

Potential impacts of CO₂ leakage on groundwater quality of overlying aquifer at geological carbon sequestration sites: A review and a proposed assessment procedure

Liange Zheng [,](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9376-2535) Peter Nico, Nicolas Spycher and Jeremy Domen, Earth & Environmental Sciences Area, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA, USA **Anthony Credoz**, TotalEnergies S.E., One R&D, CSTJF, Pau, France

Abstract: One of the risks of geologic carbon sequestration (GCS) is the leakage of injected $CO₂$ into overlying groundwater resources, resulting in potential deterioration of the quality of the groundwater due to the increase in acidity, the release of trace metals and organic compounds, and potential changes in microbial activities. A large number of studies have been conducted to evaluate various aspects of the impact of $CO₂$ leakage on overlying aquifers using natural analog, laboratory experiments, field tests, and numerical models. In this paper, we conducted an exhaustive review of the published work, focusing on the statistical assessment of the risk posed by the trace elements including Pb, As, Cd, Ba, and U and identifying the knowledge gaps. Key observations from the review include the following: (1) Pb, As, and U are metals of primary concern because multiple cases showed their concentration higher than maximum contaminant level (MCL) or other regulatory standards, (2) carbonate aquifers seemed more vulnerable to Pb and As contamination but not to U, (3) Cd and Ba are less a concern, only one case showed Cd/Ba concentration higher than MCL, (4) none of the field studies showed the concentrations of Pb and As higher than MCL, although one push–pull field test showed the concentration of U higher than MCL, (5) the order of aggressiveness in terms of releasing trace metals was determined to be as follows: batch experiment > column experiment > field test, and (6) there is no clear correlation between metal release and type of sediments, type of aquifer, the content of carbonate and clay. Evaluation likely has to be done on a case-by-case basis. For further operations of $CO₂$ storage overview and screening of potential sites, we suggest the use of an eight-step environmental risk assessment procedure comprising laboratory experiment, screening modeling work, and field testing for assessing the vulnerability of the overlying aquifers to degradation from CO₂ leakage from the GCS site. © 2021 Society of Chemical Industry and John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Keywords: $CO₂$ leakage; groundwater; risk assessment; review; procedure

Published online at Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com). DOI: 10.1002/ghg.2104

Correspondence to: Liange Zheng, Earth & Environmental Sciences Area, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, 1 Cyclotron Road, Berkeley, CA 94720, USAE-mail: LZheng@lbl.gov

Received April 16, 2021; revised June 17, 2021; accepted July 1, 2021

Introduction

arbon capture and storage (CCS) is a promising
technology to reduce net carbon dioxide (CO₂)
emissions whereby CO₂ is captured from large
point sources such as power plants, and injected into technology to reduce net carbon dioxide $(CO₂)$ point sources, such as power plants, and injected into deep geological formations. Geological carbon sequestration (GCS) is intended to persist for geological timescales¹; however, unintended leakage of injected $CO₂$ into overlying groundwater resources could occur due to either short-term, sudden releases of $CO₂$, such as in the case of a subsurface blowout or well failure, or due to slow, gradual leaks from undetected fractures or faults.² When $CO₂$ dissolves into groundwater, pH decreases, altering hydrogeochemical processes and leading to a subsequent mobilization of various ions, $2-6$ impacting water quality. The potential impacts of underground $CO₂$ storage on groundwater quality in the overlying aquifer due to leakage is an obstacle to widespread implementation.^{2,3,7,8} Therefore, a thorough understanding of the potential impacts of underground CO2 storage on hydrogeochemical processes in overlying groundwater is crucial.

A combination of lab-scale tests, field-based tests, modeling, and analysis of natural analog sites provides the most thorough understanding of the potential impacts of $CO₂$ leakage on the groundwater quality of the overlying aquifer. Lab-scale batch experiments usually involve adding $CO₂$ to a preequilibrated $sediment + water system with a high water-torock$ ratio and maximize the mobilization of ions from sediment allowing for slow geochemical processes to take place,⁹ which provide useful screening of the potential risk posed by the trace elements. Field-based studies provide water-to-rock ratios closer to natural systems and hydrological and geochemical conditions are expected to be more similar to actual GCS leakage scenarios.⁹ Models based on lab and field studies can be used to predict changes in groundwater quality based on site-specific parameters including aquifer mineral composition, flow rates, and $CO₂$ leakage rates. Natural $CO₂$ storage analog sites provide examples of both the long-term feasibility of GCS as well as potential long-term environmental impacts should leakage occur. 10

In this study, we systematically reviewed current knowledge regarding the potential impacts of $CO₂$ leakage on groundwater quality of overlying aquifer that can be a resource for drinking water or other use. From our synthesis of 350 published studies on groundwater quality impacts, we developed a workflow applicable to risk assessment of GCS in terms of the potential impact of leaking $CO₂$ on the overlying aquifer. This paper starts with a summary of the literature collected throughout this study, and then synthesizes the previously published results of impacts to groundwater from $CO₂$ leakage and identifies the data gaps and research needs. Finally, we describe a recommended workflow assessing the risk to shallow groundwater of $CO₂$ leakage.

Summary of literature

In this report, we collected a total of 139 papers/reports which encompass 350 cases. Note that one paper sometimes contains multiple cases and not all papers/reports are cited here. The break-down of these cases are as follows:

- 190 natural analog
- **16 review papers**
- 19 modeling studies
- 81 laboratory batch and/or column tests
- 42 Field tests
- Eight studies motioned microbial activities:
	- Two studies involve field test
	- Two studies are related to deep storage formation
	- Four are natural analog
- Five studies mentioned organics:
	- Two modeling studies
	- Two studies from the deep storage formation
	- One batch experiment

Summary of literature: –*In situ* **studies**

Field injection and push–pull studies to determine the effects of $CO₂$ leakage from storage formation on overlying aquifer have been conducted around the world. A summary of field studies is provided in Table A1 in Appendix. Aquifer lithology at study sites includes chalk, granite, sandstone, gravel, and coarse and fine sand of varying composition. The carbonate composition of these aquifers ranges from undetectable to over 95%. Carbonates are expected to play a major role in ion mobilization during $CO₂$ leakage events, as their dissolution buffers pH and can be a source of released trace metals 11

Overall, field studies found that simulated $CO₂$ leakage universally decreases pH and generally increases concentrations of water quality parameters such as electrical conductivity (EC), alkalinity, major ions, and trace ions. In some studies, trace metals were addressed and noted to increase in concentration, but no numerical values were included.^{8,12-16} When values were provided, increases were typically minimal, or concentrations were close to detection limits. Increases in trace metal concentrations are likely due to pH-induced desorption or ion exchange with Ca, and Mg17,18 and dissolution of Fe and Mn oxides, as heavy metals tend to adsorb to oxide surfaces.¹⁹ Decreases in Mn and Fe are theorized to be the result of coprecipitations as impurities in gibbsite $(AI(OH)₃)$ in Vrøgum studies 20 ; however, Mn and Fe show slight increases at the Brandenburg site, while ZERT site studies show fluctuations due to oxygenated water and ion exchange processes.²⁰

One exception was Mo, which was observed to decrease in concentration in the majority of studies where it was measured. No clear trends regarding the behavior of anions such as NO_3^- and SO_4^{2-} were obvious, as concentrations increase, decrease, or remain constant, depending on the study. K is relatively unaffected by exposure to a $CO₂$ plume in studies done at the ZERT site, Vrøgum, and the Paris Basin,^{17,20} and shows increases in other studies, but is unmeasured in most studies.

In carbonate-poor glacial and aeolian sands, dissolved ions such as Ca, Mg, Na, Si, Ba, and Sr and other water quality parameters such as EC and total dissolved solids (TDS) typically follow a pulse-like evolution trend, where concentrations rapidly increase following exposure to a $CO₂$ plume and gradually return to postexposure (or slightly elevated) levels after the $CO₂$ plume has passed.^{16,21,22} A separate study by Yang *et al*. ¹¹ found that carbonate dissolution can play a significant part in ion mobilization in aquifers that are as little as 1% carbonates.

Studies in Svelvik, Norway demonstrated that isotope analysis can be used to isolate changes in ion concentrations due to water-rock interactions brought on by $CO₂$ injections from the effects of saline and freshwater mixing. $23-25$

Although *in situ* field injection studies provide valuable data for the impacts of $CO₂$ leakage on groundwater quality, challenges exist when interpreting the data. Injection studies vary regarding the time period over which $CO₂$ is injected and the mineralogy of the target aquifers. Studies where $CO₂$ injection occurs for only a few days may result in observed changes to dissolved ion concentrations that appear as

a pulse, but are actually due to the short duration of the $CO₂$ injection, dilution, or flushing with fresh water.²¹ Push–pull studies, though simpler than studies that involve injection and monitoring, have limited time for reactions between $CO₂$ saturated water and aquifer minerals.26 These differences in injection periods and timeframes complicate comparisons between studies done in aquifers of similar composition. It is clear that site-specific factors such as aquifer mineralogy, geology, groundwater chemistry, and flow and leakage rates result in varying responses to CO_2 leakage.^{8,17,24,27-31}

In summary, field tests have the following features in terms of aquifer response to $CO₂$ leakage:

- Increases in alkaline earth metals and alkali metals were observed in most studies.
- Increases in trace metal (As, Pb, Cd, Ba, and U) had been observed, but concentration remained below MCL.
- Change in concentrations of Fe and Mn depended on the condition of the test site and both increase and decrease had been observed.
- Site-specific conditions dominated the response of the aquifer to $CO₂$ leakage, conclusions from one site do not apply to other sites.

Summary of literature: Lab studies

A summary of lab scale batch and column experiments is provided in Table A2. Lab batch experiments used a variety of aquifer samples from around the world including sandstone, limestone, sand, basalt, and modified or synthetic minerals. Lab batch experiments typically utilized high water to rock ratio and allowed time for samples to equilibrate under an N_2 or Ar atmosphere, before pumping in $CO₂$.

Across nearly all lab studies, a decrease in pH and increase in alkalinity, TDS or EC, Na, Ca, Mg, Sr, Fe, and Ba is observed and can be attributed to the dissolution of carbonates such as calcite $(CaCO₃)$ and dolomite $(CaMg(CO₃)₂)$, Fe, and Mn-oxides, ion exchange, and desorption.^{2,9,19,32-34} Laboratory batch tests by Little and Jackson³⁵ is one of the representatives of lab studies and they found that concentrations of Co, U, and Ba continued to increase beyond the 300-day $CO₂$ exposure window and that Ca, Sr, Mn, and Ba fluctuated significantly over the same period, indicating that long term lab experiments and field monitoring are vital to accurately determine the effects of $CO₂$ exposure on groundwater quality. Laboratory batch tests by Little and Jackson³⁵ also

found that concentrations of Al, Cr, Co, Ni, Zn, As, and Se were highest in aquifer samples with limited carbonate minerals and, as a result, the lowest pH. U was shown to be released under oxidizing conditions. Variations in concentrations of released ions between samples from the same aquifer can be indicative of aquifer mineralogical heterogeneity.³⁵

Despite studies showing a general increase in trace element concentrations, only five studies we reviewed exceed World Health Organization (WHO), European Union (EU), or the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) drinking water standards for trace elements on the list of EPA primary drinking water regulations. Elevated trace metal concentrations during $CO₂$ leakage studies exceeded drinking water standards for Pb in one study, 36 As in three studies, $34,36,37$ Cd in one study, 32 U in one study, 38 and Ba in one study. 32 One of the most significant increase had been observed by Galeczka *et al*. ³² investigating the effects of injecting $CO₂$ into a basalt aquifer saw a decrease in pH from 9–10 to 4.5 and an over 100 times increase in mobility in Sr, Fe, Al, Ca, Ba, Mn, and Mg. Dissolved Al, Fe, Mn, and Cr concentrations exceeded EU drinking water limits, with the majority of Al and Cr being in the Al^{+3} and Cr^{+3} forms, respectively. Carbonates such as calcite, siderite (FeCO₃), and ankerite (Ca(Fe,Mg,Mn)(CO₃)₂) were found to be supersaturated.

Although the increase in the concentration of major ions and trace elements had been observed in most cases, decreases in concentrations had also been observed. For example, a study by Montes-Hernandez *et al.*,³⁹ found that goethite (α -FeO(OH))and calcite could, under the right conditions, adsorb Cu(II), $Cd(II)$, $Se(IV)$, and $As(V)$ and prevent remobilization during CO2 exposure. Similarly, Shao *et al*. ⁴⁰ observed decreased concentrations in spiked Cd and As with unconsolidated sand and gravel samples that contained 0–4% carbonates by weight after $CO₂$ exposure.

The role organics (including pristine organic acids such as humic acid in an aquifer and organic compounds from storage formation) play in releasing metals when sediments were exposed to $CO₂$ was not widely studied. A study by Lawter *et al*. ⁴¹ for sediments collected from the formation in between storage formation and shallow aquifer examined the effects of organic matter on the release of major and minor ions during a lab column test and found that the presence of organic matter slowed the release of S, Sr, Ba, K, Si, and Ca and increased the rate of removal of As and Cd.

Although laboratory studies provide valuable insight into geochemical interactions within aquifers as a result of CO₂ leakage, they are limited in their ability to accurately replicate conditions within the aquifer of study. Lab studies are often done using relatively small samples of aquifer material that have been ground, dried, and are constantly stirred with large water-to-rock ratios. These conditions facilitate water–rock interactions due to greater surface area to volume ratios and results may not fully represent the complex heterogeneous aquifer system and associated reaction rates, microbial communities, and flow and transport behaviors.^{8,9,42} Batch experiments, in particular, fail to account for reactive transport and changes in hydrogeochemical conditions downstream which could result in reprecipitation or scavenging of trace elements.⁵ Additionally, $CO₂$ exposure and postmonitoring in batch experiments typically occur over the course of weeks, rather than months or years. Furthermore, changes to redox conditions could potentially occur during the collection of aquifer field samples, affecting hydrogeochemical reactions and associated lab results.⁸ Thus, *in situ* field experiments are necessary to confirm if laboratory studies reflect aquifer conditions and thoroughly understand the potential impacts of $CO₂$ leakage on groundwater quality.

In summary, lab tests have the following features in terms of aquifer response to $CO₂$ leakage:

- An increase in alkaline earth metals and alkali metals was observed in most studies.
- An increase in trace metals (As, Pb, Cd, Ba, and U) had been observed, some cases showed concentration higher MCL or other regulatory standards.
- \bullet Sediment-CO₂ reaction had been maximized during most studies and therefore metals are typically more aggressively released in comparison to field tests.
- \bullet The role of organics in releasing metals when sediments were exposed to $CO₂$ was not widely studied, but a few studies showed by organics could suppress the release of metals.
- Artifacts in the experiment such as exposure to O_2 lead to changes in the concentration of metals unrelated to $CO₂$ exposure.

Summary of literature–analog sites

Natural $CO₂$ reservoirs exist worldwide and can be classified into sites that show no evidence of leakage and sites that show leakage over time.¹⁰ These GCS analog sites can provide useful information for demonstrating the long-term feasibility of GCS as well as the potential environmental impacts if leakage should occur.

A summary of studies examining groundwater at GCS analog sites is provided in Table A3. Large variations are seen among the suite of water quality parameters and ions measured among studies. However, practically all studies report pH, temperature, EC, or TDS, Na, Ca, Cl, Mg, Fe, and some form of carbon. Nearly all natural analog sites exhibit pH levels below 7.

In a study by Afsin *et al*. ⁴³ of thermal mineral waters in Turkey, samples with pH below 7 had elevated EC, CO₂, Ca, Mg, Na, Cl, SO₄^{2–}, NO₃[–], and to a lesser degree Cd and K, compared to other mineral waters from the same region. Similarly, in a study by Cruz *et al*. ⁴⁴ of waters from the Furnas volcano, samples with pH below 7 had elevated alkalinity, EC, dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC), total inorganic carbon (TIC), Al, Fe, K, Mn, Na, SO_4^2 ⁻, Si O_2 , and NH₄⁺ compared to other mineral waters from the same region. Studies of the Vesuvius volcanic complex found that CO_2 -rich groundwater has increased concentrations of trace elements (As, Se, Mo, V, Li), and decreased levels of Al, Pb, Co, and Mn compared to unleached host rocks.⁴⁵ At Mt. Etna, Al, Th, Fe, and other poorly mobile elements tended in retained in the host rock, while As, Se, Sb, and Mo are more readily released.⁴⁶ Other metals such as Mn, Cr, V, Zn, and Cu are more dependent on redox conditions and surface-related processes.⁴⁶

Studies by Arnórsson *et al*. ⁴⁷ in Iceland found that $CO₂$ -rich water (>200 ppm dissolved TIC) from basalt aquifers are higher in Ca, Mg, Fe, As, Ba, Mn, Co, Ni, and Sr, and are close to saturation with calcite and amorphous silica compared to similar non $CO₂$ -rich waters. The authors suggest that the dissolution of plagioclase is initially responsible for increased concentrations of Ba and Sr, but that concentrations decrease as they precipitate out as secondary minerals.47 Keating *et al*. ⁴⁸ reported contrasting results for a natural analog in New Mexico, USA, where the pH depression and consequent trace element mobility were relatively minimal due to the buffering capacity of the aquifer, despite relatively high levels of dissolved $CO₂$.

Studies by Pauwels *et al*. ⁴⁹ and Lions *et al*. 50 thoroughly analyzed groundwater overlaying a natural CO₂ reservoir in Montmiral, France. Despite measuring high $CO₂$ fluxes, the isotopic analysis found no evidence that $CO₂$ was leaking from the reservoir. They suggested that high $CO₂$ fluxes could be explained by carbonate dissolution and that changes in Ca, Mg, K, and SO_4^2 could be due to Mg-calcite or dolomite dissolution, and K-feldspar (KAlSi₃O₈) dissolution with subsequent kaolinite $(Al_2Si_2O_5(OH)_4)$ precipitation.49,50 These results highlight the importance of isotopic analysis alongside major ion monitoring to ensure that $CO₂$ fluxes and associated groundwater quality changes are due to $CO₂$ reservoir leakage, instead of carbonate dissolution.

A study by Heath *et al*.⁵¹ of multiple CO₂-rich springs and a geyser in the Paradox Basin of the Colorado Plateau found the waters were slightly acidic (pH < 6.5), very saline (TDS >13850 mg L⁻¹), and had elevated levels of $HCO₃⁻$ (>3500 mg L⁻¹). All analyzed waters fell into the sodium-chloride chemical facies and are supersaturated with calcite, aragonite $(CaCO₃)$, dolomite, and hematite (Fe₂O₃). Despite the presence of surface travertine deposits, the system has remained active for over 100 000 years, suggesting that leaky reservoirs may continue to leak even when mineralization is observed.

In addition to natural analog sites, multiple studies have analyzed major and trace ions in bottled sparkling waters and bottled mineral waters. A study by Fiket *et al*. ⁵² analyzed ions and trace elements in 10 different brands of bottled sparkling spring and mineral waters from Croatia; however, the study did not indicate if sparkling waters were naturally or artificially carbonated. A study by Allen *et al*. ⁵³ measured over 20 trace elements and ions in 16 different brands of naturally sparkling bottled water from various regions around Europe. Sparkling natural mineral waters had pH values ranging from 5.8 to 7.8, with most falling below 7. Alkalinity ranged from 60–3429 mg L^{-1} as $CaCO₃$.

While analyzing analog sites for potential impacts of subsurface $CO₂$ storage and leakage on overlaying groundwater resources is valuable, it is not without issues. The effects of natural $CO₂$ seepage on groundwater resources at analog sites are difficult to elucidate because studies do not always measure or report groundwater quality parameters from similar or nearby groundwater that is not impacted by $CO₂$ seepage. Geological data regarding the composition and relative abundance of minerals such as quartz $(SiO₂)$, feldspars, and clays of aquifers or locations

where water samples are collected is also limited. The geological descriptions provided are not always sufficient and limit the ability to draw direct comparisons between analog sites and potential $CO₂$ storage sites. Furthermore, studies often sampled $CO₂$ -rich water from springs or geysers, where rapid degassing of $CO₂$ can occur. Accurate measurements of groundwater $CO₂$ concentrations and pH are vital for determining mineral-water interactions.⁵⁴

In summary, observations from analog sites have the following features:

- Lower pH and elevated EC and major ions have been observed in comparison to a typical groundwater composition.
- While analog sites provided useful information regarding the long-term impact of GCS, their implication to GCS has to be taken with caution because (1) the pristine condition before the exposure of $CO₂$ is missing (2) data from nearby site without $CO₂$ seepage which can serve as a are a reference point for analog sites were usually missing, (3) the time scale is too long for GCS operation.

Potential groundwater quality impacts

One of the primary risks of $CO₂$ leakage on groundwater quality is the release of trace elements and contaminants naturally found within aquifer rocks.⁵ These trace elements and contaminants are both adsorbed to mineral surface sites and contained within the minerals themselves.⁵ Changes in hydrogeochemical conditions (such as pH, redox potential, water composition, and $CO₂$ partial pressure) that promote the dissolution of aquifer minerals or remobilization of adsorbed contaminants are of high concern.

General water quality parameters

As groundwater is exposed to $CO₂$, whether through underground injection, leakage of $CO₂$ -rich brines, or during lab-scale experiments, dissolved $CO₂$ increases, and the formation of carbonic acid results in a decrease in pH. A decrease in pH is observed in every $CO₂$ lab and field experiment and is further supported by modeling studies. This drop of pH is one of the major driving factors in subsequent hydrogeochemical reactions that affect groundwater quality after $CO₂$ exposure.

The degree of decrease in pH is dependent on the $CO₂$ partial pressure and the presence of carbonate minerals such as calcite or dolomite, for which dissolution is thermodynamically favorable under acidic conditions, increasing alkalinity and buffering capacity of the water.5,6,17,34 Indeed, multiple studies show a significant increase in alkalinity after $CO₂$ exposure, $8,12,13,55$ even in aquifer samples that are less than 4% carbonates.^{24,38} Similarly, TDS and EC also show similar increases after $CO₂$ exposure.

When reported, oxidation reduction potential (ORP) also typically shows a slight decrease after $CO₂$ injection. One likely explanation is that dissolved $CO₂$ displaces O_2 , reducing ORP.³ This effect may have been lessened by the fact that many of the studies that reported ORP took place in shallow, unconfined aquifers. ORP plays an important role in determining the speciation and subsequent mobility of some trace elements of concern, such as As.3,5,25

General trends regarding polyatomic anions such as SO_4^2 ⁻ and NO_3^- are unclear, as they are observed to both increase and decrease in various studies. Although they are not directly affected by carbonates equilibrium, they could be impacted by $CO₂$ indirectly through mechanisms such as microbial activity.

General trends in major and trace elements

Overall, concentrations of most major and trace elements increase during $CO₂$ exposure studies. Increases in trace elements brought on by a decrease in pH due to dissolved $CO₂$ are thought to be caused by desorption, and ion exchange reactions along with the dissolution of carbonates, iron oxides, and oxyhydroxides, and sulfides.^{2,12,13,56} Iron oxides and hydroxides and clay minerals, when present, are often the primary minerals responsible for desorption/adsorption.² The effects of $CO₂$ on elemental release generally decrease with $CO₂$ pressure, an important factor to consider is that $CO₂$ pressure decreases as a plume migrates upward.^{41,57}

Increases in Na, Ca, Mg, Sr, and Ba are commonly observed in studies and are thought to be due to carbonate dissolution and Ca-driven cation exchange reactions.2,18 Concentrations of Ca, Mg, Fe, and Mn greatly increase in the majority of studies. This is explained by the dissolution of various carbonate species, such as calcite, siderite, magnesite $(MgCO₃)$, and dolomite, as well as iron sulfides.^{5,6,8,17,27} Other

elements such as Ba and Sr saw only slightly elevated concentrations in comparison. 41 This behavior is likely because Ba and Sr are often present on the exchangeable sites and as impurities in carbonate minerals.^{5,34} The dissolution of plagioclase may also be responsible for slow increases in Ca, Sr, and Ba due to the Ca-driven cation exchange.^{8,18,55,58} Trace elements such as Cd, Co, Cr, and Ni often show rapid increases in concentration following $CO₂$ exposure. Their rapid mobilization can be explained by desorption from Fe and Mn oxyhydroxides and clay minerals, $5,18$ while sustained steady increases in concentration are attributed to the dissolution of containing minerals due to a decrease in $pH.³³$ Increases in Si, Al, K, and to a lesser extent Na, can be partially attributed to silicate and clay dissolution.^{3,9,30}

Elements of concern, such as As and Pb saw increases in some studies and decreases in others. One study has shown that As and Pb desorb from illite and smectite when pH decreases, which increases aqueous concentrations of As and Pb.⁵⁹ Furthermore, increased concentrations of HCO_3^- have been shown to facilitate the desorption of arsenic and uranium from the surfaces of metal oxides and other aquifer minerals and clays.³ Other studies have found that $As(V)$ and other metals such as Cu(II), Cd(II), and Se(IV), can be immobilized by the presence of carbonates after exposure to CO_2 .^{39,40} Al and oxyanion-forming trace elements including As, Se, Sb, Mo, V, and Cr can be immobilized in oxidizing, moderately acidic aqueous systems but can see increased mobilization under highly acidic conditions.^{35,59} Other hazardous elements, such as U, were shown to be mobilized under oxidizing conditions.³⁵ Concentrations of Mo decrease in some CO_2 exposure studies, $8,9,17,27,38,60$ and increase in others.^{34,35,57} It is hypothesized that Mo adsorbs to sulfides and iron oxides at low $pH.⁴¹$

Although increases are observed in many major and trace elements, it is important to note that reactive transport mechanisms, including water–rock interactions downstream of the $CO₂$ leakage or injection site, can buffer pH and result in contaminant removal through scavenging or the precipitation of secondary minerals, 5 release or scavenging is the result of a delicate dynamic balance of reactions such precipitation/dissolution, adsorption/desorpotion,⁵⁹ natural attenuation can apparently alleviate the release of trace metals.

A statistical assessment of the risk associated with trace elements

Based on the data collected in the current work, we conducted a statistical assessment of the risk associated with trace elements, that is, among all the studies, how many of them showed the risk of trace elements. The risk was grouped in the following three categories based on the EPA regulated MCLs:

- Green flag: There is no change of concentration of trace metals when $CO₂$ was added to the system, or trace metals were not detected either in the
- background or after CO_2 was added.
• Yellow flag: Changes in the concentration of trace metals were detected, but the level of change was lower than MCL.
- Red flag: Concentrations increase to a level higher than MCL.

The studies selected for such statistical assessments are laboratory experiments and field tests. However, modeling studies, natural analog studies, and lab studies on pure minerals to study release processes (e.g., Montes-Hernandez *et al*. 39) are not included.

Pb was the focal point for risk assessment of GCS sites in terms of impact on shallow groundwater since the issue of GCS impact on shallow groundwater was brought up in some early studies (e.g., Zheng *et al*. 59). Among all the 21 eligible cases, four of them show a red flag for Pb (Table 1) and all of them are from column tests of samples from Edward aquifer, an unconfined carbonate aquifer.³⁶

Many studies measure As and 11 out of 60 studies show a red flag for As (Table 2), which were reported in Lu *et al.*,³⁴ Wunsch *et al.*,^{37,57} and Wang *et al*.³⁶ The red flag cases are not clearly related to any type of features of the aquifer, except that all these studies are batch experiments.

Cd seems not to pose a great risk to the aquifer—only one out of 44 cases shows a red flag for Cd (Table 3) and it is a quite unusual type of aquifer: basalt. 32

Ba is quite ubiquitously observed in studies—40 out of 43 studies show the yellow flag for Ba (Table 4), Increase in concentrations of Ba had been observed but was not above MCL. The only red flag for Ba was observed in a lab test with basalt.³²

Seven out of 46 studies show a red flag for U (Table 5). It is noteworthy that two of these red-flag cases are field push-pull tests³⁸ for sediments about 240-300 m deep.

Table 1. Summary of risk of contamination in terms of Pb and some relevant aquifer characteristics.

Table 2. Summary of risk of contamination in terms of As and some relevant aquifer characteristics.

Table 3. Summary of risk of contamination in terms of Cd and some relevant aquifer characteristics.

In summary, the following observation can be drawn from the statistical analyses:

- Pb, As and U are metals of primary concern: four of 21 cases showing Pb concentration above MCL, 11 of 60 cases for As, and seven of 46 cases for U show red flags.
- Carbonate aquifers seemed more vulnerable to Pb and As contamination, but not to U.
- Cd and Ba are less a concern: only one out of 44 cases for Cd and one of 43 cases for Ba showing the red flag and both for one study on basalt.
- None of the field studies show the red flag of Pb and As, one push-pull field test showed a red flag for U.

Table 4. Summary of risk of contamination in terms of Ba and some relevant aquifer characteristics.

Table 5. Summary of risk of contamination in terms of U and some relevant aquifer characteristics.

- Order of aggressiveness in terms of releasing trace metals: Batch > column > field.
- Releasing of organics were not reported for shallow aquifer (there was one study for Frio formation at 1500 m showing increasing organics).
- There is no clear correlation between metal release and type of sediments, type of aquifer, the content of carbonate and clay. Evaluation likely has to be done case by case.

Microbial impacts on water quality

Data regarding the effects of microbial communities on changes to groundwater quality due to $CO₂$ leakage is limited, partially because lab-scale studies purposefully limit microbial activity by drying samples and sediments before CO_2 experimentation.⁴² Although there are relatively few studies investigating the effects of $CO₂$ leakage on microbial communities in aquifers with respect to water quality, it is clear that changes in microbial communities brought on by the leakage of $CO₂$ into overlying groundwater have the potential to negatively impact water quality and must be further studied.

Leakage of $CO₂$ into groundwater is expected to impact microbial activity by altering environmental conditions or penetrating cells and interfering with metabolic functions.⁵ Increases in $CO₂$ concentration are generally expected to negatively impact microbial activity.⁵ Indeed, a field injection of $CO₂$ in Escatawpa, Mississippi analyzed by Gulliver *et al*. ⁶¹ found an overall decrease in microbial diversity with increased $CO₂$ concentrations, but also found increasing evidence of $CO₂$ fixation, methanogenesis, and the oxidation of reduced organics including nitrogen, hydrogen, sulfur, and iron species, impacting water quality.

Studies by Kirk *et al*. 62,63 of the Frio Formation and the ZERT site found that in lab batch experiments with lower partial pressures of CO₂, SO₄^{2−} reducing bacteria were dominant, while Fe(III) reducers were

dominant in high partial pressure $CO₂$ experiments. Injection of $CO₂$ and subsequent drop in pH increases the energy available for microbial Fe(III) reduction and has been shown to increase CO_2 trapping^{62,63} through the biomineralization of siderite and calcite.⁶⁴ However, these same conditions also led to the increase in Fe(II) and dissolution of goethite and sulfide minerals such pyrite (FeS₂), minerals that play an important role in adsorbing trace elements such as As.62,63,65 In aquifers where iron oxides and oxyhydroxides are present and natural Fe(III) reduction is normally limited, the introduction of subsurface $CO₂$ can increase microbial activity and lead to negative impacts on groundwater quality.62,63,65

In a push–pull study in the Newark Basin by O'Mullan *et al*. ⁴² increases in the concentration of U by up to 100-fold were likely caused by enhanced desorption due to uranyl carbonate complex formation, however, increases in bacterial communities associated with anaerobic oxidation of U were also observed during the early and mid-phases of injection and may have also contributed to the increase in U. No significant changes were observed in levels of As, but bacterial communities shown to mobilize arsenic under sulfide oxidizing conditions. Under the right conditions, these bacterial communities could play a significant role in trace metals geochemistry during CO₂ leakage.

Subsurface microbial activity is generally slow and changes in groundwater quality due to $CO₂$ -induced microbial activity may be minimal during short-term lab and field injection experiments.^{64,66}

Organic matter

There are two types of organic matters that could affect the response of groundwater quality to $CO₂$ leakage: one is the pristine soil organic matters such as humic and fulvic acid in the aquifer, which could affect the release of trace metals because of their association with metals in groundwater, the other is organic compounds that usually exist in the deep formation such as BTEX. The current review did not find studies regarding soil organics, but there are a few studies that examined the effects of organic compounds of deep sources on the impacts of $CO₂$ leakage on groundwater quality. It is generally agreed that mobilization of BTEX and other non- to moderately polar organic compounds from reservoir rock due to supercritical $CO₂$ injection is a possibility.5,13,67–70 This is of particular concern for $CO₂$ injection for EOR, but also has implications for injection of $CO₂$ into nonoil-bearing saline aquifers.⁷⁰

Migration of CO_2 -rich brine high in toxic organic compounds such as BTEX can negatively impact overlaying groundwater quality.^{5,13,67-71} In these cases, understanding the redox conditions of the aquifer is important for determining the biodegradation potential and persistence of organic contaminants.²

Few studies detected elevated concentrations of organic compounds during $CO₂$ injection. One notable field study that detected elevated BTEX levels after $CO₂$ injection determined that the source was contaminated $CO₂$, rather than mobilization from reservoir rock.^{17,67} Fewer studies have investigated the effects of organic matter on the release of major and trace elements during $CO₂$ exposure. One key lab study by Lawter *et al*. ⁴¹ found that concentrations of Ca, Mo, Ba, Si, K, Sr, and S were lower and removal rates of As and Cd were slightly increased in $CO₂$ exposure tests with increased levels of organic matter (toluene spike). Decreases in trace elements due to organic matter are typically attributed to surface adsorption.⁵ Note that Lawter *et al.*,⁴¹ tested sediments collected from the formation in between storage formation and the shallow aquifer that is a groundwater resource.

Data gaps and further research

Inconsistencies between studies, such as variations in $CO₂$ injection and post monitoring time frames for both field and lab studies, variations in the major and minor ions measured or reported, and the lack of data reporting consistency (e.g., ion concentration data presented in chart form only), hinder the ability to compare study results. The limited time frames of post- $CO₂$ exposure monitoring, in particular, limits data regarding the post $CO₂$ exposure behavior of mobilized trace metals and time frames required to return to background levels after pH and dissolved $CO₂$ concentrations also return to background levels.² Furthermore, studies sometimes omit a detailed breakdown of aquifer mineralogy according to carbonate, quartz, clay, k-feldspars, plagioclase, and other relevant minerals, as well as elemental composition. As discussed previously, aquifer mineralogy plays an important role in contaminant mobilization, and information regarding mineral composition would facilitate analyzing and comparing the effects of various aquifer mineralogies on contaminant mobilization from CO_2 exposure.^{5,94} A thorough review of available studies regarding impacts on groundwater quality from $CO₂$ injection

© 2021 Society of Chemical Industry and John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. 1 Greenhouse. Gas. Sci. Technol. 11:1134–1166 (2021); DOI: 10.1002/ghg.2104 1143

Figure 1. Summary of eight-step procedure for assessing the vulnerability of the shallow aquifer overlying the GCS site.

reveals that significant data gaps still exist. While the release of trace metals has been studied extensively, the response of microbial communities to $CO₂$ intrusion into aquifer and their role in the mobilization of trace metals requires further study. Organic matter, either as contaminants or an agent that enhance the mobilization of trace metals warrant further studies. Even for trace metals, a major hurdle is that aquifer responses to $CO₂$ injection or leakage are site-specific.^{2,5,25,68}

The knowledge gap regarding organics has two folds:

- 1. Impact of organic matter preexisting in the impacted aquifer in the response to $CO₂$ intrusion.
	- Impact on buffering capacity
	- Impact on CEC
	- Impact on supporting microbial activity
- 2. Impact of organics that carried by leaking $CO₂$ onto the aquifer.
	- $CO₂$ leaching of cap rock materials \cdot CO₂ leaching of cap rock materials
 \cdot Transportability of leached species
	-
	- Decomposition pathways of released organics
	- Sorption/desorption behavior of released organics

The knowledge gap regarding microbial activities is about assessing the effects of $CO₂$ -induced changes in the microbial community and Fe cycling in GCS-relevant aquifer sediments.

Proposed site assessment procedure

Based on the risk that $CO₂$ leakage could poise on shallow aquifers and the various studies in this regard that have been conducted, we propose the following eight-step procedure for assessing the vulnerability of the shallow aquifer overlying the GCS site. The procedure uses activities with different levels of effort, for example, from batch experiments and simple models to field tests and complex site models to screen the potential risk by gradually reducing the uncertainties with increasing effort (Fig. 1).

Step 1: Site survey

The purpose of Step 1 is to gather information from a literature survey in preparation for sample collection and testing/modeling in the next steps. Specifically, Step 1 is composed of the following tasks:

- Gather as much existing information on the site as possible, primarily through a literature survey, including hydrological and geochemical conditions.
- Based on current knowledge, perhaps supplemented by a geophysical survey, a statistically valid sampling procedure to obtain aquifer materials will be determined.
- Use statistical decisions and collected sediment samples from the aquifer to plan the next steps in the procedure.

Note that in Step 1, the work can be conducted for multiple sites simultaneously.

Step 2: Groundwater survey and sediment characterization

Unless thorough information can be collected in Step 1, it is likely that a groundwater survey and sediment characterization has to be conducted, which is the purpose of Step 2:

- If the concentration of a contaminant in the groundwater is below the detection limit in groundwater, the chance that this contaminant will rise above MCL upon the leakage of $CO₂$ is very low, but an increase in concentration is still possible (e.g., Varadharajan *et al*. ⁷² and Zheng *et al*. 55).
- Knowledge of the mineralogical composition of the sediment can be a useful indicator of potential contamination:
	- The existence of clay minerals indicate potential cation exchange and desorption, leading to the release of Ba, Cd, Pb, and As.
	- The existence of sulfide minerals is an indicator of a potential release of As and Pb (also Cu and Zn).
	- The amount of carbonate minerals is related to the aquifer pH buffering capacity and the degree of metal release is related to the magnitude of pH
- drop driven by $CO₂$ dissolution.

Sediment titration to assess buffering capacity is a key test to evaluate the aquifer response.
- Selective extraction is recommended because it reveals the metal-mineral associations which are good indicators of potential contamination.

Step 3: Batch experiments

The batch experiments in which sediments are mixed with field or synthetic groundwater and reacted with CO2 are recommended in Step 3:

- If contaminants are released in the batch experiment, further studies are warranted.
- If contaminants are NOT released in the batch experiments, further studies are NOT warranted.

Step 4: Screening model

The purpose of Step 4 is to screen the potential risk before investing in expensive experimental work. It has the following two substeps:

- Prepare the screening model

The geochemical model will be built based on all the information collected in Steps 1–3, that is, the groundwater survey, sediment characterization, metal-mineral association revealed by sequential leaching.

- Establish contaminant release mechanisms/reaction network
- Calibrate key parameters such as pH buffering capacity, parameters related to adsorption/desorption, and kinetic reaction rates
- Screening model
	- 1D, horizontal homogenous
	- Pore velocity from ambient flow gradient and estimated hydraulic conductivity and specific charge
	- Typical average aquifer mineralogy/ geochemical properties
	- Test many combinations of key input parameters

Step 5: Flow-through column experiment

The purpose of Step 5 is to assess the risk of contamination at the solid-to-liquid ratio close to the aquifer.

- Design column tests to validate and explore the results of the screening model
- Because of the large liquid to solid ratio, batch experiments are very aggressive in releasing contaminants, column experiments provide conditions more similar to field conditions in terms of liquid to solid ratio
	- Pay special attention to the contaminants released in batch experiments or screening model runs
	- If contaminants are released in the batch experiment with less than a moderate increase in concentration and are not released in column experiments, further studies are NOT warranted.
	- If contaminants are released in column experiments, further studies are warranted.

Step 6: Preliminary site model

The purpose of Step 6 is to further evaluate the risk without resorting to expensive field tests. The model has the following features:

- 2D horizontally homogenous
- Vertically heterogenous
- Permeability and flow rate yield ambient typical pore velocity range
- Distinct zones of average aquifer mineralogy and geochemical properties
- Evaluate different leakage scenarios
- Understand the long-term behavior.

Step 7: Field test

The ultimate measure of risk assessment is to conduct a field test at the GCS site.

- Field tests are warranted if column tests and reactive transport modeling show release of contaminants, especially to a level higher than MCL.
- Use the preliminary site model to design a field test.
- A closed-loop experiment like the Mississippi field test (Trautz *et al*. 8; Zheng *et al*. 55) is recommended to constrain the $CO₂$ plume, but the induced groundwater flow rate should not be much higher than ambient conditions (ideally about the same).
- Groundwater monitoring for an extended period before the test is necessary to provide good baseline data.

Step 8: Working site model

The working site model can be used to interpret the data from the field test and eventually developed into the model of the GCS site. It has the following features:

- Full 3-D heterogenous model
- Calibrated and refined from the field test
- Used for monitoring and risk assessment
- Complexity limits the number of uncertainty analyses.

Conclusion

In this paper, we collected data for 350 cases that were documented in 139 papers/reports, with 81 cases of laboratory batch and/or column tests and 42 cases of field tests. In general, we observed that:

- Increases in alkaline earth metals and alkali metals were observed in most studies.
- Solid phase aquifer chemistry and mineral phases are dominant factors in the release of major and trace elements.

In light of the release of trace metal from sediment upon the intrusion of $CO₂$ into the shallow aquifer, there are the following general observations:

 \bullet An increase in trace metals (As, Pb, Cd, Ba, and U) had been observed, some cases showed

concentration higher MCL or other regulatory standards.

- Pb, As and U are metals of primary concern: four cases have Pb concentration higher than MCL, and 11 for As; seven for U.
- Carbonate aquifers seemed more vulnerable to Pb and As contamination, but not to U.
- Cd and Ba are less a concern, only one of 44 case show Cd concentration higher than MCL, and one of 43 cases has Ba concentration higher than MCI
- None of the field studies show the concentration of Pb and As higher than MCL; one push-pull field test showed the concentration of U higher than MCL.
- Order of aggressiveness in terms of releasing trace metals: Batch experiment > column experiment > field test.
- There is no clear correlation between metal release and type of sediments, type of aquifer, the content of carbonate and clay. Evaluation likely has to be done on a case-by-case basis.

Despite a large number of studies being conducted, there are still knowledge gaps: one is about organics, in light of the impact of organic matter preexisting in the aquifer in the response to $CO₂$ intrusion and the impact of organics that carried by leaking $CO₂$ on the shallow aquifer. Another knowledge gap regards microbial activities; further studies are needed to assess the effects of $CO₂$ -induced changes in the microbial community and Fe cycling in GCS-relevant aquifer sediments.

Based on the literature review, using MCL as a simple risk assessment threshold, an 8-step risk assessment procedure was proposed to assess the risk of GCS site on overlying groundwater aquifers:

- Step 1: Site survey
- Step 2: Groundwater survey and sediment characterization
- Step 3: Batch experiments
- Step 4: Screening model
- Step 5: Flow-through column experiment
- Step 6: Preliminary site model
- Step 7: Field test
- Step 8: Working site model

Acknowledgment

This work is funded by TotalEnergies S.E., One R&D.

 1148 © 2021 Society of Chemical Industry and John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. | Greenhouse. Gas. Sci. Technol. **11**:1134–1166 (2021); DOI: 10.1002/ghg.2104

 1150 © 2021 Society of Chemical Industry and John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. | Greenhouse. Gas. Sci. Technol. 11:1134–1166 (2021); DOI: 10.1002/ghg.2104

L Zheng et al.

(Continued)

(Continued)

 1156 © 2021 Society of Chemical Industry and John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. | Greenhouse. Gas. Sci. Technol. **11**:1134–1166 (2021); DOI: 10.1002/ghg.2104

1158 © 2021 Society of Chemical Industry and John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. | Greenhouse. Gas. Sci. Technol. 11:1134-1166 (2021); DOI: 10.1002/ghg.2104

(Continued)

 1160 © 2021 Society of Chemical Industry and John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. | Greenhouse. Gas. Sci. Technol. 11:1134–1166 (2021); DOI: 10.1002/ghg.2104

 1162 © 2021 Society of Chemical Industry and John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. | Greenhouse. Gas. Sci. Technol. **11**:1134–1166 (2021); DOI: 10.1002/ghg.2104

References

- 1. Roberts JJ and Stalker L, What have we learned about $CO₂$ leakage from field injection tests? Energy Procedia **114**:5711–5731 (2017).
- 2. Qafoku N, Zheng L, Bacon DH, Lawter AR and Brown CF, A Critical Review of the Impacts of Leaking $CO₂$ Gas and Brine on Groundwater Quality. Pacific Northwest National Lab.(PNNL), Richland, WA (United States). (2015)
- 3. 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**:23–36 (2013).
- 4. Kharaka YK, Abedini AA, Gans KD, Thordson JJ, Beers SR and Thomas RB, Changes in the chemistry of groundwater reacted with CO₂: comparison of results from laboratory experiments and the ZERT field site, Bozeman, Montana, USA. Appl Geochem **98**:75–81 (2018).
- 5. Lions J, Devau N, de Lary L, Dupraz S, Parmentier M, Gombert P et al., Potential impacts of leakage from CO₂ geological storage on geochemical processes controlling fresh groundwater quality: a review. Int J Greenhouse Gas Control **22**:165–175 (2014).
- 6. Zhang L, Wang Y, Miao X, Gan M and Li X, Geochemistry in geologic CO₂ utilization and storage: a brief review. Adv Geo-Energy Res **3**:304–313 (2019).
- 7. Roberts JJ, Wood RA and Haszeldine RS, Assessing the health risks of natural $CO₂$ seeps in Italy. Proc Natl Acad Sci **108**:16545–16548 (2011).
- 8. 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**:298–305 (2013).
- 9. Mickler PJ, Yang C, Scanlon BR, Reedy R and Lu J, Potential impacts of CO₂ leakage on groundwater chemistry from laboratory batch experiments and field push–pull tests. Environ Sci Technol **47**:10694–10702 (2013).
- 10. Stenhouse M, Natural and industrial analogs for geological storage of carbon dioxide. IEA Greenhouse Gas R&D Programme, Cheltenham, UK. (2009).
- 11. Yang C, Hovorka SD, Delgado-Alonso J, Mickler PJ, Treviño RH and Phillips S, Field demonstration of $CO₂$ leakage detection in potable aquifers with a pulselike $CO₂$ -release test. Environ Sci Technol **48**:14031–14040 (2014).
- 12. Kharaka Y, Cole D, Thordsen J, Kakouros E and Nance HS, Gas-water-rock interactions in sedimentary basins: CO₂ sequestration in the Frio Formation, Texas, USA. J Geochem Explor **89**:183–186 (2006).
- 13. Kharaka YK, Cole DR, Hovorka SD, Gunter W, Knauss KG and Freifeld B, Gas-water-rock interactions in Frio Formation following $CO₂$ injection: implications for the storage of greenhouse gases in sedimentary basins. Geology **34**:577–580 (2006).
- 14. Kharaka YK, Thordsen JJ, Hovorka SD, Nance HS, 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).
- 15. Oliva A, de Moreira AC, Chang HK, Do Rosário FF, Musse APS, Melo CL et al., A comparison of three methods for monitoring $CO₂$ migration in soil and shallow subsurface in the Ressacada Pilot site, Southern Brazil. Energy Procedia **63**:3992–4002 (2014).
- 16. 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**:335–349 (2012).
- 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**:273–284 (2010).
- 18. 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**:202–217 (2012).
- 19. Kharaka Y, Thordsen J, Abedini A, Beers S and Thomas B, Changes in the chemistry of groundwater reacted with $CO₂$: COMPARISON of laboratory results with the ZERT field pilot. Procedia Earth Planet Sci **17**:241–244 (2017).
- 20. Cahill AG, Marker P and Jakobsen R, Hydrogeochemical and mineralogical effects of sustained $CO₂$ contamination in a shallow sandy aquifer: a field-scale controlled release experiment. Water Resour Res **50**:1735–1755 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013WR014294>
- 21. 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**:678–688 (2013).
- 22. Schulz A, Vogt C, Lamert H, Peter A, Heinrich B, Dahmke A et al., Monitoring of a simulated $CO₂$ leakage in a shallow aquifer using stable carbon isotopes. Environ Sci Technol **46**:11243–11250 (2012).
- 23. Gal F, Proust E, Humez P, Braibant G, Brach M, Koch F et al., Inducing a $CO₂$ leak into a shallow aquifer ($CO₂$ FieldLab EUROGIA+ project): MONITORING the $CO₂$ plume in groundwaters. Energy Procedia **37**:3583–3593 (2013).
- 24. Humez P, Négrel P, Lagneau V, Lions J, Kloppmann W, Gal F et al., $CO₂$ –water–mineral reactions during $CO₂$ leakage: geochemical and isotopic monitoring of a $CO₂$ injection field test. Chem Geol **368**:11–30 (2014).
- 25. Jones D, Barkwith A, Hannis S, Lister T, Gal F, Graziani S et al., Monitoring of near surface gas seepage from a shallow injection experiment at the $CO₂$ Field Lab, Norway. Int J Greenhouse Gas Control **28**:300–317 (2014).
- 26. Jun S-C, Cheon J-Y, Yi J-H and Yun S-T, Controlled release test facility to develop environmental monitoring techniques for geologically stored CO₂ in Korea. Energy Procedia **114**:3040–3051 (2017).
- 27. Rillard J, Gombert P, Toulhoat P and Zuddas P, Geochemical assessment of $CO₂$ perturbation in a shallow aquifer evaluated by a push–pull field experiment. Int J Greenhouse Gas Control **21**:23–32 (2014).
- 28. 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**:4821–4827 (2010) .
- 29. Yang C, Dai Z, Romanak KD, Hovorka SD and Treviño RH, Inverse modeling of water-rock-CO₂ batch experiments: POTENTIAL impacts on groundwater resources at carbon sequestration sites. Environ Sci Technol **48**:2798–2806 (2014).
- 30. 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**:375–387 (2013).
- 31. Zhu Q, Li X, Jiang Z and Wei N, Impacts of $CO₂$ leakage into shallow formations on groundwater chemistry. Fuel Process Technol **135**:162–167 (2015).
- 32. Galeczka I, Wolff-Boenisch D and Gislason S, Experimental studies of basalt-H₂O-CO₂ interaction with a high pressure column flow reactor: the mobility of metals. Energy Procedia **37**:5823–5833 (2013).
- 33. 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**:178–190 (2013).
- 34. Lu J, 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**:335–348 (2010).
- 35. Little MG and Jackson, RB, Potential impacts of leakage from deep CO₂ geosequestration on overlying freshwater aquifers. Environ Sci Technol **44**:9225–9232 (2010).
- 36. Wang G, Qafoku NP, Lawter AR, Bowden M, Harvey O, Sullivan C et al., Geochemical impacts of leaking $CO₂$ from subsurface storage reservoirs to an unconfined oxidizing carbonate aquifer. Int J Greenhouse Gas Control **44**:310–322 (2016).
- 37. Wunsch A, Navarre-Sitchler AK, Moore J and McCray JE, Metal release from limestones at high partial-pressures of CO2. Chem Geol **363**:40–55 (2014).
- 38. Yang Q, Matter J, Stute M, Takahashi T, O'Mullan G, Umemoto K et al., Groundwater hydrogeochemistry in injection experiments simulating CO₂ leakage from geological storage reservoir. Int J Greenhouse Gas Control **26**:193–203 (2014).
- 39. Montes-Hernandez G, Renard F and Lafay R, Experimental assessment of CO₂-mineral-toxic ion interactions in a simplified freshwater aquifer: implications for $CO₂$ leakage from deep geological storage. Environ Sci Technol **47**:6247–6253 (2013).
- 40. Shao H, Qafoku NP, Lawter AR, Bowden ME and Brown CF, Coupled geochemical impacts of leaking $CO₂$ and contaminants from subsurface storage reservoirs on groundwater quality. Environ Sci Technol **49**:8202–8209 (2015).
- 41. Lawter AR, Qafoku NP, Asmussen RM, Kukkadapu RK, Qafoku O, Bacon DH et al., Element mobilization and immobilization from carbonate rocks between $CO₂$ storage reservoirs and the overlying aquifers during a potential $CO₂$ leakage. Chemosphere **197**:399–410 (2018).
- 42. O'Mullan G, Dueker ME, Clauson K, Yang Q, Umemoto K, Zakharova N et al., Microbial stimulation and succession following a test well injection simulating $CO₂$ leakage into a shallow Newark basin aquifer. PLoS One **10**:e0117812–e0117812 (2015).
- 43. Afşin M, Kuşcu İ, Elhatip H and Dirik K, Hydrogeochemical properties of CO₂-rich thermal–mineral waters in Kayseri (Central Anatolia), Turkey. Environ Geol **50**:24–36 (2006).
- 44. Cruz JV, Coutinho RM, Carvalho MR, Oskarsson N and Gislason SR, Chemistry of waters from Furnas volcano, São Miguel, Azores: fluxes of volcanic carbon dioxide and leached material. J Volcanol Geotherm Res **92**:151–167 (1999).
- 45. Aiuppa A, Federico C, Allard P, Gurrieri S and Valenza M, Trace metal modeling of groundwater–gas–rock interactions in a volcanic aquifer: Mount Vesuvius, Southern Italy. Chem Geol **216**:289–311 (2005).
- 46. Aiuppa A, Allard P, D'Alessandro W, Michel A, Parello F, Treuil M et al., Mobility and fluxes of major, minor and trace metals during basalt weathering and groundwater transport at Mt. Etna volcano (Sicily). Geochim Cosmochim Acta **64**:1827–1841 (2000).
- 47. Arnórsson S, Hurtig N, Gysi A, Bird D, O'Day P, Carbon dioxide waters in Iceland: a natural analog to $CO₂$ sequestration in basaltic aquifers. Paper presented in 13th International Symposium on Water-Rock Interaction, Guanajuato, Mexico. (2010).
- 48. Keating EH, Fessenden J, Kanjorski N, Koning DJ and 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).
- 49. Pauwels H, Gaus I, Le Nindre YM, Pearce J and Czernichowski-Lauriol I, Chemistry of fluids from a natural analog for a geological $CO₂$ storage site (Montmiral, France): lessons for CO₂-water-rock interaction assessment and monitoring. Appl Geochem **22**:2817–2833 (2007).
- 50. Lions J, Humez P, Pauwels H, Kloppmann W and Czernichowski-Lauriol I, Tracking leakage from a natural CO₂ reservoir (Montmiral, France) through the chemistry and isotope signatures of shallow groundwater. Greenhouse Gases: Sci Technol **4**:225–243 (2014).
- 51. Heath JE, Lachmar TE, Evans JP, Kolesar PT, Williams AP, McPherson B and Sundquist E, Hydrogeochemical characterization of leaking, carbon dioxide-charged fault zones in east-central Utah, with implications for geologic carbon storage, in Carbon Sequestration and Its Role in the Global Carbon Cycle, ed. by Mcpherson BJ and Sundquist ET. American Geophysical Union, Washington, DC, Vol.**183**, pp. 147–158 (2009).
- 52. Fiket Ž, Roje V, Mikac N and Kniewald G, Determination of arsenic and other trace elements in bottled waters by high resolution inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry. Croat Chem Acta **80**:91–100 (2007).
- 53. Allen HE, Halley-Henderson MA and Hass CN, Chemical composition of bottled mineral water. Arch Environ Health **44**:102–116 (1989).
- 54. Kampman N, Bickle M, Maskell A, Chapman H, Evans J, Purser G et al., Drilling and sampling a natural $CO₂$ reservoir: implications for fluid flow and $CO₂$ -fluid–rock reactions during CO2 migration through the overburden. Chem Geol **369**:51–82 (2014).
- 55. Zheng L, Spycher N, Bianchi M, Pugh JD, Varadharajan C, Tinnacher RM et al., Impacts of elevated dissolved $CO₂$ on a shallow groundwater system: reactive transport modeling of a controlled-release field test. Chem Geol **447**:117–132 (2016).
- 56. Birkholzer J, Research project on CO₂ geological storage and groundwater resources: water quality effects caused by $CO₂$ intrusion into shallow groundwater. Techincal Report. Enironmetnal Protection Agency, Washington, DC (2008).
- 57. Wunsch A, Navarre-Sitchler AK, Moore J, Ricko A and McCray JE, Metal release from dolomites at high partial-pressures of CO2. Appl Geochem **38**:33–47 (2013).
- 58. Zheng L, Spycher N, Varadharajan C, Tinnacher RM, Pugh JD, Bianchi M et al., On the mobilization of metals by $CO₂$ leakage

into shallow aquifers: exploring release mechanisms by modeling field and laboratory experiments. Greenhouse Gases: Sci Technol **5**:1–16 (2015).

- 59. 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**:281–297 (2009).
- 60. Qafoku NP, Lawter AR, Shao H, Wang G and Brown CF, Evaluating impacts of $CO₂$ gas intrusion into a confined sandstone aquifer: experimental results. Energy Procedia **63**:3275–3284 (2014).
- 61. Gulliver D, Lipus D, Ross D and Bibby K, Insights into microbial community structure and function from a shallow, simulated CO2-leakage aquifer demonstrate microbial selection and adaptation. Environ Microbiol Rep **11**:338–351 (2019).
- 62. Kirk MF, Variation in energy available to populations of subsurface anaerobes in response to geological carbon storage. Environ Sci Technol **45**:6676–6682 (2011).
- 63. Kirk MF, Santillan EF, Sanford RA and Altman SJ, CO2-induced shift in microbial activity affects carbon trapping and water quality in anoxic bioreactors. Geochim Cosmochim Acta **122**:198–208 (2013).
- 64. Li C, Zhong S, Zhang F, Wang Z, Jiang F and Wan Y, Response of microbial communities to supercritical $CO₂$ and biogeochemical influences on microbially mediated CO2-saline-sandstone interactions. Chem Geol **473**:1–9 (2017).
- 65. Smedley PL, Kinniburgh, DG, A review of the source, behaviour and distribution of arsenic in natural waters. Appl Geochem **17**:517–568 (2002).
- 66. West JM, McKinley IG, Palumbo-Roe B and Rochelle CA, Potential impact of CO₂ storage on subsurface microbial ecosystems and implications for groundwater quality. Energy Procedia **4**:3163–3170 (2011).
- 67. Apps JA, Birkholzer JT, Spycher N, Zheng L, Herkelrath W, Kharaka Y et al., Groundwater Chemistry Changes as a Result of CO₂ Injection at the ZERT Field Site in Bozeman, Montana. Lawrence Berkeley National Lab.(LBNL), Berkeley, CA (United States). (2009).
- 68. Lemieux J-M, The potential impact of underground geological storage of carbon dioxide in deep saline aquifers on shallow groundwater resources. Hydrogeol J **19**:757–778 (2011).
- 69. Qafoku NP, Lawter AR, Bacon DH, Zheng L, Kyle J and Brown CF, Review of the impacts of leaking $CO₂$ gas and brine on groundwater quality. Earth Sci Rev **169**:69–84 (2017).
- 70. 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).
- 71. Lions J, Bricker S, Gale I, Kirk K, Knopf S, Rütters H et al., Potential impact on groundwater resources of $CO₂$ geological storage. IEAGHG Report **11**:1–201 (2011).
- 72. 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**:183–211 (2013).
- 73. Cahill AG and Jakobsen, R, Geochemical modeling of a sustained shallow aquifer $CO₂$ leakage field study and implications for leakage and site monitoring. Int J Greenhouse

Gas Control **37**:127–141 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2015.03.011>

- 74. Auken E, Doetsch J, Fiandaca G, Christiansen AV, Gazoty A, Cahill AG et al., Imaging subsurface migration of dissolved $CO₂$ in a shallow aquifer using 3-D time-lapse electrical resistivity tomography. J Appl Geophys **101**:31–41 (2014).
- 75. Frédérick G, Julie L, Zbigniew P, Philippe G, Solenne G, François P et al., CO₂ leakage in a shallow aquifer-Observed changes in case of small release. Energy Procedia **63**:4112–4122 (2014).
- 76. Apps JA, Zheng L, Spycher N, Birkholzer JT, Kharaka Y, Thordsen J et al., Transient changes in shallow groundwater chemistry during the MSU ZERT $CO₂$ injection experiment. Energy Procedia **4**:3231–3238 (2011).
- 77. Terzi K, Aggelopoulos CA, Bountas I and Tsakiroglou CD, Effects of carbon dioxide on the mobilization of metals from aquifers. Environ Sci Technol **48**:4386–4394 (2014).
- 78. Liu B, Zhao F, Xu J and Qi Y, Experimental investigation and numerical simulation of $CO₂$ –brine–rock interactions during CO₂ sequestration in a deep saline aquifer. Sustainability **11**:317 (2019).
- 79. Marcon V and Kaszuba, JP, Carbon dioxide–brine–rock interactions in a carbonate reservoir capped by shale: experimental insights regarding the evolution of trace metals. Geochim Cosmochim Acta **168**:22–42 (2015).
- 80. 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. Energy Procedia **1**:1957–1964 (2009).
- 81. Choi H and Woo, NC, Natural analog monitoring to estimate the hydrochemical change of groundwater by the carbonating process from the introduction of CO₂. J Hydrol 562:318-334 (2018).
- 82. Kim K-K, Hamm S-Y, Cheong J-Y, Kim S-O and Yun S-T, A natural analog approach for discriminating leaks of CO₂ stored underground using groundwater geochemistry statistical methods, South Korea. Water **9**:960 (2017).
- 83. Ham B, Choi B-Y, Chae G-T, Kirk MF and Kwon MJ, Geochemical influence on microbial communities at CO2-leakage analog sites. Front Microbiol **8**:2203 (2017).
- 84. Weaver TR, Cartwright I, Tweed SO, Ahearne D, Cooper M, Czapnik K et al., Controls on chemistry during fracture-hosted flow of cold CO₂-bearing mineral waters, Daylesford, Victoria, Australia: implications for resource protection. Appl Geochem **21**:289–304 (2006).
- 85. Flaathen TK, Gislason SR, Oelkers EH and Sveinbjörnsdóttir ÁE, Chemical evolution of the Mt. Hekla, Iceland, groundwaters: a natural analog for $CO₂$ sequestration in basaltic rocks. Appl Geochem **24**:463–474 (2009).
- 86. Slejko FF, Petrini R, Carulli GB, Italiano F and Ditta M, Preliminary geochemical and isotopic data on springs along the Fella-Sava fault zone (NE Italy). Boll Geofis Teor Appl **48**:423–434 (2007).
- 87. Italiano F, Bonfanti P, Ditta M, Petrini R and Slejko F, Helium and carbon isotopes in the dissolved gases of Friuli region (NE Italy): geochemical evidence of $CO₂$ production and degassing over a seismically active area. Chem Geol **266**:76–85 (2009).
- 88. Chiodini G, Frondini F, Cardellini C, Parello F and Peruzzi L, Rate of diffuse carbon dioxide Earth degassing estimated from

carbon balance of regional aquifers: the case of central Apennine, Italy. J Geophys Res : Solid Earth **105**:8423–8434 (2000).

- 89. Federico C, Aiuppa A, Allard P, Bellomo S, Jean-Baptiste P, Parello F et al., Magma-derived gas influx and water-rock interactions in the volcanic aquifer of Mt. Vesuvius, Italy. Geochim Cosmochim Acta **66**:963–981 (2002).
- 90. Gal F, Brach M, Braibant G, Bény C and Michel K, What can be learned from natural analog studies in view of $CO₂$ leakage issues in Carbon Capture and Storage applications? Geochemical case study of Sainte-Marguerite area (French Massif Central). Int J Greenhouse Gas Control **10**:470–485 (2012).
- 91. Amundson R and Kelly E, The chemistry and mineralogy of a CO₂-rich travertine depositing spring in the California

Liange Zheng

Liange Zheng is a scientist at Lawrence Berkeley National Lab. His research interests are centered on numerical modeling of non-isothermal multiphase flow and reactive transport in porous media. His research work is mainly related to the impact of CCS on groundwater and coupled processes

modeling for radioactive waste repositories.

Peter Nico

Peter Nico is a geochemist in the Energy Geosciences Division at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. He has over twenty years of research experience in experimental aqueous geochemistry and metal(oid) redox processes. He has contributed to many projects dealing with mechanistic

controls on metal release processes and carbon cycling in the areas of groundwater quality, soil processes, legacy contamination, and nuclear waste storage.

Nicolas Spycher

Nicolas Spycher is a geochemist in the Energy Geosciences Division at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. He has over thirty years of applied research experience in aqueous geochemistry and numerical modeling of water/rock/gas interactions. He has contributed to

many projects dealing with coupled geochemical, hydrological, and thermal processes related to nuclear waste storage, geothermal systems, carbon geologic storage, groundwater contamination, and ore deposits.

Coast Range. Geochim Cosmochim Acta **51**:2883–2890 (1987).

- 92. Moore J, Adams M, Allis R, Lutz S and Rauzi S, Mineralogical and geochemical consequences of the long-term presence of $CO₂$ in natural reservoirs: an example from the Springerville–St. Johns Field, Arizona, and New Mexico, USA. Chem Geol **217**:365–385 (2005).
- 93. Stevens SH and Tye, BS, NACS Natural $CO₂$ Analogs for Carbon Sequestration Final Report (No. DOE Award Number DE-FC26-01NT41150). Advanced Resources International, Arlington, VA. (2007).
- 94. Jones DG, Beaubien SE, Blackford JC, Foekema EM, Lions J, De Vittor C et al., Developments since 2005 in understanding potential environmental impacts of $CO₂$ leakage from geological storage. Int J Greenhouse Gas Control **40**:350–377 (2015).

Jeremy Domen

Jeremy Domen is a researcher at Lawrence Berkeley National Lab and PSE Healthy Energy. His research interests are the environmental impacts of oil and gas development and clean energy transition. His research work is related to methane emissions and water quality impacts from upstream oil

and gas.

Anthony Credoz

Anthony Credoz is a R&D Engineer with fifteen years of research experience in lab, modeling and industrial fields for environmental monitoring from deep underground issues to space acquisitions. He has contributed to many international projects dealing with energy production and

distribution, $CO₂$ capture and geological storage and soil, groundwater and vegetation characterization and remediation. Currently, he is managing Earth Observation and Artificial Intelligence R&D actions at TotalEnergies.