


# Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Report 51

## Preliminary Assessment of the Potential for Carbon Dioxide Disposal by Sequestration in Geological Settings in Nevada

Jonathan G. Price  
Ronald H. Hess  
Shane Fitch  
James E. Faulds  
Larry J. Garside  
Lisa Shevenell  
Sean Warren



This assessment of the potential for disposal of CO<sub>2</sub> in geological settings considers use in enhanced oil recovery, disposal in saline aquifers, storage in caverns in salt, and reaction with igneous rocks rich in magnesium and iron. Factors that limit the potential for disposal in saline aquifers include thickness of alluvial cover; nearness to faults; mineral, geothermal, and water resources; urban areas; and restricted lands. Geographic information system files used in the analysis are included on a CD-ROM and are also available at [www.nbmng.unr.edu/dox/r51.zip](http://www.nbmng.unr.edu/dox/r51.zip).

**2005**

Mackay School of Earth Sciences and Engineering  
**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO**

# CONTENTS

<b>I. Executive Summary</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>VI. Conclusions</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>II. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>VII. Acknowledgments</b>	<b>28</b>
A. Background on the Need to Address CO <sub>2</sub>	2	<b>VIII. References</b>	<b>29</b>
B. Environmental, Health, and Safety Issues	3	<b>IX. Appendix: Geographic Information System Analysis</b>	<b>31</b>
C. General Logic for Near-Term and Long-Term Solutions	3	A. Software and Projection Information	31
D. General Aspects of the Geology of Nevada	4	B. The Binary Model	32
<b>III. Factors and Maps Considered in the Assessment</b>	<b>4</b>	C. Primary Map Layers (Coverages)	32
A. Restriction of Consideration to the Deeper Parts of Alluvial Basins	4	1. Nevada State and County Boundaries	32
B. Proximity of Active Faults to Potential CO <sub>2</sub> Sequestration Sites	7	2. Geology	32
C. Proximity to Extractable Geological Resources	9	3. Interpreted Gravity Data - Areas with Greater Than 1 Kilometer of Valley Fill	32
1. Mineral Resources	9	4. Faults	33
2. Petroleum and the Potential for CO <sub>2</sub> Sequestration through Enhanced Oil Recovery	14	5. Mineral Resources	33
3. Geothermal Resources	14	6. Geothermal	33
4. Water	16	7. Deep Carbonate Aquifer	33
D. Proximity to Urban Areas and Areas of Future Urban Growth	16	8. Areas of Population	33
E. Restricted Lands	16	9. Restricted Lands	34
F. Other Data Considered	18	D. Construction of Model Shape File	34
1. CO <sub>2</sub> Generators	18	E. Other Coverages	34
2. Transportation Infrastructure	18	1. Oil and Gas Well Database	34
<b>IV. Discussion</b>	<b>19</b>	2. Nevada Abandoned Mines Database Compilation Update	34
A. Areas Remaining for Consideration	19	3. Tracts Permissive for Ore Deposits	35
B. Legal Issues	20	4. Geothermal Resource Maps	35
<b>V. Alternative Approaches to CO<sub>2</sub> Sequestration in Geological Settings</b>	<b>23</b>	5. Power Grid, Power Plant, Pipeline, and Cement and Lime Plant Data	35
A. Storage in Mined Caverns in Salt Formations	23	6. Railroads and Highways	35
B. Chemical Reaction with Mafic and Ultramafic Rocks	25	7. Mafic and Ultramafic Rocks	35

## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Large amounts of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) are generated from the burning of fossil fuels (coal, natural gas, oil, and products, such as gasoline, derived from them), wood, and other biomass. Despite efforts to limit the burning of carbon, the world economy will almost assuredly continue to use these fuels for heat, generating electricity, and transportation. Concerns about the impacts of CO<sub>2</sub> on global climate and related aspects of weather and ecological and agricultural change have stimulated investigations of ways to sequester CO<sub>2</sub>—that is, keep it from either getting into or otherwise removing it from the atmosphere.

In 2003, the State of California, in collaboration with the States of Alaska, Arizona, Oregon, and Washington, asked the State of Nevada to participate in a regional analysis of CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration potential, through both terrestrial and geological approaches. The terrestrial approaches involve growing more biomass (particularly trees), and the geological options include proven technologies, such as using CO<sub>2</sub> to enhance recovery from oil fields and disposal of CO<sub>2</sub> in saline aquifers, and more unconventional approaches. As the state with the least amount of annual precipitation, Nevada has little potential for growing substantially more biomass relative to states along the Pacific Ocean.

In this report we present a preliminary assessment of the potential for CO<sub>2</sub> disposal by sequestration in geological settings in Nevada using analysis with geographic information systems (GIS). The key assumptions made are that for CO<sub>2</sub> disposal in saline aquifers it is wisest to (1) avoid underground disposal in areas of fractured bedrock and restrict the assessment to parts of alluvial basins that are thick enough to provide a seal against leakage and have sufficient pressure to keep the CO<sub>2</sub> in a condensed phase; (2) stay away from active faults whose fracture zones may allow leakage of CO<sub>2</sub> from underground injection sites; (3) avoid areas that in the foreseeable future have a reasonably high probability of being explored and developed for mineral, geothermal, or water resources; (4) avoid current urban areas and areas that are likely to experience significant population growth during the 21st century; and (5) avoid restricted lands, such as parks and military reservations. The data sets used in the GIS analysis are made available in the electronic version of this report, so that others may reevaluate the approach with different assumptions and data sets.

There does not appear to be much potential in Nevada for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration through disposal in saline aquifers. Among the potential deep parts of alluvial basins, few remain after eliminating areas of potential potable water, geothermal resources, and mineral resources. Within the remaining areas, little is known about porosities, permeabilities, or salinities of aquifers at depths greater than 1 km. Furthermore, such an approach would require changing Nevada law, which has a long-standing philosophy of protecting all water resources, regardless of salinity. If allowed at all, a sequestration facility would be constrained by federal and state laws to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit and applicable permits from the Underground Injection Control Program of the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection.

There also does not appear to be much potential in Nevada for conventional approaches to CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration through enhanced oil recovery, in part because the oil fields in Nevada tend not to have much associated natural gas, implying that gas originally associated with the fields has escaped. Injected CO<sub>2</sub> would likely leak to the surface as well. In addition, the oil fields in Nevada are small relative to fields in many other parts of the United States, and some of the Nevada fields are considerably hotter than ideal conditions for maintaining a dense CO<sub>2</sub> phase underground.

There is some potential for disposal of CO<sub>2</sub> in mined caverns in salt formations in basins in southern Nevada, northwestern Arizona, and southwestern Utah. The highest potential for this approach is likely to be in northwestern Arizona, where thick salt deposits are well described and are being investigated for storage of natural gas.

Chemical reaction of CO<sub>2</sub> with mafic rocks (basalt, gabbro) and ultramafic rocks (serpentine, dunite, peridotite) has the potential to capture CO<sub>2</sub> in synthetic minerals, which, in turn, could be used to isolate municipal and industrial wastes. Enough of these rocks are exposed in Arizona, California, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington to meet the expected needs for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in the region. Ultramafic rocks are more favorable than mafic rocks both volumetrically and thermodynamically. Reaction of CO<sub>2</sub> with mafic or ultramafic rocks would be a long-term solution requiring considerable research to design, perfect, and demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of the chemical reactors and associated facilities.

For Nevada to be considered a potential site for significant amounts of CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in geological settings, considerably more work would need to be done to (a) assess the thicknesses and volumes of salt formations in southern Nevada, (b) demonstrate a cost-effective process for chemical reaction with ultramafic or mafic rocks, and (c) assess the volumes of ultramafic and mafic rocks that are located in optimal areas. Given the safety concerns regarding CO<sub>2</sub> storage near urban areas, known thick salt deposits in northwestern Arizona may be a better choice than potential Nevada sites for storage in salt formations. Although Nevada occurrences of ultramafic and mafic rocks have the advantage of being remote, considerably larger areas of ultramafic rocks are known in California, Oregon, and Washington, and enormous volumes of basalt occur in eastern Oregon and Washington.

## II. INTRODUCTION

A recent report by the U.S. Government (U.S. Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change Research, 2004) stated:

“Carbon is important as the basis for the food and fiber that sustain and shelter human populations, as the primary energy source that fuels economies, and as a major contributor to the planetary greenhouse effect and potential climate change. Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) is the largest single forcing agent of climate change, and methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) is also a significant contributor.

Atmospheric concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> have been increasing for about two centuries as a result of human activities and are now higher than they have been for over 400,000 years. Since 1750, CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in the atmosphere have increased by 30% and CH<sub>4</sub> concentrations in the atmosphere have increased by 150%.

Approximately three-quarters of present-day anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are due to fossil fuel combustion (plus a small amount from cement production). Land-use change accounts for the rest. The strengths of CH<sub>4</sub> emission sources are uncertain due to the high variability in space and time of biospheric sources. Future atmospheric concentrations of these greenhouse gases will depend on trends and variability in natural and human-caused emissions and the capacity of terrestrial and marine sinks to absorb and retain carbon.

Decisionmakers searching for options to stabilize or mitigate concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere are faced with two broad approaches for controlling atmospheric carbon concentrations: 1) reduction of carbon emissions at their source—such as through reducing fossil fuel use and cement production or changing land use and management (e.g., reducing deforestation); and/or 2) enhanced sequestration of carbon—either through enhancement of biospheric carbon storage or through engineering solutions to capture carbon and store it in repositories such as the deep ocean or geologic formations.

Enhancing carbon sequestration is of current interest as a near-term policy option to slow the rise in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> and provide more time to develop a wider range of viable mitigation and adaptation options. However, uncertainties remain about how much additional carbon storage can be achieved, the efficacy and longevity of carbon sequestration approaches, whether they will lead to unintended environmental consequences, and just how vulnerable or resilient the global carbon cycle is to such manipulations.”

**Table 1.** Carbon and CO<sub>2</sub>.

Carbon, C (12.0111 grams per mole)
Oxygen, O (15.9994 grams per mole)
Burning carbon:
C [in wood, grass, and fossil fuels - natural gas, petroleum (and its products - gasoline, diesel, and heating oil), and coal]
+ O <sub>2</sub> [from the atmosphere] = CO <sub>2</sub> [into the atmosphere]
With this reaction, one ton of C yields 3.664 tons of CO <sub>2</sub> ; 1 gigaton of C yields 3.664 gigatons of CO <sub>2</sub> .
1 gigaton = 10 <sup>9</sup> metric tons = 1 billion metric tons
1 gigaton of water (with a density of 1.0 g/cm <sup>3</sup> ) occupies a volume of 1 km <sup>3</sup> .
Typical density of liquid or supercritical CO <sub>2</sub> at pressure and temperature in the subsurface = 0.5 to 0.75 g/cm <sup>3</sup>
One gigaton of liquid or supercritical CO <sub>2</sub> at a density of 0.75 g/cm <sup>3</sup> occupies a volume of 1.33 km <sup>3</sup> .
1 ton of CO <sub>2</sub> as a gas at a temperature of 0°C and 1 atmosphere of pressure occupies a volume of 467 m <sup>3</sup> .
1 barrel = 42 gallons = 158.76 liters = 0.15756 m <sup>3</sup>
1 km <sup>3</sup> = 1 billion m <sup>3</sup> = 6.35 billion barrels

## A. Background on the Need to Address CO<sub>2</sub>

Large amounts of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) are generated from the burning of fossil fuels (coal, natural gas, oil, and products, such as gasoline, derived from them), wood, and other biomass. Worldwide, humans put approximately 6.5 gigatons (6.5 billion metric tons) of carbon into the atmosphere each year from the burning of fossil fuels (Service, 2004). Some handy conversions regarding carbon and CO<sub>2</sub> are listed in table 1. The U.S. alone burns approximately one gigaton of coal per year (U.S. Energy Information Administration, 2004) and has vast resources of coal. Service (2004), in interviewing Massachusetts Institute of Technology economist Howard Herzog, stated:

“Generating electricity with coal and storing the carbon underground still costs only about 14% as much as solar-powered electricity. And unlike most renewable energy, companies can adopt it more easily on a large scale and can retrofit existing power plants and chemical plants. That’s particularly important for dealing with the vast amounts of coal that are likely to be burned as countries such as China and India modernize their economies. ‘Coal is not going to go away,’ Herzog says. ‘People need energy, and you can’t make energy transitions easily.’ Sequestration, he adds, ‘gives us time to develop 22nd century energy sources.’ That could give researchers a window in which to develop and install the technologies needed to power the hydrogen economy.”

Although no coal is produced in Nevada, coal is the primary source of energy for generation of electricity in Nevada. Thus, burning of coal is the major industrial contributor of CO<sub>2</sub> to the atmosphere from Nevada. Other contributors in Nevada include power plants, homes, businesses, and other facilities that burn natural gas, heating fuel, diesel fuel, and petroleum; cement and lime plants (that heat carbonate rocks, particularly limestone, to drive off CO<sub>2</sub> and produce reactive lime); and aircraft, trains, trucks, and automobiles.

According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration (2004), in 2002 Nevada’s coal-fired power plants, which had a capacity of generating 2,658 megawatts of electricity, released 16.6 million metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> while producing 16.4 million megawatt-hours. In the same year Nevada’s gas-fired power plants, which had a capacity of generating 1,485 megawatts, released 5.8 million metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> while producing 12.2 million megawatt-hours. Total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Nevada power plants in 2002 were 22.4 million metric tons, corresponding to 6.1 million tons of carbon (table 1).

Despite efforts to limit the burning of carbon, the world economy will almost assuredly continue to use these fuels for heat, generating electricity, and transportation for several decades to come. Concerns about the impacts of CO<sub>2</sub> on global climate and related aspects of weather and ecological and agricultural change have stimulated investigations of ways to sequester CO<sub>2</sub>—that is, keep it from either getting into or otherwise removing it from the atmosphere.

In 2003, the State of California, in collaboration with the U.S. Department of Energy and the States of Alaska, Arizona, Oregon, and Washington, asked the State of Nevada to participate in a regional analysis of CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration potential, through both terrestrial and geological approaches. The



terrestrial approaches involve growing more biomass (particularly trees), and the geological options include proven technologies, such as using CO<sub>2</sub> to enhance recovery from oil fields and disposal of CO<sub>2</sub> in saline aquifers, and more unconventional approaches. As the state with the least amount of annual precipitation, Nevada has little potential for growing substantially more biomass, relative to states along the Pacific Ocean. The Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology (NBMG) agreed to conduct a preliminary assessment of the potential for geological sequestration in Nevada. This report presents the methodology and results of this assessment.

## B. Environmental, Health, and Safety Issues

The primary objective of geologic sequestration is removal of CO<sub>2</sub> that might otherwise have entered the atmosphere; therefore, leakage needs to be minimized or altogether avoided. Prevention of leakage is also needed to avoid adverse environmental, health, and safety impacts. The oil industry, which has several decades of experience in handling CO<sub>2</sub> for injection into the ground, has not experienced major incidents regarding its use of concentrated CO<sub>2</sub>. Although it is probably safe to assume that large-scale sequestration can be engineered to essentially avoid or acceptably minimize adverse impacts, it is important to recognize the hazards of CO<sub>2</sub> in concentrated form.

Sequestration of CO<sub>2</sub> raises health and safety concerns for two primary groups of people: workers at the site of injection and the general public living or recreating near the site of injection or the pipelines used to transport the CO<sub>2</sub> from its source (power plant or other industrial facility). Although CO<sub>2</sub> occurs naturally in the air we breathe, when concentrated it can be a lethal gas that displaces oxygen in air and can quickly suffocate animals. Plants, which use oxygen as well, can also be killed by excessive CO<sub>2</sub> in soil gas and air. Underground miners have long been aware of the hazards of CO<sub>2</sub>, and care is taken in underground mines to flush through ventilation systems CO<sub>2</sub> that seeps into some mines naturally. Because CO<sub>2</sub> is denser than the nitrogen and oxygen gases that dominate the air we breathe, CO<sub>2</sub> escaping from the ground or from pipelines and storage facilities tends to move into low areas, unless there is sufficient wind or moving air to disperse it.

Recent natural disasters attest to the dangers of CO<sub>2</sub>. On 21 August 1986, Lake Nyos, a volcanic lake in Cameroon, western Africa, suddenly released approximately 80 million m<sup>3</sup> of CO<sub>2</sub>, which asphyxiated approximately 1,800 people on the flanks of the volcano at distances up to 25 km (Krajick, 2003; Service, 2004). Two years earlier in Cameroon, CO<sub>2</sub> killed 37 people nearby at Lake Monoun. In the United States, volcanic CO<sub>2</sub> is the cause of massive tree kills near Mammoth Lakes, first noticed in 1990 (Sorey and others, 1996). The Cameroon incidents may be worst-case scenarios for the type of accident that could occur at a large CO<sub>2</sub> injection facility. For comparison, one moderate-size (1,000-megawatt) coal-fired electrical power plant that burns 2.5 million metric tons of carbon per year will generate 4.7 billion m<sup>3</sup> of CO<sub>2</sub> per year. Although a catastrophic release of CO<sub>2</sub> could be devastating to anyone nearby, there is sufficient industrial experience in transporting CO<sub>2</sub> by pipeline and injecting it for enhanced oil recovery that the U.S. Department of Energy is seriously investigating the potential for large-scale disposal by geological sequestration.

In reviewing the risks associated with CO<sub>2</sub> pipelines that would need to be constructed to transport large volumes from sources to underground-injection sites, Barrie and others (2004) stated:

“Public perception is that there is significant experience with pipeline design and that CO<sub>2</sub> is relatively benign. Those in industry know that this is not the case and that special design considerations need to be implemented when constructing facilities for processing and pipelining CO<sub>2</sub>. Significant information has already been published detailing the hazards of CO<sub>2</sub> and the dangers presented by relatively low releases.”

Wickham (2003) reported 72 accidental deaths from 1975 through 1999 associated with the use of carbon dioxide in total flooding, a technique for extinguishing industrial and marine fires. He noted that death can occur in a matter of minutes when CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations exceed 17%, and adverse health effects can be experienced with prolonged exposure at concentrations as low as 2%. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (<http://www.osha.gov/>) warns about deaths from industrial accidents involving asphyxiation from CO<sub>2</sub>.

To keep CO<sub>2</sub> in a compressed, liquid state, CO<sub>2</sub> pipeline pressures must be higher than those used typically in natural gas pipelines. Extra precautions and different designs are therefore necessary for CO<sub>2</sub> pipelines. Nonetheless, CO<sub>2</sub> pipelines have been in operation for many years, and the industry has done well to reduce the risks associated with CO<sub>2</sub> releases (Barrie and others, 2004). The U.S. Department of Transportation requires reporting of accidents and incidents involving CO<sub>2</sub> and other hazardous liquid pipelines. For the period from 1 January 1990 through 1 November 2004, the U.S. Department of Transportation (2004) reported 14 incidents involving CO<sub>2</sub> pipelines, with the highest annual loss in 2004—8,180 barrels (1,299 m<sup>3</sup>) of CO<sub>2</sub>. Fortunately, no fatalities occurred associated with these leaks.

Section III of this report discusses key subsurface characteristics that are needed to assure that CO<sub>2</sub>, once injected into the ground, will stay there without slow leakage that would ruin the objective of keeping it out of the atmosphere or without rapid leakage that could be an environmental, health, or safety concern. Key geologic concerns are having a thick enough seal to keep the CO<sub>2</sub> in a dense phase and avoiding faults and fractures that could serve as pathways for fluid flow. Key socioeconomic concerns are economic benefits of extraction of mineral, energy and water resources; proximity to urban areas, largely for safety concerns; and land-use restrictions, particularly in parks, wilderness areas, military reservations, and the Nevada Test Site.

## C. General Logic for Near-Term and Long-Term Solutions

Near-term options for disposal of CO<sub>2</sub> in geological settings involve proven technologies—enhanced oil recovery (EOR) and injection into saline aquifers (Bartlett, 2003; Friedmann, 2003; White and others, 2004). Use of CO<sub>2</sub> in EOR projects has been demonstrated for many years in the Permian Basin of

western Texas (Dutton and others, 2005) and elsewhere, but these projects did not attempt to keep the CO<sub>2</sub> in the ground permanently, and leakage to the surface does occur (Klusman, 2003). In order to stabilize atmospheric concentrations, leakage of less than 0.01% per year for geological sequestration may be needed (S.M. Benson, personal commun., 2003). A large-scale demonstration project for both EOR and CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration is underway at the Weyburn oil field in Saskatchewan (Friedmann, 2003; White and others, 2004; Service, 2004); CO<sub>2</sub> is piped to the oil field from a plant in Beulah, North Dakota, which uses coal to produce a hydrogen-rich gas.

Demonstration projects are also underway to evaluate CO<sub>2</sub> injection into saline aquifers. A project in the Frio Formation in Texas shows promise for demonstrating disposal in permeable sandstones in states along the Gulf of Mexico (Bartlett, 2003; [www.beg.utexas.edu/enviroqlty/co2seq/publications.htm](http://www.beg.utexas.edu/enviroqlty/co2seq/publications.htm)). At the Sleipner West natural gas field in the North Sea, the producing company is injecting co-produced CO<sub>2</sub> into saline aquifers as a means of avoiding a Norwegian tax on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (Bartlett, 2003; Friedmann, 2003). In a reconnaissance evaluation of possible sites for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in saline aquifers in the United States, Hovorka and others (2000) noted little potential in basin-fill sediments and carbonate aquifers in the Basin and Range province of Arizona, California, and Nevada, a conclusion reinforced by this report.

Less proven technologies for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration include isolation in coal seams, thereby enhancing the recovery of coalbed methane, and oil shales, thereby enhancing oil recovery (Friedmann, 2003; Pinsker, 2003) and chemical reaction with rocks (Goff and Lackner, 1998; Friedmann, 2003; Reed, 2003; Cipolli and others, 2004). Nevada contains little coal or oil shale, but there are abundant exposures of rocks that could be used in chemical reactions.

## **D. General Aspects of the Geology of Nevada**

The general geology of Nevada is summarized in table 2 (modified from Price, 2004, and references therein). Of particular importance to CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration are repeated tectonic events during the Paleozoic, Mesozoic, and Cenozoic eras that have fractured the rocks to such an extent that natural gas generally has escaped to the surface. Ongoing crustal extension is responsible for the current basin-and-range topography in Nevada. Essentially every mountain range is bounded on one or both sides by a fault that has been active in Quaternary time.

Nevada's energy and mineral production (fig. 1) is closely linked to its tectonic history. Deep circulation of meteoric water along faults helps make geothermal resources abundant. Igneous activity during the Jurassic, Cretaceous, and Tertiary Periods is responsible for the formation of many of the metallic ore deposits scattered throughout the state. Exploration for oil and gas has occurred throughout much of the state (Garside and others, 1988), but oil has been produced commercially from only two localities, Railroad Valley in Nye County and Pine Valley in Eureka County. Minor amounts of natural gas have been produced from some wells, but the amounts are too small to justify building gas pipelines to markets in urban areas. In many cases, oil has also migrated to the surface to form seeps at springs.

We have constructed a conceptual model of oil and potential CO<sub>2</sub> reservoirs and seals in Nevada (fig. 2). In general, oil occurs in two broad types of reservoirs in Nevada: fractured and permeable Paleozoic sedimentary rocks (mostly limestones but locally also sandstones) and fractured Tertiary ash-flow tuffs. Ideal reservoirs for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration would be permeable (but unfractured) sandstones. Such sandstones may occur in the Paleozoic section and in the Tertiary valley-fill sequences in the basins. Seals for the oil reservoirs include Paleozoic marine shales, Tertiary lacustrine shales, and the non-welded, clay- or zeolite-altered upper zones of ash-flow tuffs. These rocks could also form seals for CO<sub>2</sub> reservoirs. The best seals appear to be above the Paleozoic-Tertiary unconformity. Some Paleozoic shales may be adequate seals, but these would have to be thoroughly tested if they were to provide the primary deterrent to escape of CO<sub>2</sub> from a potential reservoir.

## **III. FACTORS AND MAPS CONSIDERED IN THE ASSESSMENT**

In this section, we describe the assumptions, factors, and maps considered in assessing areas for possible CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in saline brine formations in Nevada, and we discuss the potential for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration through enhanced oil recovery. Details of the analysis methodology using a geographic information system (GIS) are provided in the appendix. Copies of all GIS layers used in the analysis are supplied in the compact disc accompanying this report, so that users may choose other assumptions and approaches in reanalyzing the data. We use a simple, binary approach; that is, in considering each factor, an area is either favorable or not favorable for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration. In the final analysis, we combine the areas in the GIS to determine remaining areas for possible consideration.

### **A. Restriction of Consideration to the Deeper Parts of Alluvial Basins**

Areas of bedrock outcrop (fig. 3) are eliminated from consideration for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration, because basin-and-range extensional deformation, coupled with earlier fracturing associated with crustal shortening (table 2), has so thoroughly fractured the bedrock that it is unlikely to contain seals that are adequate to prevent escape of CO<sub>2</sub>.

The pressure needed to keep CO<sub>2</sub> in a liquid or dense supercritical state depends on temperature (fig. 4). The pressure at the critical point is 7.4 megapascals (1,070 pounds per square inch), which corresponds to a depth of 753 m, if one assumes hydrostatic pressure (pressure of a column of water with a density of 1.0 g/cm<sup>3</sup>). A minimum depth of 800 m has been assumed for consideration of CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in other studies (e.g., Downey and Clinkenbeard, 2005). As illustrated on figure 4, if temperatures are higher than typical geothermal gradients (25 to 30°C/km) would predict at that depth, the supercritical CO<sub>2</sub> fluid density would be lower, and less CO<sub>2</sub> could be accommodated in the formation than in the preferred case for sequestration. Temperatures in some oil fields in Nevada are considerably higher than would be predicted from typical geothermal gradients (fig. 4), and

**Table 2.** Geologic time scale with major events in Nevada history (modified from Price, 2004).

Million years before present		
*****		
CENOZOIC		
Quaternary	Modern earthquakes, mountain building, basaltic and rhyolitic volcanism, and geothermal activity are expressions of Basin and Range extension that began in the Tertiary Period. The crust is being pulled apart in Nevada, causing valleys to drop relative to mountains, and right-lateral strike-slip faults in western Nevada accommodate approximately 20% of the motion between the Pacific and North American plates. Prior to 10,000 years ago, ice ages caused glaciers to form in the higher mountains and large lakes to develop in valleys.	
1.88	-----	
Tertiary	Basin and Range extension began about 30 to 40 million years ago. Igneous activity during the Tertiary Period was caused not only by extension but also by subduction (descent of oceanic crust into the Earth's mantle) of oceanic plates beneath the North American Plate and, in northern Nevada, by motion of the crust over the Yellowstone hot spot in the mantle. Numerous Nevada ore deposits, including most major gold and silver deposits and the copper ores near Battle Mountain, formed during this time. Gypsum deposits formed from evaporating lakes in southern Nevada. Tertiary basalts are abundant in several parts of the state.	
65	*****	
MESOZOIC		
Cretaceous	The Cretaceous Period and Mesozoic Era ended abruptly with the extinction of dinosaurs and many marine species. Numerous granitic igneous intrusions, scattered throughout Nevada, originated from subduction along the west coast of North America. Much of the granite in the Sierra Nevada formed at this time. The igneous activity caused many metallic mineral deposits to form, including the copper-gold-silver-lead-zinc ores near Ely in White Pine County, copper-molybdenum ores north of Tonopah in Nye County, and tungsten ores in several mining districts. In southern and eastern Nevada, sheets of rocks were folded and thrust from the west to the east during the Sevier Orogeny (mountain building), which began in Middle Jurassic time and ended at or beyond the end of the Cretaceous Period.	
144	-----	
Jurassic	A subduction zone to the west caused igneous intrusions (including the gabbroic complex near Lovelock), volcanism, and associated ore deposits (e.g., copper deposits near Yerington). Sandstones, including those in the Valley of Fire, were deposited in southeastern Nevada, and sedimentary gypsum deposits formed in northwestern Nevada.	
208	-----	
Triassic	The general geography of Nevada during the Triassic Period was similar to that during the Jurassic Period-igneous activity in the west and deposition of sedimentary rocks in continental to shallow marine environments to the east. Explosive volcanism produced thick ash-flow tuffs in west-central Nevada. Economically important limestone, gypsum, and silica-sand deposits formed in southern Nevada. The Sonoma Orogeny, which began during Late Permian time and ended in Early Triassic time, moved rocks from the west to the east along the Golconda Thrust in central Nevada. The large marine reptiles at Berlin-Ichthyosaur State Park lived during the Triassic Period.	
251	*****	
PALEOZOIC		
Permian	Volcanism to the west and deposition of thick limestones to the east were characteristics of much of the Paleozoic Era in the Great Basin. Some marine gypsum deposits formed in southern Nevada.	
290	-----	
Pennsylvanian	The Antler highland, which formed earlier, was eroded and shed sediments into the basins to the east. Carbonate rocks were deposited in eastern and southern Nevada.	
320	-----	
Mississippian	During the Antler Orogeny, from Late Devonian to Early Mississippian time, rocks were folded and thrust from the west to the east. Rocks thrust from the east include fragments of oceanic crust, including some basalts, serpentinites, and deep-water sedimentary rocks. The Roberts Mountains Thrust, below which many of the gold deposits in north-central Nevada occur, formed at this time. Conglomerate, sandstone, siltstone, and shale were deposited in the thick basin of sediments derived from the Antler highland, and carbonate rocks were deposited further east.	
360	-----	
Devonian	Limestone was deposited in eastern Nevada, and shale, chert, and economically important barite were deposited in northeastern and central parts of the state. No record of middle to lower Paleozoic rocks exists in the western part of the state. The quiet, shallow-marine tectonic setting that persisted earlier in the Paleozoic Era began to change, as small land masses from the Pacific Ocean collided with western North America.	
418	-----	
Silurian	Carbonate rocks (dolomite and limestone) in the eastern part of the state and silica-rich rocks (shale, sandstone, and chert) in the central part of the state record similar deposition to that during the rest of the middle to early Paleozoic Era.	
438	-----	
Ordovician	Marine deposition during the Ordovician Period was similar to that during the rest of the early Paleozoic Era, with the exception of basalts (metamorphosed to greenstones) locally interbedded with sedimentary rocks found today in the central part of the state. Some sedimentary barite deposits and copper-zinc-silver ores formed in sea-floor sediments during this time.	
490	-----	
Cambrian	Middle and Upper Cambrian deposition resembled that during much of the Paleozoic Era, with carbonate rocks to the east and shale plus sandstone to the west. Lower Cambrian and uppermost Precambrian rocks are characterized by quartzite and metamorphosed siltstone throughout much of Nevada.	
543	*****	
PRECAMBRIAN		
	The oldest rocks in Nevada (at least 2,500 million years old in the East Humboldt Range in northeastern Nevada and at least 1,700 million years old in southern Nevada) are metamorphic rocks. Precambrian rocks also include granites (about 1,450 million years old) and younger sedimentary rocks. Beginning approximately 750 million years ago, Antarctica and Australia may have rifted away from western North America, setting the stage for the development of a western continental margin that is similar to the Atlantic coast of today. A shallow marine, tectonically quiet setting persisted in eastern Nevada for the next 700 million years.	




Figure 1. The location of oil fields, major mines, and geothermal power plants in operation in Nevada in 2004.



abundant hot springs throughout the state attest to shallow, hot rocks in many locations. Given the absence of reliable data on temperature gradients in many areas, we have used a somewhat more conservative figure of 1,000 m as a minimum depth for consideration of CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in Nevada.

The United States Geological Survey (USGS) has interpreted publicly available gravity data, calibrated with known depths from exploration drilling, to infer areas that have at least one km of valley fill (fig. 5). We exclude from consideration any areas that are not considered in this USGS analysis to have at least one km of valley filling sediments and/or volcanic rocks.

The NBMG is the official repository for information about wells drilled for oil and gas and geothermal exploration and development in Nevada. Using the conceptual model of potential CO<sub>2</sub> reservoirs and seals (fig. 2), we extracted important geologic data from the well records (table 3). These data are summarized in NBMG Open-File Report 04-1 (Hess, 2004a). These data may be helpful in a more detailed analysis of the potential for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration at a later time, and they are useful in assessing the potential for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration using EOR.

## B. Proximity of Active Faults to Potential CO<sub>2</sub> Sequestration Sites

We use the Quaternary fault database of the USGS (<http://qfaults.cr.usgs.gov/>) and the database prepared by Craig M. dePolo (NBMG work in progress) for locations of faults (fig. 6). The former database has been checked by NBMG earthquake experts. There are two broad types of Quaternary faults in the Basin and Range province in Nevada—strike-slip faults and normal faults. Some faults have moved with oblique slip (a combination of normal and strike slip). Faults commonly have zones of fracturing, which could allow CO<sub>2</sub> to escape. In fact, it is likely that CO<sub>2</sub> would escape along these faults, because many Nevada petroleum seeps and hot springs occur along faults. We therefore exclude from consideration areas that are close to faults. For normal faults, we exclude an area 1.93 km wide on the hanging wall (down-dip side) of the fault. The 1.93-km figure corresponds to the surface projection of a 60-degree dipping fault to a vertical depth of 3 km plus an additional 200 m into the hanging wall to account for a zone of fault gouge, breccia, and fractures (fig. 7A). In the GIS analysis, we actually use a 1.93-km zone on both sides, because the footwall is already excluded as bedrock or as areas of alluvial






Figure 2. Cross-sectional conceptual model of potential CO<sub>2</sub> reservoirs and seals in Nevada.



**Figure 3.** Map showing the distribution of bedrock (gray, representing consolidated rocks of Tertiary and older age) versus Quaternary-Tertiary alluvial deposits (white) in Nevada. Areas of Quaternary glacial drift, which are generally thin and occur mostly in mountains, are included with the bedrock. Major lakes are shown in black.



**Figure 5.** Map showing where valley-filling alluvium and volcanic rocks exceed 1 km in thickness (white areas, modified from Dohrenwend and others, 1996).



**Figure 4.** Phase relations, with lines of equal density, for CO<sub>2</sub> (modified from Roedder, 1984). TP = triple point (-56.6°C, 0.5 megapascals), at which solid, liquid, and gaseous CO<sub>2</sub> coexist. CP = critical point (31.0°C, 7.38 megapascals), above which the distinction between gas and liquid cannot be made with increasing pressure or temperature. ES = bottom-hole temperature (93°C at 1,830 m) in the Eagle Springs oil field (Shevenell and Garside, 2005, and [www.nbmj.unr.edu/geothermal/gthome.htm](http://www.nbmj.unr.edu/geothermal/gthome.htm)). BF = reservoir temperature (120–130°C at about 1,625 m) in the Bacon Flat-Grant Canyon oil fields (Hulen and others, 1994).

cover less than one kilometer in thickness. For strike-slip faults, we exclude an area 500 m on either side of the fault (fig. 7B). We feel that this is a reasonable minimum number, corresponding to the typical 1-km width of breccia and gouge along the San Andreas fault in California but somewhat less than the 2-km-wide zone of fault splays along well mapped strike-slip faults in Nevada. Before any site in Nevada would be used for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in saline brines or EOR, the geological framework of the site would need to be investigated in detail to locate the three-dimensional distribution of fault splays, gouge, and breccias.

We use the probabilistic seismic hazard analysis by the USGS to report the expected peak acceleration (expressed as a percentage of the acceleration due to gravity, %g) with 2% probability of exceedance in 50 years (<http://eqhazmaps.usgs.gov/html/us2002.html>) for the state, including those areas that may be potential CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration sites (fig. 8). We did not eliminate any areas based on these values of seismic intensity and ground motion. Should sites be chosen, the engineers designing the facility should take into consideration these values and any (deterministic) values based on credible scenarios on nearby faults. Furthermore, should

CO<sub>2</sub> pipelines be built across faults in Nevada, care must be taken to design them to accommodate the maximum likely slip resulting from earthquakes on specific faults.

## C. Proximity to Extractable Geological Resources

### 1. Mineral Resources

Nevada is a major producer of nonfuel mineral resources, generally ranking second or third among the 50 states in recent years in terms of total dollar value of annual production. Nevada production is the reason why we are in the midst of the biggest gold-mining boom in American history (fig. 9). Gold and silver dominate the mining activity, but many other commodities are currently being mined [barite, copper, magnesite, lithium, the specialty clays, sepiolite and saponite, other clays, construction aggregate (sand, gravel, and crushed stone), lime, diatomite, gypsum, raw materials for cement, silica (industrial sand), dimension stone, semiprecious gemstones, perlite, salt, kalinite (potassium alum), zeolites, and mercury as a by-product of gold and silver processing]. In the past, Nevada has been a major producer of antimony, arsenic,

**Table 3.** Information recorded from records of deep wells drilled in Nevada (Hess, 2004).

#### DEFINITIONS

CO<sub>2</sub> reservoir rock = sandstone, conglomerate, sand, or gravel

Seal rock = shale, mudstone, claystone, mud, clay, halite, gypsum, salt, or nonwelded (possibly clay- or zeolite-altered) ash-flow tuff

NEITHER A CO<sub>2</sub> RESERVOIR ROCK NOR SEAL =

limestone, dolomite, fractured volcanic rock, fractured sandstone, quartzite, metamorphic rocks, or granite or other igneous rocks

Data collected from well records, if available, in wells within areas not otherwise excluded for consideration of CO<sub>2</sub>

1. Total depth of well.
2. Are there potential CO<sub>2</sub> reservoir rocks in the well below 1 km (3281 ft) depth? If no, go to next well.
3. Is there a potential seal below 1 km and above that reservoir rock? If no, go to next well.
4. Depth to base of Cenozoic/Tertiary volcanic rocks and alluvium.
5. Depth to base of deepest reservoir rock in pre-Tertiary sedimentary package.
6. How fresh is the water in this deepest reservoir rock? (Total dissolved solids - TDS?)
7. How porous is this deepest reservoir rock? % of porosity?
8. How permeable is this deepest reservoir rock? K in millidarcy?
9. Thickness of the thickest single pre-Tertiary reservoir rock.
10. How fresh is the water in this thickest pre-Tertiary reservoir rock?
11. How porous is this thickest pre-Tertiary reservoir rock?
12. How permeable is this thickest pre-Tertiary reservoir rock?
13. Total thickness of all pre-Tertiary reservoir rocks.
14. Thickness of the thickest single pre-Tertiary seal rock above the deepest reservoir rocks.
15. Total thickness of all pre-Tertiary seal rocks above the deepest reservoir rocks.
16. Depth to base of deepest reservoir rock in Tertiary sedimentary package below 1 km.
17. How fresh is the water in this deepest reservoir rock in Tertiary package?
18. How porous is this deepest reservoir rock in Tertiary package?
19. How permeable is this deepest reservoir rock in Tertiary package?
20. Thickness of the thickest single Tertiary reservoir rock below 1 km.
21. How fresh is the water in this thickest single Tertiary reservoir?
22. How porous is this thickest single Tertiary reservoir?
23. How permeable is this thickest single Tertiary reservoir?
24. Total thickness of all Tertiary reservoir rocks below 1 km.
25. Thickness of thickest single Tertiary seal rock below 1 km.
26. Total thickness of all Tertiary seal rocks below 1 km.
27. Total thickness of all Tertiary seal rocks below 1 km and above shallowest reservoir rock.
28. Thickness of halite beds below 1 km.

#### FACTORS THAT CAN NOW BE DERIVED FROM THESE NUMBERS

- A. Total thickness of potential reservoir rocks = #13 + #24
- B. Total thickness of potential seal rocks above the deepest reservoir rock and below 1 km = #15 + #26
- C. Reservoir rock to seal rock ratio = #A/#B, ~ sand/shale ratio




Figure 6. Distribution of Quaternary faults in Nevada with buffered zones next to faults.






Figure 8. Map showing expected peak acceleration (as percentage of the acceleration due to gravity) with 2% probability of exceedance in 50 years from the USGS probabilistic seismic hazard analysis (<http://eqhazmaps.usgs.gov/2002April03/CNU/CNUpga2500v4.gif>).



A. Normal fault



B. Strike-slip fault

Figure 7. Cross sections of active faults typically found in Nevada.



fluorite, iron, lead, manganese, molybdenum, tungsten, and zinc, and resources exist of a number of additional metals, industrial minerals, and uranium. For some of these commodities, Nevada will undoubtedly be a producer again in the future.

Hess (2001) identified over 100,000 point locations of mine shafts, prospect pits, adits, open-pit mines, quarries, sand-and-gravel borrow pits, and other excavations in Nevada (fig. 10). Although this database was not directly used in the analysis of mineral resources, it illustrates the broad geographic distribution of mineral resources in Nevada.

We exclude from consideration for potential CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration any areas that are likely to experience mineral production in the future, with the exception of sand and gravel resources, which are mined from shallow (generally less than 100 m deep) quarries and blasting is rarely needed to break the rock. Mining of these resources would not necessarily impinge on the safety of a deeper CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration site. Most of the other mineral commodities are mined from underground workings or large open pits. Deep exploratory drilling, the opening of mine workings themselves, and ground shaking from blasting could adversely affect the integrity of a CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration reservoir. Furthermore, leakage of CO<sub>2</sub> from a reservoir at depth could kill people underground and in low areas in the open-pit mines.

There are several approaches that could be taken to evaluate areas of potential mineral-resource development. The USGS (Cox and others, 1996a, b, and c) used various geological and GIS approaches to identify tracts of land that they consider

permissive for several types of metal deposits, including epithermal deposits (fig. 11), pluton-related deposits (fig. 12), and deposit types not directly related to plutonic activity (fig. 13). When combined, the three USGS maps would eliminate from consideration nearly all of the state (fig. 14).

Another approach to evaluating areas of potential mineral-resource development is to use locations of existing mines and prospects. Tingley (1998) outlined mining districts (fig. 15) using similarities in geological environments and, to a lesser extent, commodities produced. To test how well this map captures known mineral deposits, we compared the mining district outlines with two databases on mineral occurrences in Nevada—(1) the combined Mineral Resource Data System (MRDS) database of the USGS and the Mineral Industry Location System (MILS) database of the former U.S. Bureau of Mines and (2) an NBMG database on gold and silver resources in Nevada (Davis and Tingley, in review). The latter database includes known deposits, mostly with well defined resources, many of which have yet to go into production.

Many MRDS/MILS data points lie outside the mining district outlines (fig. 16), because these locations often represent single mines for which a district designation was not warranted. Ninety-five percent of the MRDS/MILS data points lie within a buffer of 5 km around the mining district outlines; 99% are within a 12-km buffer; and 100% are within 42 km of the mining district outlines. Most, but not all, of the locations from the NBMG database on gold and silver resources in Nevada fall within the outlines of the mining districts (fig. 17).




Figure 9. U.S. and Nevada gold production from 1835 through 2004 (Price and Meeuwig, 2005).




Figure 10. Locations of mine shafts, prospect pits, adits, open-pit mines, quarries, sand-and-gravel borrow pits, and other mineral-resource excavations in Nevada (from Hess, 2001).




Figure 11. Tracts permissible for epithermal deposits (dark areas, Cox and others, 1996b).




Figure 12. Tracts permissible for pluton-related deposits (dark areas, Cox and others, 1996a).






Figure 13. Tracts permissible for deposit types not directly related to plutonic activity (dark areas, Cox and others, 1996c).



**Figure 14.** Combined tracts permissive for metal-bearing mineral resources (dark areas, derived by combining dark areas from figs. 11, 12, and 13).



**Figure 15.** Locations of mining districts (Tingley, 1998). Metal-mining districts are shown with dark shading; districts that produced only industrial minerals are shown with light shading.



**Figure 16.** Locations of points (individual mines) in the combined MRDS/MILS database (Source: USGS and U.S. Bureau of Mines) superimposed on the outlines of mining districts (fig. 15).



**Figure 17.** Locations of points (individual gold and silver deposits) in the NBMG database on gold and silver resources superimposed on the outlines of mining districts (fig. 15).

We compared the MRDS/MILS data points with the NBMG database. With few exceptions, the bulk of the deposits in the NBMG database fall within 5 km of a MRDS/MILS location (fig. 18). A combination of these maps provides us with our best estimate of the areas likely to experience mineral-resource development; these are areas to be excluded from consideration for CO<sub>2</sub> disposal (fig. 19). We chose to include features from three databases:

- (1) a 5-km buffer around the MRDS/MILS locations,
- (2) a 5-km buffer around the NBMG database of known gold and silver resources, and
- (3) outlines of mining districts.

We chose not to add a buffer around the mining districts because the 5-km buffer around the other locations largely covers those outlines and because many of the outlines for industrial minerals reasonably cover the area that is likely to experience production.

Although we can use this approach to predict the most likely areas for metallic mineral-resource exploration, it is not possible to predict where everyone may choose to explore in the future. As an example, the Carlin trend, a belt of gold deposits in north-central Nevada, which accounts for 12% of all the gold ever mined in the United States and a bit more than 1% of all the gold ever mined in the world (Price and Meeuwig, 2005), had little activity before the discovery of the Carlin deposit in 1961. Since then, many Carlin-type gold deposits have been discovered along the Carlin trend and the subparallel Battle Mountain-Eureka trend, areas which before 1961 would have been beyond the 5-km buffers of known deposits. The impact of withdrawal of federal lands from mineral exploration and development, which may be necessary for CO<sub>2</sub> disposal in deep wells in Nevada, is discussed in the section on Legal Issues.

## **2. Petroleum and the Potential for CO<sub>2</sub> Sequestration through Enhanced Oil Recovery**

Significant production of oil in Nevada has come only from Railroad and Pine Valleys (fig. 20). There is, however, considerable excitement about the potential for oil and gas discovery in deep zones below thrust faults. We do not attempt to eliminate any areas of potential oil and gas discovery from consideration for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration (unless those areas are eliminated for other reasons), because such areas may be ideal for use of CO<sub>2</sub> in enhanced oil recovery. Before any enhanced oil recovery using CO<sub>2</sub> would be undertaken, however, care must be taken to ensure that the reservoirs would not leak beyond the limits required for effective long-term sequestration. We suspect that the reservoirs would, in general, be leaky, because the active extensional tectonic environment in Nevada has probably limited natural gas accumulations.

There is some potential for use of CO<sub>2</sub> in enhanced oil recovery in Nevada, but the ability for the Nevada oil reservoirs to trap and retain the CO<sub>2</sub> is questionable. Some of the oil fields are hot, and the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> sequestered would therefore be less than in an equal volume of reservoir rock at the same depth in a cooler area (fig. 4). The fields are also

small, relative to many fields in the United States. Only two Nevada fields have produced over 10 million barrels, and cumulative production from all 15 fields is only 48 million barrels (Davis, 2004). To put this in perspective, one gigaton of CO<sub>2</sub> at a density of 0.75 g/cm<sup>3</sup> would occupy a volume of 8.5 billion barrels. That is, much larger oil fields than those discovered thus far in Nevada will be needed for significant CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration. Some of the fields (particularly in Pine Valley) are shallower than the minimum depth of 800 m for liquid or supercritical CO<sub>2</sub>. The potential for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration through enhanced oil recovery in Nevada is also likely to be further limited because of leakage. These oil fields tend not to have much associated natural gas, implying that gas that was probably associated with the fields has largely escaped. We do know that gas was associated with these oil fields, because small amounts of gas have been reported in some of the fields, and one in Huntington Valley (Jiggs No. 10-1 of Wexpro Co.) discovered significant quantities of gas but was too far from market to be economic. Injected CO<sub>2</sub> would likely leak to the surface as well, although the time scale for such leakage is not known. The timing of oil and gas generation in Nevada is not well known, and it almost assuredly occurred at different times at different places, given the repeated history of thrusting and intrusion (table 2). The fact that some source rocks near the producing oil fields in Nevada are immature and the hot temperatures of some of the fields imply that oil and gas may be generated today, in which case leakage of natural gas has likely been fairly rapid.


In addition, the larger fields in Railroad Valley, one of which (the Kate Spring Field) does have a small amount of natural gas (Davis, 2004), are distant from any natural gas pipelines and major industrial sources of CO<sub>2</sub>. A relatively close source could arise in the future, however, if the 1,600-megawatt coal-fired power plant proposed in White Pine County (Public Utilities Commission of Nevada, 2005) comes on line as expected by 2010 or shortly thereafter.

## **3. Geothermal Resources**


Nevada is a significant producer of electrical energy from geothermal resources (worth on the order of \$100 million per year; Hess, 2004b). Geothermal resources are also used in Nevada for space heating and other industrial purposes, notably for drying garlic and onions. Hot springs and wells (with water warmer than 37°C) and warm springs (with water warmer than 20°C and 10°C above the average annual surface temperature) occur throughout the state (Shevenell and Garside, 2005), but most of the commercial geothermal developments have been in the northern part of the state (fig. 1). Known geothermal areas are likely to be problematic for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration because densities of the supercritical CO<sub>2</sub> will be lower than is optimal for economical sequestration (fig. 4).

The Great Basin Center for Geothermal Energy at the University of Nevada, Reno has analyzed the potential for geothermal development in Nevada, largely using regional heat flow and state of stress as deduced from geodetic observations (fig. 21, Coolbaugh and others, 2005, in press). Primarily using locations of known hot and warm springs and wells,







**Figure 18.** Locations of points (individual gold and silver deposits) in the NBMG database on gold and silver resources superimposed on the 5-km buffers around locations (individual mines) in the combined MRDS/MILS database.



**Figure 19.** Areas likely to experience mineral-resource development, with the exception of sand and gravel in Nevada (dark areas). This map combines a 5-km buffer around the MRDS/MILS locations with a 5-km buffer around the NBMG database of known gold and silver resources, and outlines of mining districts. Note that a broader area is indicated by the USGS in their analysis of tracts permissive for metal-bearing mineral resources (fig. 14).



**Figure 20.** Gray shade indicates areas of reported oil production in Nevada. Black dots indicate oil production wells with greater than 1 km of Quaternary-Tertiary valley fill.



**Figure 21.** Simplified geothermal potential map of Nevada, adapted from Coolbaugh and others (in press). Gray areas have a higher than average probability of hosting high-temperature (greater than or equal to 150°C) geothermal resources compared to the rest of the Great Basin. Circles are known geothermal systems with estimated reservoir temperatures greater than or equal to 150°C.

Trexler and others (1983) outlined broad areas in Nevada as having potential for geothermal resource development (fig. 22a). Blackwell and Richards (2004a and 2004b) used a combination of data from bottom-hole temperatures and heat-flow measurements of various petroleum and geothermal exploration wells to estimate temperatures at 4 km below the surface. As an additional comparison, areas with temperatures greater than 150°C at 4 km are considered by Blackwell and Richards (2004b) to have the most potential (fig. 22b).

In comparing the locations of known geothermal anomalies (hot and warm springs, hot and warm wells, and holes with measured moderate and high heat flow from Shevenell and Garside (2005) with figures 21, 22a, and 22, we note that a buffer of 20 km from these geothermal anomalies includes nearly all the high and moderate potential areas shown on figures 21 and 22a. We have therefore chosen a buffer of 20 km from these known geothermal anomalies for the areas to exclude from consideration for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration on the basis of potential geothermal resources (fig. 23). Although a more sophisticated approach may have been to elongate the buffer zones along faults that control the geothermal systems, we know too little about the controlling faults to do this throughout the state (Faulds and others, 2004).

#### 4. Water

Nevada is the driest state in the nation in terms of average annual precipitation. Water is a precious resource for many reasons—industrial and urban sustainability and growth, ecological health, agriculture, recreation, and other cultural values. Sustaining adequate water resources is vital for Nevada's future. One of the principal aquifers in the state is the Deep Carbonate Aquifer of eastern Nevada (Thomas and others, 1986; fig. 24). It is broadly defined to include the entire package of Paleozoic carbonate rocks stretching from the northeastern part of the state south-southwestward into California, with a general drop in the elevation of the potentiometric surface in that direction. The aquifer is recharged primarily through rain and snowmelt in the high mountains. The carbonate rocks underlie many of the valleys as well. For example, the water co-produced with petroleum in carbonate rocks in Railroad Valley is dominantly fresh water and is considered a resource for future use. This aquifer feeds important springs and wetlands in the region. We eliminate areas potentially underlain by the Deep Carbonate Aquifer from consideration for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration.

By eliminating all areas potentially underlain by the Deep Carbonate Aquifer, we are also eliminating the possibility of using deep (> 1 km) saline aquifers that may occur above the Deep Carbonate Aquifer in the Tertiary basins of eastern and southern Nevada. We anticipate that such situations are rare, because the Deep Carbonate Aquifer, itself recharged by rain and snowmelt high in the mountains, tends to recharge the overlying Tertiary aquifers, as in Las Vegas Valley. There are two major reasons for eliminating these areas: (1) drilling through any deep saline aquifers in search of potable water in the Deep Carbonate Aquifer could hinder the integrity of a CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration site; and (2) depending on the density of the brine-CO<sub>2</sub> fluid and the relative heads of the brine and the deeper aquifer, the brine could sink into and contaminate the Deep Carbonate Aquifer.


There are other areas of significant potable groundwater resources outside the Deep Carbonate Aquifer. For example, some large gold-mining operations in northern Nevada pump substantial quantities (tens to hundreds of thousands of liters per minute) of high-quality water from alluvial and bedrock aquifers. Before any project to dispose of CO<sub>2</sub> in saline aquifers were to be undertaken, the local hydrogeology would need to be investigated in detail to understand impacts on useable water resources. In addition, as discussed in the section on Legal Issues in this report, the State of Nevada considers all waters, regardless of salinity, as potential resources.

#### D. Proximity to Urban Areas and Areas of Future Urban Growth


Because of safety issues, we do not feel that it would be wise to build a CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration facility near urban areas. We have therefore eliminated from consideration areas that are currently densely populated or may be developed during the 21st century (fig. 25). We eliminate from consideration a 30-km buffer around current urban areas (as mapped from 2000 data of the U.S. Census Bureau), a 10-km buffer around current towns not classified as urban areas, and a 10-km buffer along major highways connecting urban areas (specifically, U.S. Highway 395, I-15, I-80, U.S. Highway 50 from Lake Tahoe to Fallon, U.S. Highway 95 from Indian Springs to Laughlin, U.S. Highway 93 from Apex to Hoover Dam, and Nevada Route 160, which goes through Pahrump). These buffers are reasonable given the remarkable urban growth in Nevada during the 20th century. For example, Las Vegas was not an urban area at the beginning of the 20th century, but by the beginning of the 21st century, nearly the entire 20x30-km valley had been converted to urban and suburban development.

#### E. Restricted Lands


Approximately 86% of Nevada is managed by the federal government, largely by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park Service, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Energy. Nevada contains many areas in which a CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration facility could not be permitted, in part because of the difficulty of building a pipeline into the facility. These include National, Regional, and State Parks; National Recreation Areas; Wilderness Areas (but not Wilderness Study Areas); Military Reservations; and the Nevada Test Site. These areas have been eliminated from consideration (fig. 26), because it is unlikely that permission for building a CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration facility would be granted by the controlling agencies. We did not consider the possibility of directional drilling into these restricted lands, nor did we consider the possibility that Congress could act to allow CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in these areas as a general benefit to the public. Permission might be granted in some other reserved lands, such as BLM Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, National Conservation Areas, Indian Reservations, and National Wildlife Refuges. Should further consideration be given to specific areas, care should be taken to avoid areas that may be converted to a restricted status.




**Figure 22a.** Areas of potential for geothermal development (gray) according to Trexler and others (1983).



**Figure 22b.** Areas of potential for geothermal development (gray) according to Blackwell and Richards (2004b), using their areas with temperatures in excess of 150°C at 4 km depth.




**Figure 23.** Areas excluded from consideration for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration on the basis of potential geothermal resources. This map uses a buffer of 20 km from the locations of known hot and warm springs, hot and warm wells, and moderate to high heat flow wells shown on NBMG Map 141 (Shevenell and Garside, 2005).




**Figure 24.** Distribution of the Deep Carbonate Aquifer, the principal deep aquifer in eastern and southern Nevada.





**Figure 25.** Areas of current high population density and areas likely to be developed during the 21st century. The gray areas include a 30-km buffer around major current population centers and a 10-km buffer around highways along which significant development has been taking place.



**Figure 26.** National, Regional, and State Parks, National Recreation Areas, Wilderness Areas, Military Reservations, and the Nevada Test Site.

## F. Other Data Considered

### 1. CO<sub>2</sub> Generators

Ideally, a sequestration site will be located close to the site of CO<sub>2</sub> generation. The largest generators of CO<sub>2</sub> are generally power plants, refineries, and lime and cement plants (fig. 27). In Nevada, large coal-fired power plants are located near Battle Mountain (Valmy plant, Humboldt County), Laughlin (Mohave plant, Clark County), and Moapa (Reid Gardner plant, Clark County). New coal-fired power plants have been proposed in the Gerlach area in northern Washoe County in the northwestern part of the state (Sempra Energy's Granite Fox project), in White Pine County in the eastern part of the state (White Pine Energy Associates), and in Boulder Valley in Eureka County in the northern part of the state (Newmont Mining Company), and Sierra Pacific Power has proposed expanding the Valmy operation.

Nevada also has several natural gas-fired (and oil-fired) power plants; among the largest are the Clark Station in Las Vegas Valley in Clark County, the Fort Churchill plant in Lyon County, the El Dorado plant southwest of Boulder City in Clark County, and the Tracy plant near Reno-Sparks in Washoe County. Additional gas-fired plants came into service in 2003 and 2004 at Apex, North Las Vegas, and Primm in Clark County, and others have been proposed to the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (<http://www.puc.state.nv.us/>) to meet the demands of the region's increasing population. Natural

gas is also burned in the production of wallboard from gypsum in Clark and Washoe Counties.


The only significant, albeit small, oil refinery in Nevada is in Railroad Valley. Much of Nevada's petroleum is trucked or railed to the Salt Lake City area for refining. A small refinery near Tonopah in Nye County is no longer in operation.

The only major operating cement plant in Nevada (with production over 500,000 short tons per year) is at Fernley in Lyon County. Another plant near Logandale in Clark County produced intermittently in recent years, and development is underway to start a new plant near Interstate 80 in Pershing County (Castor, 2004). Major lime plants operate in the Toano Range near West Wendover in Elko County, and at Apex, near Las Vegas in Clark County. Small amounts of lime are also produced at a plant in Henderson near Las Vegas (Castor, 2004). The major existing CO<sub>2</sub>-generating facilities are located on figure 27.


### 2. Transportation Infrastructure

Constructing a CO<sub>2</sub> pipeline would be facilitated if it follows current pipelines and transportation routes, along which rights of way may be easier to obtain than in remote areas. Figure 28 has locations of current major gas and petroleum-product (gasoline, jet fuel, diesel fuel) pipelines, electrical transmission lines, highways, and railroads. Major storage facilities for petroleum products in Nevada are currently in and near urban areas and on military bases.





**Figure 27. Major CO<sub>2</sub> generators in Nevada (coal- and natural gas-fired power plants, proposed coal-fired power plants, cement and lime plants, and oil refineries).**



**Figure 28. Major pipelines for petroleum products and natural gas, electrical transmission lines, highways, and railroads.**

## IV. DISCUSSION

### A. Areas Remaining for Consideration


The binary (yes-no) approach of GIS analysis used in this report (Appendix) to assess the potential for CO<sub>2</sub> disposal in saline aquifers boils down to the following key assumptions or criteria: (1) avoid underground disposal in areas of fractured bedrock and restrict the assessment to parts of alluvial basins that are thick enough to provide a seal against leakage and have enough pressure to keep the CO<sub>2</sub> in a condensed phase; (2) stay away from active faults whose fracture zones may allow leakage of CO<sub>2</sub> from underground injection sites; (3) avoid areas that in the foreseeable future have a reasonably high probability of being explored and developed for mineral, geothermal, and water resources; (4) avoid current urban areas and areas that are likely to experience significant population growth during the 21st century; and (5) avoid restricted lands, such as parks and military reservations. After combining the relevant GIS data sets, a few areas that meet all the criteria remain (fig. 29).

The valleys with the largest areas of potential for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration by injection into saline aquifers are Granite Springs Valley in Pershing County, Antelope and Reese River Valleys in Lander County, and Ione Valley in Nye County. Each contains 30 km<sup>2</sup> or more area. The NBMG has no records of deep (>1,000 m) wells in any of these areas. The type of information listed in table 3 would be needed to more fully evaluate the potential for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in these areas. In particular, information is needed on the porosity, permeability, thickness, and salinity of deep aquifers in these areas. Although no data are available in

the immediate areas shown to be potentially favorable for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration on figure 29, we can hypothesize the existence of favorable aquifers on the basis of nearby wells and the expectation that most deep alluvial basins will contain some permeable sandy aquifers and clay-rich seals.

A further complication is that some of the areas shown as thick basins are likely filled with thick accumulations of Tertiary volcanic rocks rather than mostly sediments. Because the differences in density between sediments and volcanic rocks, particularly tuffs, is small, the zones shown on figure 5, interpreted from gravity data, actually show combined thickness of basin-filling sediments and volcanic rocks. For example, the upper part of a well near the thickest part of Antelope Valley (Arco Exploration's Antelope Valley No. 1 well, a wildcat drilled in late 1984 and early 1985 in Lander County) contains basin-filling sands, gravels, silt, and clay, but from 212 to 890 m, the well penetrated mostly tuff and clay-rich tuffaceous sediments. All four areas with 30 km<sup>2</sup> or greater area in figure 29 are likely to contain significant accumulations of Tertiary volcanic rocks; that is, the basin-filling sediments may not be as thick as desired.

The total area identified with potential for CO<sub>2</sub> disposal in figure 29 is 524 km<sup>2</sup>. If further investigation indicated that thick, permeable sandstones with saline water do indeed exist in these areas, it is possible that significant amounts of CO<sub>2</sub> could be sequestered. Assuming a porosity of 10% in the subsurface sandstone formation, 1 gigaton of CO<sub>2</sub> at a density of 0.75 g/cm<sup>3</sup> would require a volume of 13.3 km<sup>3</sup>. Assuming the sandstone thickness to be 100 m, this would require a



**Figure 29. Areas with potential for CO<sub>2</sub> waste disposal through geological sequestration in possibly saline aquifers in Nevada (white). All other areas within Nevada have been eliminated for one or more of the following reasons: outcropping bedrock (fig. 3), shallow valley fill (fig. 5), nearness to faults (fig. 6), mineral-resource development (fig. 19), geothermal resource development (fig. 23), potable water resources (fig. 24), urban expansion (fig. 25), or permission is not likely to be granted (fig. 26).**

surface area of 133 km<sup>2</sup>. One gigaton of CO<sub>2</sub> is a reasonable expectation for a full-scale CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration project associated with a large power plant. A 2,000+-megawatt plant that burned 5 million metric tons of carbon per year for 50 years would produce 0.9 gigaton of CO<sub>2</sub>. Clearly, more data would be needed on the subsurface geology in these areas remaining after the GIS analysis before proceeding with a CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration project.

The largest of the areas identified with potential for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in figure 29 is Granite Springs Valley. Although little is known about the subsurface geology in this valley, based on regional comparisons, it is possible that the area has potential for geothermal development, and the subsurface temperatures may be too high for cost-effective sequestration. Richards and Blackwell (2002a) rated the Trinity Mountains, immediately east of Granite Springs Valley, as one of the top 15 areas for geothermal development in Nevada, based in part on estimated heat loss (Richards and Blackwell, 2002b). Should further investigation of Granite Springs Valley be warranted, particular care should be taken to evaluate its geothermal potential.

## B. Legal Issues

This section discusses Nevada laws and regulations that pertain to potential CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration projects. Whereas injection of CO<sub>2</sub> to enhance oil recovery would likely be allowed, disposal in saline aquifers currently appears to be illegal in Nevada. Nevada law prohibits disposal of industrial wastes, whether considered hazardous or not, into any aquifers. Nonetheless, the Nevada Legislature could change the law to specifically allow CO<sub>2</sub> injection into saline aquifers. No such prohibition exists in many other states, and Nevada law does allow injection of materials into aquifers under other, specific exemptions.

Nevada law (table 4) currently prohibits disposal of pollutants in aquifers, including saline aquifers. Chapter 445a of the Nevada Revised Statutes (concerning water controls) contains the relevant sections of the law. Section 465 specifically prohibits injection of fluids through a well into any waters of the State, which are defined in Section 415 to include groundwater. Section 400 defines pollutants and provides exceptions for injection of fluids to stimulate oil, natural gas, or geothermal production. That is, injection of CO<sub>2</sub> for enhanced oil recovery may be permitted in Nevada.

The Underground Injection Control (UIC) Program of the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection regulates injection wells under the authority of the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 445A.300 - 445A.730 and the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) NAC 445A.810 - 445A.925, inclusive. According to the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (2005), Nevada has divided injection wells into five classes pursuant to federal regulations:

Class I for the disposal of industrial, municipal, and radioactive waste,

Class II for the production and storage of oil and gas (including enhanced oil recovery),

Class III for the extraction of minerals or energy (in-situ mining),

Class IV for injection of hazardous waste,

Class V for several specific exceptions (table 4).

Class I and Class IV wells are prohibited in the State regulations, and currently no Class I or IV wells are known to exist in Nevada. As of 1999, there were approximately 85 active UIC permits, including both Class II and Class V wells, in the State. There have been no Class III well applications submitted to date. One of the major differences between the federal and State of Nevada UIC regulations is that a permit is required in Nevada for all injection activities, regardless of well class.

Unless the law were changed to specifically allow an exception, injection of CO<sub>2</sub> into saline aquifers would not be permitted, because CO<sub>2</sub>, as a waste product from industrial activities of electrical power, cement, and lime production, would be considered a pollutant, and the injection well would be considered either a Class I or IV well. The underlying reason for prohibiting injection of pollutants into aquifers is the loss of the aquifers as sources of water for future municipal, industrial, or agricultural use. As the driest state in the Nation in terms of average annual precipitation, Nevada is particularly cautious in protecting its limited water resources. Even saline waters may someday be considered for use, because desalination may be cheaper than other options for acquiring additional water resources.

**Table 4.** Selected Nevada laws regarding injection of fluids through wells.

---

**Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 445A.465 Injection of fluids through well or discharge of pollutant without permit prohibited; regulations.**

1. Except as authorized by a permit issued by the Department pursuant to the provisions of NRS 445A.300 to 445A.730, inclusive, and regulations adopted by the Commission, it is unlawful for any person to:

- (a) Discharge from any point source any pollutant into any waters of the State or any treatment works.
- (b) Inject fluids through a well into any waters of the State.
- (c) Discharge from a point source a pollutant or inject fluids through a well that could be carried into the waters of the State by any means.
- (d) Allow a pollutant discharged from a point source or fluids injected through a well to remain in a place where the pollutant or fluids could be carried into the waters of the State by any means.

2. The Commission shall adopt regulations which provide a simplified procedure for approval by the Department of permits that are required by subsection 1 for work related to clearing and maintaining the channel of a navigable river, including, without limitation, dredging or filling, bank stabilization or restoration, channel clearance, construction of irrigation diversions or the clearance of vegetation, debris or temporary obstructions. The regulations must include a limitation on the time allowed for the processing of an application for such a permit to not more than 60 days after receipt by the Department of a completed application and any required fees, unless the Administrator determines that it is in the public interest to hold a public hearing regarding the application and promptly notifies the applicant of that determination.

(Added to NRS by 1973, 1711; A 1985, 765; 1991, 857, 1742, 1743; 1997, 1262)

**NRS 445A.415 "Waters of the State" defined.** "Waters of the State" means all waters situated wholly or partly within or bordering upon this state, including but not limited to:

1. All streams, lakes, ponds, impounding reservoirs, marshes, water courses, waterways, wells, springs, irrigation systems and drainage systems; and
2. All bodies or accumulations of water, surface and underground, natural or artificial.

(Added to NRS by 1973, 1709)-(Substituted in revision for NRS 445.191)

**NRS 445A.400 "Pollutant" defined.** "Pollutant":

1. Means dredged soil, solid waste, incinerator residue, sewage, garbage, sewage sludge, munitions, chemical wastes, biological materials, radioactive materials, heat, wrecked or discarded equipment, rock, sand, cellar dirt and industrial, municipal and agricultural waste discharged into water.

2. Does not mean water, gas or other material which is injected into a well to facilitate production of oil or gas, or water derived in association with oil or gas production and disposed of in a well, if the well is used either for facilitating production or for disposal purposes and if the Department determines that such injection or disposal will not result in the degradation of ground or surface water resources.

3. Does not mean water, gas or other material injected into a well or used to stimulate a reservoir of geothermal resources if the Department determines that the injection or stimulation will not result in the degradation of ground or surface water resources.

(Added to NRS by 1973, 1708; A 1981, 660)-(Substituted in revision for NRS 445.178)

---

**Definitions of Classes of Wells in the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC)**

**NAC 445A.845 Class I wells.** (NRS 445A.425) A Class I well is an injection well for the disposal of industrial, municipal and radioactive waste, whereby fluids are injected below the lowest formation containing, within one-quarter mile of the well bore, water with a concentration of total dissolved solids of 10,000 milligrams or less per liter, and includes:

1. A well used for the injection of hazardous waste by a person who generates hazardous waste or an owner or operator of a facility for the management of hazardous waste; and
2. A well for the disposal of industrial waste and municipal sewage effluent.

(Added to NAC by Environmental Comm'n, eff. 7-22-87; A by R042-01, 10-25-2001)

**NAC 445A.846 Class II wells.** (NRS 445A.425) A Class II well is an injection well for the production and storage of oil and gas and includes a well which injects fluids:

1. Which are brought to the surface in connection with the conventional production of oil or natural gas;
2. For enhanced recovery of oil or natural gas; and
3. For storage of hydrocarbons which are liquid at standard temperature and pressure.

(Added to NAC by Environmental Comm'n, eff. 7-22-87)-(Substituted in revision for NAC 445.42375)

**NAC 445A.847 Class III wells.** (NRS 445A.425) A Class III well involves a special process which injects fluids for the extraction of minerals or energy, except geothermal energy, and includes:

1. Mining of sulfur by the Frasch process;
2. In situ production of uranium or other metals from bodies of ore which have not been conventionally mined;
3. Solution mining of salts or potash; and
4. In situ recovery of fossil fuel, which includes coal, tar sands, oil shale and any other fossil fuel which can be mined by this process.

(Added to NAC by Environmental Comm'n, eff. 7-22-87)-(Substituted in revision for NAC 445.4238)

**NAC 445A.848 Class IV wells.** (NRS 445A.425) A Class IV well is an injection well which injects hazardous wastes into or above a formation containing, within one-quarter mile of the well bore, an underground source of drinking water or an aquifer which has been exempted pursuant to NAC 445A.850 to 445A.855, inclusive, and includes a well used by:

1. Persons who generate hazardous waste or radiological or high-level radioactive waste; and
2. An owner or operator of a facility for the management of hazardous waste or a site for the disposal of radioactive waste.

(Added to NAC by Environmental Comm'n, eff. 7-22-87)-(Substituted in revision for NAC 445.42385)

---

*continued*

**Table 4. (Continued)**

---

**NAC 445A.849 Class V wells.** (NRS 445A.425) A Class V well is any injection well not included in Classes I, II, III and IV, and includes:

1. Wells used to inject the water for heating or cooling by a heat pump;
2. Cesspools or other devices receiving wastes which have an open bottom and sometimes have perforated sides;
3. Wells used to inject water previously used for cooling;
4. Wells used to drain surface fluid, primarily the runoff from storms, into a subsurface formation;
5. Wells used for the injection of fluids accumulated from dewatering operations;
6. Drywells and wells used for the injection of nonhazardous wastes into a subsurface formation;
7. Wells used to replenish the water in an aquifer;
8. Wells used to inject water into an aquifer of fresh water to prevent the intrusion of water of a lower quality into the fresh water;
9. Wells used to inject a mixture of water and sand, mill tailings or other solids into subsurface mines;
10. Wells used to inject sanitary waste for facilities other than single-family residences or facilities having a volume capacity of less than 5,000 gallons per day;
11. Wells used to inject fluids into a zone, other than an oil or gas producing zone, to reduce or eliminate subsidence associated with the overdraft of fresh water;
12. Wells used for the storage of hydrocarbons in a gaseous state at standard temperature and pressure;
13. Geothermal injection wells used in contact and noncontact heating and aquaculture, and in the production of energy;
14. Wells used for solution mining of ores or minerals in conventional mines, such as stopes leaching;
15. Wells used to inject spent brine into the same formation from which it was withdrawn after extraction of halogens or their salts;
16. Injection wells used in experimental technologies;
17. Injection wells that are approved under a federal or state cleanup program and used to reinject pumped and treated contaminated ground water, other than hazardous waste, back into the same formation.
18. Injection wells used to inject fluids for the chemical or microbiological treatment of contaminated ground water or soil; and
19. Motor vehicle waste disposal wells.

(Added to NAC by Environmental Comm'n, eff. 7-22-87; A by R042-01, 10-25-2001)

---

**NAC 445A.856 Prohibited wells and injections; exceptions.** ( NRS 445A.425, 445A.465)

1. Except as otherwise provided in this section, Class I and Class IV injection wells are prohibited, and the Division shall not issue any permit to construct or operate such a well.
2. Cesspools and other types of vertical injection wells or drywells used for the injection of sanitary waste, other than engineered leach fields approved by the Division or local health authority, are prohibited.
3. The injection of any hazardous waste through a well is prohibited, except under conditions where injection wells are used to inject contaminated groundwater that has been treated and is being injected into the same formation from which it was drawn, if the subsurface emplacement of fluids is approved by the Environmental Protection Agency, or this State, as required pursuant to the provisions for the cleanup of releases under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C.£§ 9601 et seq., or pursuant to NAC 445A.226 to 445A.22755, inclusive.
4. Motor vehicle waste disposal wells that were not operational or under construction on or before April 5, 2000, are prohibited.

(Added to NAC by Environmental Comm'n, ef f. 7 22 87; A 10 21 87; R042 01, 10 25 2001)

---

**Table 5. Selected Nevada laws regarding hazardous waste.**

---

**NRS 459.425 "Disposal" defined.** "Disposal" means the discharge, deposit, injection, dumping, spilling, leaking or placing of any hazardous waste into or on any land or water in a manner which might allow the hazardous waste or any part of it to enter the environment, be emitted into the air or be discharged into any water, including any ground water.

(Added to NRS by 1981, 880)-(Substituted in revision for NRS 444.710)

**NRS 459.430 "Hazardous waste" defined.** "Hazardous waste" means any waste or combination of wastes, including, without limitation, solids, semisolids, liquids or contained gases, except household waste, which:

1. Because of its quantity or concentration or its physical, chemical or infectious characteristics may:
  - (a) Cause or significantly contribute to an increase in mortality or serious irreversible or incapacitating illness; or
  - (b) Pose a substantial hazard or potential hazard to human health, public safety or the environment when it is given improper treatment, storage, transportation, disposal or other management.
2. Is identified as hazardous by the Department as a result of studies undertaken for the purpose of identifying hazardous wastes.

The term includes, among other wastes, toxins, corrosives, flammable materials, irritants, strong sensitizers and materials which generate pressure by decomposition, heat or otherwise.

(Added to NRS by 1981, 880; A 1999, 1121)

**NRS 459.460 Applicability of NRS 459.400 to 459.600, inclusive.**

1. NRS 459.400 to 459.600, inclusive, do not apply to any activity or substance which is subject to control pursuant to NRS 445A.300 to 445A.955, inclusive, and 459.010 to 459.290, inclusive, except to the extent that they can be applied in a manner which is not inconsistent with those sections.

2. The Director shall administer NRS 459.400 to 459.600, inclusive, in a manner which avoids duplication of the provisions of NRS 445A.300 to 445A.955, inclusive, and 445B.100 to 445B.640, inclusive, and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, 7 U.S.C.£§ 136 et seq.

(Added to NRS by 1981, 881; A 2003, 2115)

**NRS 459.465 Types of waste subject to NRS 459.400 to 459.600, inclusive.** The following types of waste are subject to the provisions of NRS 459.400 to 459.600, inclusive, only if they are regulated pursuant to the Federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, 42 U.S.C.£§ 6901 et seq.:

1. Fly ash, bottom ash, slag and waste removed from flue gas from the combustion of coal or other fossil fuels;
2. Solid waste from extraction, beneficiation and processing of ores and minerals, including phosphate rock and overburden from the mining of uranium ore;
3. Dust from cement kilns; and
4. Drilling fluids and other wastes produced by exploration, development or production of oil, gas or geothermal energy.

(Added to NRS by 1981, 882; A 2003, 2115)

---



According to Nevada laws regarding hazardous wastewater (table 5), permits for disposal of these wastes are required from the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. Whether liquid CO<sub>2</sub> itself would be considered a hazardous waste is not certain.

Much of the land administered by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service is open to exploratory drilling for mineral, oil and gas, and geothermal resources. If a CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration project involving injection into the subsurface were to move forward in Nevada, presumably the project's footprint would have to be withdrawn from mineral and energy exploration and development. Such a land withdrawal would be open for public comment, and it is quite possible that such a project would be opposed by the mineral, oil and gas, and geothermal industries and by the State.

One of the alternative approaches to CO<sub>2</sub> disposal mentioned in the next section of this report would generate large volumes of a solid carbonate-rock waste product. Permits would be required from the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources to prevent air pollution or surface-water or groundwater contamination from a facility constructed for this purpose.

## V. ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO CO<sub>2</sub> SEQUESTRATION IN GEOLOGICAL SETTINGS

Although enhanced oil recovery and deep disposal in non-potable aquifers are two proven technologies for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration, opportunities for these approaches appear to be


limited in Nevada. There are, however, alternative approaches. We explore two such alternatives here. Storage of CO<sub>2</sub> in mined caverns in salt formations would take advantage of existing technologies for storage of natural gas in these formations. Chemical reaction with mafic and ultramafic rocks is an unproven technology that has much promise for long-term, permanent disposal of CO<sub>2</sub> without many of the safety and leakage concerns associated with underground injection.

### A. Storage in Mined Caverns in Salt Formations

One possible approach to CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration is to develop repositories in thick salt deposits. Caverns within salt are excavated through dissolution of salt with fresh water (i.e. solution mining). This process produces significant quantities of brine, which can be reinjected into saline aquifers proximal to the salt deposit. In some cases, solution mining is used to produce industrial salt. For example, Morton Salt operates a solution mine in thick salt deposits near Phoenix, Arizona (Rauzi, 2002). Volatile materials, such as liquefied petroleum gas (LPG), have been safely stored in salt-solution caverns in many parts of the country. Two LPG facilities presently exist in Arizona and several others are currently or have recently been under investigation (e.g., Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 1982).

The Basin and Range province hosts several unusually thick Cenozoic salt deposits, including some of the thickest in the world (fig. 30; Peirce, 1976; Faulds and others, 1997). Most of the salt resides in Cenozoic basins produced by basin-and-range extension. Halite deposits are particularly thick in some of these basins and may have significant economic potential for storage of natural gas (Rauzi, 2002).

Figure 30. (a) Major Cenozoic evaporite deposits in the Basin and Range (from Faulds and others, 1997). (b) Generalized geologic map of the Hualapai basin area showing Bouguer gravity contours (10 mgal intervals; from Davis and Conradi 1981) and location of drill holes and cross section (fig. 31). Cf, Cerbat Range fault; CP, Colorado Plateau; Cr, Cerbat Range; CR, Colorado River; DV, Detrital and southern part of Virgin River depression; GC, Grand Canyon; GT, Grand Wash trough; GV, Grapevine Mesa; HB, Hualapai basin; L, Luke basin; LM, Lake Mead; NGW, northern Grand Wash fault; P, Picacho basin; SGW, southern Grand Wash fault; SL, Great Salt Lake; SV, South Virgin Mountains; WH, White Hills.




The basins containing the thick salt deposits owe their origin to a relatively complex history of tectonism and drainage evolution. Large-magnitude crustal extension in middle Tertiary time gave way to more widely distributed east-westerly extension and block faulting in the late Miocene (typically ~10 Ma in much of the province). Localized deep basins developed in the hanging walls of steeply dipping northerly striking normal faults. Basin-and-range block faulting that accompanied deposition of post mid-Miocene basin fill locally produced steep basin margins and prominent escarpments (Dickinson, 1991), which served to accentuate development of some regional depressions or sinks. In the western Great Basin, northwest-striking right-lateral faults contributed to development of some basins.

By late Miocene time, a reduction in extensional strain rates promoted widespread aggradation (building up) of sediments within composite basins. Basin-fill sedimentation ultimately buried a rugged mid-Tertiary paleogeography of corrugated tilt blocks (Dickinson, 1991). Facies patterns in late Tertiary basin fill are congruent with modern topography and reflect construction of alluvial fans derived from flanking ranges. The alluvial fans interfinger with and give way to floodplain, lacustrine, and continental playa environments toward the basin floors.

Reduced strain rates and regional aggradation in late Tertiary time facilitated the evolution of regional drainage systems that ultimately integrated large networks of basins. In eastern parts of the Basin and Range, major drainages emanated from the relative highlands of the Colorado Plateau, and vast quantities of fresh water began flowing into regional sinks in late Tertiary time. Many basins also became regional sinks for groundwater flow systems. Prior to development of through-going drainage systems to the Gulf of California in Pliocene time (~3 to 5 Ma), thick nonmarine evaporite deposits (halite, anhydrite, and gypsum) accumulated in these sinks. Evaporite deposition was focused in the younger basins associated with high-angle basin-

and-range faulting, either within the lower parts of the sinks or in satellite basins proximal to major river systems. The thickest known salt deposit of this vintage is the 2.5-km-thick Red Lake salt in the Hualapai basin of northwest Arizona just south of Lake Mead (fig. 31; Faulds and others, 1997).

Because the geologic setting of southern Nevada is similar to that of northwest Arizona, several northerly trending basins within southern Nevada probably host thick salt deposits. These include the Virgin River depression and Eldorado and Piute basins (fig. 5). Mannion (1974) documented ~500 m of late Tertiary salt in the southern part of the Virgin River depression, specifically in the Overton Arm area of Lake Mead. In addition, high TDS (total dissolved solids) characterizes wells in the northern part of Eldorado Valley and the deeper levels (~300 m) of some wells in the Mesquite area (M. Johnson, Virgin Valley Water District, personal commun., 2004). Maximum basin depth and thickness of basin-fill sediments generally ranges from ~2 to 6 km in Nevada (e.g., Bohannon and others., 1993; Langenheim and Schmidt, 1996; Langenheim and others, 2001). However, the eastern part of the Virgin River depression exceeds 8 km in depth in the northwest corner of Arizona (Langenheim and others, 2001). Although thick salt has not been documented in the northern and eastern parts of the Virgin River depression, it is important to note that the deeper parts of this basin have not been penetrated by drill holes. Considering the location of the Virgin River depression at both the mouth of the Virgin River Canyon and near the confluence of the Virgin and Colorado Rivers, as well as the presence of thick salt in the shallower southern part of the basin (Mannion, 1974), it is likely that thick evaporite deposits reside in the deep eastern part of the basin. Most of the potential salt-bearing basins in southern Nevada are relatively quiet tectonically, with little activity on range-bounding faults over the past several million years. One exception to this is the northern part of the Eldorado basin, where the Black Hills fault shows evidence of rupturing in a sizeable earthquake in the past 10,000 years (Fossett and Taylor, 2003).



**Figure 31.** 1:1 cross section showing the Red Lake salt deposit in the Hualapai basin, northwest Arizona (view is toward the north; from Faulds and others, 1997). Unit patterns: stippled, Proterozoic gneiss; cross-hatched, Paleozoic sedimentary strata; dark gray, Miocene volcanic rocks; black, Miocene sedimentary rocks; light gray, late Miocene-early Pliocene salt deposit; gravel pattern along fault, alluvial fan deposits; white, early Pliocene to recent silt and sand deposits, with minor anhydrite and gypsum at base.



Considering the rapid population growth and related recent construction of natural gas power plants near Las Vegas, presence of the coal-fired Mohave Generating Station (MGS) at Laughlin, relative tectonic quiescence, and proximity of thick salt deposits, the southern Nevada region may be a favorable location for a CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration project. This may be particularly relevant for the MGS, a 1,580-megawatt coal-fired power plant located approximately 120 km southwest of the Grand Canyon and only 65 km southwest of the 2.5-km-thick Red Lake salt deposit. The MGS began operations in 1971 and is one of the largest sources of air pollution in the West (emitting up to 40,000 short tons of sulfur dioxide, SO<sub>2</sub>, per year), contributing significantly to visibility impairment at the Grand Canyon (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1999). In fact, once controls are installed at the Centralia Power Plant in Washington State, as scheduled in the next few years, the MGS will be the largest source of SO<sub>2</sub> in the West. The MGS is operated by Southern California Edison, the majority owner of the plant. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Nevada Power Company, and Salt River Project also own interests in the plant. This facility is the only coal-fired, base-loaded power plant in the United States that receives coal through a slurry pipeline, which originates 440 km to the east at Black Mesa in northern Arizona. Carbon dioxide emissions from the MGS could possibly be contained within a solution cavern within the nearby Red Lake salt deposit. However, the MGS may shut down in the near future due to the costs of necessary pollution control retrofits and repairs to the coal-slurry pipeline that transports coal from northeastern Arizona, in which case the MGS may no longer be a major source of CO<sub>2</sub> (Edwards, 2005).

Disposal of CO<sub>2</sub> in mined caverns in salt formations may be considered legal in Nevada, in contrast to the case with disposal in saline aquifers, if isolation of the CO<sub>2</sub> from groundwater can be assured. Injection of brine from the solution-mining process into deep saline aquifers may be considered illegal in Nevada, but salt could be economically recovered, and the wells could possibly be permitted as Class III injection wells (table 4). Given the safety concerns in dealing with CO<sub>2</sub> and the locations of potentially thick salt deposits in Nevada near areas that are likely to undergo urban and suburban expansion during the 21st century, the Red Lake salt deposit in more remote areas of Arizona may be a good target for further investigation.

The volume of caverns needed to hold the CO<sub>2</sub> exhaust from a major power plant is substantial. Using the factors in table 1, a plant that burns 250 million metric tons of carbon in coal over its lifetime (approximately a 2,000-megawatt plant operating for 50 years) would need 1.2 km<sup>3</sup> of underground storage space. For such an operation, only sedimentary basins with thick, extensive salt formations would be practical.

## B. Chemical Reaction with Mafic and Ultramafic Rocks

The principal means by which CO<sub>2</sub> is naturally sequestered in rocks is through the alteration of calcium- and magnesium-rich rocks, ultimately forming carbonates (rocks composed primarily of calcite, CaCO<sub>3</sub>, the major mineral in limestone, and dolomite, CaMg(CO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>). The Earth contains abundant calcium and magnesium in basalts (volcanic rocks commonly

erupted at ocean ridges on the seafloor, in volcanic islands, such as Hawaii, and in certain continental areas, such as the Columbia River Plateau east of the Cascade Range in Oregon and Washington) and gabbros (intrusive equivalents of basalts). These rocks are termed mafic to describe their high magnesium and iron (ferrous) contents.

One approach to permanent CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration would be to speed up the natural process. Minerals in these rocks can react with CO<sub>2</sub> to produce various carbonates, silica, and alumina as reaction products. As indicated in table 6, in terms of volume of material required for the reactions and volume of materials produced, rocks with high concentrations of the mineral forsterite (Mg<sub>2</sub>SiO<sub>4</sub>), the magnesium end member of the olivine group, would be most favored. One gigaton of carbon, approximately the amount of coal burned annually in the United States, would require reaction with 5.86 gigatons of forsterite (approximately 1.82 km<sup>3</sup> of dunite, a rock composed mostly of Mg-rich olivine) and would produce 9.52 gigatons of product composed of 7.02 gigatons of magnesite plus 2.50 gigatons of quartz. Assuming 20% porosity in the waste product, this would be 2.92 km<sup>3</sup> of magnesite product and 1.18 km<sup>3</sup> of quartz product, for a total of 4.10 km<sup>3</sup> of waste product. Reaction of CO<sub>2</sub> with other minerals would require considerably more volume of reactant and would produce considerably more waste product than reaction with Mg<sub>2</sub>SiO<sub>4</sub>, although reaction with serpentinite, a rock composed mostly of serpentine minerals, such as antigorite, Mg<sub>6</sub>Si<sub>4</sub>O<sub>10</sub>(OH)<sub>8</sub>, is nearly as favorable volumetrically as reaction with olivine (table 6). Coincidentally, the reaction of CO<sub>2</sub> with Mg<sub>2</sub>SiO<sub>4</sub> is also favorable thermodynamically; heat generated from the reaction could be used to provide energy needed to pulverize the rock, thereby speeding up the kinetics of the reaction.

Goff and Lackner (1998) describe the potential use of ultramafic rocks for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration. These are particularly Mg-rich igneous rocks, including dunite, serpentinite, and peridotite, a rock composed mostly of olivine and pyroxenes, minerals composed primarily of (Mg,Fe,Ca)SiO<sub>3</sub>. They describe a scenario in which the ultramafic rocks would be reacted with hydrochloric acid to facilitate reactions with CO<sub>2</sub>. Unfortunately, although ultramafic rocks are abundant in California, Oregon, and Washington, Nevada contains only small amounts of these types of rocks near the surface. Nevada does, however, have abundant basalt and other mafic rocks (fig. 32). The volume requirements for reactions with basalts are considerably less favorable than for reactions with ultramafic rocks, such that any use of basalts in Nevada would have to deal with large volumes of waste products. For example, using the hypothetical basalt composition in table 6, 5.2 km<sup>3</sup> of basalt would need to be mined to react with one gigaton of carbon, and 8.5 km<sup>3</sup> of waste would be generated from the reaction, more than enough to refill the hole from which the basalt would be mined.

A hypothetical scenario for permanent CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration would be to site a CO<sub>2</sub>-generating power plant near a large amount of ultramafic rock or basalt, which would be mined and used in chemical reactors. The waste products from the reactions could be used to isolate municipal and other waste materials, which would refill the holes dug in the mining operations. Because of the volume considerations (table 6), additional landfills would be required, or artificial hills would be constructed near where the ultramafic rock or basalt had been mined. Ideally, such an industrial ecology facility would

**Table 6.** Theoretical weights and volumes of reactants and products in reactions between CO<sub>2</sub> and various rocks and minerals (data from Weast, 1971, Roberts and others, 1974, and Robie and Hemingway, 1995).

Mineral reactant	Ratio of weights of mineral reactant to C	Volume of Mineral reactant (m <sup>3</sup> /t of C)	Ratio of weights of solid products to C	Volume of solid products (m <sup>3</sup> /t of C) assuming 20% porosity in products
1. Mg <sub>2</sub> SiO <sub>4</sub> (forsterite)	5.86	1.82	9.52	4.10
2. Fe <sub>2</sub> SiO <sub>4</sub> (fayalite)	8.48	1.93	12.15	4.24
3. Mg <sub>6</sub> Si <sub>4</sub> O <sub>10</sub> (OH) <sub>8</sub> (antigorite)	7.69	2.98	10.36	4.49
4. MgSiO <sub>3</sub> (enstatite)	8.36	2.62	12.02	5.28
5. FeSiO <sub>3</sub> (ferrosilite)	10.98	2.75	14.65	5.42
6. CaSiO <sub>3</sub> (wollastonite)	9.67	3.32	13.34	6.20
7. CaAl <sub>2</sub> Si <sub>2</sub> O <sub>8</sub> (anorthite)	23.16	8.39	26.83	11.22
8. NaAlSi <sub>3</sub> O <sub>8</sub> (albite)	43.66	16.67	47.33	21.18
9. Hypothetical basalt	16.32	5.21	19.98	8.50

1. Mg<sub>2</sub>SiO<sub>4</sub> (forsterite in olivine) + 2CO<sub>2</sub> (gas, captured from power plant) = 2MgCO<sub>3</sub> (magnesite) + SiO<sub>2</sub> (quartz or other silica compound)
2. Fe<sub>2</sub>SiO<sub>4</sub> (fayalite in olivine) + 2CO<sub>2</sub> (gas) = 2FeCO<sub>3</sub> (siderite) + SiO<sub>2</sub> (quartz)
3. Mg<sub>6</sub>Si<sub>4</sub>O<sub>10</sub>(OH)<sub>8</sub> (antigorite) + 6CO<sub>2</sub> (gas) = 6MgCO<sub>3</sub> (magnesite) + 4SiO<sub>2</sub> (quartz) + 4H<sub>2</sub>O (water)
4. MgSiO<sub>3</sub> (enstatite in pyroxenes) + CO<sub>2</sub> (gas) = MgCO<sub>3</sub> (magnesite) + SiO<sub>2</sub> (quartz)
5. FeSiO<sub>3</sub> (ferrosilite in pyroxenes) + CO<sub>2</sub> (gas) = FeCO<sub>3</sub> (siderite) + SiO<sub>2</sub> (quartz)
6. CaSiO<sub>3</sub> (wollastonite in pyroxenes) + CO<sub>2</sub> (gas) = CaCO<sub>3</sub> (calcite) + SiO<sub>2</sub> (quartz)
7. CaAl<sub>2</sub>Si<sub>2</sub>O<sub>8</sub> (anorthite in plagioclase) + CO<sub>2</sub> (gas) = CaCO<sub>3</sub> (calcite) + Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (alumina or corundum) + 2SiO<sub>2</sub> (quartz)
8. 2NaAlSi<sub>3</sub>O<sub>8</sub> (albite in plagioclase) + CO<sub>2</sub> (gas) = Na<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> (sodium carbonate) + Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (alumina or corundum) + 6SiO<sub>2</sub> (quartz)
9. The composition of this hypothetical basalt is calculated with the following assumptions:

Hypothetical Basalt	Mole Fraction	Chemical composition	Weight %
Mg <sub>2</sub> SiO <sub>4</sub> (in olivine)	0.15	SiO <sub>2</sub>	48.6
Fe <sub>2</sub> SiO <sub>4</sub> (in olivine)	0.05	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	19.2
CaSiO <sub>3</sub> (in pyroxenes)	0.07	MgO	11.5
MgSiO <sub>3</sub> (in pyroxenes)	0.23	FeO	7.8
FeSiO <sub>3</sub> (in pyroxenes)	0.10	CaO	11.2
CaAl <sub>2</sub> Si <sub>2</sub> O <sub>8</sub> (in plagioclase)	0.30	Na <sub>2</sub> O	1.7
NaAlSi <sub>3</sub> O <sub>8</sub> (in plagioclase)	0.10	TOTAL	100.0
TOTAL	1.00		

With the exception of reaction 8, all reactions are thermodynamically favorable (with respect to calculated negative Gibbs free energies of reaction at 25°C).

be located close to railroads (to bring coal from Wyoming and other sources and waste from cities) or perhaps ports (to bring coal from Alaska and possibly oil or natural gas from any location), electrical transmission lines, and cities that use the electricity and generate the municipal waste.

The locations of large outcrops of mafic rocks in Nevada are plotted with locations of current railroads, pipelines, electrical transmission lines, and major CO<sub>2</sub> generators in figure 32. Should such a scenario be pursued, volumes of mafic rocks would need to be assessed. It is likely that sufficient volumes of basalt and ultramafic rocks occur in the western states to meet the CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration needs of the region (Goff and Lackner, 1998). In Nevada, Tertiary basalts crop out in many parts of the state, and a large gabbroic complex occurs near Lovelock in northern Churchill and southern Pershing Counties.

Serpentinite, presumably altered pieces of dunite- or peridotite-rich oceanic crust thrust onto the North American continent during Paleozoic and Mesozoic mountain-building events (Stewart, 1980), occurs in small bodies in Mineral, northwestern Nye, and eastern Humboldt Counties.

Using the factors in table 6, a large coal-fired power plant (burning 5 million metric tons of carbon in coal per year and generating on the order of 2,000 megawatts) would need to mine approximately 14.9 million m<sup>3</sup> of serpentinite or 26.1 million m<sup>3</sup> of basalt per year and would generate approximately 22.5 or 42.5 million m<sup>3</sup>, respectively, of solid waste per year. Over a 50-year life, the solid waste would amount to approximately 1.1 or 2.1 km<sup>3</sup>, depending on whether serpentinite or basalt, respectively, were used for the chemical reactions. These numbers are comparable to the sizes of large-






Figure 32. Distribution of mafic (magnesium- and iron-rich) rocks (black), major power plants (gray triangles), cement and lime plants (gray hexagons), major electric power transmission lines, pipelines, and rail lines in Nevada.

scale copper and gold mines in Nevada (e.g., the Robinson and Yerington copper mines and the Carlin and Betze-Post gold mines) and other parts of the western United States.

Depending on the chemical reactor design (using supercritical, liquid, or gaseous CO<sub>2</sub> versus an aqueous solution as described by Goff and Lackner, 1998), considerable water may be needed for the process. Interestingly, reaction of CO<sub>2</sub> with serpentinite, which is more abundant in California than in Nevada, would produce approximately one ton of water for each ton of carbon sequestered, thereby perhaps eliminating the need to consume existing water resources. A further advantage of serpentinite is that it is locally considered a nuisance, because of commonly contained asbestos, which would be destroyed upon reaction with CO<sub>2</sub>. Commercial-scale sequestration by reaction with rocks, although highly attractive as a means of permanently disposing of the CO<sub>2</sub>, is likely to be far in the future, because the chemical reactors and overall power generation-mining-waste disposal systems would need to be designed, perfected, and demonstrated to be cost-effective.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have presented an approach to a preliminary assessment of the potential for CO<sub>2</sub> disposal by sequestration in geological settings in Nevada using GIS analysis. The key assumptions made are that for CO<sub>2</sub> disposal in saline aquifers it is wisest to (1) avoid areas of fractured bedrock and restrict the assessment to parts of alluvial basins that are deep enough to provide a thick, relatively impermeable seal against leakage and have sufficient pressure to keep the CO<sub>2</sub> in a condensed phase; (2) stay away from active faults whose fracture zones may allow leakage of CO<sub>2</sub> from underground injection sites; (3) avoid areas that in the foreseeable future have a reasonably high probability of being explored and developed for mineral, geothermal, and water resources; (4) avoid current urban areas and areas that are likely to experience significant population growth during the 21st century; and (5) avoid restricted lands, such as parks and military reservations. The data sets used in the GIS analysis are made available in the electronic version of this report, so that others may reevaluate the approach with different assumptions and data sets.

There does not appear to be much potential in Nevada for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration through disposal in saline aquifers. Among the potential deep parts of alluvial basins, few remain after eliminating areas of potential potable water, geothermal resources, and mineral resources. Within the remaining areas, little is known about porosities, permeabilities, or salinities of aquifers at depths greater than 1 km. Furthermore, such an approach would require changing Nevada law, which has a long-standing philosophy of protecting all water resources, regardless of salinity. Even if the law were changed to allow injection of liquid CO<sub>2</sub> into saline aquifers, other institutional constraints that would apply may limit the possibilities. Nevada's Underground Injection Control regulations would need to be followed, and federal lands would need to be withdrawn from exploration for mineral and energy resources, if the project were on or affected lands managed by the federal government.

There also does not appear to be much potential in Nevada for conventional approaches to CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration through enhanced oil recovery, in part because the oil fields in Nevada tend not to have much associated natural gas, implying that gas that was associated with the fields has escaped. Injected CO<sub>2</sub> would likely leak to the surface as well, although the time scale may be quite long. In addition, the oil fields in Nevada are small relative to fields in many other parts of the United States, and some of the Nevada fields are considerably hotter than ideal conditions for maintaining a dense CO<sub>2</sub> phase underground.

There is some potential for disposal of CO<sub>2</sub> in mined caverns in salt formations in basins in southern Nevada, northwestern Arizona, and southwestern Utah. The highest potential for this approach is likely to be in northwestern Arizona, where thick salt deposits are well described and are being studied for storage of natural gas.

Chemical reaction of CO<sub>2</sub> with mafic rocks (basalt, gabbro) and ultramafic rocks (serpentinite, dunite, peridotite) has the potential to capture CO<sub>2</sub> in synthetic minerals, which, in turn, could be used to isolate municipal and industrial wastes. Enough of these rocks are exposed in Arizona, California, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington to meet the expected needs for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in the region. Ultramafic rocks are more favorable than mafic rocks both volumetrically and thermodynamically. Chemical reaction with mafic or ultramafic rocks would be a long-term solution requiring considerable research to design, perfect, and demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of the chemical reactors and associated facilities.

For Nevada to be considered a potential site for significant amounts of CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in geological settings, considerably more work would need to be done to (a) assess the thicknesses and volumes of salt formations in southern Nevada, (b) demonstrate a cost-effective process for chemical reaction with ultramafic or mafic rocks, and (c) assess the volumes of ultramafic and mafic rocks that are located in optimal areas. Given the safety concerns regarding CO<sub>2</sub> storage near urban areas, known thick salt deposits in northwestern Arizona may be a better choice than potential Nevada sites for storage in salt formations. Although Nevada occurrences of ultramafic and mafic rocks have the advantage of being remote, considerably larger areas of ultramafic rocks are known in California, Oregon, and Washington, and enormous volumes of basalt occur in eastern Oregon and Washington.

## VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research leading to this report was supported by a grant from the U.S. Department of Energy through the California Energy Commission and by the State of Nevada through the Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology. We thank Curt Oldenburg and Larry Myer, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory; Allen Biaggi, Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources; Christopher Ross, U.S. Bureau of Land Management; Paul Lechler, Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology; and John Clinkenbeard, California Geological Survey, for their helpful comments in reviewing a draft this report. We also thank Jack Hursh, Liz Crouse, Kris Pizarro, and Jennifer Mauldin for drafting the figures, Dick Meeuwig for editing the manuscript, and Jack Hursh for layout of the publication. The authors accept full responsibility for the content of this report.

## VIII. REFERENCES

- Barrie, J., Brown, K., Hatcher, P.R., and Schellhase, H.U., 2004, Carbon dioxide pipelines: a preliminary review of design and risks: 7th International Conference on Greenhouse Gas Control Technologies, Vancouver, British Columbia (<http://uregina.ca/ghgt7/PDF/papers/peer/126.pdf>).
- Bartlett, K., 2003, Demonstrating carbon sequestration: *Geotimes*, v. 48, no. 3, p. 22–24.
- Bohannon, R.G., Grow, J.A., Miller, J.J., and Black, R.H., Jr., 1993, Seismic stratigraphy and tectonic development of the Virgin River depression and associated basins, southeastern Nevada and northwestern Arizona: *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, v. 105, p. 501–520.
- Blackwell, D.D., and Richards, M., 2004a, Geothermal map of North America: American Association of Petroleum Geologists Map 423, scale 1:6,500,000.
- Blackwell, D.D., and Richards, M., 2004b, The 2004 geothermal map of North America, explanation of resources and applications: *Geothermal Resources Council Transactions*, v. 28, p. 317–320.
- Castor, S.B., 2004, Industrial minerals, in Price, J.G., Meeuwig, R.O., Tingley, J.V., Castor, S.B., Hess, R.H., and Davis, D.A., *The Nevada mineral industry, 2003: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Special Publication MI-2003*, p. 48–54, [www.nbmng.unr.edu/dox/mi/03.pdf](http://www.nbmng.unr.edu/dox/mi/03.pdf)
- Cipolli, F., Gambardella, B., Marini, L., Ottonello, G., and Zuccolini, M.V., 2004, Geochemistry of high-pH waters from serpentinites of the Gruppo di Voltri (Genova, Italy) and reaction path modeling of CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in serpentinite aquifers: *Applied Geochemistry*, v. 19, p. 787–802.
- Coolbaugh, M., Zehner, R., Kreemer, C., Blackwell, D., and Oppliger, G., 2005, A map of geothermal potential for the Great Basin, USA: recognition of multiple geothermal environments: *Geothermal Resources Council Transactions*, v. 29.
- Coolbaugh, M., Zehner, R., Kreemer, C., Blackwell, D., Oppliger, G., Sawatzky, D., Blewitt, G., Pancha, A., Richards, M., Helm-Clark, C., Shevenell, L., Raines, G., Johnson, G., Minor, T., and Boyd, T., in press, Geothermal potential map of the Great Basin, western United States: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Map 151.
- Cox, D.P., Ludington, S., Berger, B.R., Moring, B.C., Sherlock, M.G., Singer, D.A., and Tingley, J.V., 1996a, Tracts permissive for pluton-related deposits, plate 12-1; in *An Analysis of Nevada's Metal-Bearing Mineral Resources: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Open-File Report 96-2*. (This plate is also available at [www.nbmng.unr.edu/dox/ofr962/plate121.pdf](http://www.nbmng.unr.edu/dox/ofr962/plate121.pdf).)
- Cox, D.P., Ludington, S., Berger, B.R., Moring, B.C., Sherlock, M.G., Singer, D.A., and Tingley, J.V., 1996b, Tracts permissive for epithermal deposits, plate 12-2; in *An Analysis of Nevada's Metal-Bearing Mineral Resources: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Open-File Report 96-2*. (This plate is also available at [www.nbmng.unr.edu/dox/ofr962/plate122.pdf](http://www.nbmng.unr.edu/dox/ofr962/plate122.pdf).)
- Cox, D.P., Ludington, S., Berger, B.R., Moring, B.C., Sherlock, M.G., Singer, D.A., and Tingley, J.V., 1996c, Tracts permissive for deposit types not directly related to plutonic activity, plate 12-3; in *An Analysis of Nevada's Metal-Bearing Mineral Resources: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Open-File Report 96-2*. (This plate is also available at [www.nbmng.unr.edu/dox/ofr962/plate123.pdf](http://www.nbmng.unr.edu/dox/ofr962/plate123.pdf).)
- Davis, D.A., 2004, Oil and gas, in Price, J.G., Meeuwig, R.O., Tingley, J.V., Castor, S.B., Hess, R.H., and Davis, D.A., *The Nevada mineral industry, 2003: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Special Publication MI-2003*, p. 62–69.
- Davis, D.A., and Tingley, J.V., in review, Gold and silver resources in Nevada: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Map 149, 1:1,000,000 scale.
- Davis, W.E., and Conradi, A., Jr., 1981, Bouguer gravity map of Hualapai Valley, Mohave County, Arizona: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 81-770, 8 p.
- dePolo, C., 1999, Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Quaternary Fault Database: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology, ongoing project.
- Dickinson, W.R., 1991, Tectonic setting of faulted Tertiary strata associated with the Catalina core complex in southern Arizona: *Geological Society of America Special Paper* 264, 106 p.
- Dohrenwend, J.C., Jachens, R.C., Moring, B.C., and Schruben, P.G., 1996, Indicators of subsurface basin sbgeometry in Nevada, Plate 8; in *An analysis of Nevada's metal-bearing mineral mbmresources: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Open-File Report 96-2*. (This plate is also available at [www.nbmng.unr.edu/dox/ofr962/plate812.pdf](http://www.nbmng.unr.edu/dox/ofr962/plate812.pdf).)
- Downey, C., and Clinkenbeard, J., 2005, An overview of geologic carbon sequestration potential in California: California Energy Commission Report, in press.
- Dutton, S.P., Kim, E.M., Broadhead, R.F., Raatz, W.D., Breton, C.L., Ruppel, S.C., and Kerans, C., 2005, Play analysis and leading-edge oil-reservoir development methods in the Permian basin: Increased recovery through advanced technologies: American Association of Petroleum Geologists Bulletin, v. 89; no. 5; p. 553–576.
- Edwards, J.G., 2005, Mohave Generating Station: Pollution feud unresolved, plant in Laughlin faces Dec. 31 closure for failing to install \$1 billion in controls: Las Vegas Review Journal (July 10, 2005), [http://www.reviewjournal.com/lvrj\\_home/2005/Jul-10-Sun-2005/business/2369846.html](http://www.reviewjournal.com/lvrj_home/2005/Jul-10-Sun-2005/business/2369846.html).
- Faulds, J.E., Coolbaugh, M., Blewitt, G., and Henry, C.D., 2004, Why is Nevada in hot water? Structural controls and tectonic model of geothermal systems in the northwestern Great Basin: *Geothermal Resources Council Transactions*, p. 649–654.
- Faulds, J.E., Schreiber, B.C., Reynolds, S.J., Gonzalez, L., and Okaya, D., 1997, Origin and paleogeography of an immense, nonmarine Miocene salt deposit in the Basin and Range (western USA): *Journal of Geology*, v. 105, p. 19–36.



- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 1982, Red Lake salt cavern, gas storage project; final environmental impact statement: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Office of Pipeline and Producer Regulation, EIS-0028, 217 p.
- Fossett, E., and Taylor, W.J., 2003, Evidence and implications of Holocene faulting along the Black Hills fault, southern Nevada: Geological Society of America Abstracts with Programs, v. 35, no. 6, p. 476.
- Friedmann, S.J., 2003, Storing carbon in Earth: *Geotimes*, v. 48, no. 3, p. 16–20.
- Garside, L.J., Hess, R.H., Fleming, K.L., Weimer, B.S., 1988, Oil and gas developments in Nevada: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Bulletin 104, 136 p.
- Goff, F., and Lackner, K.S., 1998, Carbon dioxide sequestering using ultramafic rocks: *Environmental Geosciences*, v. 5, p. 89–101.
- Hess, R.H., 2001, Nevada Abandoned Mines Database compilation update: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Open-File Report 01-07, CDROM.
- Hess, R.H., 2004a, Nevada Oil and Gas Well Database (NVOILWEL): Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Open-File report 04-1, 288 pages and dBASE file, web address: [www.nbmng.unr.edu/lists/oil/oil.htm](http://www.nbmng.unr.edu/lists/oil/oil.htm)
- Hess, R.H., 2004b, Geothermal Energy, *in* Price, J.G., Meeuwig, R.O., Tingley, J.V., Castor, S.B., Hess, R.H., and Davis, D.A., The Nevada mineral industry, 2003: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Special Publication MI-2003, p. 62–69, [www.nbmng.unr.edu/pub/dox/mi/03.pdf](http://www.nbmng.unr.edu/pub/dox/mi/03.pdf)
- Hovorka, S.D., Romero, M.L., Treviño, R.H., Warne, A.G., Ambrose, W.A., Knox, P.R., and Tremblay, T.A., 2000, Project evaluation: phase II: optimal geological environments for carbon dioxide disposal in brine-bearing formations (aquifers) in the United States: The University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology, final report prepared for U.S. Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory, under contract no. DE-AC26-98FT40417, 222 p.
- Hulen, J.B., Bereskin, S.R., Goff, F., Ross, J.R., and Bortz, L.C., 1994, Geology and geothermal origin of Grant Canyon and Bacon Flat Oil Fields, Railroad Valley, Nevada: AAPG Bulletin, v. 78, no. 4, p. 596–623.
- Idaho National Engineering & Environmental Laboratory, 2003, Regions of Known or Potential Geothermal Resources, digital conversion from Geothermal Resources of Nevada, 1983: Idaho National Engineering & Environmental Laboratory, web address: <http://geothermal.inel.gov/maps-software.shtml>
- Klusman, R.W., 2003, A geochemical perspective and assessment of leakage potential for a mature carbon dioxide-enhanced oil recovery project and as a prototype for carbon dioxide sequestration; Rangely field, Colorado: American Association of Petroleum Geologists Bulletin, v. 87, no. 9, p. 1485–1507.
- Krajick, K., 2003, Killer lakes: *Smithsonian*, v. 34, p. 46–50.
- Langenheim, V.E., and Schmidt, K.M., 1996, Thickness and storage capacity of basin fill of the northern part of the Eldorado Valley, Nevada and the extent of the Boulder City pluton: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 96-512, 35 p.
- Langenheim, V.E., Bohannon, R.G., Glen, J.M., Jachens, R.C., Grow, J.A., Miller, J.J., Dixon, G.L., and Katzer, T.C., 2001, Basin configuration of the Virgin River depression, Nevada, Utah, and Arizona: A geophysical view of deformation along the Colorado Plateau - Basin and Range transition, *in* Erskine, M.C., Faulds, J.E., Bartley, J.M., and Rowley, P.D., eds., The geologic transition, High Plateaus to Great Basin—The Mackin Volume: Pacific Section, American Association of Petroleum Geologists Publication GB 78, p. 205–226.
- Mannion, L. E., 1974, Virgin River salt deposits, Clark County, Nevada, *in* Coogan, A.H., ed., Fourth symposium on salt: Cleveland, Northern Ohio Geological Society, v. 1, p. 166–175.
- Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, 2005, Underground Injection Control Program; [http://ndep.nv.gov/bwpc/uic\\_overview04.htm](http://ndep.nv.gov/bwpc/uic_overview04.htm).
- Peirce, H.W., 1976, Tectonic significance of Basin and Range thick evaporite deposits, *in* Wilt, J.C., and Penny, J.P., eds., Tectonic digest: Arizona Geological Society Digest 10, p. 325–339.
- Pinsker, L.M., 2003, Value added in coal seams: *Geotimes*, v. 48, no. 3, p. 24–25.
- Price, J.G., 2004, Geology of Nevada, *in* Castor, S.B., Papke, K.G., and Meeuwig, R.O., eds., Betting on industrial minerals, Proceedings of the 39th Forum on the Geology of Industrial Minerals: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Special Publication 33, p. 191–200, [www.nbmng.unr.edu/dox/imfprice.pdf](http://www.nbmng.unr.edu/dox/imfprice.pdf).
- Price, J.G., and Meeuwig, R.O., 2004, Overview, *in* Price, J.G., Meeuwig, R.O., Tingley, J.V., Castor, S.B., Hess, R.H., and Davis, D.A., The Nevada mineral industry, 2003: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Special Publication MI-2003, p. 3–11, [www.nbmng.unr.edu/dox/mi/03.pdf](http://www.nbmng.unr.edu/dox/mi/03.pdf)
- Price, J.G., and Meeuwig, R.O., 2005, Overview, *in* Price, J.G., Meeuwig, R.O., Tingley, J.V., Castor, S.B., Hess, R.H., and Davis, D.A., The Nevada mineral industry, 2004: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Special Publication MI-2004, p. 3–11, [www.wftftp://comstock.nbmng.unr.edu/pub/dox/mi/04.pdf](http://www.wftftp://comstock.nbmng.unr.edu/pub/dox/mi/04.pdf)
- Public Utilities Commission of Nevada, 2005, Proposed generation plants in Nevada, June 2005, <http://puc.state.nv.us/ELECTRIC/propgen.pdf>.
- Raines, G.L., Connors, K.A., Moyer, L.A., and Miller, R.J., 2003, Spatial Digital Database for the Geologic Map of Nevada Geology, Digital database, version 3.0: U.S. Geological Survey, Open-File Report 03-66, <http://geopubs.wr.usgs.gov/open-file/of03-66/>
- Raines, G.L., Sawatzky, D.L., and Connors, K.A., 1996, Great Basin geoscience database: U.S. Geological Survey, Digital Data Series DDS-41, <http://keck.library.unr.edu/data/gbgeosci/gbgdb.htm>
- Rauzi, S.L., 2002, Arizona has salt!: Arizona Geological Survey Circular 30, 36 p.



- Reed, C., 2003, Making rocks: *Geotimes*, v. 48, no. 3, p. 24–25.
- Richards, M., and Blackwell, D.D., 2002a, The forgotten ones, geothermal roads less traveled in Nevada: *Geothermal Resources Council Bulletin*, v. 31, no. 2, p. 69–73.
- Richards, M., and Blackwell, D.D., 2002b, The Nevada story, turning loss into gain: *Geothermal Resources Council Bulletin*, v. 31, no. 3, p. 107–110.
- Roberts, W.L., Rapp, G.R., Jr., and Weber, J., 1974, *Encyclopedia of minerals*: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, New York, 693 p.
- Robie, R.A., and Hemingway, B.S., 1995, Thermodynamic properties of minerals and related substances at 298.15 K and 1 bar (105 pascals) pressure and at higher temperatures: *U.S. Geological Survey Bulletin* 2131, 461 p.
- Roedder, Edwin, 1984, Fluid inclusions: *Mineralogical Society of America, Reviews in Mineralogy*, v. 12, 644 p.
- Service, R.F., 2004, The carbon conundrum: *Science*, v. 305, p. 962–963.
- Shevenell, L., and Garside, L.J., 2005, Nevada geothermal resources (second edition) [map]: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Map 141, 1:750,000 scale.
- Sorey, M.L., Farrar, C.D., Gerlach, T.M., McGee, K.A., Evans, W.C., Colvard, E.M., Hill, D.P., Bailey, R.A., Rogie, J.D., Hendley, J.W., II, and Stauffer, 1996, P.H., Invisible CO<sub>2</sub> gas killing trees at Mammoth Mountain, California: *U.S. Geological Survey Fact Sheet* 172-96, version 2.0, <http://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/fs172-96/>.
- Stewart, J.H., 1980, Geology of Nevada: A discussion to accompany the geologic map of Nevada: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Special Publication 4, 136 p.
- Stewart, J.H. and Carlson, J.E., 1978, Geologic map of Nevada: U.S. Geological Survey, scale 1:500,000, 2 sheets.
- Thomas, J.M., Mason, J.L., and Crabtree, J.D., 1986, Ground-water levels in the Great Basin region of Nevada, Utah, and adjacent states: U.S. Geologic Survey Hydrologic Investigations Atlas HA-694-B, 1:1,000,000-scale map
- Tingley, J.V., 1998, Mining districts of Nevada (second edition): Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Report 47, 128 p. (Report 47d CDROM version).
- Trexler, D.T., Flynn, T., Koenig, B.A., and Ghusn, G. Jr., 1983, Geothermal resources of Nevada: National Geophysical Data Center, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, [www.nbmng.unr.edu/geothermal/mapfiles/noaa.pdf](http://www.nbmng.unr.edu/geothermal/mapfiles/noaa.pdf)
- Turner, R.M., Bawiec, W. J., Ambroziak, R. A., 1991, Geology of Nevada; a digital representation of the 1978 geologic map of Nevada: U.S. Geological Survey, Digital Data Series DDS-2, CDROM
- U.S. Bureau of Land Management, 2003a, Nevada Lands Status Coverage: Geospatial Data and Metadata Web Site, BLM Statewide Coverages of Nevada, [http://www.nv.blm.gov/gis/geospatial\\_data.htm](http://www.nv.blm.gov/gis/geospatial_data.htm).
- U.S. Bureau of Land Management, 2003b, Wilderness Lands of Nevada: Geospatial Data and Metadata Web Site, BLM Statewide Coverages of Nevada, [http://www.nv.blm.gov/gis/geospatial\\_data.htm](http://www.nv.blm.gov/gis/geospatial_data.htm).
- U.S. Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change Research, 2004, Our changing planet - the U.S. climate change science program for fiscal years 2004 and 2005, 119 p., [www.usgcrp.gov/usgcrp/Library/Ocp2004-5/default.htm](http://www.usgcrp.gov/usgcrp/Library/Ocp2004-5/default.htm).
- U.S. Department of Transportation, 2004, Office of Pipeline Safety, Pipeline statistics Web site (<http://ops.dot.gov/stats.htm>).
- U.S. Energy Information Administration, 2004, Energy statistics: [www.eia.doe.gov](http://www.eia.doe.gov).
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1999, Final Project Mohave Report (Measurement of Haze and Visibility Effects), <http://www.epa.gov/region09/air/mohave/report.html>.
- U.S. Geological Survey, 2004, Quaternary Faults and Fold Database of the United States: <http://qfaults.cr.usgs.gov/>; This website contains information on faults and associated folds in the United States that are believed to be sources of M>6 earthquakes during the Quaternary (the past 1,600,000 years).
- Wickham, R.T., 2003, Review of the use of carbon dioxide total flooding fire extinguishing systems: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 97 p., [www.epa.gov/ozone/snap/fire/co2/co2report2.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/ozone/snap/fire/co2/co2report2.pdf).
- Weast, R.C., ed., 1971, *Handbook of chemistry and physics*: Chemical Rubber Company, Cleveland, Ohio.
- White, D.J., Burrowes, G., Davis, T., Hajnal, Z., Hirsche, K.I., Hutcheon, I., Majer, E., Rostron, B., and Whittaker, S., 2004, Greenhouse gas sequestration in abandoned oil reservoirs: The International Energy Agency Weyburn pilot project: *GSA Today*, v. 14, no. 7, p. 4–10.

## IX. APPENDIX: GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM ANALYSIS

The GIS data sets used in this assessment are included in the compact disk (CD) version of this report. Included on the CD are metadata files for each data set. Further descriptions of the metadata and the assumptions made in deciding how to use each data set are given in this section. Should further consideration be given to CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in Nevada, others may wish to reevaluate our approach, make different assumptions, or use different data sets.

### A. Software and Projection Information

All coverages in this project are in UTM, zone 11, meters, NAD 27 projection. Original data coverages that were not in this projection were projected using the projection wizard in Arcview 3.3. Coverages that extended beyond the Nevada state line were clipped to exclude areas outside of the state prior to final modeling. Arcview 3.3 and ARCGIS 9.0 were used for data development, editing, analysis, and modeling. All data layers were designed to be used at a scale of 1:1,000,000 or smaller. Minor edits were performed on some preliminary coverages to remove line work errors and to close polygons.

## B. The Binary Model

We used a binary model for the GIS analysis. Simply put, a binary model is a series or stack of data layers that are attributed in such a way as to show where data of interest, per layer, are and where they are not. Typically, values used include zero or one, yes or no, or a unique number per map layer if the feature is present and no value or a null value where it is not present. In this approach, for any data layer being considered, an area is either acceptable for subsurface CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration or eliminated from consideration. We considered other approaches, such as assigning different weights to different layers and applying distance-probability distributions (e.g., to handle nearness to urban areas or known mineral deposits), but for this preliminary assessment of CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration, we considered the binary model to be the most justifiable and easiest to understand.

In our binary model, we assigned a “no” value to areas of bedrock and to shallow parts of alluvial basins that are not thick enough to provide a seal against leakage or have sufficient pressure to keep the CO<sub>2</sub> in a condensed phase. We assigned a “no” value to areas close to active faults where CO<sub>2</sub> may easily leak from underground injection sites and to areas that in the foreseeable future have a reasonably high probability of being explored and developed for mineral, geothermal, and water resources. We also assign a “no” value to current urban areas and areas that are likely to experience significant population growth during the 21st century, as well as to restricted lands, such as parks and military reservations. In the final GIS analysis, areas assigned an attribute of “no” in any of these GIS layers were combined spatially (unioned) to create the overall area eliminated from further consideration. The remaining area, which was assigned “yes” on every GIS layer, remains as having potential for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration by disposal in deep brine aquifers.

In this preliminary assessment of the potential for CO<sub>2</sub> disposal by sequestration in geological settings, we use the entire state as the spatial extent. There are two near-term opportunities for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in Nevada: EOR and injection into saline aquifers. There are limited opportunities for EOR in oil fields with past production (see section on Petroleum above), and these are not considered in the GIS analysis. The GIS binary model is restricted to areas that may be amenable to injection into saline aquifers. Alternative approaches for geological sequestration are discussed separately from the GIS binary model.

The primary question asked of the binary model was “where should consideration be given to CO<sub>2</sub> disposal in saline aquifers?” Another way of asking the question is “what areas should be eliminated from consideration for CO<sub>2</sub> disposal in saline aquifers?”

## C. Primary Map Layers (Coverages) for the Binary Model

### 1. Nevada State and County Boundaries

The digital 1:1,000,000-scale Nevada State and County boundary coverage, 2nd edition, 1998, produced by the Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology was extensively used for graphic

presentation of data results, primarily on plot maps and graphics used in this report, and as the layer that all of the data sets were clipped to for the special extent of the binary model.

### 2. Geology

We used the digital version of the Stewart and Carlson (1978) Geologic Map of Nevada (Raines and others, 2003) to produce a map that indicates areas of valley fill versus bedrock in Nevada. The original paper map was printed as a single sheet at a scale of 1:500,000, then reprinted as two sheets in 1991. The database by Raines and others (2003), which is reproduced in this report, supersedes earlier published digital versions (Turner and others, 1991; Raines and others, 1996). This database can be queried in many ways to produce a variety of maps. This database is not meant to be used or displayed at any scale larger than 1:500,000 (for example, 1:100,000). Attributes that were selected from the Stewart and Carlson map that indicated areas of valley fill included alluvium, lake deposit, landslide, and playa. These selected attributes were exported into a shape file called “Val\_fill” and became the model layer for areas of valley fill. With the exception of alluvium, lake deposit, landslide, playa and water features, all other units were selected and exported as the shape file “Bedrock.” This shape file became the model layer for areas of bedrock (fig. 3). In the binary model, areas of bedrock were not considered for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration.

### 3. Areas with Greater Than One Kilometer of Valley Fill

The U.S. Geological Survey has interpreted gravity data in terms of thickness of valley fill, including alluvium and some Tertiary volcanic rocks (Dohrenwend and others, 1996). We used the 1-km contour in Plate 8 of Dohrenwend and others (1996) to locate deep basins in Nevada, which we defined as equal to or more than 1 km in depth. The NBMG Open-File Report from which this coverage came is a large compilation of various data sets that were designed to expand the knowledge base on mineral deposits in Nevada with the end goal of presenting a series of mineral deposit permissive maps for Nevada. The gravity dataset is one of the preliminary coverages that was developed to complete the permissive maps. Because of limitations such as data availability, uneven distribution of data, and model grid size, the overall accuracy of this data set is believed to be  $\pm 250$  m (Dohrenwend and others, 1996). The shape file (Depth\_1k.shp) was used to generate figure 5. In the binary model, only areas greater than 1 km of valley fill were considered for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration.

The coverage developed in the preceding step was used to produce a layer showing areas of shallow valley fill. This was done by combining the greater than 1 km of valley fill map with the alluvial cover map, developed earlier in this process from the Stewart and Carlson (1978) Geologic Map of Nevada (Raines and others, 2003). The areas of valley fill that fell outside of the area of greater than 1 km depth were selected and exported to a new shape file (Vf\_Shallow.shp). The map layer showing areas with less than 1 km of valley fill was then used in the model (fig. 5).

#### 4. Faults

Locations of faults that have moved during the Quaternary Period (the last 1.6 million years) were taken from the USGS Quaternary Fault (USGS\_QF) database (U.S. Geological Survey, 2004, <http://qfaults.cr.usgs.gov/>) and NBMG Quaternary Fault (NBMG-QF) database (dePolo, 1999). We used NBMG-QF to identify strike-slip faults that were not attributed as such in the USGS-QF database. This was accomplished by selecting those faults that were within 500 m of identified strike-slip faults within the NBMG-QF database. Faults that fell within 500 m but were attributed as normal faults in the USGS-QF data were not included on the list of strike-slip faults. The strike-slip faults so identified in the USGS-QF database plus those already attributed as strike-slip in the original USGS-QF database, plus those faults shown as strike-slip in the NBMG-QF database were plotted with a 500-m buffer. All other faults from both quaternary fault data sets were plotted with a 1,930-m (1.93-km) buffer. All the buffer maps were then merged into one coverage to create a map layer showing the distribution of areas potentially affected by Quaternary faults in Nevada. A graphic plot of these data showing the buffer areas around the faults combined with the actual location of the faults shown as lines was produced (fig. 6). In the binary model, areas within these buffers near faults were excluded from consideration for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration.

#### 5. Mineral Resources

The mineral resources layer is a compilation of four data sets. The first data set (Mining\_Districts) is the “Mining Districts of Nevada” 2nd edition by Tingley (1998). This is a digital polygon coverage of mining districts in Nevada.

The second data set (NV\_MRDS) is the USGS Mineral Resource Data System (MRDS) database from “Nevada Abandoned Mines Database Compilation Update” by Hess (2001). A subset of MRDS data contained in this report was used as a point coverage indicating sites that have had some type of mineral exploration, development, or production. The original MRDS database was created and is still maintained by the USGS. Sand and gravel locations were removed before these data were used.

The third data set (MILS2000) is the Mineral Inventory Lands System (MILS) database from Hess (2001). A subset of MILS data contained in this report was used as a point coverage indicating sites that have had some type of mineral exploration, development, or production. The original MILS database was created by the U.S. Bureau of Mines and is no longer being updated. Sand and gravel locations were removed before these data were used.

The fourth data set (Map\_120\_e) is the database for the updated “Gold and silver resources in Nevada” map being prepared by Davis and Tingley (in review). This map shows locations of deposits with a noted or implied gold and/or silver resource or reserve discovered since 1930. Base-metal and industrial-mineral deposits that contain a significant amount of gold or silver are also shown. This point coverage was used to show locations of known precious metal resources.

Significant pre-1930 gold and silver deposits are captured in the second and third data sets.

The second, third, and fourth data sets, all point coverages, were plotted with a 5-km buffer, which takes into account potential location inaccuracies, necessary space to develop a large surface or subsurface mine, and the potential for additional discoveries associated with the known resource. Five km is also within the effective distance of large hydrothermal systems responsible for the formation of most ore deposits in Nevada. Once the point coverages were buffered, all three were combined with the mining district coverage using the union command. Internal polygons were dissolved by aggregating all areas that fell within a buffer or mining district area into single polygons. Portions of those polygons that fell outside of Nevada were clipped to the Nevada State boundary. This became the mineral resource coverage for the model (fig. 19). In the binary model, areas within the 5-km buffer of known deposits or within a defined mining district were excluded from consideration for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration.

#### 6. Geothermal Resources

The geothermal resource layer is based on the identified geothermal springs and wells found on the Nevada geothermal resources map of Shevenell and Garside (2005). The well and spring locations are available for download as an Excel spreadsheet file. This file was generated into a point shape file and projected to UTM, zone 11, meters, NAD 27 projection. A 20-km buffer was then created around all of the geothermal sites. Twenty km was chosen because this buffer map visually correlated well with previously published resource potential outlined by Trexler and others (1983), and it included most of the moderate to high potential areas suggested by Blackwell and Richards (2004a and b) and Coolbaugh and others (2005, in press). Areas within the 20-km buffer (fig. 23) were excluded from consideration for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in the binary model.

#### 7. Deep Carbonate Aquifer

We used the approximate extent of the carbonate-rock province (Deep Carbonate Aquifer) in eastern Nevada as outlined by Thomas and others (1986) in their study of groundwater levels in the Great Basin region of Nevada, Utah, and adjacent states. A shape file was created showing the area identified as being underlain by carbonate rocks and then used in the binary model (fig. 24), wherein areas underlain by the Deep Carbonate Aquifer are excluded from consideration for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in saline aquifers.

#### 8. Areas of Population

The areas of population layer was developed from three data sets. The first data set, consisting of roads in Nevada, 1998 edition (Roads\_10k\_buffer.shp), was digitized by NBMG from 1:500,000-scale source materials. The coverage contains interstate highways, U.S. highways, state highways, and some minor roads. From this coverage, major highways such as Interstates 80 and 15 and sections of U.S. and State highways near urban areas were selected (see section on Proximity to



Urban Areas and Areas of Future Urban Growth). These features were exported to a shape file. A 10-km buffer was created around the selected highways. This selection was made because ongoing rapid growth in Nevada's urban areas tends to follow the major transportation corridors outward from existing communities.

The second data set, showing urban areas as of 2000 (Nv\_urban\_utm27.shp), was developed by the U.S. Census Bureau. The Nevada data were downloaded as a polygon shape file from the ESRI Web Site ([http://www.esri.com/data/download/census2000\\_tigerline/index.html](http://www.esri.com/data/download/census2000_tigerline/index.html)). All urban areas identified in Nevada were selected and a 30-km buffer was produced around the urban polygons. This was done to include areas of possible future development during the 21st century and to provide a buffer for public safety concerns.

The third data set (Cities.shp) includes digitized point locations for the center of 101 communities in Nevada. This includes many smaller communities not included in the urban areas coverage. A 10-km buffer was developed around these communities.

All three of the above coverages were combined using the union command to form the urban area coverage (People.shp) for use in the model. This combined coverage includes the Las Vegas and Reno-Carson City urban areas, major towns along Interstate 15 and 80, and the communities of Yerington, Ely, Austin, Eureka, and other small Nevada towns (fig. 25). In the binary model, these areas are excluded from consideration for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration.

## 9. Restricted Lands

The restricted lands layer was developed from two data sets. The first data set is the "Nevada Lands Status Coverage" developed by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (2003a). This was designed to display the distribution of land ownership throughout Nevada. It was originally captured for the Bureau of Land Management by the University of Utah, for use with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife GAP Program. The data were updated using the Geographic Coordinate Database (GCDB) in 2003. From this data set we selected areas identified as being managed by Department of Defense, Department of Energy (Nevada Test Site), National Park Service, Nevada State lands, and regional parks. These select areas were then exported to a shape file.

The second data set is the "Wilderness Lands of Nevada" developed by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (2003b). These data represent designated wilderness areas in Nevada administered by the U.S. Department of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management. Late in 2004 the President signed a new law passed by Congress to designate additional land in Lincoln County as wilderness. It is not included in this data set and has not been included in the project analysis. The wilderness lands data set was combined with the shape file created in the step above and used as the restricted lands coverage for the model (fig. 26). These restricted lands were excluded from consideration in the binary model.

## D. Construction of Model Shapefile

All the map layers developed above were combined using the union command. When supplied with two input shape files (map layers), the union command merges the data so that all the attribute data present in the coverages remain spatially intact in the new output shape file. Where the various polygons overlap and the boundaries stay the same, the data are attributed from both data sets to the existing polygon. Where the polygon boundaries do not overlap or only partially overlap, new polygons covering only the area of difference are created in the output shape file and attributed with the data from the specific coverage for that particular area. The first two shape files to be combined were bedrock and shallow valley fill. These two shape files were then combined with the Quaternary faults layer followed by the mineral resource layer. This combined file of four layers was then combined with the carbonate rocks layer and the areas of population layer. This combined layer was then combined with the restricted lands layer and the geothermal resources layer. This combined shape file was then combined with the final layer, the 1 km or greater basin fill coverage.

Typical Boolean operators for query statements include AND, OR, and NOT. Other operators that can be used in query expressions include equals (=), great than (>), less than (<), not equal to (<>), greater than or equal to (>=), and less than or equal to (<=). The final areas identified for potential CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration were identified by applying the following compound query: areas not equal to BEDROCK and not equal to SHALLOW VALLEY FILL and not equal to QUATERNARY FAULTS and not equal to MINERAL RESOURCES and not equal to CARBONATE ROCKS and not equal to POPULATION and not equal to RESTRICTED LANDS and not equal to GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES and equal to ONE KILOMETER OR GREATER OF VALLEY FILL.

The above query selected 98 polygons out of a database total of 37,690 polygons (fig. 29). These 98 polygons collectively have an area of 524 km<sup>2</sup> or less than 0.2 % of the total area of the state's 285,987 km<sup>2</sup>. Only four of the 98 polygons are 30 km<sup>2</sup> or greater in area.

## E. Other Coverages

### 1. Oil and Gas Well Database

The Nevada Oil and Gas Well Database (Hess, 2004a) was updated and used to generate a shape file for checking some basin depth information.

### 2. Nevada Abandoned Mines Database Compilation Update.

The Nevada Abandoned Mines Database Compilation Update (file name NV\_PTS) contains the digitized locations of mine shaft, prospect, mine tunnel and cave, quarry, and gravel-sand-clay or borrow pit locations from all USGS 7.5-minute topographic quadrangles in Nevada plus sites identified by the Nevada Division of Minerals as hazardous mine site locations.



Each location has an associated record that identifies the map name; symbol type; mining district name determined from Tingley (1998), if within a district; Division of Minerals serial number (for their sites only); land management code, which identifies the site as being on federally managed or private land (location data merged from digital land status coverage supplied by BLM); and UTM (zone 11, NAD27) location coordinates.

This coverage was used during the model definition phase as a possible alternate or additional additive layer indicating areas of potential mineral resources. There are over 100,000 points identified in this data set. Attempts at building this layer into the model, either as a density grid, point coverage, or buffered point coverage, was not practical due to a lack of associated attribute information such as size of workings, production, commodity, reserve, or resource information. We decided not to use this data set in the final model. It was, however, used to produce figure 10, which indicates areas of past mineral development and exploration.

### 3. Tracts Permissive for Ore Deposits

The U.S. Geological Survey's analysis of Nevada's metal-bearing mineral resources (Cox and others, 1996a, b, and c) was tested for potential model layers. Specifically, we compared their maps of tracts permissive for three broad types of deposits: epithermal deposits (fig. 11), pluton-related deposits (fig. 12), and deposit types not directly related to plutonic activity (fig. 13).

### 4. Geothermal Resource Maps

We examined the maps of potential geothermal resources by Trexler and others (1983), which was digitally converted by the Idaho National Engineering & Environmental Laboratory (2003), Blackwell and Richards (2004a and 2004b), and Coolbaugh and others (2005, in press). The former map (fig. 22a) shows the regions favorable for the discovery of thermal water at shallow depth (<1000 m) of sufficient temperature for direct heat applications. This map was reproduced in the Geothermal section of The Nevada Mineral Industry 2003 (Hess, 2004a). Trexler and others (1983) cautioned that although only small areas of this region may be underlain by such thermal water; the region represents that part of the state that deserves further exploration. Local sources of thermal water may be discovered in areas of Nevada not identified in this coverage. Existing data do not document the presence or lack of usable thermal water at shallow depths. The original published map also included data on geothermal well and spring temperatures and known geothermal resource area (KGRA) boundaries that were not included in the digital conversion data set. The Blackwell and Richards (2004a and 2004b) maps (fig. 22b) rely primarily on bottom-hole temperatures and heat-flow measurements in wells, and the Coolbaugh and others (in press) map (fig. 21) was created by combining several GIS layers in a manner that attempts to optimize areas favorable for discovery of geothermal reservoirs capable of being exploited for power generation.

## 5. Power Grid, Power Plant, Pipeline, and Cement and Lime Plant Data

The power grid, power generation, and pipeline data were put together from parts of various data sets supplied by Sierra Pacific Power Company, the Federal Energy Information Administration, the Nevada Public Utilities Commission, and the Western Governors' Association. These data can be used to identify potential sites within proximity to existing electrical generation or transmission facilities and to generate page size graphics. The cement and limestone production coverage (Cement.shp) was developed from information in the Nevada Mineral Industry 2003 (Castor, 2004) publication. Major CO<sub>2</sub> generators are plotted on figures 27 and 32, and pipelines and electrical transmission lines are plotted on figures 28 and 32.

## 6. Railroads and Highways

The railroad coverage was developed and provided by the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT). This coverage is an advance draft version; it is part of a larger digital conversion project that is still in the review process and has not been released. The original line coverage with which NDOT started was from the USGS transportation-rail digital line graphs (DLG) for Nevada. NDOT provided additional data and locational update edits from USGS 1:24,000-scale topographic maps in the form of digital raster graphic (DRG) files, USGS digital orthophoto quads (DOQ), and other historical maps georeferenced to the DRGs or DOQs. The NDOT coverage includes active rail lines as well as historical, dismantled, and proposed rail routes. For this project, only active rail lines were used in figures 28 and 32.

Highways (Roads\_10k\_buffer.shp) were digitized by NBMG from 1:500,000-scale source materials (1998 version, which is still valid today). These are plotted in figure 28.

## 7. Mafic and Ultramafic Rocks

Map layers were developed to show areas with potential for chemical reaction of CO<sub>2</sub> with minerals in mafic and ultramafic rocks. We used the digital version (Raines and others, 2003) of the Stewart and Carlson (1978) Geologic Map of Nevada to identify areas associated with mafic rocks. Attributes that were selected from the Stewart and Carlson map included Qtb (Quaternary basalt flows), Tb (Tertiary basalt flows), Tba (Tertiary andesite and basalt flows), Tbg (Tertiary Banbury Formation), Tob (Tertiary older basaltic rocks), Jgb (middle Jurassic gabbroic complex), and Pzsp (serpentine). These selected units were exported into a shape file (mafic.shp) and became a layer for areas of mafic rocks. Although this layer was not used in the binary analysis, it was used, along with locations of major sources of CO<sub>2</sub> (electric power generation plants and cement and lime plants), major electrical transmission lines, major gas pipelines, and active rail lines, to create figure 32.

# Nevada System of Higher Education 2005

## Board of Regents

Bret Whipple, *Chair*

Mark Alden  
Stavros Anthony  
Jill Talbot Derby  
Dorothy Sewell Gallagher  
Douglas R. Hill  
Linda C. Howard

James D. Leavitt  
Howard Rosenberg  
Jack L. Schofield  
Steve Sisolak  
Michael Wixom

James E. Rogers, *Chancellor*

## University of Nevada, Reno

Joseph N. Crowley, *Interim President*

## Mackay School of Earth Sciences and Engineering

James Taranik, *Director*

## Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology

Jonathan G. Price, *Director/State Geologist*

## Scientific Research Staff

### Economic Geology, Geologic Mapping, and Geologic Framework

Harold F. Bonham, Jr., *Research Geologist (Emeritus)*  
Stephen B. Castor, *Research Geologist*  
John W. Erwin, *Geophysicist (Emeritus)*  
James E. Faulds, *Research Geologist*  
Larry J. Garside, *Research Geologist*  
Christopher D. Henry, *Research Geologist*  
Liang-Chi Hsu, *Research Mineralogist (Emeritus)*  
John L. Muntean, *Research Economic Geologist*  
Keith G. Papke, *Industrial Minerals Geologist (Emeritus)*  
Joseph V. Tingley, *Research Geologist (Emeritus)*

### Geologic Hazards and Engineering Geology

John W. Bell, *Research Engineering Geologist*  
Craig M. dePolo, *Research Geologist*  
P. Kyle House, *Research Geologist*  
Alan R. Ramelli, *Research Geologist*

### Nevada Geodetic Laboratory

Geoffrey Blewitt, *Research Professor*  
Bret Pecoraro, *Laboratory Assistant*  
William C. Hammond, *Research Scientist*  
Corné W. Kreemer, *Postdoctoral Scholar*  
Hans-Peter Plag, *Research Scientist*

### Environmental Geology and Hydrogeology

Paul J. Lechler, *Chief Chemist/Geochemist*  
Lisa Shevenell, *Research Hydrogeologist*

### Science Education

Daphne D. LaPointe, *Research Geologist*

## Research and Administrative Support Staff

### Cartography, Publication Support

Elizabeth Crouse, *Publications Manager*  
Christine Arritt, *Cartographer*  
Martha Henson, *Administrative Aide*  
Jack Hursh, Jr., *Cartographer*  
Gary Johnson, *Information Systems Specialist*  
Jennifer Mauldin, *Cartographer*  
Kris R. Pizarro, *Cartographic Supervisor*  
Dick Meeuwig, *Editor and Webmaster*  
Susan Tingley, *Senior Cartographer (Emeritus)*

### Analytical Laboratory

Mario Desilets, *Chemist/Quality Assurance Officer*

### Information and Publication Sales

David Davis, *Geologic Information Specialist*  
Ron Hess, *Information Systems Specialist/GIS Supervisor*  
Charlotte Stock, *Sales Manager*

### Administration

Terri M. Garside, *Executive Assistant*

### Manuscript reviewed by:

Curt Oldenburg and Larry Myer, *Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory*  
Allen Biaggi, *Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources*  
John Clinkenbeard, *California Geological Survey*  
Paul Lechler, *Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology*  
Christopher Ross, *U.S. Bureau of Land Management*

Graphics: Jack Hursh, Liz Crouse, Kris Pizarro, and Jennifer Mauldin

Editor: Dick Meeuwig

Typography and layout: Jack Hursh

The Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology (NBMG) is a research and public service unit of the University of Nevada and is the state geological survey. NBMG is part of the Mackay School of Mines at the University of Nevada, Reno. NBMG scientists conduct research and publish reports on mineral resources, engineering geology, environmental geology, hydrogeology, and geologic mapping. Individuals interested in Nevada geology are encouraged to visit, call, or write NBMG or visit our homepage at [www.nbmgsales@unr.edu](http://www.nbmgsales@unr.edu).

When visiting NBMG by car, please stop at the information booth just inside the Center Street entrance on the south end of the Reno campus of the University of Nevada. Ask for the Mackay School of Mines map and directions to parking areas and the NBMG offices in the west wing of the Scrugham Engineering-Mines Building. Free parking for Publication Sales Office customers is located on the southwest corner of Palmer Engineering building.

Information Office (room 311)  
Publication Sales Office (room 310)

*Store hours:* 7:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., Monday through Friday  
(open until 5:00 p.m. on Tuesdays)

NBMG publications and maps, U.S. Geological Survey maps, and related publications can be purchased at the Publication Sales Office or ordered over the Internet at [www.nbmgsales@unr.edu](http://www.nbmgsales@unr.edu).

Orders for publications or requests for information may also be made by telephone, fax, e-mail, or U.S. Mail.

<i>Orders:</i>	(775) 784-6691 x2
<i>Information:</i>	(775) 784-6691 x133
<i>Phone hours:</i>	7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m., Monday through Friday
<i>Fax:</i>	(775) 784-1709
<i>e-mail:</i> (orders)	nbmgsales@unr.edu
(information)	nbmginfo@unr.edu

U.S. Mail:	Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology
	Mail Stop 178
	University of Nevada
	Reno, NV 89557-0088

The University of Nevada, Reno is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action employer and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, age, creed, national origin, veteran status, physical or mental disability, and in accordance with university policy, sexual orientation, in any program or activity it operates. The University of Nevada, Reno employs only United States citizens and aliens lawfully authorized to work in the United States.