

1 Estimating carbon dioxide residence times cales through  
2 noble gas and stable isotope diffusion profiles

3 **Carmen A. Zwahlen<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Niko Kampman<sup>1,3</sup>, Paul Dennis<sup>4</sup>, Zheng Zhou<sup>1</sup> and Greg**  
4 **Holland<sup>1,2</sup>**

5 <sup>1</sup>*Lancaster Environment Centre, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YQ, UK*

6 <sup>2</sup>*School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester*  
7 *M13 9PL, UK*

8 <sup>3</sup>*Shell Global Solutions International, Kessler Park 1, 2288 GS Rijswijk, Netherlands*

9 <sup>4</sup>*School of Environmental Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich Research Park,*  
10 *Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK*

11 E-mail: carmen.zwahlen@manchester.ac.uk

12 **ABSTRACT**

13 The study of natural carbon dioxide reservoirs provides fundamental insight into  
14 processes involved in carbon capture and storage. However the calculations of process  
15 rates such as dissolution of CO<sub>2</sub> into the formation water remain uncertain due to  
16 indirectly determined ages of the CO<sub>2</sub> influx. The proposed ages for the Bravo Dome gas  
17 field in New Mexico, USA, vary from 56 ka to 1.5 Ma. Here we demonstrate that  
18 residence times can be estimated from simple modeling of noble gas and stable isotope  
19 diffusion profiles from the gas water contact through the gas column. The Bravo Dome  
20 gas field shows a gradient in noble gas concentrations and isotopic ratios from East to  
21 West across the 70 km wide field. A mantle like endmember with a <sup>3</sup>He/<sup>4</sup>He (R/R<sub>A</sub>) ratio  
22 of up to 4.7 is found in the west in contrast to a ground water endmember with high

23 concentrations of air and crustal derived noble gases in the east. The air and crustal  
24 derived noble gases decrease gradually toward the west. Stable isotope compositions (C  
25 and O) also vary across the field. Diffusion modeling of He, Ne, Ar, Kr, Xe and  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  data  
26 yield residence times for the  $\text{CO}_2$  between  $14.1 \pm 0.2$  and  $16.9^{+1.1}_{-0.5}$  ka. This is far less  
27 than the previous estimates of 1.2–1.5 Ma based on apatite (U-Th)/He thermochronology,  
28 leading to a dissolution rate of  $29900^{+11800}_{-10700}$  t/a to  $35900 \pm 12300$  t/a, implying that  
29 28% of the total emplaced  $\text{CO}_2$  dissolved. This new method can be applied to a wide  
30 variety of gas fields with variation in the concentration of groundwater derived noble  
31 gases and allow a better assessment of the timescale of other diffusive fluid-fluid  
32 interactions.

### 33 INTRODUCTION

34 Natural carbon dioxide reservoirs serve as natural analogues for geological  $\text{CO}_2$   
35 storage and hence are studied extensively to understand processes that act over geological  
36 timescales (Bickle et al., 2013). In order to quantify the rates of interactions between  
37 carbon dioxide, subsurface fluids and the host rock, it is crucial to know the residence  
38 time of the  $\text{CO}_2$  in the reservoir. Previous estimates of  $\text{CO}_2$  reservoir residence times  
39 include dating of surface intrusive igneous rocks (Armstrong, 1969), dating of close-by  
40 effusive igneous rocks (Condit, 1995; Stroud, 1997) and apatite (U-Th)/He  
41 thermochronology (Sathaye et al., 2014). These methods have been used to infer  
42 residence times for the Bravo Dome (New Mexico, USA)  $\text{CO}_2$  reservoir ranging between  
43 56 ka (Stroud, 1997) and 1.5 Ma (Sathaye et al., 2014). Petrographic studies on drill cores  
44 suggest the carbon dioxide filling of Bravo Dome in mid Cenozoic (Hartig et al., 2011),  
45 but rely exclusively on relative time constraints of diagenetic mineral growths with

46 poorly developed textures. Here we present a model for estimating directly the CO<sub>2</sub>  
47 residence time applied to the Bravo Dome gas field. The model relies on spatial sampling  
48 of gases across the field and uses the diffusion of groundwater derived noble gases  
49 entering the gas column at the gas water contact, with known diffusion constants, to  
50 estimate residence ages.

## 51 **BRAVO DOME FIELD**

52 Bravo Dome is a well-studied sandstone hosted CO<sub>2</sub> reservoir in New Mexico,  
53 USA (Baines and Worden, 2004; Cassidy, 2006; Dubacq et al., 2012; Gilfillan et al.,  
54 2008; Gilfillan et al., 2009; Hartig et al., 2011; Holland and Ballentine, 2006; Kessler et  
55 al., 2001; Sathaye et al., 2014). The gas is primarily of magmatic origin (Staudacher,  
56 1987), has <sup>3</sup>He/<sup>4</sup>He (R/R<sub>A</sub>) ratios up to 4.7 and CO<sub>2</sub>/<sup>3</sup>He ratios in the mid-oceanic ridge  
57 basalt (MORB) range (Ballentine et al., 2001; Cassidy, 2006; Gilfillan et al., 2008;  
58 Holland and Ballentine, 2006). The gas field comprises a thin laterally extensive reservoir  
59 with an east-west extent of more than 70 km (Fig. 1) and supercritical reservoir  
60 conditions (Broadhead, 1993). The western portion of the gas field is not in contact with  
61 formation water since it overlies dry impermeable basement (Cassidy, 2006) and we  
62 assume the most western fault on the map in Figure 1 represents the east-west gas water  
63 contact (Appendix DR4). On the east side of this fault the water table is within the  
64 sandstone formation and the CO<sub>2</sub> overlies water-saturated rock, with lateral juxtaposition  
65 of CO<sub>2</sub> and formation water also occurring laterally to the extreme east (Fig. 1). Oxygen  
66 isotope data of CO<sub>2</sub> gas confirm the western fault as a gas water contact since the gas  
67 samples east of the fault have δ<sup>18</sup>O of 29‰ (Vienna standard mean ocean water, V-  
68 SMOW) on average, which is the value predicted from CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O fractionation

69 (Brenninkmeijer et al., 1983) and complete equilibration with formation water of  $\delta^{18}\text{O} =$   
70  $-11\text{‰}$  at 33 °C (Cassidy, 2006) (Fig. 2A).

## 71 **MODEL**

### 72 **Data and Corrections**

73 The gas samples were collected in two different sampling campaigns (b and c) of  
74 the Bravo Dome gas field (Gilfillan et al., 2008; Gilfillan et al., 2009; Holland and  
75 Ballentine, 2006). Noble gas data of sample set b are from previous studies (Gilfillan et  
76 al., 2008; Gilfillan et al., 2009; Holland and Ballentine, 2006), whereas sample set c has  
77 been measured following previous methods (Holland and Ballentine, 2006) (Appendix  
78 DR1). The oxygen isotopic and carbon isotopic analysis of sample set b were performed  
79 at the University of East Anglia (Norwich, UK) using MIRA (multi- isotopologue ratio  
80 analyzer) mass spectrometer (P. Dennis, unpublished data) with procedures following  
81 Royle (2015) and precision for standard replicates of  $<0.01\text{‰}$ . The carbon isotopes of  
82 sample set c were measured at Lancaster University (UK) using an Isoprime100 mass  
83 spectrometer with a multiflow inlet. The data were corrected to V-PDB (Vienna Peedee  
84 belemnite) using international standards LSVEC ( $\delta^{13}\text{C} -46.6\text{‰}$ ), NBS 18 ( $\delta^{13}\text{C}$   
85  $-5.014\text{‰}$ ) and CO1 ( $\delta^{13}\text{C} +2.492\text{‰}$ ). Precision for standard replicates ( $n = 5$ , 1 standard  
86 deviation) was  $<0.1\text{‰}$  for carbon isotopes.

87 The data for the model comprise the noble gas measurements and their sampling  
88 distance to the gas water contact. The distance from the 26 selected wells to the gas water  
89 contact have been measured horizontally for the wells west of the main fault and  
90 vertically for the wells east of it, since these are the shortest distances to the gas water

91 contact (Fig. 1). The perforation interval depths from which the CO<sub>2</sub> is produced have  
92 been considered for the wells with vertical distances to the gas water contact.

93 At the gas water contact, the air and crustal derived noble gases, which  
94 accumulated in the formation water, degas into the CO<sub>2</sub> because of the higher  
95 concentration and lower solubility in the formation water than in the CO<sub>2</sub> phase. In  
96 addition to this increase in noble gas concentration in the CO<sub>2</sub>, noble gas concentrations  
97 in the gas phase are also enhanced by contemporaneous CO<sub>2</sub> dissolution into the  
98 formation water. This solvent loss effect can be corrected based on <sup>3</sup>He concentrations  
99 (Appendix DR3) (Dubacq et al., 2012).

#### 100 **Parameters and Error Calculation**

101 Following the noble gas concentration correction, the data can then be compared  
102 to a diffusion profile based on Fick's second law of diffusion:

$$103 \quad \left[ \frac{\partial C}{\partial t} = D_{eff} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} \right] (1)$$

104 where  $C$  stands for concentration,  $t$  for time,  $D_{eff}$  for the effective diffusion  
105 coefficient and  $x$  for the distance. The solution of the equation involves two boundary  
106 conditions which are set to be a constant noble gas concentration in the CO<sub>2</sub> at the gas  
107 water contact ( $C_{start}$ ) and a magmatic derived noble gas concentration ( $C_{end}$ ) at the  
108 western end of the gas field:  $[C(x, t) = C_{start} - (C_{start} - C_{end}) * \text{erf}\left(\frac{x}{2\sqrt{t*D_{eff}}}\right)] (2)$

109 The effective diffusion coefficient compensates for the indirect travel paths of the  
110 particles and differs from the common diffusion coefficient by taking into account the  
111 porosity and tortuosity:  $[D_{eff} = D \frac{\phi}{\tau}] (3)$  where  $D$  stands for the diffusion coefficient,  $\phi$   
112 the porosity and  $\tau$  the tortuosity. The diffusion coefficients have been calculated after the

113 method of He and Yu (1998) since no experimental data exists for diffusion of noble  
114 gases in supercritical CO<sub>2</sub> (Appendix DR2). Poling et al. (2001) tested this approach for  
115 the vitamin K<sub>1</sub> in supercritical CO<sub>2</sub> and found a low error of 0.4% compared to the  
116 empirically determined diffusion coefficient. The calculated diffusion coefficients for the  
117 noble gases in CO<sub>2</sub> are approximately one order of magnitude higher compared to those  
118 in water. The reported porosity of the Tubb formation in New Mexico at Bravo Dome is  
119 20% on average (Johnson, 1983; Cassidy, 2006) and the tortuosity has been calculated to  
120 be 2.4 which is a typical value for sandstones (Cassidy, 2006; Epstein, 1989; Matthews  
121 and Spearing, 1992).

122 Solutions for the diffusion profiles are calculated using a Monte Carlo simulation  
123 in Matlab where both boundary conditions and the diffusion time multiplied by the  
124 diffusion coefficient are fitted 1000 times to the data taking into account the error on  
125 measurements through minimizing  $X^2$ .

$$126 \quad X^2 = \sum_i^n \frac{(x_i - x_m)^2}{\frac{1}{2}x_{error\ range}^2} + \frac{(y_i - y(x_m))^2}{\sigma_y^2} \quad (4)$$

127 where  $x_m$  and  $y(x_m)$  are model values for the distance and the concentration,  $x_i$  and  
128  $y_i$  are the distance and concentration of the data points,  $x_{error\ range}$  is the error range of  
129 the distance and  $\sigma_y$  is the standard error of the concentration measurements (Appendix  
130 DR2). The data points in the simulation are picked randomly within the normal  
131 distribution of their standard error for the concentration and within the error range of their  
132 distance to the gas water contact. A second Monte Carlo simulation is set up to evaluate  
133 the error of the diffusion coefficient on the diffusion time. The most probable diffusion  
134 time, the diffusion coefficient,  $C_{start}$  and  $C_{end}$  are reported with asymmetric error brackets  
135 defining the 95% quantile (Fig. 2, Appendix DR2). In the simulation for xenon, about

136 one-fifth of the  $C_{end}$  concentrations resulted in negative values which were excluded since  
137 negative concentrations are meaningless. The model simplifies the field and does not  
138 account for lithology heterogeneities, residual water, compartmentalization of the field,  
139 lateral heterogeneities and temporal variation in the noble gas concentration in the  
140 formation water which would have the tendency to increase the diffusion time.

141 The fitted carbon isotope  $C_{start}$  composition of  $-7.9\text{‰}$  (Appendix DR2) fits well  
142 with a  $\text{CO}_2$  composition in equilibrium with formation water at Bravo Dome that is in  
143 equilibrium with dolomite. Dolomite with an  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  of  $\sim 2\text{‰}$  PDB (Hoefs, 2008) in  
144 equilibrium with the formation water at Bravo Dome (Kessler et al., 2001; Hartig et al.,  
145 2011) results in a  $\text{CO}_2$  groundwater endmember of  $-8\text{‰}$  based on a  $\text{CO}_2(\text{g})$ -dolomite (g-  
146 gaseous) fractionation of  $-10\text{‰}$  (Sheppard and Schwarz, 1970; Clark and Fritz, 1997) at  
147  $33\text{ °C}$  (Cassidy, 2006). The fitted  $C_{end}$  composition of the carbon isotope is  $-4.1\text{‰}$  which  
148 is in the range of magmatic derived  $\text{CO}_2$  (Jenden et al., 1993).

#### 149 **AGE ESTIMATION**

150 The model generates noble gas diffusion profiles from the gas/water contact in the  
151 east toward the western end of the field that are consistent with the observed well gas  
152 concentrations and place age constraints for the  $\text{CO}_2$  emplacement at between  $14.1 \pm 0.2$   
153 and  $16.9^{+1.1}_{-0.5}$  ka (Fig. 2C-H, Appendices DR2 and DR4). The age difference between the  
154 noble gases could arise from the uncertainty of the diffusion coefficients since the noble  
155 gas diffusion coefficients are calculated and not empirically measured. The diffusion ages  
156 are strongly influenced by the wells close to the gas water contact since these define the  
157 curvature and hence the age of the diffusion profile.

158           The diffusion of the groundwater derived noble gases through the CO<sub>2</sub> most likely  
159 started when the CO<sub>2</sub> first contacted the formation water. The gas water contact probably  
160 moved down dip from the inferred entry point (see figure 4B in Sathaye et al., 2014)  
161 throughout the filling of the CO<sub>2</sub> but this does not affect the diffusion of the noble gases  
162 in the CO<sub>2</sub>, assuming a slug like displacement of the formation water which is reasonable  
163 given the likely slow rates of filling. Today the gas water contact is more than 30 km  
164 away from the inferred entry point of the CO<sub>2</sub> (Sathaye et al., 2014). Therefore later CO<sub>2</sub>  
165 pulses, as proposed in previous studies (Baines and Worden, 2004; Sathaye et al., 2014),  
166 would not alter the noble gas diffusion profile at the gas water contact. The water table in  
167 the Bravo Dome field lies horizontally (Cassidy, 2006) and the anhydrite seal likely  
168 prevents groundwater recharge which suggests a stagnant aquifer (Akhbari and Hesse,  
169 2017). The estimated CO<sub>2</sub> emplacement ages are younger than the youngest dated  
170 effusive rock in the area. Deep igneous activity, however, could have continued after the  
171 last lava flow 56ka ago (Stroud, 1997).

172           Additionally, the change in carbon and oxygen isotopes has been investigated;  
173 this can give insight into the source of the CO<sub>2</sub> and extent of gas water exchange and CO<sub>2</sub>  
174 dissolution. The  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  varies from  $-3.2\text{‰}$  PDB in the west to  $-5.8\text{‰}$  PDB in the east.  
175 This isotopic difference originates from the presence of two sources of carbon. There is a  
176 magmatic carbon input in the west, which is isotopically distinct from the formation  
177 water derived carbon in the east. Similarly to the noble gases, diffusion controls the  
178 mixing between these two endmembers (Fig. 2B). Diffusion modeling of the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  profile  
179 indicates a development period of  $15.0^{+0.2}_{-0.5}$  ka (Fig. 2B). This age agrees well with the  
180 age estimates derived from diffusion modeling of the noble gas concentration profiles.



181           However, the evolution of oxygen isotopes is more complex. The  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$  varies  
182 from a minimum of 18.6‰ in the west to 29‰ in the east. The wells in the west have  
183 lighter isotopic composition but differ by more than 9–12‰ from an expected mantle like  
184  $\text{CO}_2$  composition of 6–9‰ (Eiler, 2001). During the displacement of the formation water  
185 by the invading  $\text{CO}_2$  an irreducible water saturation of typically 5%–22% in sandstones  
186 (Krevor et al., 2012) will be trapped in the  $\text{CO}_2$  filled pores. The pores in the Tubb  
187 formation thus contain an irreducible water saturation with a sufficient mass of oxygen  
188 such that, O-isotopic exchange can modify the O-isotopic composition across the entire  
189  $\text{CO}_2$  filled volume. A residual water content correction has been made to the O-isotope  
190 ratios based on the mass balance equation  $\delta^{18}\text{O}^f_{\text{CO}_2} = \delta^{18}\text{O}^i_{\text{CO}_2}(1-X^0_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}) + X^0_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$   
191  $(\delta^{18}\text{O}_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} + \varepsilon)$  (5) (Johnson et al., 2011) where  $\varepsilon$  is the  $\text{CO}_2(\text{g})\text{-H}_2\text{O}$  fractionation factor at  
192 33 °C (Brenninkmeijer et al., 1983),  $\delta^{18}\text{O}^i_{\text{CO}_2}$  and  $\delta^{18}\text{O}^f_{\text{CO}_2}$  refer to initial and final  
193 composition of the  $\text{CO}_2$  respectively, and  $X^0_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$  is the fraction of oxygen in the system  
194 from water. This amendment decreases the measured values only very little since the  
195 residual water saturation is as low as 5–10 vol% (Sathaye et al., 2014). Due to this  
196 complexity, the spatial trends in O-isotopic composition are not a useful constraint on the  
197 emplacement age.

## 198 **DISSOLUTION RATE**

199           Combining the range of residence times of  $14.1 \pm 0.2$  and  $16.9^{+1.1}_{-0.5}$  ka with the  
200 gas mass, which has been subject to dissolution, enables the estimation of the dissolution  
201 rate. The dissolved gas can simply be estimated by subtracting the present mass of gas in  
202 the reservoir from the mass of gas that was in place originally. The present gas volume in  
203 the reservoir has previously been estimated to be  $1.3 \pm 0.6$  Gt  $\text{CO}_2$  (Sathaye et al., 2014).

204 The original gas mass can be calculated from the difference between the present gas and  
205 the deviation from the highest CO<sub>2</sub>/<sup>3</sup>He ratio (7.4\*10<sup>9</sup>) (Appendix DR1), representing  
206 dissolution of CO<sub>2</sub> through apparent increase in <sup>3</sup>He. The dissolved gas mass has been  
207 calculated in the past (Sathaye et al., 2014), however, the highest CO<sub>2</sub>/<sup>3</sup>He ratio used was  
208 5.35\*10<sup>9</sup> (Cassidy, 2006; Gilfillan et al., 2008; Gilfillan et al., 2009). Therefore the  
209 dissolved mass is by one-third larger than previously estimated (Sathaye et al., 2014) and  
210 equates to 506 ± 166 Mt CO<sub>2</sub>. This amount is 28% of the new total estimated  
211 emplacement of 1.8 ± 0.67 Gt CO<sub>2</sub>. The resulting dissolution rate ranges from 29900  
212  $\begin{matrix} +11800 \\ -10700 \end{matrix}$  t/a to 35900 ± 12300 t/a. The gas water contact covers an estimated area of 623  
213 km<sup>2</sup> (Sathaye et al., 2014) and enables estimating the flux that ranges from 48  $\begin{matrix} +19 \\ -17 \end{matrix}$  to 58  
214 ± 19.7 g/(m<sup>2</sup>a). This flux is over 500 times larger compared to previous estimates [0.1  
215 g/(m<sup>2</sup>a)] (Sathaye et al., 2014) but still almost 400 times smaller than the estimates for the  
216 permeable Sleipner CO<sub>2</sub> storage site in the North Sea [20 kg/(m<sup>2</sup>a)], (Neufeld et al.,  
217 2010).

## 218 CONCLUSIONS

219 This diffusion model has, for the first time, been applied to estimation of the  
220 residence time of CO<sub>2</sub> in Bravo Dome. This is key for quantifying the rate of CO<sub>2</sub>  
221 dissolution occurring in carbon dioxide reservoirs. Combining the range of residence  
222 times of 14.1 ± 0.2 and 16.9  $\begin{matrix} +1.1 \\ -0.5 \end{matrix}$  ka with the gas volume, that has been subject to  
223 dissolution, we could estimate the CO<sub>2</sub> dissolution rate of 29900  $\begin{matrix} +11800 \\ -10700 \end{matrix}$  t/a to 35900 ±  
224 12300 t/a. Furthermore, the model can be tested on other natural CO<sub>2</sub> and enhanced oil  
225 recovery (EOR) reservoirs to investigate gas-water interactions and quantify gas

226 dissolution rates into the formation waters that are ubiquitously found in subsurface gas  
227 reservoirs.

## 228 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

229 We would like to thank Dr. Alina Marca from the University of East Anglia and  
230 Dave Hughes from Lancaster University for technical assistance. We are also grateful to  
231 the Statistics department at Lancaster University, Dr. Benoit Dubacq from the Centre  
232 national de la recherche scientifique (CNRS) and Prof. Jamie Gilmour from the  
233 University of Manchester for their helpful advice regarding the fitting procedure. We  
234 thank and Marc Hesse, Junji Yamamoto and one anonymous reviewer for valuable  
235 comments on this manuscript.

## 236 **REFERENCES CITED**

- 237 Akhbari, D., and Hesse, M.A., 2017, Causes of underpressure in natural CO<sub>2</sub> reservoirs  
238 and implications for geological storage: *Geology*, v. 45, no. 1, p. 47–50.
- 239 Armstrong, R.L., 1969, K-Ar dating of laccolithic centers of the Colorado Plateau and  
240 vicinity: *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, v. 80, no. 10, p. 2081–2086.
- 241 Baines, S.J., and Worden, R.H., 2004, The long-term fate of CO<sub>2</sub> in the subsurface:  
242 Natural analogues for CO<sub>2</sub> storage: *Geological Society of London, Special*  
243 *Publications*, v. 233, p. 59–85, doi:10.1144/GSL.SP.2004.233.01.06.
- 244 Ballentine, C.J., Schoell, M., Coleman, D., and Cain, B.A., 2001, 300-Myr-old magmatic  
245 CO<sub>2</sub> in natural gas reservoirs of the west Texas Permian basin: *Nature*, v. 409, no.  
246 6818, p. 327–331.
- 247 Bickle, M., Kampman, N., and Wigley, M., 2013, Natural analogues: Reviews in

- 248 Mineralogy and Geochemistry, v. 77, no. 1, p. 15–71.
- 249 Brenninkmeijer, C.A.M., Kraft, P., and Mook, W.G., 1983, Oxygen isotope fractionation  
250 between CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>O: *Chemical Geology*, v. 41, p. 181–190, doi:10.1016/S0009-  
251 2541(83)80015-1.
- 252 Broadhead, R.F., 1993, Carbon dioxide in northeast New Mexico: *West Texas Geol. Soc.*  
253 *Bull.*, v. 32, p. 5–8.
- 254 Cassidy, M.M., 2006, Occurrence and Origin of Free Carbon Dioxide Gas Deposits in the  
255 Earth's Continental Crust [Ph.D. Thesis]: Houston, Texas, University of Houston,  
256 242 p.
- 257 Clark, I.D., and Fritz, P., 1997, *Environmental Isotopes in Hydrogeology*: Boca Raton,  
258 Florida, CRC Press, LLC, 342 p.
- 259 Condit, C.D., 1995, DDM-SVF: A Prototype Dynamic Digital Map of the Springerville  
260 Volcanic Field, Arizona: *GSA TODAY*, v. 5, no. 4.
- 261 Dubacq, B., Bickle, M.J., Wigley, M., Kampman, N., Ballentine, C.J., and Sherwood  
262 Lollar, B., 2012, Noble gas and carbon isotopic evidence for CO<sub>2</sub>-driven silicate  
263 dissolution in a recent natural CO<sub>2</sub> field: *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, v.  
264 341–344, p. 10–19, doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2012.05.040.
- 265 Eiler, J.M., 2001, Oxygen isotope variations of basaltic lavas and upper mantle rocks:  
266 *Reviews in Mineralogy and Geochemistry*, v. 43, p. 319–364,  
267 doi:10.2138/gsrmg.43.1.319.
- 268 Epstein, N., 1989, On tortuosity and the tortuosity factor in flow and diffusion through  
269 porous media: *Chemical Engineering Science*, v. 44, no. 3, p. 777–779.

- 270 Gilfillan, S.M.V., Ballentine, C.J., Holland, G., Blagburn, D., Lollar, B.S., Stevens, S.,  
271 Schoell, M., and Cassidy, M., 2008, The noble gas geochemistry of natural CO<sub>2</sub> gas  
272 reservoirs from the Colorado Plateau and Rocky Mountain provinces, USA:  
273 *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, v. 72, p. 1174–1198,  
274 doi:10.1016/j.gca.2007.10.009.
- 275 Gilfillan, S.M.V., Lollar, B.S., Holland, G., Blagburn, D., Stevens, S., Schoell, M.,  
276 Cassidy, M., Ding, Z., Zhou, Z., Lacrampe-Couloume, G., and Ballentine, C.J.,  
277 2009, Solubility trapping in formation water as dominant CO<sub>2</sub> sink in natural gas  
278 fields: *Nature*, v. 458, p. 614–618, doi:10.1038/nature07852.
- 279 Hartig, K.A., Soreghan, G.S., Goldstein, R.H., and Engel, M.H., 2011, Dolomite in  
280 Permian paleosols of the Bravo Dome CO<sub>2</sub> field, USA: Permian reflux followed by  
281 late recrystallization at elevated temperature: *Journal of Sedimentary Research*, v.  
282 81, p. 248–265, doi:10.2110/jsr.2011.24.
- 283 He, C.-H., and Yu, Y.-S., 1998, New Equation for Infinite-Dilution Diffusion  
284 Coefficients in Supercritical and High-Temperature Liquid Solvents: *Industrial &*  
285 *Engineering Chemistry Research*, v. 37, p. 3793–3798, doi:10.1021/ie970898+.
- 286 Hoefs, J., 2008, *Stable isotope geochemistry*: Berlin, Springer Science & Business  
287 Media, 288 p.
- 288 Holland, G., and Ballentine, C.J., 2006, Seawater subduction controls the heavy noble gas  
289 composition of the mantle: *Nature*, v. 441, no. 7090, p. 186–191.
- 290 Jenden, P.D., Hilton, D.R., Kaplan, I.R., and Craig, H., 1993, Abiogenic hydrocarbons  
291 and mantle helium in oil and gas fields, *in* Howell, D.G., et al., eds., *U.S. Geological*  
292 *Survey Professional Paper 1570*: Reston, Virginia, U.S. Geological Survey, p. 31–56.

- 293 Johnson, R.E., 1983, Bravo dome carbon dioxide area, northeast New Mexico, *in* Fassett,  
294 J. E., ed., Oil and Gas Fields of the Four Corners Area: Four Corners Geological  
295 Society, v. 3, p. 745–748.
- 296 Kessler, J.L.P., Soreghan, G.S., and Wacker, H.J., 2001, Equatorial aridity in western  
297 Pangea: Lower Permian loessite and dolomitic paleosols in northeastern New  
298 Mexico, USA: *Journal of Sedimentary Research*, v. 71, p. 817–832,  
299 doi:10.1306/2DC4096B-0E47-11D7-8643000102C1865D.
- 300 Krevor, S., Pini, R., Zuo, L., and Benson, S.M., 2012, Relative permeability and trapping  
301 of CO<sub>2</sub> and water in sandstone rocks at reservoir conditions: *Water Resources*  
302 *Research*, v. 48, p. W02532, doi:10.1029/2011WR010859.
- 303 Matthews, G.P., and Spearing, M.C., 1992, Measurement and modelling of diffusion,  
304 porosity and other pore level characteristics of sandstones: *Marine and Petroleum*  
305 *Geology*, v. 9, no. 2, p. 146–154.
- 306 Neufeld, J.A., Hesse, M.A., Riaz, A., Hallworth, M.A., Tchelepi, H.A., and Huppert,  
307 H.E., 2010, Convective dissolution of carbon dioxide in saline aquifers: *Geophysical*  
308 *Research Letters*, v. 37, L22404, doi:10.1029/2010GL044728.
- 309 Poling, B.E., Prausnitz, J.M., John Paul, O., and Reid, R.C., 2001, *The properties of gases*  
310 *and liquids*: New York, McGraw-Hill, 768 p.
- 311 Royle, S., 2015, *The coral Cladocora caespitosa as a high resolution palaeoclimate*  
312 *archive [Ph.D. Thesis]*: Norwich, England, School of Environmental Sciences,  
313 University of East Anglia, 240 p.
- 314 Sathaye, K.J., Hesse, M.A., Cassidy, M., and Stockli, D.F., 2014, Constraints on the  
315 magnitude and rate of CO<sub>2</sub> dissolution at Bravo Dome natural gas field: *Proceedings*

316 of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, v. 111, p.  
317 15332–15337, doi:10.1073/pnas.1406076111.  
318 Sheppard, S.M.F., and Schwarz, H.P., 1970, Fractionation of carbon and oxygen isotopes  
319 and magnesium between coexisting metamorphic calcite and dolomite: Contributions  
320 to Mineralogy and Petrology, v. 26, p. 161–198, doi:10.1007/BF00373200.  
321 Staudacher, T., 1987, Upper mantle origin for Harding County well gases: Nature, v. 325,  
322 p. 605–607, doi:10.1038/325605a0.  
323 Stroud, J.R., 1997, The geochronology of the Raton-Clayton Volcanic Field, with  
324 implications for volcanic history and landscape evolution [M.S. Thesis]: Socorro,  
325 New Mexico, USA, New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, 164 p.

326

#### 327 FIGURE CAPTIONS

328

329 Figure 1. A: Map of the Bravo Dome gas field (New Mexico, USA), showing the top of  
330 the CO<sub>2</sub> hosting Tubb formation (black contour lines, in m above sea level [a.s.l.]), gas  
331 water contact (short dashed line), the <sup>3</sup>He/<sup>4</sup>He ratio (long dashed line) and the 26  
332 sampling wells (circles). B: West-east cross-section highlighting the gas water contact  
333 within the Tubb formation on the eastern side of the western most fault, as opposed to the  
334 west side, where the gas reservoir is not in contact with the formation water. The  
335 sampling wells are projected with their perforation depth (circles).

336

337 Figure 2. The CO<sub>2</sub> dissolution corrected noble gas concentrations and the measured stable  
338 isotopes are plotted against the distance to the gas water contact (A-H). The groundwater

339 derived noble gases diffusing from the gas water contact through the gas column are  
340 fitted by a Monte Carlo simulation to Fick's second law of diffusion equation (C-H). This  
341 reveals the residence time of the CO<sub>2</sub>. Additionally the Ne diffusion profile is drawn for  
342 1.2 Ma (D). The carbon isotopes show a diffusive mixing between a magmatic carbon  
343 source and a formation water carbon source that is in equilibrium with dolomite (B). The  
344 time estimated using the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  isotopes is within the range of ages estimated from the  
345 noble gases. Oxygen isotopes show full equilibration with formation water in the eastern  
346 part of the field close to the gas water contact (A). Concentration and distance errors are  
347 smaller than symbols (circles). Symbol fillings correspond to well locations in Figure 1.  
348  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$  and  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values are relative to: V-SMOW-Vienna standard mean ocean water; V-  
349 PDB- Vienna Peedee belemnite. cm<sup>3</sup>STP-cubic centimeter at standard temperature and  
350 pressure.  
351  
352 1GSA Data Repository item 2017Appendices DR1-DR4, are available online at  
353 <http://www.geosociety.org/datarepository/2017/> or on request from  
354 [editing@geosociety.org](mailto:editing@geosociety.org).









