dissolution and precipitation rates (which in turn depend partially on differences in surface areas available for dissolution and precipitation), relative rates of carbonate mineral precipitation (e.g. calcite vs. siderite), and on whether sorption is considered reversible or not. Concentration trends also depend on the partitioning (solid-solution) behavior of trace elements into re-precipitated

carbonates, as a function of water chemistry. All these characteristics are expected to be strongly influenced by the physical path taken by groundwater as it ascends toward the surface. Therefore, the overall risk of potential CO₂ leakage into groundwater should not only consider the chemical impact of carbonic acid on the mobilization of metals, but should also take into account the path of contaminated groundwater to potential receptors at shallow depths where the ambient pressure is too low to maintain elevated CO₂ (carbonic acid) concentrations into solution.




Figure 7

[Open in figure viewer](#)
[PowerPoint](#)

Modeled pH and dissolved concentrations of some metals, as a function of CO₂ partial pressure (x axis in log scale). Arrows and colors show path taken upon CO₂ pressurization followed by depressurization as illustrated in Figure 6 (“no sed.” is depressurization case with sediments removed).

Summary and conclusion

The controlled release of CO₂ into shallow aquifers at the MSU-ZERT and Mississippi test sites provided a unique opportunity to combine numerical modeling analyses with extensive datasets collected in the field and the laboratory, to assess the effects of potential CO₂ leaks from deep storage formations on the quality of freshwater aquifers. At both sites, the groundwater pH responded quickly to carbonation, dropping by about 0.8 pH units in the MSU-ZERT experiment (a well-buffered system) and about 3 pH units in the Mississippi experiment (a poorly buffered system). At both sites, the pH decrease was accompanied primarily by increased dissolved concentrations of alkali and alkaline earth metals as well as Fe. The concentrations of a few other trace metals also increased, but to a lesser extent, and never exceeding regulatory limits. The main differences in response to carbonation at these sites were the types of concentration profiles observed with time for mobilized constituents. Fairly continuous increases with time (and pH drop) were observed at the MSU-ZERT

site, followed by a quick return to background conditions once carbonation ended.¹⁷ At the Mississippi site, however, the carbonation of groundwater first yielded a pulse of mobilized constituents,¹⁹ followed by slow concentration increases after the injection ended (when the groundwater flow velocity decreased). The slow rise in concentrations eventually reached new plateaus although the pH remained depressed for months after the injection ended. This contrasting behavior at these two test sites is attributed to the slow ambient groundwater velocity and lower pH buffering capacity (very small amounts of carbonate minerals) at the Mississippi site compared to the MSU-ZERT site.

Characterization and modeling studies of the field data suggest that at both sites, calcite dissolution, ion exchange and/or desorption were the primary mechanisms of initial (fast) release of alkali and alkaline earth metals. Effects from slow dissolution of other minerals were only noticeable in the Mississippi field experiment after the injection ended, due to the slow ambient groundwater velocity at this site once the pump was turned off. This shows that the ambient groundwater flow rate is an important parameter to consider, in addition to the pH buffering capacity of an aquifer, when evaluating the potential impact of CO₂ leakage on groundwater quality.

A series of previously published laboratory sequential leaching tests⁹ using sediments from the Mississippi site were simulated. By applying our conceptual model of Ca-driven cation exchange previously developed for the MSU-ZERT field test,²⁶ then cross-tested with simulations of the Mississippi field experiment,¹⁹ we were able to simulate these laboratory experiments reasonably well, and explain differences observed between laboratory and field test results. Our simulations suggest that calcite dissolution and Ca-driven cation exchange may control the initial release of alkali and alkaline earth metals in both the field and laboratory experiments, although the dissolution of calcite containing metal impurities cannot be ruled out as another potential mechanism of metal release.

A higher dissolution rate of calcite, compared to the rate used to model the field experiments, was required to model the laboratory data. This suggests that laboratory tests might be too aggressive in leaching out trace elements, relative to what would be expected in the field, as solution and sediment are well mixed under a no-flow condition in the laboratory tests. This should be taken into account when laboratory tests are used to evaluate the potential impact of CO₂ leakage on groundwater quality.

Simple, generic numerical experiments illustrated how the mobilization of metals under elevated P_{CO_2} could be reversed under depressurization, which would occur when groundwater ascends (or is pumped) to the ground surface and CO₂ volatilizes under decreasing hydrostatic pressure. The extent of reversibility is likely to depend on the path followed by groundwater when it is brought to the surface, both in terms of physical path (affecting the surface area available for metal re-precipitation and/or re-sorption) and temperature-pressure path (affecting the thermodynamic drive for these reactive processes). The largest reversal would be expected to occur between P_{CO_2} of a few bar and atmospheric values, when the gradient of pH change with P_{CO_2} is the steepest. In contrast, the potential impacts from the mobilization of organic compounds²⁵ and brine displacement³⁴ by supercritical CO₂ in deep saline aquifers, followed by leakage to shallow groundwater bodies, could be much less reversible, and therefore may warrant more attention than the impact from the

CO₂ alone. However, the sequestration of metals by resorption and re-precipitation upon CO₂ exsolution, in the context of impacts from CO₂ leakage, has been given little attention and may warrant more study investigating the effects of CO₂ pressurization and depressurization along different flow paths.

Reactive transport models are important tools being used to assess the potential risk of CO₂ geological sequestration to groundwater over long periods of time. Geochemical reaction networks implemented in these simulations form the core of such models. This paper demonstrates that the close integration of field and laboratory tests with numerical modeling is crucial to assess various key geochemical reactions and parameters, and thus to increase the confidence in, and predictability of, numerical models.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Electric Power Research Institute; the EPA, Office of Water, under an Interagency Agreement with the US Department of Energy (DOE) at LBNL, under contract number DE-AC02-05CH11231; and the Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL), National Risk Assessment Program (NRAP), of the US Department of Energy under Contract No. DEAC02-05CH11231.

Appendix A: Mississippi field site reactive-transport-model mineralogical, thermodynamic, and kinetic data

Modeled geochemical processes include aqueous complexation, surface complexation (using a double diffuse layer model), cation exchange (using the Gaines-Thomas convention), and mineral precipitation/dissolution under kinetic constraints (using published rate laws). The implemented cation exchange reactions and selectivity coefficients are listed in Table A1. In this model, it is assumed that ferrihydrite (as Fe(OH)₃(s)), is the adsorbent, and the surface complexation reactions and constants are listed in Table A2. Based on the sediment mineralogical characterization,⁹ the model considered illite, smectite, Fe(OH)₃(s) and amorphous iron sulfide (mackinawite, FeS(m)), in addition to major aquifer minerals such as quartz, K-feldspar, and plagioclase (Ab80An20). The amount of iron sulfide (FeS(m)) was estimated from selective extraction data (~0.02 vol%), and the amount of Fe(OH)₃(s) from the sediment acid titration data (~0.015 vol%), assuming this phase dominates H⁺ sorption, as a first approximation. Carbonates were not detected using XRD and solid TIC-TOC analysis, but very rare gains in calcite were found by micro-X ray spectroscopy. Therefore, trace amounts of calcite were included in the simulations (0.0058%), an amount that was calibrated to yield best match of observed and modeled Ca response to CO₂ release. The amount of illite, smectite, quartz, and K-feldspar were roughly estimated from examinations of sediment cores and thin sections.

Table A1. Cation exchange reactions and selectivity coefficients.⁴³

Cation exchange reaction	$K_{Na/M}$
$Na^+ + X-H = X-Na + H^+$	1
$Na^+ + X-K = X-Na + K^+$	0.2

Cation exchange reaction	$K_{Na/M}$
$Na^+ + 0.5X-Ca = X-Na + 0.5Ca^{+2}$	0.4
$Na^+ + 0.5X-Mg = X-Na + 0.5Mg^{+2}$	0.45
$Na^+ + 0.5X-Ba = X-Na + 0.5Ba^{+2}$	0.35
$Na^+ + 0.5X-Mn = X-Na + 0.5Mn^{+2}$	0.55
$Na^{++} + 0.5X-Sr = X-Na + 0.5Sr^{+2}$	0.35
$Na^{++} + 0.5X-Zn = X-Na + 0.5Zn^{+2}$	0.4
$Na^{++} + X-Li = X-Li + Li^+$	1.1

Table A2. Surface complexation reactions and surface complexation constants (logK) on ferrihydrite. The reaction constants for surface protonation are from Dzombak and Morel⁴⁴ and surface complexation reactions of carbonate are from Appelo *et al.*⁴⁵

Surface complexation	logK
$HFO_sOH_2^+ = HFO_sOH + H^+$	-7.29
$HFO_wOH_2^+ = HFO_wOH + H^+$	-7.29
$HFO_sO^- + H^+ = HFO_sOH$	8.93
$HFO_wO^- + H^+ = HFO_wOH$	8.93
$HFO_wCO_2^- + H_2O = HFO_sOH + HCO_3^-$	-2.45
$HFO_wCO_2H + H_2O = HFO_sOH + HCO_3^- + H^+$	-10.4

Table A3. Equilibrium constants and volume fraction for minerals.

Primary Mineral	Volume fraction (%)	logK(25°C)	Secondary Mineral	logK(25°C)
Quartz	92	-3.75	Gypsum	-4.48
Calcite	0.0058*	1.85	Dolomite	2.52
FeS(m)	0.02	-3.5	Siderite	-0.25
K-feldspar	2	-22.39	Witherite	1.77
Smectite-Na	0.5	-38.32	Rhodochrosite	0.252
Illite	1	-42.69	Strontianite	-0.31
Fe(OH) ₃ (s)	0.15	-5.66	Dawsonite	-17.9
Ab80An20	4	-14.8		

* varies depending models

The simulations are conducted with TOUGHREACT³⁵ which uses a general form of rate expression: ³⁶

$$r = kA \left| 1 - \frac{K^{-\theta}}{Q} \right|^{\eta} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where r is the kinetic rate, k is the rate constant (mol/m²/s), which is temperature dependent, A is the specific reactive surface area per kg H₂O, K is the equilibrium constant for the mineral–water reaction written for the destruction of one mole of mineral, and Q is the reaction quotient. Here, we set the parameters θ and η to unity. The rate constant for calcite dissolution is given as a combination of neutral, acid, and carbonate mechanisms:^{37, 38}

$$k = 1.5 \times 10^{-6} e^{-E_a^{nu}/RT} + 0.5 e^{-E_a^H/RT} \alpha_H + 9.6 \times 10^{-5} e^{-E_a^{CO_2}/RT} \alpha_{CO_2} \quad (\text{A2})$$

where E_a^{nu} , E_a^H and $E_a^{CO_2}$ are activation energies with values of 23.5, 14.4, and 35.4 (kJ/mol) respectively, according to Palandri and Kharaka.³⁸ 1.5×10^{-6} , 0.5 and 9.6×10^{-5} are rate constant in mol/m²/s for neutral, acid, and carbonate mechanisms, respectively. α_H is the activity of proton and α_{CO_2} is the activity of dissolved CO₂. R is the gas constant. The surface area, A , is a function of specific surface area and the abundance of minerals. The specific surface area of calcite was set to 9.8 cm²/g, a value which was calibrated, together with the initial calcite volume fraction, to match the breakthrough curves of alkaline earth metals observed during the field experiment at the Mississippi site. It should be noted that reaction rates depend on the reactive surface area A in Eqn (A1), which is a function of the product of the specific surface area and the volume fraction of each mineral. Therefore, the calibrated values of specific surface area and volume fraction of calcite should be viewed as arbitrary and non-unique (co-linearly varying) values, the product of which being of relevance but not each value separately.

Thermodynamic data (Table ^{A3}) were taken primarily from the EQ3/6 database *data0.ymp.R4*, ³⁹ which relies on Gibbs free energy data primarily from SUPCRT92^{40, 41} for aqueous species, and from Helgeson *et al.*⁴² for minerals.

Appendix B: Set-up of CO₂ reaction and degassing numerical experiments

The problem was run with TOUGHREACT V2³⁵ and the same thermodynamic database as used for the other simulations (Appendix ^{Appendix A}). CO₂ pressurization was simulated with one model gridblock, fully liquid-saturated, in contact with a 5-bar CO₂ gas buffer allowed to dissolve at a rate prescribed to yield stable pH values near ~ 5.5 within a couple months (down from ~ 8 initially) (Fig. ⁶). The system at low pH and ~ 5 bar CO₂ was then allowed to degas through a second large (essentially open) model gridblock at atmospheric CO₂ pressure, into which gas from the first gridblock was allowed to slowly flow until atmospheric CO₂ levels was reached. The leakage rate was adjusted such that the system returned to initial atmospheric CO₂ levels within about 180 days (an arbitrary but realistic value).

Ba, Pb, and Ni were included in trace quantities into calcite (in arbitrary amounts of 2×10^{-5} moles Ba, 0.5×10^{-5} moles Pb, and 0.5×10^{-5} moles Ni for each mole of Ca). These elements and Fe, Ca, Mg, were also

considered initially sorbed onto the sediment, assuming sorption data for iron hydroxides from Dzomback and Morel,[44](#) except Fe⁺² from Liger *et al.*[46](#) (from the *phreeqc.dat* database, corrected for consistency with the other data). The solid phase (sediments) prior to addition of CO₂ was assumed to contain (by solid volume) 10% plagioclase (An₂₀), 0.1% FeS, 0.1% calcite, and 0.01% iron hydroxides (as ferrihydrite). Siderite was allowed to precipitate but not assumed initially present. The initial water composition was taken from Trautz *et al.*,[19](#) with adjusted initial Fe, Ca, and Al concentrations to yield chemical equilibrium with FeS, calcite, and plagioclase, respectively, at 25°C.

References

1. Lemieux J-M, Review: The potential impact of underground geological storage of carbon dioxide in deep saline aquifers on shallow groundwater resources. *Hydrogeol J* **19**(4):757–778 (2011).
2. Harvey OR, Qafoku NP, Cantrell KJ, Lee G, Amonette JE and Brown CF, Geochemical implications of gas leakage associated with geologic CO₂ storage—A qualitative review. *Environ Sci Technol* **47**(1):23–36 (2012).
3. Smyth RC, Hovorka SD, Lu J, Romanak KD, Partin JW, Wong C *et al.*, Assessing risk to fresh water resources from long term CO₂ injection-laboratory and field studies. *Energ Procedia* **1**(1):1957–1964 (2009).
4. Lu JM, Partin JW, Hovorka SD and Wong C, Potential risks to freshwater resources as a result of leakage from CO₂ geological storage: A batch-reaction experiment. *Environ Earth Sci* **60**(2):335–348 (2010).
5. Little MG and Jackson RB, Potential impacts of leakage from deep CO₂ geosequestration on overlying freshwater aquifers. *Environ Sci Technol* **44**(23):9225–9232 (2010).
6. Wei Y, Maroto-Valer M and Steven MD, Environmental consequences of potential leaks of CO₂ in soil. *Energ Procedia* **4**(0):3224–3230 (2011).
7. Viswanathan H, Dai Z, Lopano C, Keating E, Hakala JA, Scheckel KG *et al.*, Developing a robust geochemical and reactive transport model to evaluate possible sources of arsenic at the CO₂ sequestration natural analog site in Chimayo, New Mexico. *Int J Greenhouse Gas Control* **10**(0):199–214 (2012).
8. Humez P, Lagneau V, Lions J and Negrel P, Assessing the potential consequences of CO₂ leakage to freshwater resources: A batch-reaction experiment towards an isotopic tracing tool. *Appl Geochem* **30**(0):178–190 (2013).
9. Varadharajan C, Tinnacher RM, Pugh JD, Trautz RC, Zheng L, Spycher NF *et al.*, A laboratory study of the initial effects of dissolved carbon dioxide (CO₂) on metal release from shallow sediments. *Int J Greenhouse Gas Control* **19**(0):183–211 (2013).
10. Wunsch A, Navarre-Sitchler AK, Moore J and McCray JE, Metal release from limestones at high partial-pressures of CO₂. *Chem Geol* **363**(0):40–55 (2014).
11. Kirsch K, Navarre-Sitchler AK, Wunsch A and McCray JE, Metal release from sandstones under experimentally and numerically simulated CO₂ leakage conditions. *Environ Sci Technol* **48**(3):1436–1442 (2014).
12. Keating EH, Fessenden J, Kanjorski N, Koning DJ and Pawar R, The impact of CO₂ on shallow groundwater chemistry: Observations at a natural analog site and implications for carbon sequestration. *Environ Earth Sci* **60**(3):521–536 (2010).

13. Peter A, Lamert H, Beyer M, Hornbruch G, Heinrich B, Schulz A *et al.*, Investigation of the geochemical impact of CO₂ on shallow groundwater: Design and implementation of a CO₂ injection test in Northeast Germany. *Environ Earth Sci* **67**(2):335–349 (2012).
14. Cahill AG and Jakobsen R, Hydro-geochemical impact of CO₂ leakage from geological storage on shallow potable aquifers: A field scale pilot experiment. *Int J Greenhouse Gas Control* **19**(0):678–688 (2013).
15. Gal F, Prousta E, Humeza P, Braibanta G, Bracha M, Kocha F *et al.*, Inducing a CO₂ leak into a shallow aquifer (CO₂FieldLab EURO-GIA +project): Monitoring the CO₂ plume in groundwaters. GHGT-11 proceedings paper. *Energ Procedia* **37**:3583–3593 (2013).
16. Yang C, Mickler PJ, Reedy R, Scanlon BR, Romanak KD, Nicot J-P *et al.*, Single-well push-pull test for assessing potential impacts of CO₂ leakage on groundwater quality in a shallow Gulf Coast aquifer in Cranfield, Mississippi. *Int J Greenhouse Gas Control* **18**(0):375–387 (2013).
17. Kharaka YK, Thordsen JJ, Kakouros E, Ambats G, Herkelrath WN, Beers SR *et al.*, Changes in the chemistry of shallow groundwater related to the 2008 injection of CO₂ at the ZERT field site, Bozeman, Montana. *Environ Earth Sci* **60**(2):273–284 (2010).
18. Spangler LH, Dobeck LM, Repasky KS, Nehrir AR, Humphries SD, Barr JL *et al.*, A shallow subsurface controlled release facility in Bozeman, Montana, USA, for testing near surface CO₂ detection techniques and transport models. *Environ Earth Sci* **60**(2):227–239 (2010).
19. Trautz RC, Pugh JD, Varadharajan C, Zheng L, Bianchi M, Nico PS *et al.*, Effect of dissolved CO₂ on a shallow groundwater system: A controlled release field experiment. *Environ Sci Technol* **47**(1):298–305 (2013).
20. Wang S and Jaffe PR, Dissolution of a mineral phase in potable aquifers due to CO₂ releases from deep formations; effect of dissolution kinetics. *Energ Convers Manage* **45**:2833–2848 (2004).
21. Carroll S, Hao Y and Aines R, Geochemical detection of carbon dioxide in dilute aquifers. *Geochem Trans* **10**(4):1–18 (2009).
22. Zheng L, Apps JA, Zhang Y, Xu T and Birkholzer JT, On mobilization of lead and arsenic in groundwater in response to CO₂ leakage from deep geological storage. *Chem Geol* **268**(3/4):281–297 (2009).
23. Apps JA, Zheng L, Zhang Y, Xu T and Birkholzer JT, Evaluation of groundwater quality changes in response to CO₂ leakage from deep geological storage. *Transp Porous Med* **82**(1):215–246 (2010).
24. Wilkin RT and Digiulio DC, Geochemical impacts to groundwater from geologic carbon sequestration: Controls on pH and inorganic carbon concentrations from reaction path and kinetic modeling. *Environ Sci Technol* **44**(12):4821–4817 (2010).
25. Zheng L, Spycher N, Birkholzer J, Xu T, Apps J and Kharaka Y, On modeling the potential impacts of CO₂ sequestration on shallow groundwater: Transport of organics and co-injected H₂S by supercritical CO₂ to shallow aquifers. *Int J Greenhouse Gas Control* **14**(0):113–127 (2013).
26. Zheng L, Apps JA, Spycher N, Birkholzer JT, Kharaka YK, Thordsen J *et al.*, Geochemical modeling of changes in shallow groundwater chemistry observed during the MSU-ZERT CO₂ injection experiment. *Int J Greenhouse Gas Control* **7**(0):202–217 (2012).
27. Kharaka YK, Thordsen JJ, Hovorka SD, Nance S, Cole DR, Phelps TJ *et al.*, Potential environmental issues of CO₂ storage in deep saline aquifers: Geochemical results from the Frio-I Brine Pilot test, Texas, USA. *Appl Geochem* **24**:1106–1112 (2009).
28. Johnson JW, Knauss KG, Glassley WE, DeLoach LD and Tompson AFB, Reactive transport modeling of plug-flow reactor experiments: Quartz and tuff dissolution at 240°C. *J Hydrol* **209**(1/4):81–111 (1998).

29. Zhu C, In situ feldspar dissolution rates in an aquifer. *Geochim Cosmochim Acta* **69**(6):1435–1453 (2005).
30. Geroni JN, Cravotta CA and Sapsford DJ, Evolution of the chemistry of Fe bearing waters during CO₂ degassing. *Appl Geochem* **27**:2335–2347 (2012).
31. Tutolo BM, Luhmann AJ, Kong XZ, Saar MO and Seyfried WE, Experimental observation of permeability changes in dolomite at CO₂ sequestration conditions. *Environ Sci Technol* **48**:2445–2452 (2014).
32. Drummond SE and Ohmoto H, Chemical evolution and mineral deposition in boiling hydrothermal systems. *Econ Geol* **80**:1427–1439 (1985).
33. Allen HE, Halley-Henderson M and Hass CN, Chemical composition of bottled mineral water. *Arch Environ Health* **44**(2):102–116 (1989).
34. Birkholzer JT, Zhou Q and Tsang C-F, Large-scale impact of CO₂ storage in deep saline aquifers: A sensitivity study on pressure response in stratified systems. *Int J Greenhouse Gas Control* **3**:181–194 (2009).
35. Xu T, Spycher N, Sonnenthal E, Zhang G, Zheng L and Pruess K, TOUGHREACT Version 2.0: A simulator for subsurface reactive transport under non-isothermal multiphase flow conditions. *Comput Geosci* **37**(6):763–774 (2011).
36. Lasaga AC, Soler JM, Ganor J, Burch TE and Nagy KL, Chemical weathering rate laws and global geochemical cycles. *Geochim Cosmochim Acta* **58**:2361–2368 (1994).
37. Plummer LN, Parkhurst DL and Wigley TML, Critical review of the kinetics of calcite dissolution and precipitation, in *Chemical Modeling in Aqueous System*, ed by Jenne E, ACS Symposium Series. American Chemical Society, Washington, DC (1979).
38. Palandri J and Kharaka YK, *A Compilation of Rate Parameters of Water-Mineral Interaction Kinetics for Application to Geochemical Modeling*, Open File report 2004-10682004. U.S. Geological Survey (2004).
39. Wolery T and Jove-Colon C, *Qualification of Thermodynamic Data for Geochemical Modeling of Mineral-Water Interactions in Dilute Systems*, ANL-WIS-GS-000003 REV 01, ACC: DOC.20070619.0007. Sandia National Laboratories, Las Vegas, NV (2007).
40. Johnson JW, Oelkers E and Helgeson HC, SUPCRT92: A software package for calculating the standard molal thermodynamic properties of minerals, gases, aqueous species and reactions from 1 to 5000 bar and 0 to 1000°C. *Comput Geosci* **18**:899–947 (1992).
41. Shock E, Sassani D, Willis M and Sverjensky D, Inorganic species in geo-logic fluids: Correlations among standard molal thermodynamic properties of aqueous ions and hydroxide complexes. *Geochim Cosmochim Acta* **61**:907–950 (1997).
42. Helgeson HC, Delany JM, Nesbitt HW and Bird DK, Summary and critique of the thermodynamic properties of rock forming minerals. *Am J Sci* **278-A**:1–229 (1978).
43. Appelo CJA and Postma D, *Geochemistry, Groundwater and Pollution*. A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands (1994).
44. Dzombak DA and Morel FMM, *Surface Complexation Modeling-Hydrous Ferric Oxide*. John Wiley & Sons, New York (1990).
45. Appelo CAJ, Van Der Weiden MJJ, Tournassat C and Charlet L, Surface complexation of ferrous iron and carbonate on ferrihydrite and the mobilization of arsenic. *Environ Sci Technol* **36**(14):3096–3103 (2002).
46. Liger E, Charlet L and van Cappellen P, Surface catalysis of uranium(VI) reduction by iron(II). *Geochim Cosmochim Acta* **63**(19/20):2939–2955 (1999).