# Training Students in Simulation & Risk Assessment for Carbon Sequestration

## DE-FE0002059

John McCray

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

COLORADOSCHOOLOFMINES

U.S. Department of Energy National Energy Technology Laboratory Carbon Storage R&D Project Review Meeting Developing the Technologies and Building the Infrastructure for CO<sub>2</sub> Storage

August 21-23, 2012

# **Presentation Outline**

- Benefits to Program
- Project Overview: Goals, objectives, tasks
- Accomplishments
- Technical Status and Findings
- Summary: Lessons Learned & Future Work
- Bibliography

# Benefit to the Program

Program goals being addressed.

 Develop technologies that will support industries' ability to predict CO<sub>2</sub> storage capacity in geologic formations to within ±30 percent.

From the RFP: "... provide training opportunities for graduate and undergraduate students that will provide the human capital and skills required for implementing and deploying CCS technologies. Training can be accomplished through fundamental research .... Fundamental research is needed to advance science in: simulation and risk assessment; .... verification, and accounting; ....and integrity for long-term CO<sub>2</sub> storage and capture.

# Benefit to the Program

Our project has two goals: training and research.

Training: 2 M.S. and one 1 PhD student will receive degrees and can continue in the arena of carbon sequestration. 1 post-doctoral student has received technical and project-management training. A university course has been developed and delivered twice. The training enables advance professionals to enter the GCS field.

Research: (a) developing simulation methodologies to better understand and predict leakage of  $CO_2$  from the injection zone, and impact of leakage on aquifers, (b) experiments to understand impacts of  $CO_2$ leakage on aquifer water quality. The research should enhance public confidence in sequestration, and enable better prediction of storage efficiencies.

## **Project Overview**: Goals and Objectives

- The primary objectives of the project are to *train* students and advance the science in two critical areas of risk assessment:
- multi-process, multi-scale characterization and model simulation of the risks associated with leakage into overlying aquifers;
- (2) pore-scale geochemical processes in CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration...including mineral reactivity and multiphase fluid reactions, needed to assess the likelihood of an successful sequestration effort.

## **Project Overview**: Goals and Objectives

#### Success criteria:

- MS students complete thesis and receive graduate degrees
- PhD student completes required exams, dissertation, and receives PhD degree.
- Post-doctoral researcher achieves career position
- Experiments and simulations are completed.
- Peer-reviewed journal articles are submitted/accpted (goal: 1 per MS student and 3 per PhD student, and 1 additional for the per team)

## **Project Overview**: Goals and Objectives : Tasks

	Percent Complete		FY	2010		FY 2011				FY 2012				FY 2013
Task		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13
Taks 1: Project Management Plan and Reporting	90%													
1.1 Project Management Plan (PMP)	100%													
1.2 Planning and Reporting	90%		Α	В	С		D				Е			
Task 2: Quantifying risk associated with leakage of $CO_2$ into overlying aquifers														
2.1 Lit review on CO <sub>2</sub> leakage and impacts on aquifer water quality	100%													
2.2 Lit review on toxicity of CO <sub>2</sub> leakage byproducts.	100%					G								
2.3 Identification of scenarios	90%				F		J	K						
2.4 Risk assessment modeling	90%											N		Р
Task 3: Laboratory experiments and associated modeling to elucidate pore- scale geochemical processes associated with carbon injection, storage and sequestration														
3.1 Detailed sample characterization	60%					Η								
3.2 Laboratory experiments	60%							L						
3.3 Reanalysis of samples from experiments	25%													
3.4 Geochemical modeling	10%													0
Task 4: Seminar taught for course credit on risk-assessment associated with CO <sub>2</sub> sequestration														
4.1 Develop course syllabus	100%						Ι							
4.2 Develop course materials	100%													
4.3 Deliver Course	100%							Μ						

# Accomplishments to Date

- Alexis Sitchler (PhD Penn State) has received training as a project manager for this project, and recently agreed to a tenure-track faculty position in the Geology & Geological engineering Dept at CSM. She will continue a career in GCS research.
- Erica Siirilla (B.S. Univ. Colorado) completed M.S. Thesis and degree (grad date Dec 2010), and entered PhD program at CSM. Expected to graduate in May 2013
- Hannah Menke (B.S. Columbia Univ) completed her M.S. thesis, defends tomorrow at 9:30 am. Will continue on to a PhD program in carbon sequestration at Imperial College (London).

8

– Katy Kirsch started an M.S. Thesis (Hydrology) in May.

# Accomplishments to Date

- Developed and delivered (twice) a graduate-level course (ESGN/GEGN 598) on carbon sequestration, focusing on fundamental applied concepts and papers from the literature. More than 35 graduate students received training via course.
- Post-Doc (Navarre-Sitchler) and two PhD students (Siirilla, Wunsch) participated in teaching carbon sequestration and/ or risk in ESGN/GEGN 598 and ESGN/GEGN 581 (risk assessment).
- 2 M.S. Theses completed (Siirilla and Menke)
- 3 peer-reviewed papers completed.
- Risk assessment methodology created.
- Experimental protocal developed, experiments underway

9

# **Technical Status**

Because this is a training grant, we have arranged this section by student:

- Erica Siirilla
- Hanna Menke
- Katie Kirsch

### Siirilla 1. Development of a Quantitative Human Health Risk Framework for CO<sub>2</sub> Leakage



A: CO<sub>2</sub> leakage and dissolution of metals

- B: Heterogeneous flow and transport of metals
- C: Possible capture in one or more downgradient wells
- D: Water delivery system to many different households
- E: Household exposure and health risk via multiple pathways to varying individuals

Advances in Water Resources 36 (2012) 146-164



## A quantitative methodology to assess the risks to human health from CO<sub>2</sub> leakage into groundwater

#### Erica R. Siirila<sup>a,c,\*</sup>, Alexis K. Navarre-Sitchler<sup>b</sup>, Reed M. Maxwell<sup>a,c</sup>, John E. McCray<sup>b,c</sup>

\*Department of Geology and Geological Engineering, Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO 80401, United States

<sup>b</sup> Environmental Science and Engineering Division, Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO 80401, United States

<sup>c</sup> Hydrologic Science and Engineering Program, Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO 80401, United States

#### ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Available online 1 December 2010

Keywords: Carbon Capture and Storage Metal mobilization Carbon dioxide leakage Monte Carlo Human health risk Joint Uncertainty and Variability

#### ABSTRACT

Leakage of CO2 and associated gases into overlying aquifers as a result of geologic carbon capture and sequestration may have adverse impacts on aquifer drinking-water quality. Gas or aqueous-phase leakage may occur due to transport via faults and fractures, through faulty well bores, or through leaky confining materials. Contaminants of concern include aqueous salts and dissolved solids, gaseous or aqueous-phase organic contaminants, and acidic gas or aqueous-phase fluids that can liberate metals from aguifer minerals. Here we present a quantitative risk assessment framework to predict potential human health risk from CO2 leakage into drinking water aquifers. This framework incorporates the potential release of CO2 into the drinking water aquifer; mobilization of metals due to a decrease in pH; transport of these metals down gradient to municipal receptors; distributions of contaminated groundwater to multiple households; and exposure and health risk to individuals using this water for household purposes. Additionally, this framework is stochastic, incorporates detailed variations in geological and geostatistical parameters and discriminates between uncertain and variable parameters using a two-stage, or nested, Monte Carlo approach. This approach is demonstrated using example simulations with hypothetical, yet realistic, aquifer characteristics and leakage scenarios. These example simulations show a greater risk for arsenic than for lead for both cancer and non-cancer endpoints, an unexpected finding. Higher background groundwater gradients also yield higher risk. The overall risk and the associated uncertainty are sensitive to the extent of aquifer stratification and the degree of local-scale dispersion. These results all highlight the importance of hydrologic modeling in risk assessment. A linear relationship between carcinogenic and noncarcinogenic risk was found for arsenic and suggests action levels for carcinogenic risk will be exceeded in exposure situations before noncarcinogenic action levels, a reflection of the ratio of cancer and non-cancer toxicity values. Finally, implications for ranking aquifer vulnerability due to geologic configuration, aquifer mineralogy, and leakage scenarios are discussed. © 2010 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

#### Drawing Connections Between Geochemical Reactions and Aquifer Transport at Different Scales

#### (A) At the leakage source:

- Multi-component, nonlinear geochemical reactions and fluid transport
- Run until a steadystate metal concentration and pH are achieved



#### (B) Far-field aquifer:

- Steady-state concentration from (A) used as initial metal concentration
- Contaminant plume modeled with a particle-tracking technique
  - Linear reactions

Answers questions such as, "How does mineralogy composition affect the risk?"

Answers questions such as, *"How does aquifer stratification affect the risk?"* 

•

#### Includes a Robust, Probabilistic Treatment of Risk: The Nested Monte Carlo Approach

Outer, Uncertainty Loop



#### Yields Risk as a Function of Uncertainty and Variability

#### Example simulations show:

- The specific metal mobilized in the event of CO<sub>2</sub> leakage greatly affects the outcome of risk
- 2. Hydrologic aquifer properties such as the degree of stratification and local dispersion greatly affect the magnitude and *distribution (i.e. uncertainty)* of risk
- Risk is sensitive to the hydrologic flow parameters and warrants further examination in CCS risk assessment



# Siirilla 2: Investigating how kinetic sorption and local dispersion influence risk.



2. Kinetic (rate-dependent) sorption

$$R_{LEA} = 1 + \frac{\rho_b K_d}{\theta} \longrightarrow K_d = \left[\frac{k_f}{k_r}\right] \longrightarrow R_{kin} = 1 + \frac{\rho_b}{\theta} \left[\frac{k_f}{k_r}\right]$$

#### Evaluating effective reaction rates of kinetically driven solutes in large-scale, statistically anisotropic media: Human health risk implications

#### Erica R. Siirila<sup>1,2</sup> and Reed M. Maxwell<sup>1,2,3</sup>

Received 17 October 2011; revised 20 January 2012; accepted 7 March 2012; published 25 April 2012.

[1] The interplay between regions of high and low hydraulic conductivity, degree of aguifer stratification, and rate-dependent geochemical reactions in heterogeneous flow fields is investigated, focusing on impacts of kinetic sorption and local dispersion on plume retardation and channeling. Human health risk is used as an endpoint for comparison via a nested Monte Carlo scheme, explicitly considering joint uncertainty and variability. Kinetic sorption is simulated with finely resolved, large-scale domains to identify hydrogeologic conditions where reactions are either rate limited (nonreactive), in equilibrium (linear equilibrium assumption is appropriate), or are sensitive to time-dependent kinetic reactions. By utilizing stochastic ensembles, effective equilibrium conditions are examined, in addition to parameter interplay. In particular, the effects of preferential flow pathways and solute mixing at the field-scale (marcrodispersion) and subgrid (local dispersion, LD) are examined for varying degrees of stratification and regional groundwater velocities (v). Results show effective reaction rates of kinetic ensembles with the inclusion of LD yield disequilibrium transport, even for averaged (or global) Damköholer numbers associated with equilibrium transport. Solute behavior includes an additive tailing effect, a retarded peak time, and results in an increased cancer risk. The inclusion of LD for nonreactive solutes in highly anisotropic media results in either induced solute retardation or acceleration, a new finding given that LD has previously been shown to affect only the concentration variance. The distribution, magnitude, and associated uncertainty of cancer risk are controlled by the up scaling of these small-scale processes, but are strongly dependent on v and the source term.

Citation: Siirila, E. R., and R. M. Maxwell (2012), Evaluating effective reaction rates of kinetically driven solutes in large-scale, statistically anisotropic media: Human health risk implications, *Water Resour. Res.*, 48, W04527, doi:10.1029/2011WR011516.

## An Expansive Sensitivity Analysis Was Conducted

- 1. Sorption:
  - Equilibrium
  - Kinetic "slow"
  - Kinetic "fast"
  - Tracer
- 2. Local dispersion
  - *P*e = ∞
  - *Pe* ≠ ∞
- 3. Anisotropy
  - *ε* = 0.1
  - ε = 0.006
- 4. Mean groundwater velocity
  - v = 0.001 m/d
  - v = 0.01 m/d
  - v = 0.1 m/d
- 5. Continuous and pulse sources



## Significant Findings Include:

- Even when equilibrium conditions were expected based on Da number (i.e. slow groundwater velocities), the effect of kinetic reactions is apparent
- Faster breakthrough, lower peak concentration, but more tailing
- Higher overall risk

#### Equilibrium Scenario



 The inclusion of local dispersion in non-sorbing solutes (i.e. a tracer) yields either apparent retardation or acceleration when the simulated aquifer is highly anisotropic – higher calculated risk

#### Implications: Carcinogenic, Human Health Risk

LEA	
Kinetic	

**Excluding** Local Dispersion ( $Pe=\infty$ ) **Including** Local Dispersion



### Siirilla 3: The Development of a Time Dependent Risk Assessment (TDRA) framework



#### Risk is only calculated during this time of contamination

Question1: How can risk outside of this Exposure Duration (ED) window influence an assessment?

Question2: How does the assessment change given varying concentration signals?

Question3: How is risk affected by the size of the ED window?

Science of the Total Environment 431 (2012) 221-232



Contents lists available at SciVerse ScienceDirect

#### Science of the Total Environment

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/scitotenv



Erica R. Siirila a,c,\*, Reed M. Maxwell a,b,c,1

<sup>a</sup> Hydrologic Science and Engineering Program, Colorado School of Mines, 1500 Illinois St., Golden, CO 80401, United States

<sup>b</sup> Integrated Groundwater Modeling Center (IGWMC), Colorado School of Mines, 1500 Illinois St., Golden, CO 80401, United States

<sup>c</sup> Department of Geology and Geological Engineering, Colorado School of Mines, 1500 Illinois St., Golden, CO 80401, United States

#### ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 20 March 2012 Received in revised form 9 May 2012 Accepted 9 May 2012 Available online 9 June 2012

Keywords: Cancer risk Stochastic Uncertainty Variability Kinetic Arsenic

#### ABSTRACT

We present a new Time Dependent Risk Assessment (TDRA) that stochastically considers how joint uncertainty and inter-individual variability (JUV) associated with human health risk change as a function of time. In contrast to traditional, time independent assessments of risk, this new formulation relays information on when the risk occurs, how long the duration of risk is, and how risk changes with time. Because the true exposure duration (ED) is often uncertain in a risk assessment, we also investigate how varying the magnitude of fixed size durations (ranging between 5 and 70 years) of this parameter affects the distribution of risk in both the time independent and dependent methodologies. To illustrate this new formulation and to investigate these mechanisms for sensitivity, an example of arsenic contaminated groundwater is used in conjunction with two scenarios of different environmental concentration signals resulting from rate dependencies in geochemical reactions. Cancer risk is computed and compared using environmental concentration ensembles modeled with sorption as 1) a linear equilibrium assumption (LEA) and 2) first order kinetics (Kin), Results show that the information attained in the new time dependent methodology reveals how the uncertainty in other time-dependent processes in the risk assessment may influence the uncertainty in risk. We also show that individual susceptibility also affects how risk changes in time, information that would otherwise be lost in the traditional, time independent methodology. These results are especially pertinent for forecasting risk in time, and for risk managers who are assessing the uncertainty of risk.

© 2012 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Science of the Total Environment

# Using two contamination scenarios, TDRA yields

- Information on how risk changes as a function of time: d(Risk)/dt
- 2. A comparison of risk duration versus magnitude

Percent of time over the RAL:

- Scenario 1: 63%
- Scenarios 2: 93%

Consider higher risk over a shorter period of time? Or a lower risk over a longer period of time?



3000

0

6000

time (y)

12000

15000

9000

## Menke: Numerical multiphase simulations to investigate leakage through a fault



Recently, won the best student presentation at the Front **Range Consortium for Research Computing** Symposium

## High Performance Computing:

- Conducted at Golden Energy Computing Organization (GECO). •Simulations run for 3 years of injection, then 0.5 years for pressure/saturation equilibration.
- > 1,000,000 degrees of freedom in each simulation
- 1 simulated year of  $CO_2$  injection: ~10 days (wall-clock time) on 128 processors (30,700 CPU hrs)
- Suite of simulations used approx 1,500,000 CPU hrs





Numerical Model: PFlowTran (LANL)



## Base Case and Variation of Parameters:

- Base Case created from known literature values.
- Varied parameters to try and understand leakage constraints:
  - Injection Points Horizontal Distance from Fault
  - Injection Rate
  - Fault Permeability

![](_page_25_Figure_6.jpeg)

						21: 1 4250		5.5.001 / 1	
		<b>4</b> • • <b>40</b> 12 · • • 2	<u>Case:</u>	Base	<u>2 [inject 100m</u> from fault]	<u>3 [inject 250m]</u>	4 [1n] 0.9 kg/s] below fault	5 [In] 0.8 kg/s] below fault	
Fault Perm					< 0.2	< 0.3	0.1	0.2	
Caprock Perm		1x 10 <sup>-19</sup> m <sup>2</sup>	Avg H <sub>2</sub> O Leakage rate [kg/yr]	2.67 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	3.12 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	3.92 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	1.63 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	2.84 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	
			Avg CO <sub>2</sub> Leakage rate [kg/yr]	1.19 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	1.09 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	9.74 x 10 <sup>5</sup>	1.01 x 10 <sup>5</sup>	7.79 x 10 <sup>5</sup>	
Formation Perm		1x 10 <sup>-9</sup> m <sup>2</sup>	Max H <sub>2</sub> O Leakage rate [kg/yr]	1.16 x 10 <sup>7</sup>	1.16 x 10 <sup>7</sup>	1.16 x 10 <sup>7</sup>	2.62 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	9.32 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	
			Max CO <sub>2</sub> leakage Rate [kg/yr]	1.61 x 10°	1.45 x 10°	1.23 x 10°	1.31 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	1.03 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	
Injection Rate		1 kg/s	Total H <sub>2</sub> O Leaked	7.94 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	9.26 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	1.18 x 10 <sup>7</sup>	8.05 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	8.51 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	
Fault Dimensions		5m x 10m x 25m	Total CO <sub>2</sub> Leaked [kg]	3.58 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	3.17 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	2.73 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	2.91 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	2.18 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	
	Total Leakage [Kg]	8.E+00   7.E+06   6.E+06   5.E+06   4.E+06   3.E+06   2.E+06   1.E+06   0.E+00							
		0.0 0.5	1.0 1.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5		
			Ti	me [Yr]					
		Base Case: CO2	•••••• Case 4 (Ir	nj 0.9): CO2	·Case 5	(Inj 0.8): CO2			
		Base Case: H2O	····· Case 4 (Ir	nj 0.9): H2O	Case 5	(Inj 0.8): H2O			
Fi	igure	3.10: Total Leakage of C	O <sub>2</sub> and H <sub>2</sub> O in l	kg when th	ne injection ra	te is varied.			

![](_page_27_Figure_0.jpeg)

Figure 3.6: Leakage rate in kg/yr is plotted as a function of time for the base case and cases 2 & 3. As the injection point is moved away from the fault the  $CO_2$  leakage rate falls and the H<sub>2</sub>O leakage rate increases.

## Menke: Findings

-Brine leakage may increase for conditions where CO2 leakage decreases (lower injection pressures, further distance from fault) due to relative permeability considerations

- Reduction in buoyancy (denser SC  $CO_2$ ) at larger times can cause decreases in CO2 leakage and increases in brine leakage

-Leakage rates do not scale linearly with injection rates, permeability, and distance from the fault.

-If a leak is detected, leakage can be stopped "relatively quickly" by turning off injection (fast ramp down).

## Kirsch: Dissolution Experiments with Siliclastic Rocks

To investigate the geochemical response of sandstone aquifers to CO<sub>2</sub> leakage

![](_page_29_Picture_2.jpeg)

Outcrop of the Mesaverde Group

Samples were collected from outcrop of the Mesaverde Group in northwestern Colorado in Routt County.

These sandstones currently yield water to wells for local domestic and agricultural purposes, and have the potential for increased groundwater development in a water-scarce future.

![](_page_29_Picture_6.jpeg)

Which minerals are likely controlling the aqueous concentration of trace metals?

Rock Characterization:

- Point count
- Whole rock
- XRD
- BET surface area
- Sequential extraction
- SEM/EDX

![](_page_30_Figure_8.jpeg)

# Experiments: How does the fluid composition and microbiology change with time at elevated $CO_2$ partial pressures?

![](_page_31_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_2.jpeg)

# Results so far: Dissolution of silicate rock can buffer pH

![](_page_32_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Picture_2.jpeg)

# Summary: Lessons Learned

-Aquifer heterogeneities are important in risk calculations

-Kinetic reactions with local dispersion can result in lower peak concentrations, but earlier arrival and longer tails, thus higher calculated risk

-Temporal risk calculated considering longer exposure durations with smaller concentrations important in evaluating the true risk

-Brine leakage may increase for conditions where  $CO_2$  leakage decreases (lower injection pressures, further distance from Fault) due to relative permeability-pressure considerations

-If a leak is detected, leakage can be stopped "relatively quickly" by turning off injection (fast ramp down).

-Typical sandstone minerals can buffer acidity during leakage into <sup>34</sup> aquifers

# Summary: Future Work

- Siirilla to complete PhD dissertation.
- Menke successfully defend thesis

- Complete paper on multiphase simulations of leakage through faults.

- Complete experiments, evaluate metal release and impact on microbes from sandstones at typical aquifer pressures.

-Kirsch to complete M.S. Thesis

-Complete paper on experiments.

# Bibliography

- Siirila, E.R., Maxwell, R.M., 2012, A new perspective on human health risk assessment: Development of a time dependent methodology and the effect of varying exposure durations: Science of the Total Environment, v. 431, p. 221-232, available at: <u>http://</u> <u>www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969712007097.</u>
- Siirila, E.R., Navarre-Sitchler, A., Maxwell, R.M., McCray, J.E., 2012, A quantitative methodology to assess the risks to human health from CO2 leakage into groundwater: Advances in Water Resources, v. 36, p. 146-164, available at: http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0309170810002149.
- Siirila, E.R., Maxwell, R.M., 2012, Evaluating effective reaction rates of kinetically driven solutes in large-scale, statistically anisotropic media: human health risk implications: Water Resources Research, v. 48, p. W04527, available at: http://www.agu.org/pubs/crossref/2012/2011WR011516.shtml.
- Bearup, L., Navarre-Sitchler, A., Maxwell, R.M., **McCray, J.E**., 2012. Kinetic metal release from competing processes in aquifers, *Environ. Sci* Technol., available at <u>doi/10.1021/es203586y</u>
- <u>Menke, H., Navarre-Sitchler</u>, A., Maxwell, R.M., McCray, J.E., 2012. Evaluating brine and CO2 leakage rates during geologic sequestration using numerical simulations, in preparation for *Science of the Total Environment*
- <u>Kirsch, K., Navarre-Sitchler, A., Wunsch, A.,</u> McCray, J.E. 2012. Assessing the impact of CO<sub>2</sub> leakage on groundwater chemistry and microbiology in siliclastic aquifers: ân experimental investigation of CO<sub>2</sub>-water-rock reactions, in preparation for *Applied Geochemistry*.

# Bibliography (Cont.)

#### **Theses Completed**

- <u>Menke, H.,</u> 2012. Evaluating storage of geologically sequestered CO2 using numerical simulations, M.S. Thesis in Environmental Science and Engineering, Colorado School of Mines, Golden CO.
- Siirilla, E.R., 2012. A quantitative methodology to assess the risks to human health from CO2 leakage into groundwater, M.S. Thesis in Hydrologic Science and Engineering, Colorado School of Mines, Golden CO.

#### Abstracts

More than 15:

American Geophysical Union Fall Meeting

Geological Society of America Annual Meeting

ASCE Environmental Water Resources Institute Annual Meeting

Goldschmidt Meeting on Geochemistry

National Ground Water Association Summit

# Questions?

![](_page_37_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Picture_4.jpeg)

# Appendix

# **Organization Chart**

![](_page_39_Figure_1.jpeg)

## **Project Overview**: Goals and Objectives : Milestones

Tack/	Project Milstone Description	Project Duration - Dec 2009 - Nov 2012													Planned	Planned	Actual	Actual End		
Subtask #			FY 2	010			FY 2	011			FY 2	2012		FY 13	Start Date	End Date	Start Date	Date	Comments	
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	QS	Qь	Q/	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13						
1.2	A - Project Kickoff meeting														12/1/09	12/31/09	12/1/09	12/31/09	Completed as planned	
12	B - Educational Program Instituted														1/1/10	6/30/10	1/1/10	1/30/10	Completed ahead of schedule	
1.6	b - Educational Program Instituted		_	_											1/1/10	0/00/10	1/1/10	1/00/10	completed alread of schedule	
																	Quarterly report for Q3 - 2010			
12	C - Semi-Annual Progress Report														9/1/10	9/30/10	7/1/10	7/31/10	FY serves as semi-annual report per email from Joshua Hull	
1.2	C - Semi-Aindar Progress Report				_										5/1/10	5/50/10	//1/10	7/51/10	per email non sosida nan	
1.2	D - Yearly Review Meeting														11/1/11	11/1/11	11/1/11	11/1/11	Participation in NETL webinar	
1.2	E - Yearly Review Meeting														9/30/12	9/30/12				
2.3	F - Determine most probable leakage scenarios														4/1/10	6/30/10	4/1/10	6/30/10	Completed as planned	
	G - List of EPA-regulated byproducts of														., _,	0,00,00	., _,	-,,		
	reaction between aquifer materials and																			
2.2	C02														4/1/10	12/31/10	4/1/10	9/30/10	Completed ahead of schedule	
2.1	H - Initial characterization of injection														1/1/10	12/21/10	1/1/10	10/01/10	Completed as planned	
3.1	I - Development of course syllabus														1/1/10	12/31/10	1/1/10	12/31/10	Completed as planned	
4.1	complete														12/1/10	8/15/11	11/1/10	8/1/11	Completed as planned	
	J - Identify and rank aquifer sites for use																			
2.3	in risk simulations complete														7/1/10	3/31/11	1/1/10	3/31/11	Completed as planned	
	K - Identify and rank aquifer-leakage																			
	scenarios for use in risk simulations														10/1/10	6/20/11	10/1/10	6/20/11	Completed as planned	
2.5	Ontrol - Determine rate parameters of														10/1/10	0/30/11	10/1/10	6/30/11	Completed as planned	
3.2	important geochemical reactions														7/1/10	6/30/11	7/1/10	6/30/11	Completed as planned	
	M - Summary on demographics and																			
4.3	grades for the university course														6/1/11	12/31/11	8/1/11		in progress	
24	N - Complete screening risk assessment														7/1/11	6/20/12	7/1/11	6/20/12	Completed as planned	
2.4	O - Complete geochemical modeling for														//1/11	0/30/12	//1/11	0/30/12	Completed as planned	
3.4	relevant carbon injection scenarios														10/1/11	11/30/12	10/1/11		in progress	
	P - Complete primary risk simulations for																			
2.4	aquifer leakage														7/1/12	11/30/12	7/1/11		in progress	