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Abstract

Geologic sequestration of carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) in a deep, saline aquifer is being proposed for a power-generating facility in Florida as a method to mitigate contribution to global climate change from greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The proposed repository is a brine-saturated, dolomitic-limestone aquifer with anhydrite inclusions contained within the Cedar Keys/Lawson formations of Central Florida. Thermodynamic modeling is used to investigate the geochemical equilibrium reactions for the minerals calcite, dolomite, and gypsum with 28 aqueous species for the purpose of determining the sensitivity of mineral precipitation and dissolution to the temperature and pressure of the aquifer and the salinity and initial pH of the brine. The use of different theories for estimating CO$_2$ fugacity, solubility in brine, and chemical activity is demonstrated to have insignificant effects on the predicted results. Nine different combinations of thermodynamic models predict that the geochemical response to CO$_2$ injection is calcite and dolomite dissolution and gypsum precipitation, with good agreement among the quantities estimated. In all cases, CO$_2$ storage through solubility trapping is demonstrated to be a likely process, while storage through mineral trapping is predicted to not occur. Over the range of values examined, it is found that net mineral dissolution and precipitation is relatively sensitive to temperature and salinity, insensitive to CO$_2$ injection pressure and initial pH, and significant changes to porosity will not occur.
1: Introduction

It is becoming increasingly accepted by the scientific community that global climate change due to anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG) is occurring. Greenhouse gases are being released at higher rate than the biosphere’s ability to absorb them, with a resulting net increase of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere (1). A greenhouse gas of primary concern is carbon dioxide (CO₂). One of the major sources of CO₂ emissions is the combustion of fossil fuels for power generation and industrial processes in today’s energy-intensive global economy (1). Part of the long-term solution to global climate change is widespread adoption of low carbon fuels for power generation and industrial processes; however, in the near term, techniques to reduce CO₂ emissions are being investigated (1).

One of the more promising mitigation techniques being investigated is capturing CO₂ from large point-source emitters and storing it to prevent release to the atmosphere (1; 2). This process, commonly referred to as carbon capture and storage (CCS), relies on technologies that have already been implemented at smaller scales by the oil and gas industries for enhanced oil recovery (EOR) and CO₂ disposal from natural gas refining (1; 2). Proposed repositories for large-scale storage of captured CO₂ include depleted oil and natural gas fields, coal beds, the deep ocean, and deep saline aquifers (1; 2). Deep saline aquifers are ideal candidates for storing CO₂ because they are commonly
found throughout the world, often have large storage capacity and ideal geologic properties, are not used as drinking water sources, and are isolated from the biosphere (1; 3; 4).

Injection of CO$_2$ into deep aquifers for geologic storage requires a compressed CO$_2$ stream recovered from industrial processes and an injection well drilled into the receiving formation (2). Typically, the CO$_2$ is injected into and maintained within the aquifer under supercritical conditions to take advantage of higher density of the CO$_2$ phase under these conditions; in other words, more mass of CO$_2$ is stored per bulk aquifer volume when it is supercritical versus when it is gaseous (1). As CO$_2$ injection into the aquifer continues, it will displace the native brine as it sweeps through the formation (2). As the native brine is being displaced by CO$_2$ sweeping, some brine will remain trapped in pores due to capillary forces. This trapped brine is known as the residual brine saturation, and may absorb CO$_2$ from the injected CO$_2$ phase.

Carbon dioxide storage in deep saline aquifers involves many uncertainties from geochemical and geologic perspectives. Carbon dioxide storage in a deep saline aquifer results in numerous geochemical reactions between the native brine and the rock minerals that comprise the aquifer formation (2; 4). These reactions are expected to result in dissolution and precipitation of different minerals, and this can have consequences related to formation integrity and storage efficiency (4). Excess mineral dissolution could weaken the aquifer formation, which could increase the risk of CO$_2$ escaping into other geologic formations (1; 5). Conversely, excess mineral precipitation could decrease the porosity of the formation, potentially decreasing the permeability of the aquifer to injected CO$_2$ or decreasing the available volume for bulk CO$_2$ storage (6).
The University of South Florida has been investigating the feasibility of capturing CO$_2$ from a power generating facility in Polk County, Florida and storing it in a deep, dolomitic-limestone aquifer located within the Cedar Keys/Lawson formation of Central Florida (7; 8; 9). Geochemical modeling of CCS in this formation has been previously performed by researchers at the University of South Florida using TOUGHREACT software (7). The previous models predicted that CO$_2$ injection in this formation would lower the pH of the native brine, resulting in the dissolution of calcite and dolomite and the precipitation of gypsum (7). Additionally, it was found that porosity increased very slightly due to excess mineral dissolution in areas where CO$_2$-saturated brine interacts with the mineral phase (7). However, further investigation into the methods used by the TOUGHREACT software for estimating thermodynamic parameters (activity coefficients, fugacity coefficients, solubility) is deemed warranted. Alternative geochemical models of CCS in the Cedar Keys/Lawson injection zone that yield similar predictions to those of TOUGHREACT simulations would lend support to the results reported by Cunningham et al. (7).

The first objective of this thesis is to develop a general thermodynamic framework for geochemical modeling of CO$_2$ injection into a dolomitic limestone aquifer that is representative of the Cedar Keys/Lawson injection zone. After developing a framework for geochemical modeling, the next objective is to examine the system sensitivity to different methods for estimating thermodynamic parameters for CO$_2$. The third objective is to investigate the system sensitivity to geophysical and chemical parameters like initial pH, CO$_2$ injection pressure, brine salinity, and temperature. The final objective of this
thesis is to use the results of the geochemical model to estimate changes in porosity induced by CO$_2$ injection.

This thesis will first discuss existing knowledge of CO$_2$ injection into deep saline aquifers (Chapter 2). It will then explore the thermodynamic variables involved in describing the geochemical system and different methods for their estimation (Chapter 3). This will be followed by discussion of the calculation methodology required to solve non-linear geochemical equations that describe the chemistry induced by CO$_2$ dissolution into residual brine (Chapter 4). Finally, data obtained from the models related to mineral precipitation and dissolution and changes in porosity will be presented (Chapter 5), and appropriate conclusions will be drawn (Chapter 6).
2: Literature Review

A great deal of research on CO\textsubscript{2} injection into geologic formations is available in the literature for a wide variety of conditions and intended purpose of storage. While the idea of widespread and large-scale capture and storage of CO\textsubscript{2} from facilities like fossil fuel power plants is relatively new, the process and technologies of injecting CO\textsubscript{2} underground are not (1; 10). Carbon dioxide injection has been used primarily in the oil industry as a way to increase oil production from declining fields and in the gas industry as a way to dispose of CO\textsubscript{2} that is stripped from natural gas during refining operations, though at a smaller scale than would be needed for widespread adoption of CO\textsubscript{2} sequestration from power generation facilities (1; 10). Much of the research has focused on CO\textsubscript{2} storage in sandstone formations because they often hold oil or natural gas and often include the possibility of mineral trapping due to the presence of aluminosilicate minerals (1; 11; 12). However, recent research has also considered the possibility of using carbonate formations as CO\textsubscript{2} storage repositories (5; 6; 13). Studies have included both laboratory experiments and computer modeling of expected conditions for a CO\textsubscript{2} injection process into a carbonate aquifer (4; 5; 6; 13; 14).

Carbon dioxide is trapped in a deep saline aquifer by several processes. Initially, CO\textsubscript{2} is trapped within the pores of the aquifer formation due to capillary forces and underneath the aquifer confining layer by hydrodynamic forces due to buoyancy (1; 2). As time passes, CO\textsubscript{2} is further trapped in the aquifer by dissolution and speciation into
native brine through solubility and ionic trapping (1; 2). Finally, dissolved carbonate species can be further trapped by combining with dissolved cations to form solid mineral precipitates in thermodynamic equilibrium with the brine during a process known as mineral trapping (1; 2).

It has been suggested that mineral trapping of CO$_2$ in a typical calcium carbonate aquifer (i.e. calcium or calcite is present in significant amounts) is not a viable mechanism for CO$_2$ storage due to the increase in solubility of calcium carbonate minerals at low pH conditions resulting from CO$_2$ dissolution into native brine (4; 6; 13). This is in contrast to the precipitation of low-solubility carbonate minerals that is expected in aluminosilicate-rich, iron-rich, or magnesium-rich aquifer formations (3; 10; 11). Modeling performed by others typically predicts a pH around 4.8 as a result of CO$_2$ dissolution into brine contained within a carbonate aquifer (5; 7). Solution buffering by bicarbonate ion (HCO$_3^-$) due to dissolution of carbonate-containing minerals is predicted to be the dominant mechanism for determining the pH of CO$_2$-saturated brine in carbonate aquifers (4; 5; 7). Additionally, solution buffering enhances the dissolution of CO$_2$, and this can contribute to additional CO$_2$ storage by solubility trapping (5; 15).

Calcite, if present, is always predicted to dissolve locally when it is in contact with CO$_2$-saturated brine (5; 6; 7; 13), although some studies have found that it can precipitate downstream from areas of high dissolution due to particle trapping in pores and exposure to high bicarbonate concentration in displaced brine (6). The net calcite dissolution is predicted to be relatively low when compared to its abundance in the mineral phase (i.e., aquifer matrix) (5; 7). However, near the injection well, some have noted that calcite dissolution can be quite high, leading to large increases in porosity with high connectivity.
– i.e. channeling through the rock formation (4). Dolomite, if it is also present in the mineral phase, has been predicted by some models to dissolve along with calcite when in contact with CO\(_2\) saturated brine (5; 7). However, other models predict that dolomite can precipitate when magnesium-saturated brine encounters a pure calcite phase (13). Cunningham et al. also suggest that gypsum precipitates due to increased Ca\(^{2+}\) concentrations released by calcite and dolomite dissolution when sulfate ion (SO\(_4^{2-}\)) is present (7).

In the literature, most computer models of single-phase CO\(_2\) injection into carbonate aquifers typically predict that that permeability and porosity are not likely to be significantly affected (5; 7; 13). However, some research suggests that micro-scale anisotropic features of the aquifer formation can influence mineral dissolution and precipitation and have a significant effect on changes in porosity and permeability (13; 14). This is consistent with lab experiments performed by Izgec et al. (6). Others have explored the difference between injecting pure-phase CO\(_2\) versus CO\(_2\)-saturated brine and found that injection of CO\(_2\)-saturated brine can damage the aquifer formation by excessive carbonate mineral dissolution. This is a result of continuous refreshing of CO\(_2\)-saturated brine that is cation-deficient near the wellhead (4). In general, however, most studies do not predict that changes in porosity and permeability due to geochemical effects of CO\(_2\) injection into carbonate aquifers represent a significant impediment to implementation (4; 5; 7).

Most research into the geochemical effects of CO\(_2\) injection into a carbonate aquifer suggests that carbonate minerals will dissolve. However, there is some disagreement over the extent of carbonate mineral dissolution and the effects of this dissolution on porosity
and permeability. Furthermore, there is a lack of data comparing the effects of the choices of different methods for estimating thermodynamic parameters on the geochemical system. Finally, there is little information available in the literature on the sensitivity of the geochemistry involved with CO₂ injection into a carbonate aquifer to physical and chemical parameters like initial pH, CO₂ injection pressure, and brine salinity.
3: Estimating Thermodynamic Variables

To model the effects of CO\textsubscript{2} injection into a carbonate aquifer, the system must be described in a thermodynamic context. This thermodynamic description is based on solubility equilibrium relationships for minerals, aqueous complexes, and CO\textsubscript{2} with ions dissolved in the native brine of the aquifer formation. Deviations from ideal thermodynamic behavior due to high pressure, salinity, and temperature are accounted for by activity coefficients for aqueous species and by a fugacity coefficient for the supercritical CO\textsubscript{2} phase.

3.1: Equilibrium Constant, \( K \)

The equilibrium constant, \( K \), represents the ratio of product activities to reactant activities that occurs when the forward and reverse rates of a reaction are equal (i.e., the reaction is at equilibrium). Consider a chemical reaction where the reactants \( A \) and \( B \) are in equilibrium with the products \( C \) and \( D \). The reaction can be written in the following manner:

\[
aA + bB \rightleftharpoons cC + dD
\]

Equation 1

where lowercase letters represent a stoichiometric coefficient and uppercase letters represent a chemical species. The equilibrium constant is given by the following expression:
where \( a_j \) represents the chemical activity of species \( j \).

Equilibrium constants for many reactions have been determined experimentally and values are available in the literature. For this study, equilibrium constants are taken from the thermodynamic database included with the TOUGHREACT geochemical modeling software (16). This database has equilibrium constants for many geochemical reactions as functions of temperature and is considered valid over a temperature range of 0-300°C (16). The equilibrium constants for most reactions considered in this paper are calculated using an equation of the following form (16):

\[
\log K = a \ln T + b + cT + \frac{d}{T} + \frac{e}{T^2}
\]

where \( K \) is the equilibrium constant, \( T \) is the temperature in Kelvin and \( a \) through \( e \) are constants that are defined in the geochemical database for each equilibrium reaction (16). Most of the geochemical reactions considered in this thesis are analyzed using equilibrium constants.

### 3.2: Activity Coefficient, \( \gamma \)

The activity coefficient, \( \gamma \), relates the activity of a chemical species to its concentration, and is a way to account for non-ideal effects that occur at high ionic strength, temperature, and pressure. The following equation describes the relationship between chemical activity and the activity coefficient:

\[
a_i = \gamma_i m_i
\]
where \( a_i \) is the activity of chemical \( i \) and \( m_i \) represents the molal concentration of \( i \). The activity coefficient must be estimated for the following three types of aqueous species: neutral, ionic, and dissolved CO\(_2\). Methods for estimating activity coefficients for these different types of aqueous species are described below.

3.2.1: Activity Coefficient for Neutral Aqueous Species

A neutral species is a solvated complex containing positive and negative ions with a net charge of zero. Examples include NaHCO\(_3\)\(_{aq}\), NaCl\(_{aq}\), CaCO\(_3\)\(_{aq}\), etc. The activity of aqueous neutral species is assumed to be equal to unity (11; 16).

3.2.2: Activity Coefficient for Charged Aqueous Species

Charged aqueous species includes ions and charged aqueous complexes. When charged species are dissolved in a solvent that contains high concentrations of other charged species, the effects of individual species are dampened due to ionic interactions. This dampening effect is quantified by the activity coefficient, \( \gamma \). In general, charged aqueous species have activity coefficients that are less than unity.

To calculate the activity coefficient for charged aqueous species, the method presented by Helgeson et al. (17) is used. This method is chosen because it is applicable for temperatures between 0-600°C, pressures up to 5000 bar, and chloride brines up to 6 molal ionic strength (16; 17). This is the calculation method that is used in the TOUGHREACT software (16). The expression for estimating activity coefficients of charged aqueous species is as follows (16; 17):
where \( A_\gamma \) and \( B_\gamma \) are Debye-Huckel parameters; \( z_j \) is the ionic charge for charged species \( j \); \( \tilde{I} \) is the true ionic strength in molal units; \( \vec{d}_j \) is the ion distance of closest approach for ion \( j \); \( m^* \) is the sum of molal concentrations for all dissolved species; \( \omega_{\text{abs},j} \) is the absolute Born coefficient for charged species \( j \); and \( b_{NaCl} \) and \( b_{Na^+,Cl^-} \) are parameters describing ionic interaction.

The equations to estimate Debye-Huckel parameters \( A_\gamma \) and \( B_\gamma \) were regressed as functions of temperature and pressure using data given in Tables 1 and 2 of Helgeson et al. (18). These tables contain experimental data values for these Debye-Huckel parameters at different temperatures for the saturation pressure of water and five constant pressures ranges between 1 kilobar and 5 kilobar. Linear interpolation is used for estimating values that lie between the constant pressure lines. Plots of \( A_\gamma \) and \( B_\gamma \) as functions of temperature for the different pressures are obtained using data from the literature (18) and are presented in the following figures:
Figure 1: Debye-Huckel Parameter $A_\gamma$ as a Function of Temperature at Constant Pressures

Figure 2: Debye-Huckel Parameter $B_\gamma$ as a Function of Temperature at Constant Pressures
The true ionic strength is given by the following equation (17):

\[ \bar{I} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_j m_j z_j^2 + \sum_q m_q z_q^2 \right) \]  

Equation 6

where \( m \) represents molal concentration, subscript \( j \) represents free ionic species and subscript \( q \) represents aqueous complexes. This is different from the stoichiometric ionic strength, where the concentrations in the calculation do not take into account whether the ions are complexed with other ions. Stoichiometric ionic strength is defined by the following equation (17):

\[ I = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_j m_j z_j^2 + \sum_q v_j m_{q,j} z_j^2 \right) \]  

Equation 7

where \( m_j \) represents the molal concentration of the free ion \( j \), \( v_j \) is the stoichiometric coefficient of species \( j \) combined in aqueous complex \( q \), and \( m_{q,j} \) represents the molal concentration of aqueous complex \( q \) containing ion \( j \). Note that in the aqueous complex summation operator, the charge of ion \( j \) is used for calculations, as opposed to the charge of aqueous complex \( q \) used in the true ionic strength calculation.

The distance of closest approach, \( \hat{a}_j \), for charged species interactions is based on the assumption that most ionic interactions will involve Na\(^+\) and Cl\(^-\) ions due to their high concentrations (16; 19). This implies that most charged species are shielded by surrounding Na\(^+\) or Cl\(^-\) ions, depending on the respective charges. The distance of closest approach is calculated as follows (16; 17; 19):
where $r_{\text{eff},j}$ is the effective ionic radius of species $j$ in Angstroms. These expressions are based on simplifications of Equation 125 of Helgeson et al. (17) by Reed (19) as explained in the TOUGHREACT user guide (16). Values for $r_{\text{eff}}$ are taken from Table 3 of Helgeson et al. (17). Note that 1.91 and 1.81 are the ionic radii in Angstroms for Na$^+$ and Cl$^-$, respectively.

The absolute Born coefficient for ion $j$, $\omega_{\text{abs},j}$, is an ion solvation parameter and is calculated as follows (16; 17):

$$\omega_{\text{abs},j} = \frac{\eta (z_j)^2}{r_{\text{eff},j}}$$  

Equation 10

where $\eta = 1.66027 \cdot 10^5$ Ang-cal/mole and $r_{\text{eff},j}$ is in Angstroms. It is related to the dielectric constant of the solution (17).

Calculating the interaction parameters $b_{\text{NaCl}}$ and $b_{\text{Na}^+,\text{Cl}^-}$ follows a procedure similar to that used for calculating the Debye-Huckel parameters. Equations were regressed based on data given in Tables 29 and 30 of Helgeson et al. (17) as functions of temperature for the saturation vapor pressure for water and at five additional constant pressures ranging from 1 kilobar to 5 kilobar. Linear interpolation is used to estimate values for interaction
parameters that lie between constant pressure lines. Plots of $b_{\text{NaCl}}$ and $b_{\text{Na}^+,\text{Cl}^-}$ are given in the following figures:

Figure 3: Helgeson Interaction Parameter $b_{\text{NaCl}}$ as a Function of Temperature at Constant Pressures
In summary, Equations 5, 6, and 8-10 are used with data given in Figures 1-4 to estimate the activity coefficient for each species of dissolved ion and charged aqueous complex.

### 3.2.3: Activity Coefficient for Aqueous CO$_2$

The activity coefficient for aqueous (dissolved) CO$_2$ describes the non-ideal effects of high temperature, pressure, and ionic strength on the chemical activity of CO$_2$(aq). This
coefficient is used to account for the “salting-out” effect that decreases CO
2 solubility in high ionic strength solutions as compared with pure water (16; 20). At low ionic strengths, the activity coefficient for dissolved CO
2 is considered to be unity (16; 21). However, the activity coefficient increases at high ionic strength as the solution becomes more “crowded” for dissolved CO
2 and dissolution is less than predicted based on ideal thermodynamic considerations. For this study, three different models are used to estimate \( \gamma_{CO2} \).

3.2.3.1: \textit{Method of Drummond (22)}

This model is a function of temperature and ionic strength and is given by the following expression (16; 22):

\[
\ln \gamma_{CO2} = \left( C + FT + \frac{G}{T} \right) I - (E + HT) \left( \frac{I}{I + 1} \right)
\]

Equation 11

where \( T \) is the temperature in Kelvin; \( I \) is the molal ionic strength; and \( C, F, G, E \) and \( H \) are constants tabulated by Drummond (16; 22). This model has been cited in numerous publications and has been incorporated into TOUGHREACT geochemical modeling software as well as others (16). This model is valid for a temperature range of 20-400 °C and 0-6.5 molal NaCl concentration and yields the molal scale activity coefficient for aqueous CO
2 (16; 22).

3.2.3.2: \textit{Method of Rumpf et al. (23)}

This model is a function of temperature and ionic strength and is given by the following expression (21; 23):

\[
\ln \gamma_{CO2} = 2m_{salt}B^{(0)} + 3(m_{salt})^2 \Gamma
\]

Equation 12
where (21; 23):

\[
B^{(0)} = 0.254 - \frac{76.82}{T} - \frac{10656}{T^2} + \frac{6312 \times 10^3}{T^3}
\]

Equation 13

and (21; 23):

\[
\Gamma = -0.0028
\]

Equation 14

where \( T \) is the temperature in Kelvin and \( m_{salt} \) is the molal concentration of all dissolved salt species. A variation presented by Spycher et al. (21) based on a simplification presented by Duan et al. (24) is included to yield the final form of the equation (21):

\[
\ln \gamma_{CO2} = 2B^{(0)}\left(m_{Na} + m_K + 2m_{Ca} + 2m_{Mg}\right) + 3\Gamma m_{Cl}\left(m_{Na} + m_K + m_{Ca} + m_{Mg}\right)
\]

Equation 15

where \( m \) is the molal concentration of the indicated species. This method is valid for temperature from 313-433 K and 0-6 molal salt concentration and yields a molal scale activity coefficient (21).

3.2.3.3: Method of Duan and Sun (25)

This model is a function of temperature, pressure, and ionic strength, and is given by the following expression (25):

\[
\ln \gamma_{CO2} = 2\lambda\left(m_{Na} + m_K + 2m_{Ca} + 2m_{Mg}\right) + \zeta m_{Cl}\left(m_{Na} + m_K + m_{Ca} + m_{Mg}\right) - 0.07m_{SO4}
\]

Equation 16

where \( \lambda \) and \( \zeta \) are parameters calculated based on the following equation (25):
where $P$ is the pressure in bars, $T$ is the temperature in Kelvin, and $c_i$ through $c_{11}$ are constants from Table 2 of Duan and Sun (25). Note that $\lambda$ and $\zeta$ use different sets of constants $c_i$ through $c_{11}$. This CO$_2$ activity coefficient model is valid for temperatures of 273-573 K, pressures of 0-2000 bar and ionic strengths of 0-4.3 molal (25).

3.3: Estimating the Fugacity Coefficient for Gaseous and Supercritical CO$_2$, $\varphi_{CO2}$

The fugacity coefficient, $\varphi_{CO2}$, is a parameter used to describe the deviation from ideal thermodynamic behavior of gaseous/supercritical CO$_2$ that is observed at high temperature and pressure. The fugacity coefficient is used to calculate the fugacity of the CO$_2$(g,sc) phase, a thermodynamic value that is akin to the activity of an aqueous species. Gas phase fugacity is calculated as follows:

$$ F = \varphi_{CO2} * P_{CO2} $$

where $F$ is the fugacity, $\varphi$ is the fugacity coefficient, and $P_{CO2}$ is the partial pressure of CO$_2$ in bars. For this study, two models are used to estimate $\varphi_{CO2}$ as described below.

3.3.1: Method of Spanyer and Reed (26)

This model, a function of temperature and pressure, is given by the following expression (26):

$$ \ln \varphi_{CO2} = \left( \frac{a}{T^2} + \frac{b}{T} + c \right) P + \left( \frac{d}{T^2} + \frac{e}{T} + f \right) \frac{P^2}{2} $$

Equation 19
where $T$ is the temperature in Kelvin; $P$ is the total gas pressure in bars; and $a$, $b$, $c$, $d$, $e$ and $f$ are constants given by Spycher and Reed (26). This model is applicable for a temperature range of 50-350°C and pressure up to 500 bars (26). It is reported that there are significant discrepancies between the estimated compressibility factor, $Z$, using this model and experimentally observed values of $Z$ at the $P$-$T$ ranges considered (26). This indicates that the method of Spycher and Reed (26) might not be the best method for estimating the CO$_2$ fugacity coefficient. However, this model has been incorporated into the geochemical modeling software TOUGHREACT (16) and is thus considered in this thesis.

3.3.2: Method of Duan et al. (20)

This model, also a function of temperature and pressure, is given by the following expression (20):

$$
\varphi_{CO_2} = c_1 + \left[ c_2 + c_3T + \frac{c_4}{T} + \frac{c_5}{(T - 150)} \right]P + \left[ c_6 + c_7T + \frac{c_8}{T} \right]P^2
+ \left[ c_9 + c_{10}T + \frac{c_{11}}{T} \right] \ln P + \frac{[c_{12} + c_{13}T]}{P} + \frac{c_{14}}{T} + c_{15}T^2
$$

Equation 20

where $T$ is the temperature in Kelvin, $P$ is the pressure in bars, and $c_1 - c_{15}$ are constants given in Table 1 of Duan et al. (20). This model has been fitted to experimental data for six T-P ranges ranging from 273-573K and 0-2000 bar (20).

3.4: Estimating the Activity of Water, $a_W$

The activity of water, $a_W$, is considered to be unity under ideal conditions. However, at elevated temperature, pressure, and ionic strength, the activity of water begins to deviate from unity as a function of the osmotic coefficient, $\Phi$ (16; 17):
\[ \ln a_w = -\Phi \frac{m^*}{55.51} \]  

Equation 21

where \( m^* \) is the total molal concentration of all dissolved ions. The osmotic coefficient, \( \Phi \), is calculated as follows (16):

\[ \Phi = \frac{-2.303}{m^*} \sum_j m_{t,j} \left[ \frac{A_j z_j^2 I^{0.5} \sigma}{3} + \frac{\log \left( 1 + \frac{m^*/55.51}{m^*/55.51} \right)}{m^*/55.51} \right. 
\]

\[ \left. - 0.50 \left( l_{\omega,\text{abs},j} b_{\text{NaCl}} + [b_{Na^+,Cl^-} - 0.19(|z_j| - 1)] \frac{m_{\text{CHRG}}}{2} \right) \right] \]  

Equation 22

where (16; 17):

\[ \sigma = \frac{3}{\tilde{A}^3 B_y^{2/3} I^{1.5}} \left( \frac{1}{\tilde{A}} - 2 \ln \tilde{A} \right) \]  

Equation 23

where (16; 17):

\[ \tilde{A} = 1 + \tilde{A} B_y \sqrt{I} \]  

Equation 24

where \( I \) is the stoichiometric ionic strength (see Equation 7), \( m_{t,j} \) is the total molal concentration of ion \( j \), and \( m_{\text{CHRG}} \) is the total molal concentration of all charged species in solution. This procedure for calculating the osmotic coefficient utilizes several modifications presented in the TOUGHREACT user manual (16). The original form of the osmotic coefficient equation is Equation 190 of Helgeson et al. (17); and assuming NaCl dominance in solution, would yield this expression (17):
Note that this is a function of the true ionic strength, $I$ (see Equation 6). However, it is reported in the TOUGHREACT user guide (16), and implemented in the TOUGHREACT program, that using the stoichiometric ionic strength and half the charged species molality more accurately matches experimentally obtained data than the original formulation based solely on the true ionic strength (16).

3.5: Aqueous CO$_2$ Concentration, $m_{CO2}$

The molal concentration of dissolved CO$_2$ in brine is estimated using four methods.

3.5.1: Equilibrium Constant

This method is based on the equilibrium expression for the following chemical reaction:

$$\text{CO}_2(\text{g,sc}) + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightleftharpoons \text{H}^+ + \text{HCO}_3^-$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation 26}

$$K_{CO2(\text{g,sc})} = \frac{a_{H^+}a_{\text{HCO}_3^-}}{F_{CO2}a_W}$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation 27}

where $F_{CO2}$ is the fugacity of gaseous/supercritical CO$_2$, which is estimated using techniques discussed in Section 3.3. The activity of bicarbonate ion is constrained additionally by equilibrium with dissolved CO$_2$ according to the following equations:
\[
\text{CO}_2^{(aq)} + \text{H}_2\text{O}^\text{aq} \leftrightarrow \text{H}^+ + \text{HCO}_3^-
\]
Equation 28

\[
K_{\text{CO}_2^{(aq)}} = \frac{(a_{\text{H}^+})(a_{\text{HCO}_3^-})}{(a_{\text{CO}_2^{(aq)}})(a_{w})}
\]
Equation 29

The value for \( K_{\text{CO}_2^{(aq)}} \) is taken from thermodynamic database included with TOUGHREACT geochemical modeling software and is calculated as a function of temperature. At 45°C, the log \( K_{\text{CO}_2^{(aq)}} \) value is -6.273 (16). The activity of \( \text{CO}_2^{(aq)} \) is related to the molal concentration of \( \text{CO}_2 \) by the following equation:

\[
m_{\text{CO}_2} = \frac{a_{\text{CO}_2^{(aq)}}}{Y_{\text{CO}_2}}
\]
Equation 30

The equations simplify to yield an expression for \( m_{\text{CO}_2} \) as a function of \( \text{CO}_2 \) fugacity, equilibrium constants, and activity coefficient. The concentration of dissolved \( \text{CO}_2 \), along with the solution pH, is used to estimate the activity of bicarbonate, \( \text{HCO}_3^- \), which all other geochemical species are functions of. The pH is then iterated until the geochemical system converges.

3.5.2: Method of Duan and Sun (25)

This model is a function of temperature, pressure and salt content, and is given by Equation 9 of Duan and Sun (25):

\[
\ln m_{\text{CO}_2} = \ln(Y_{\text{CO}_2} P_{\text{TOTCO}_2} \varphi_{\text{CO}_2}) - \frac{\mu_{\text{CO}_2}^{(0)}}{RT} - 2\lambda(m_{\text{Na}} + m_{\text{K}} + 2m_{\text{Ca}} + 2m_{\text{Mg}}) - \zeta(m_{\text{Cl}}(m_{\text{Na}} + m_{\text{K}} + m_{\text{Ca}} + m_{\text{Mg}}) + 0.07m_{\text{SO}_4}
\]
Equation 31
where \( y_{CO2} \) is the CO\(_2\) mole fraction in the gaseous phase (assumed in this study to be unity) and \( \mu_{CO2}^{l(0)} \) is the difference between the chemical potentials of CO\(_2\) in the gaseous phase and the liquid phase (20). The value of \( \mu_{CO2}^{l(0)}/RT \) is calculated similarly to \( \lambda \) and \( \zeta \) using constants given in Table 2 of Duan and Sun (2003). This CO\(_2\) solubility model is valid for temperatures of 273-573K, pressures of 0-2000 bar and ionic strengths of 0-4.3 m, and yields values that are within 10% of experimentally observed values (20).

3.5.3: Method of Spycher and Pruess (21)

This model is a function of temperature, pressure and salt content, and is given by Equation 2 of Spycher and Pruess (21):

\[
x_{CO2} = \frac{\Phi_{CO2}(1 - y_{H2O}) P_{TOT}}{55.51 y'_{s} K_{CO2(g)}^{0}} \exp \left( \frac{-(P - P^0) \bar{V}}{RT} \right)
\]

where \( y_{H2O} \) is the water mole fraction in the gaseous phase (assumed to be zero for this study); \( y'_s \) is the mole fraction scale activity coefficient for aqueous CO\(_2\); \( K_{CO2}^{0} \) is the thermodynamic equilibrium constant for CO\(_2\) dissolution; \( P^0 \) is 1 bar; and \( \bar{V} \) is the average partial molar volume of CO\(_2\) over the \( P^0 \rightarrow P \) range, which is assumed to be 32.6 cm\(^3\)/mole based on data in Table 2 of Spycher and Pruess (21).

To calculate \( K_{CO2}^{0} \), the following equation is used (21):

\[
K_{CO2(g)}^{0} = a + bT + cT^2 + dT^3
\]

where \( a, b, c, \) and \( d \) are constants given in Table 2 of Spycher and Pruess (21) and \( T \) is temperature in degrees Celsius.
The mole fraction activity coefficient for CO₂ can be converted from the molal scale activity coefficient (see Section 3.2.3:) with the following equation (21):

$$
\gamma'_x = \gamma'_m \left[ \frac{(1 + m_{CO2} + m_{salt})/55.51}{1 + m_{CO2}/55.51} \right]
$$

Equation 34

where $m_{salt}$ is the total molal concentration of all species that are not aqueous CO₂ and $\gamma'_m$ is the molal scale activity coefficient that is calculated using methods presented earlier. It is reported by Sypcher and Pruess (21) that more accurate results are obtained using the methodology of Duan and Sun (25) or Rumpf et al. (23) for calculating $\gamma'_m$.

The molal concentration of aqueous CO₂ can be determined from the mole fraction of aqueous CO₂ using the following relationship (21):

$$
m_{CO2} = x_{CO2} (m_{salt} + 55.51) \frac{1}{1 - x_{CO2}}
$$

Equation 35

Unlike the previous two models for CO₂ aqueous solubility, this model requires an iterative solution. This is due to the need to convert between mole fraction and molal scales. The solution procedure is as follows:

1. Make initial guess for $m_{CO2,GUESS}$
2. $\gamma'_x = f(m_{CO2,GUESS})$
3. $x_{CO2} = f(\gamma'_x)$
4. $m_{CO2,NEW} = f(x_{CO2})$
5. \[ \Delta = |m_{CO2,\text{GUESS}} - m_{CO2,\text{NEW}}| \]

6. If \( \Delta > \text{tolerance} \), \( m_{CO2,\text{GUESS}} = m_{CO2,\text{NEW}} \), repeat from Step 2.
   If \( \Delta < \text{tolerance} \), solution has converged.

The methodology presented by Spycher and Pruess (21) is valid from 12-100°C, 1-600 bar and 0-6 molal NaCl concentration (21). However, the iterative procedure is slightly cumbersome for calculations.

3.5.4: Spycher and Pruess (21) adaptation of the method of Duan and Sun (25)

This methodology is a combination of models presented in Spycher et al. (27) and Duan and Sun (25) that is presented in Spycher and Pruess (21). If the CO\(_2\) solubility model presented by Duan and Sun (25) is simplified into standard thermodynamic variables and the natural-log terms are eliminated, the following equation results (21):

\[
\text{Equation 36}
\]

\[ m_{CO2} = \frac{F_{CO2}}{K_{CO2} \gamma_{CO2}} \]

where \( F_{CO2} \) is the fugacity of the gaseous CO\(_2\) phase, \( K_{CO2} \) is the thermodynamic equilibrium constant and \( \gamma_{CO2} \) is the activity coefficient of aqueous CO\(_2\). Now assume there are two systems that are identical except that one consists of pure water and the other system consists of a brine solution with known ionic concentrations.

For pure water (21):

\[
\text{Equation 37}
\]

\[ m_{CO2}^0 = \frac{F_{CO2}}{K_{CO2} \gamma_{CO2}^0} \]
For brine (21):

\[
m_{\text{CO}_2} = \frac{F_{\text{CO}_2}}{K_{\text{CO}_2} \gamma_{\text{CO}_2}}
\]

Equation 38

The gas phase fugacity and thermodynamic equilibrium constants are equal because they are functions of temperature and pressure but not salt content. Thus (21):

\[
\frac{m_{\text{CO}_2}^0}{m_{\text{CO}_2}} = \frac{\gamma_{\text{CO}_2}}{\gamma_{\text{CO}_2}^0}
\]

Equation 39

However, in pure water, \( \gamma_{\text{CO}_2} \) approaches unity (16; 21; 27). Thus (21):

\[
\frac{m_{\text{CO}_2}^0}{m_{\text{CO}_2}} = \gamma_{\text{CO}_2}
\]

Equation 40

Solving for \( m_{\text{CO}_2} \) (21):

\[
m_{\text{CO}_2} = \frac{m_{\text{CO}_2}^0}{\gamma_{\text{CO}_2}}
\]

Equation 41

To determine \( \gamma_{\text{CO}_2} \), the activity coefficient expression presented by Duan and Sun (25) is used (21), although it appears that any suitable method for estimating \( \gamma_{\text{CO}_2} \) could suffice. To determine the solubility of \( \text{CO}_2 \) in pure water, \( m_{\text{CO}_2}^0 \), the methodology presented by Sypcher et al. (27) is used. This model is given by the following equation (27):

\[
x_{\text{CO}_2}^0 = \frac{\Phi_{\text{CO}_2}(1 - \gamma_{\text{H}_2\text{O}})P_{\text{rot}}}{55.51 K_{\text{CO}_2(g)}^{\theta}} \exp \left( \frac{-[P - P^0]V}{RT} \right)
\]

Equation 42
This model for determining solubility in pure water is identical to the model for determining CO\textsubscript{2} solubility (see Equation 32) in brine with the exception of the missing $\gamma'_x$ term, which is neglected because $\gamma'_x$ approaches unity in pure water (21). Eliminating the $\gamma'_x$ term makes the solution procedure non-iterative because there is no conversion from mole fraction to molal scale. All other model parameters are calculated in an identical fashion to the procedure presented by Spycher and Pruess (21).

3.6: Summary

The parameters discussed in this chapter are used to describe the thermodynamic environment of a geochemical system. These parameters include solubility equilibrium constants for mineral precipitation and dissolution, for the formation of aqueous complexes, and for dissolution of CO\textsubscript{2}. In addition, non-ideal effects due to high pressure, salinity, and temperature are accounted for using activity and fugacity coefficients. These parameters and their methods of estimation are then incorporated into the solution procedure discussed in Chapter 4 to describe pre- and post-injection conditions for CCS in a carbonate aquifer.
4: Model Development

4.1: Model Overview

Geochemical models are used to estimate the equilibrium concentrations of various dissolved ions for the purpose of quantifying mineral precipitation and dissolution in response to CO₂ injection. To accomplish this, models were developed to describe both pre-CO₂ injection and post-CO₂ injection geochemical conditions. For pre-injection conditions, the brine pH and salinity (salt mass-fraction) and the aquifer temperature and pressure are specified parameters and are used to estimate the initial equilibrium concentrations of dissolved ions. For post-injection conditions, CO₂ injection pressure, aquifer temperature and pressure, and brine salinity are specified parameters and are used to estimate the new equilibrium pH and ion concentrations. Then, the difference between pre- and post-injection equilibrium ion concentrations is used to estimate the extent of mineral precipitation and dissolution and net CO₂ solubility trapping that occurs during thermodynamic equilibrium processes associated with CO₂ injection.

4.2: System of Geochemical Equations

The geochemical model is used to solve for the equilibrium concentrations of 28 aqueous species, the activity of water, and the solution net charge. The geochemical system is non-linear, based on 30 equations and used to solve for 30 unknown values. This system of equations includes 24 equilibrium expressions for ions and aqueous
complexes, two total mass expressions for Na\(^+\) and Cl\(^-\) ions, three equations to describe the dissociation and the activity of water, and one charge balance equation that calculates the net charge of the solution.

### 4.2.1: Rock Minerals

There are three solubility equilibrium expressions that describe the precipitation or dissolution of rock minerals assumed to be present in the aquifer. These rock minerals are calcite (CaCO\(_3\)(s)), dolomite (CaMg(CO\(_3\))\(_2\)(s)), and gypsum (CaSO\(_4\)·2H\(_2\)O(s)). These three minerals are the sources of Ca\(^{2+}\), Mg\(^{2+}\), and SO\(_4^{2-}\) ions in solution that are available for geochemical reaction. The precipitation/dissolution reactions and log \(K\) values from the TOUGHREACT database (16) for each mineral are given in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>log (K) 35°C</th>
<th>log (K) 45°C</th>
<th>log (K) 55°C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calcite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{CaCO}_3(s) + \text{H}^+ \rightleftharpoons \text{Ca}^{2+} + \text{HCO}_3^-)</td>
<td>1.703</td>
<td>1.552</td>
<td>1.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolomite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{CaMg(CO}_3)_2(s) + 2\text{H}^+ \rightleftharpoons \text{Ca}^{2+} + \text{Mg}^{2+} + 2\text{HCO}_3^-)</td>
<td>2.173</td>
<td>1.828</td>
<td>1.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{CaSO}_4(s) \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightleftharpoons \text{Ca}^{2+} + \text{SO}_4^{2-} + 2\text{H}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>-4.494</td>
<td>-4.533</td>
<td>-4.584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2: Carbonate System

There are three carbonate equilibrium expressions for \( \text{CO}_2(aq) \), \( \text{HCO}_3^- \), and \( \text{CO}_3^{2-} \) that take into account reactions of \( \text{CO}_2 \) in the aqueous phase and dissolution from the gaseous phase. For pre-injection conditions, the geochemical system is closed; i.e., there is no separate \( \text{CO}_2 \) gas phase that dissolved carbonate species must be in equilibrium with. Thus, the concentrations of aqueous carbonate species are constrained only by the assumed initial pH. For post-injection conditions, the geochemical system is open; i.e., the concentrations of aqueous carbonate species must be in equilibrium with a separate \( \text{CO}_2 \) phase that can dissolve into or out of solution. The carbonate system reactions and \( \log K \) values from the TOUGHREACT database (16) are given in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Equilibrium Reactions for Carbonate Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CO}_2(g,sc) + H_2O \overset{\text{eq}}{\rightleftharpoons} H^+ + \text{HCO}_3^- )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CO}_2(aq) + H_2O \overset{\text{eq}}{\rightleftharpoons} H^+ + \text{HCO}_3^- )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CO}_3^{2-} + H^+ \overset{\text{eq}}{\rightleftharpoons} \text{HCO}_3^- )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that that equilibrium relationship for \( \text{CO}_2(g,sc) \) and \( \text{HCO}_3^- \) in Table 2 is not used when other methods (i.e., Duan and Sun (25) or Spycher and Pruess (21)) are used to estimate the molal concentration of \( \text{CO}_2(aq) \), \( m_{\text{CO}_2} \). In this case, \( m_{\text{CO}_2} \) is estimated using other methods and the equilibrium relationship between \( \text{CO}_2(aq) \) and \( \text{HCO}_3^- \) is assumed to be valid for remaining calculations.
4.2.3: *Aqueous Complexes*

There are 18 equilibrium expressions that describe aqueous-complexing reactions that are combinations of the ions in solution made available by the previous six equilibrium reactions given in Table 1 and Table 2. These aqueous complexes include both dissolved charged species (CaCl\(^+\), MgHCO\(_3^+\), NaSO\(_4^-\), etc) and dissolved neutral species (NaCl\(_{aq}\), NaHCO\(_3\)(aq), etc). The following table contains the 18 aqueous-complexing reactions considered and their respective log \( K \) values from the TOUGHREACT database (16).

**Table 3: Equilibrium Reactions for Aqueous Complexes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>log ( K )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaCl(^+) ⇌ Ca(^{2+}) + Cl(^-)</td>
<td>0.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaCl(_2)(aq) ⇌ Ca(^{2+}) + 2Cl(^-)</td>
<td>0.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaCO(_3)(aq) + H(^+) ⇌ Ca(^{2+}) + HCO(_3^-)</td>
<td>6.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaHCO(_3^+) ⇌ Ca(^{2+}) + HCO(_3^-)</td>
<td>-1.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaOH(^+) + H(^+) ⇌ Ca(^{2+}) + H(_2)O</td>
<td>12.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaSO(_4)(aq) ⇌ Ca(^{2+}) + SO(_4^{2-})</td>
<td>-2.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCl(_{aq}) ⇌ H(^+) + Cl(^-)</td>
<td>0.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSO(_4^-) ⇌ H(^+) + SO(_4^{2-})</td>
<td>-2.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgCl(^+) ⇌ Mg(^{2+}) + Cl(^-)</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgCO(_3)(aq) + H(^+) ⇌ Mg(^{2+}) + HCO(_3^-)</td>
<td>7.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgHCO(_3^+) ⇌ Mg(^{2+}) + HCO(_3^-)</td>
<td>-1.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgOH(^+) + H(^+) ⇌ Mg(^{2+}) + H(_2)O</td>
<td>11.434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Reaction Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>log $K$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{MgSO}_4^{\text{aq}} \rightleftharpoons \text{Mg}^{2+} + \text{SO}_4^{2-}$</td>
<td>35°C: -2.510, 45°C: -2.645, 55°C: -2.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{NaCl}^{\text{aq}} \rightleftharpoons \text{Na}^+ + \text{Cl}^-$</td>
<td>0.749, 0.711, 0.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{NaCO}_3^- + \text{H}^+ \rightleftharpoons \text{Na}^+ + \text{HCO}_3^-$</td>
<td>9.864, 9.935, 10.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{NaHCO}_3^{\text{aq}} \rightleftharpoons \text{Na}^+ + \text{HCO}_3^-$</td>
<td>-0.085, -0.001, 0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{NaOH}^{\text{aq}} + \text{H}^+ \rightleftharpoons \text{Na}^+ + \text{H}_2\text{O}$</td>
<td>13.850, 13.575, 13.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{NaSO}_4^- \rightleftharpoons \text{Na}^+ + \text{SO}_4^{2-}$</td>
<td>-0.840, -0.870, -0.899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.4: Salinity

It is assumed that the salinity (salt mass fraction) is a known parameter, and the salt mass fraction is considered to be only NaCl. The contribution to salinity due to other dissolved ions is assumed to be insignificant. Thus, the total mass of Na$^+$ and Cl$^-$ available for reaction per unit volume is specified by the assumed salinity. Salinity, $S$, is defined by the following equation:

$$S = \frac{\text{mass NaCl}}{\text{mass NaCl + mass H}_2\text{O}} \times 100\% \quad \text{Equation 43}$$

where $S$ is in percent. This is used to specify the total molal concentration of Na$^+$ and Cl$^-$ ions:

$$\left( m_{\text{Na,Cl}} \right)_{\text{TOT}} = \frac{S}{MW_{\text{NaCl}} \times (1 - S)} \quad \text{Equation 44}$$

where $(m_{\text{Na,Cl}})_{\text{TOT}}$ is the total molal concentration of Na$^+$ and Cl$^-$ ions respectively, and
$MW_{NaCl}$ is the formula weight for NaCl (58.443$ \times 10^{-3}$ kg/mole). Note that this equation is applied twice in the geochemical model to determine the concentrations of both Na$^+$ and Cl$^-$. This is used as a constraint for all species containing Na$^+$ and Cl$^-$. because the sum of concentration of Na$^+$ and Cl$^-$ in all species containing Na$^+$ and Cl$^-$ must equal the total concentrations for Na$^+$ and Cl$^-$ specified by the known salt mass-fraction.

4.2.5: Water (H$_2$O) System

The dissociation of water (H$_2$O) into H$^+$ and OH$^-$ ions must be considered for any system contained within the aqueous phase. The water dissociation reaction and log $K$ values from the TOUGHREACT database (16) are given in the following table:

Table 4: Equilibrium Reactions for H$_2$O Dissociation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>log $K$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H$^+$ + OH$^-$ $\rightleftharpoons$ H$_2$O</td>
<td>13.680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The activities of H$^+$ and OH$^-$ are related to the activity of H$_2$O (see Chapter 3.4) by the following expression:

$$K_W = \frac{\alpha_{H_2O}}{\alpha_{H^+} \cdot \alpha_{OH^-}}$$  

Equation 45

The pH of the brine is related to the chemical activity of H$^+$ by the following equation:

$$pH = -\log \alpha_{H^+}$$  

Equation 46
4.2.6: Charge Balance

The charge balance equation quantifies the net charge of the solution. It is the sum of the concentrations all ionic and complexed species multiplied by their respective overall charge:

\[
NET\ CHARGE = \sum_j m_j z_j + \sum_q m_q z_q
\]

where \(m\) indicates molal concentration, \(z\) indicates charge, subscript \(j\) indicates ions and subscript \(q\) indicates aqueous complexes.

4.3: Iterative Solution Procedure

Because the system of equations is non-linear, an iterative solution procedure is required. In this iterative procedure, a basis species from the parent reactions that appears often in the system of equilibrium equations is chosen. The basis species is chosen in such a way that all other geochemical species are functions of this species and its value can be conveniently iterated until all equations are satisfied. Essentially, this means picking a basis species that is not specified by any known parameters. The molal concentration of this basis species is then iterated until the net solution charge converges to zero (within an allowable tolerance). For initial conditions (pre-injection), the basis species is bicarbonate ion, \(\text{HCO}_3^-\), because it is not constrained solely by any specified parameter (i.e. initial pH, aquifer pressure, salinity, or temperature). For calculations after \(\text{CO}_2\) injection occurs, \(\text{H}^+\) is the chosen basis species because the pH is no longer specified and the activity of \(\text{HCO}_3^-\) is now constrained by equilibrium with the gaseous \(\text{CO}_2\) phase. The solution procedure consists of an inner iteration loop and an outer iteration loop which are discussed below.
4.3.1: Inner Iteration Loop

The purpose of the inner iteration loop is to estimate concentrations of all geochemical species given a particular starting estimate for the concentration of the basis species. The inner iteration loop is necessary because thermodynamic parameters like activity coefficients, activity of water, and aqueous CO$_2$ concentration are functions of the concentrations of all geochemical species, which are functions of thermodynamic parameters and the concentration of the basis species. Figure 5 and Figure 6 are flow charts of the algorithms used for the inner iteration loop for pre- and post-injection conditions, respectively.

Figure 5: Inner Iteration Loop for Pre-CO$_2$ Injection
In order to generate initial estimates for the activities and molal concentrations of all geochemical species, activity coefficients are initially assumed to equal unity. The initial estimates for activities and molal concentrations are then used to initialize the inner iteration loop. The molal concentrations of species $j$ at iteration $n$ are solved for using the following expression:

$$
(a_j)_n = \frac{\prod (a_{a_j})^{\nu}}{K_j}^{n-1}
$$

Equation 48

where $a_{a_j}$ is the activity of all other species in the $j^{th}$ equilibrium reaction raised to their
respective stoichiometric coefficient $\nu$, and $K_j$ is the equilibrium constant for the $j^{th}$ equilibrium reaction (as given in Tables 1-4).

The activity of species $j$ is used to estimate the concentration of species $j$ at iteration $n$ with the following expression:

$$ (m_j)_n = \frac{(a_j)_n}{(\gamma_j)_n} $$  

Equation 49

where $\gamma_j$ is the activity coefficient for species $j$. The activity coefficient for the $j^{th}$ ion at iteration $n$ is estimated using concentrations and the ionic strength from the previous iteration:

$$ (\gamma_j)_n = f(T, P, z, m_{n-1}, I_{n-1}) $$  

Equation 50

The procedure is similar for estimating the activity of water at the $n^{th}$ iteration:

$$ (a_w)_n = f(T, P, z_j, m_{n-1}, I_{n-1}) $$  

Equation 51

To solve for the concentrations of free Na$^+$ and Cl$^-$ ions at iteration $n$, the following expressions are used:

$$ (m_{Na^+})_n = (m_{Na^+})_{TOTAL} - \left( \sum_q \nu_{Na^+}(m_{Na^+})_q \right)_{n-1} $$  

Equation 52

$$ (m_{Cl^-})_n = (m_{Cl^-})_{TOTAL} - \left( \sum_q \nu_{Cl^-}(m_{Cl^-})_q \right)_{n-1} $$  

Equation 53
where $m$ indicates molal concentration and $(m_{Na^+})_q$ and $(m_{Cl^-})_q$ indicate molal concentration of Na$^+$ and Cl$^-$ in aqueous complex $q$ multiplied by their stoichiometric coefficient $ν$, respectively. These concentrations for free Na$^+$ and Cl$^-$ ions are then used to solve for the activities of aqueous complexes containing Na$^+$ and Cl$^-$ ions for iteration $n$.

The inner iteration loop is considered to have converged when the change in ionic strength between successive iterations is less than a specified tolerance. A minimal change in ionic strength between iterations indicates that a stable solution has been determined for the given basis species activity.

**4.3.2: Outer Iteration Loop**

At equilibrium, the solution cannot have a net charge. Thus, the model is solved in such a way as to drive the net charge of the brine to zero, and the charge balance equation is used as the convergence criterion for the outer iteration process. An initial estimate is made for the concentration of the basis species and the inner iteration loop is solved to convergence. Then, the outer iteration loop is used to iterate the concentration of the basis species until the calculated solution charge approaches zero (within a specified tolerance). Figure 7 is a flowchart demonstrating the algorithm used for the outer iteration loop. For each iteration of the outer loop, a new value for the pH (pre-injection) or $[HCO_3^-]$ (post-injection) is tested. For each value of pH or $[HCO_3^-]$ tested, the inner iteration loop must be solved to convergence. When the solution net charge approaches zero, the system has converged and the model yields the equilibrium concentrations of the geochemical species.
4.4: Model Implementation

Computer programs were developed to calculate activity coefficients for ionic species, charged aqueous complexes, and aqueous CO$_2$; the fugacity coefficient for CO$_2$(g,sc); aqueous CO$_2$ concentration; and the activity of water. These programs are written in Visual Basic so they can be implemented in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet where inner and outer iterative calculations are performed.

The inner iteration loop is written directly into the spreadsheet as sequential blocks of cells where calculations are carried out and relevant values are passed forward to the next block. In practice, a fixed number of inner iterations are written explicitly into the
structure of the spreadsheet. Excess iterations are written into the spreadsheet to ensure that the inner loop will converge for a given estimate of the basis species concentration. In most cases, fewer than ten inner iterations are required per outer iteration, and 20 inner iterations are sufficient in all scenarios examined. The outer loop is iterated using the SOLVER function that is included in Microsoft Excel. The SOLVER function iterates the concentration of the basis species until the convergence criterion of net solution charge approaching zero is met.

4.5: Model Limitations

The geochemical model is based on the assumption of system equilibrium for both pre- and post-CO₂ injection conditions. The model only examines geochemistry in the residual brine saturation and does not address chemical processes that occur at the moving CO₂-brine interface. The model also assumes the presence of only three minerals: calcite, dolomite, and gypsum. The model is based on the assumption that only these three minerals are allowed to dissolve and/or precipitate. Finally, the model does not address advective/transport effects or chemical reaction rates.

4.6: Model Outputs

Once solved, the geochemical model yields the concentrations and activity coefficients of all aqueous species included in the system, the activity of water, and the CO₂(\text{g,sc}) fugacity for post-injection conditions. Next, the amount of minerals that precipitate or dissolve due to CO₂ injection can be estimated by examining the difference in concentrations of calcium, magnesium, and sulfate ions in solution for pre- and post-injection conditions. Positive concentration difference indicates that ions enter solution
due to mineral dissolution, and negative concentration difference indicates that ions leave solution due to mineral precipitation. Thus:

\[ \Delta Dolomite = (m_{Mg^{2+}})_{post} - (m_{Mg^{2+}})_{pre} \]  
Equation 54

\[ \Delta Gypsum = (m_{SO_4^{2-}})_{post} - (m_{SO_4^{2-}})_{pre} \]  
Equation 55

\[ \Delta Calcite = [(m_{Ca^{2+}})_{post} - (m_{Ca^{2+}})_{pre}] - \Delta Dolomite - \Delta Gypsum \]  
Equation 56

where \( m \) indicates molal concentration and subscripts \( pre \) and \( post \) refer to conditions before and after CO\(_2\) injection, respectively.

Changes in concentrations of carbonate species can also be used to estimate the net CO\(_2\) storage via the solubility trapping mechanism:

\[
\text{Net CO}_2 \text{ Storage} = \left( \sum \text{carbonate species} \right)_{post} - \left( \sum \text{carbonate species} \right)_{pre} - (\Delta Calcite + 2 \times \Delta Dolomite) \]
Equation 57

4.7: Comparison of Thermodynamic Sub-models

With three different models for estimating \( \gamma_{CO_2} \), two models for estimating \( \phi_{CO_2} \), and four models for estimating \( m_{CO_2} \), as described in Chapter 3, there are 24 possible combinations of thermodynamic sub-models that could be studied. Initially, nine overall geochemical models were developed using different combinations of the thermodynamic models, as summarized in Table 5.
Table 5: Combinations of Sub-Models for CO₂ Thermodynamic Parameter Estimation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sub-models for CO₂ thermodynamic parameter estimation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO(_{2(aq)}) Activity Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Drummond (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Drummond (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rumpf et al. (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rumpf et al. (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Duan and Sun (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Drummond (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Drummond (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Rumpf et al. (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rumpf et al. (23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These nine combinations of thermodynamic sub-models were then used to examine a baseline geochemical scenario to determine the sensitivity of model outputs to the choice of thermodynamic sub-models. The baseline geochemical scenario has an initial pH of 7.5, brine salinity of 10%, initial aquifer pressure of 100 bar, CO₂ injection pressure of 160 bar, and aquifer temperature of 45°C. The equilibrium pH, equilibrium CO₂ molality, and mineral precipitation/dissolution for calcite, dolomite and gypsum were determined for each model after CO₂ injection and plotted along with their respective average values in the following figures:
Figure 8: Equilibrium pH for Various Choices of Thermodynamic Sub-Models

Figure 9: CO₂ Molality for Various Choices of Thermodynamic Sub-Models
Figure 10: Calcite Dissolution for Various Choices of Thermodynamic Sub-Models

Figure 11: Dolomite Dissolution for Various Choices of Thermodynamic Sub-Models
Figure 12: Gypsum Precipitation for Various Choices of Thermodynamic Sub-Models

Figure 13: Net CO$_2$ Storage for Various Choices of Thermodynamic Sub-models
The average equilibrium pH is around 4.79, and this agrees closely with results in the literature (5; 7). The average CO\textsubscript{2} concentration is 1.0 molal, which also agrees generally well with results by others (5; 7). In general, the different combinations of thermodynamic models yield similar results. Precipitation of gypsum and dissolution of calcite and dolomite also agree well with predictions by others (5; 7). The average estimated net CO\textsubscript{2} storage is around 2.1 molal.

Several trends can be observed based on the choices of CO\textsubscript{2} parameter sub-models. First, the choice of methodology for estimating the activity coefficient for CO\textsubscript{2(aq)} does not have significant effect on the model predictions. Next, it is observed that systems using the equilibrium constant from the thermodynamic database for calculating the concentration of CO\textsubscript{2(aq)} (i.e., models 1-4) predict higher values for mineral precipitation and dissolution, CO\textsubscript{2(aq)} concentration, and net CO\textsubscript{2} storage than systems using the Duan and Sun (25) or the Spycher and Pruess (21) solubility models (i.e., models 5-9). This is because the equilibrium constant method for estimating CO\textsubscript{2} solubility does not take into account the effects of high ionic strength, and probably over-estimates the dissolved CO\textsubscript{2} concentration. In general, the models using more recent correlations for CO\textsubscript{2} solubility that include the effects of dissolved ions (models 5-9) are in good agreement.

Using the CO\textsubscript{2} fugacity model as a distinguishing characteristic, it is observed that models using the Spycher and Reed (26) model for CO\textsubscript{2(g,sc)} fugacity coefficient (i.e., models 1, 4, and 9) estimate higher values for mineral dissolution/precipitation, CO\textsubscript{2(aq)} concentration, and net CO\textsubscript{2} storage, and estimate lower values for equilibrium pH. The choice of fugacity coefficient model has the greatest effect on geochemical predictions. This is because the temperatures and pressures being considered are at the low end of the
recommended ranges for use with the Spycher and Reed model where inaccuracies are reported for fugacity coefficient estimation (26). The fugacity coefficient model presented by Duan et al. (20) is fitted to experimental data for six different $T$-$P$ regimes and probably a better choice for the conditions considered.

However, the differences in geochemical predictions are generally low – estimates from all models for the equilibrium pH agree to within ±1% of the average, estimates from all models for mineral precipitation and dissolution agree to within ±10% of the average, and estimates from all models for $m_{CO2}$ and net CO$_2$ storage agree to within ±25% of the average. This suggests that the choice of thermodynamic sub-models for estimating CO$_2$ parameters does not have a large effect on the solution to the geochemical system. Additionally, these results suggest that variations in estimated CO$_2$ solubility have a limited effect on other estimated quantities like equilibrium pH and mineral precipitation or dissolution.

From these nine geochemical systems, three were chosen such that each model used different sub-models for calculating $m_{CO2}$ and $\gamma_{CO2}$. The models chosen for further investigation are models 1, 5, and 8 from the preceding table. These models are used to examine the sensitivity of the system to key chemical and physical parameters as described in the next chapter.
5: Model Results

Models 1, 5 and 8 are used to examine the effects of initial pH, CO\textsubscript{2} injection pressure, salinity, and temperature on the geochemical system. Simulations are performed such that one parameter varies while the other three are kept constant in order to evaluate the sensitivity of the geochemical system to the varying parameter. These simulations are variants of the base case described in Chapter 4 where the initial pH is 7.5, aquifer pressure is 100 bar, CO\textsubscript{2} injection pressure is 160 bar, salinity is 10\%, and temperature is 45°C.

5.1: Effect of Initial pH

In these simulations, temperature, CO\textsubscript{2} injection pressure and salinity are constant at 45°C, 160 bar and 10\%, respectively. Three sets of simulations using an initial pH of 6.5, 7.5, and 8.5 were performed.
Figure 14: Equilibrium pH as a Function of Initial pH

Figure 15: Calcite Dissolution as a Function of Initial pH
Figure 16: Dolomite Dissolution as a Function of Initial pH

Figure 17: Gypsum Precipitation as a Function of Initial pH
Note that the geochemical system predicts slightly increasing quantities for mineral dissolution and precipitation and very slightly increasing net CO₂ storage with increasing initial pH. However, the system is insensitive to initial pH. This is consistent with the findings by others (7). Insensitivity to initial pH is due to the fact that equilibrated pre-injection brine has similar composition over the range of pH examined due to the dominance of bicarbonate ion in solution for pH 6-9. Note also that the initial pH has no effect on the equilibrium pH for post-CO₂ injection conditions. The initial pH does not influence the equilibrium pH after CO₂ injection because the post-injection system has excess CO₂ available, so the separate CO₂ phase will be the controlling phase for equilibrium. Because of these reasons, net mineral precipitation and dissolution is influenced very little by the initial pH.
5.2: Effect of CO$_2$ Injection Pressure

In these simulations, temperature, initial pH and salinity are constant at 45°C, 7.5 and 10%, respectively. Three sets of simulations are performed for CO$_2$ injection pressures of 120, 160 and 200 bars.

![Equilibrium pH as a Function of CO$_2$ Injection Pressure](image)

Figure 19: Equilibrium pH as a Function of CO$_2$ Injection Pressure
Figure 20: Calcite Dissolution as a Function of CO\textsubscript{2} Injection Pressure

Figure 21: Dolomite Dissolution as a Function of CO\textsubscript{2} Injection Pressure
Figure 22: Gypsum Precipitation as a Function of CO$_2$ Injection Pressure

Figure 23: Net CO$_2$ Storage as a Function of CO$_2$ Injection Pressure
Note that the geochemical system predicts slightly increasing quantities of mineral dissolution and precipitation, decreased equilibrium pH, and increased net CO₂ storage in response to increasing CO₂ injection pressure. However, the system is relatively insensitive to CO₂ injection pressure. This is due to the fact that the fugacity of the CO₂(g,sc) phase does not vary proportionally with pressure over the range of pressures examined. Using the baseline scenario and the Spycher and Reed (26) methodology for estimating CO₂ fugacity, varying the pressure from 120 bar to 200 bar results in a change in fugacity from 70 to 88 bar; i.e. a 67% increase in pressure results in a 26% increase in fugacity. Similarly, using the Duan et al. (20) methodology for estimating CO₂ fugacity, the same 67% increase in pressure results in a 19% increase in CO₂ fugacity. This minimizes the effects of increased CO₂ pressure on the concentrations of carbonate species.
5.3: Effect of Salinity

In these simulations, temperature, initial pH and CO$_2$ injection pressure are constant at 45°C, 7.5 and 160 bar, respectively. Three sets of simulations are performed for brine salinities of 5%, 10% and 15%.

Figure 24: Equilibrium pH as a Function of Salinity
Figure 25: Calcite Dissolution as a Function of Salinity

Figure 26: Dolomite Dissolution as a Function of Salinity
Figure 27: Gypsum Precipitation as a Function of Salinity

Figure 28: Net CO$_2$ Storage as a Function of Salinity
The geochemical system appears to be sensitive to salinity, with increasing salinity resulting in increasing quantities of mineral dissolution and precipitation, decreasing equilibrium pH, and decreasing net CO$_2$ storage. The sensitivity of mineral dissolution and precipitation and equilibrium pH to salinity is due to decreasing estimates for activity coefficients at higher ionic strengths. A lower activity coefficient means that more of a certain ion must be in solution for a given activity required for equilibrium than for a higher activity coefficient; in other words, it takes more of a certain ion to exert the same thermodynamic influence on the solution with a lower activity coefficient than with a higher activity coefficient. These increased ion concentrations thus require proportionally more minerals dissolution. Salinity has the greatest effect on net CO$_2$ storage out of all the physical and chemical parameters examined. The sensitivity of net CO$_2$ storage to salinity is due to the decreasing solubility of CO$_2$ in higher salinity solutions because of the salting out mechanism.
5.4: Effect of Temperature

In these simulations, initial pH, CO$_2$ injection pressure and salinity are constant at 7.5, 160 bar and 10%, respectively. Three sets of simulations are performed at temperature of 35, 45 and 55°C.

![Equilibrium pH vs Temperature](image)

Figure 29: Equilibrium pH as a Function of Temperature
Figure 30: Calcite Dissolution as a Function of Temperature

Figure 31: Dolomite Dissolution as a Function of Temperature
Figure 32: Gypsum Precipitation as a Function of Temperature

Figure 33: Net CO₂ Storage as a Function of Temperature
The geochemical system appears to be relatively sensitive to temperature, with increasing temperature resulting in decreasing quantities of mineral dissolution and precipitation, decreasing equilibrium pH, and decreasing net CO$_2$ storage. Sensitivity to temperature is due to decreasing equilibrium constants at higher temperatures for the geochemical reactions considered (see Table 1-Table 4). This effect, known as retrograde solubility, is particularly pronounced with calcium carbonate (CaCO$_3(s)$). This means that less free ions must be in solution to achieve equilibrium with the solid mineral phase and the injected CO$_2$ phase. The decrease in equilibrium pH associated with increased temperatures is also due to the decreased equilibrium constant for the dissociation of water. In other words, at elevated temperatures, the activity of H$^+$ ions is increased relative to standard conditions.

5.5: Effects on Porosity, $\varepsilon$

The formation porosity, $\varepsilon$, is the ratio of void volume to bulk aquifer volume, and can change as a result of mineral precipitation and dissolution due to CO$_2$ injection. If significant amounts of minerals dissolve, then porosity will increase. Conversely, if mineral precipitation is the dominant effect, then porosity will decrease. For simplicity, geochemical reactions occurring in the brine that is being displaced by the moving CO$_2$ interface are not considered. Rather, only the residual pore brine that is not displaced by the moving CO$_2$ interface – i.e. it is held in place due to capillary forces – is considered to reach equilibrium with the CO$_2$ phase. The change in porosity can be estimated as follows:
\[ \Delta \varepsilon = \varepsilon_{\text{initial}} \times S_{\text{RES}} \times (1 - S) \times \rho_{\text{BRINE}} \times \Delta V_{\text{minerals}} \]  

Equation 58

where \( \varepsilon_{\text{initial}} \) is the initial porosity (i.e., before CO\(_2\) injection), \( S_{\text{RES}} \) is the residual brine saturation of the pore volume, \( S \) is the salinity, \( \rho_{\text{BRINE}} \) is the density of the brine, and \( \Delta V_{\text{minerals}} \) is the change in mineral volume per kg of H\(_2\)O. To estimate \( \Delta V_{\text{minerals}} \), the following expression is used:

\[ \Delta V_{\text{minerals}} = \sum \frac{\Delta\text{mineral}}{\rho_{\text{mineral}}} \]  

Equation 59

where \( \Delta\text{mineral} \) is the net mass of mineral precipitated/dissolved per kg H\(_2\)O and \( \rho_{\text{mineral}} \) is the respective mineral density.

Brine density is estimated and values are tabulated in the following table for various combinations of salinity and temperature (28).

### Table 6: Brine Densities at Various Salinities and Temperatures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salinity (%)</th>
<th>Density (kg/m(^3))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 °C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mineral densities are estimated using the molecular weights and molar volumes in the TOUGHREACT thermodynamic database (16) for each respective mineral using the following relationship:
\[ \rho = \frac{MW}{MV} \]  

Equation 60

where \( MW \) indicates the molecular weight in g/mole and \( MV \) indicates the molar volume in cm\(^3\)/mole for respective mineral. Calculated densities for calcite, dolomite, and gypsum are listed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mineral</th>
<th>Density (g/cm(^3))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calcite</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolomite</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsum</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following three combinations of porosity and residual brine saturations are examined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>( \varepsilon_{INITIAL} )</th>
<th>( S_{RES} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the three scenarios of porosity and residual brine saturation listed in Table 8, the change in porosity is calculated for the base geochemical scenario described earlier in this chapter with varying initial pH, CO\(_2\) injection pressure, salinity and temperature. Results are given in Table 9.
Table 9: Change in Porosity for Scenarios 1-3 Using Various Combinations of Initial pH, CO₂ Injection Pressure, Salinity, Temperature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>c_{INITIAL}</th>
<th>S_{RES}</th>
<th>Init. pH</th>
<th>CO₂ Injection Pressure (bar)</th>
<th>Salinity</th>
<th>Temp. (°C)</th>
<th>Estimated Δε</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.3E-06</td>
<td>6.9E-06</td>
<td>6.8E-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.3E-06</td>
<td>6.9E-06</td>
<td>6.9E-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.3E-06</td>
<td>6.9E-06</td>
<td>6.9E-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.0E-06</td>
<td>7.3E-06</td>
<td>7.2E-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.4E-06</td>
<td>6.6E-06</td>
<td>6.5E-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.8E-06</td>
<td>7.3E-06</td>
<td>7.3E-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.0E-06</td>
<td>6.8E-06</td>
<td>6.8E-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.2E-05</td>
<td>9.4E-06</td>
<td>9.3E-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6.0E-06</td>
<td>5.2E-06</td>
<td>5.2E-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.0E-05</td>
<td>4.1E-05</td>
<td>4.1E-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.0E-05</td>
<td>4.2E-05</td>
<td>4.1E-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.0E-05</td>
<td>4.2E-05</td>
<td>4.1E-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.8E-05</td>
<td>4.4E-05</td>
<td>4.3E-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.0E-05</td>
<td>4.0E-05</td>
<td>3.9E-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.3E-05</td>
<td>4.4E-05</td>
<td>4.4E-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.8E-05</td>
<td>4.1E-05</td>
<td>4.1E-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.0E-05</td>
<td>5.7E-05</td>
<td>5.6E-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.6E-05</td>
<td>3.1E-05</td>
<td>3.1E-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.2E-04</td>
<td>1.0E-04</td>
<td>1.0E-04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.2E-04</td>
<td>1.0E-04</td>
<td>1.0E-04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.2E-04</td>
<td>1.0E-04</td>
<td>1.0E-04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.2E-04</td>
<td>1.1E-04</td>
<td>1.1E-04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.3E-04</td>
<td>9.9E-05</td>
<td>9.8E-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.3E-04</td>
<td>1.1E-04</td>
<td>1.1E-04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.2E-04</td>
<td>1.0E-04</td>
<td>1.0E-04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.8E-04</td>
<td>1.4E-04</td>
<td>1.4E-04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9.1E-05</td>
<td>7.8E-05</td>
<td>7.8E-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimates for the change in porosity are positive (i.e., porosity increases) for all models and are virtually identical for models 5 and 8 and model 1 agreeing within 20%.
The change in porosity is strongly related to the initial porosity and residual brine saturation, with estimates spanning three orders of magnitude for initial porosity ranging from 0.1 to 0.3 and residual brine saturation ranging from 0.1 to 0.5. Specifically, higher initial porosity and residual brine saturation results in larger estimated changes in porosity for the geochemical system considered. This is because higher initial porosity and residual brine saturation implies that there is more brine available per unit aquifer volume for equilibration with surrounding minerals and the injected CO₂, resulting in larger net mineral dissolution and precipitation quantities per unit aquifer volume. However, the overall change in porosity is very small for all scenarios considered, with a maximum change that is three orders of magnitude less than the initial porosity. This agrees well with observations by others (5; 7).

5.6: Choice of Thermodynamic Sub-model for CO₂ Parameter Estimation

In every simulation, model 1 gave the largest net mineral reactions and change in pH. This is most likely due to the greater fugacity coefficient predicted using the method of Spercher and Reed (26) and the higher aqueous CO₂ concentration predicted using the equilibrium constant method. Models 5 and 8 use more recently developed correlations that account for the effects of dissolved salts to estimate the equilibrium dissolved CO₂ concentration, and the lower estimated aqueous CO₂ concentrations result in slightly lower net mineral reactions and changes in pH as compared to model 1. However, estimates of mineral precipitation and dissolution are closely grouped within the same order of magnitude for all three models, indicating that the choice of thermodynamic sub-models does not have a significant impact on the estimated quantities.
6: Summary and Conclusion

Different thermodynamic sub-models are used to construct overall geochemical models to describe pre- and post- CO₂ injection conditions in a deep, saline aquifer that is comprised of calcite, dolomite, and gypsum. It is found that the overall geochemical models are relatively insensitive to appropriate choices for thermodynamic sub-models for estimating such parameters as CO₂(aq) activity coefficient, CO₂(g,sc) fugacity coefficient, and the solubility of CO₂(aq). These geochemical models are used to determine concentrations of ionic species and aqueous complexes and quantify the amount of minerals that are dissolving into or precipitating out of solution so that the change in porosity due to CO₂ injection can be estimated. All of the models predict that calcite and dolomite will dissolve and gypsum will precipitate. The models all predict that CO₂ storage by solubility trapping is likely, but carbonate mineral dissolution under acidic conditions prevents mineral trapping.

It is determined that mineral dissolution and precipitation, along with requisite changes in porosity, are relatively sensitive to the temperature and salinity of the native brine in the aquifer and relatively insensitive to the CO₂ injection pressure and initial pH of the brine. However, over the range of conditions examined, the estimated net change in porosity is low, with a maximum increase of magnitude 10⁻⁴ and a minimum increase of magnitude 10⁻⁶. It appears that CO₂ injection and storage in deep, saline aquifers comprised of calcite, dolomite, and gypsum for the physical and chemical conditions considered will have little effect on the formation porosity.
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