Seismic modelling: 4D capabilities for CO₂ injection
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Abstract

This paper focuses on modelling the seismic response to a theoretical CO₂ injection into the upper reservoir at the Longyearbyen CO₂ Lab site in Svalbard, Norway. The modelling aims to assess the monitoring potential of a carbon capture and storage site. We demonstrate the effect of reservoir porosity and CO₂ concentration on seismic reflection amplitudes using a prestack depth migration simulator. In addition, we look at five different CO₂ plumes of increasing volume and model the seismic response as a proxy to monitoring the evolution of a CO₂ plume. We show that even low porosity reservoirs (2%) will generate a significant seismic response from the injection of CO₂, and that low CO₂ concentrations will also be detected. However, further increases in the CO₂ concentration will not be as simple to monitor, with the CO₂ contact providing the best seismic imaging potential. Furthermore, we demonstrate how illumination angle and hence seismic acquisition design is critical to avoid imaging artefacts.
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1. Introduction

The Longyearbyen CO₂ Lab project was initiated in 2007 by The University Centre in Svalbard (UNIS), with the aim of converting the coal-fired power station in Longyearbyen on Svalbard (Norway), into a site for carbon capture and storage (CCS); ultimately transforming Svalbard into a CO₂ neutral community. Eight slim-hole exploration wells were drilled, fully cored and logged. Seismic surveys were completed and a microseismic monitoring network
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was deployed. Injection and fracture monitoring tests were completed in 2010 and 2013 to help understand the storage potential and fracture conductivity in addition to any potential seismic risk. Numerous geomechanical and modelling studies have been completed within the project (e.g. [1,2,3,4,5]).

The target siliciclastic reservoir for the CCS is located at a depth of 672-972 m, Late Triassic to Middle Jurassic in age. The reservoir is characterized by low to moderate matrix porosity (5-18%) and low permeability (>2 mD) [6], and can be divided into two formations. The upper ~25 m thick Knorringfjellet formation exhibits higher matrix porosity and permeability making it a better target for CO₂ injection, compared with the underlying ~275 m De Geerdalen formation [2].

This paper focuses on modelling the seismic response to a theoretical CO₂ injection into the upper reservoir as a means to improve monitoring of CCS sites. The modelling aims to demonstrate both the effect of reservoir porosity and CO₂ concentration on the seismic reflection amplitudes. In addition, we look at five different CO₂ plumes of increasing volume and model the seismic response using a novel prestack depth migration (PSDM) simulator.

2. Seismic modelling methodology

Seismic modelling typically involves the computation of synthetic seismograms either by ray-tracing (e.g. [7,8]), or finite difference (e.g. [9]). The synthetic seismograms must then be processed to generate the migrated seismic responses. Here we use a novel ray-based approach using a 3D prestack-depth convolution [10,11,12], which does not require the computational effort of computing synthetic seismograms. The method provides an estimation of the point scatterer response of a prestack depth migration at a reference point, which accounts for 3D resolution and illumination effects. The 3D convolution operator is called a Point Spread Function (PSF), and is generated from illumination vectors (difference between the slowness vectors from a shot and to a receiver [9]) at the reference point for a given survey design (i.e. multiple shots and receivers). The illumination vectors are combined with a selected wavelet to generate the PSDM filter in the wavenumber domain (i.e. the spatial frequency of a wave). By applying an inverse fast Fourier transform to this filter the PSF is generated, showing the imaging response in the spatial domain. Such PSFs may vary for different reference points throughout a target region depending on the survey geometry and the velocity model (and hence wave propagation effects), and thus need computing throughout the target region (full-field approach). However, if the variation between PSFs is small enough, it is possible to use a single computation (local target approach) to be representative for the entire target region.

In order to generate the final PSDM image, the PSF(s) must be convolved with a reflectivity cube for the target region that represents the elastic 4D changes imposed by the different CO₂ injection scenarios. Within this target we define the rock properties in terms of effective Vp, Vs, density, bulk modulus, shear modulus, and porosity, which can be derived from the well logs at the CO₂ Lab (e.g. [13]). Further, we also define values for water saturation and CO₂ concentration, together with the bulk modulus and density values of the brine and CO₂. Whereas values for mineral properties, e.g. quartz bulk modulus, shear modulus and density, are generally taken from published sources such as [14], the fluid properties vary with the actual fluid composition, and the temperature and pressure in target area. In order to quantify the fluid properties, we use the equations outlined in [15] for the brine properties whereas the CO₂ properties were quantified using [16]. Together these values are used to compute the overall effect on the elastic properties using the Gassmann equations [14]. They are simple and widely used equations for 4D rock physics modelling, and are known to provide useful results for clastic reservoirs even though they are based on the assumptions that both the solid and fluid phase are homogeneous and the pore space is interconnected:

\[
K = K_{\text{dry}} + \frac{\left(1 - \frac{K_{\text{dry}}}{K_{\text{solid}}}\right)^2}{\frac{\phi}{K_{\text{fluid}}} + (1-\phi)\frac{K_{\text{dry}}}{K_{\text{solid}}}} - \frac{K_{\text{dry}}}{K_{\text{solid}}}^2, \quad \mu = \mu_{\text{dry}}, \quad \rho = \phi \rho_{\text{fluid}} + (1-\phi) \rho_{\text{solid}}
\]
where $K$, $K_{\text{dry}}$, $K_{\text{solid}}$, $K_{\text{fluid}}$ are the effective bulk moduli of the saturated rock, the dry rock, the mineral material making up the rock, and the pore fluid. $\phi$ is the porosity, $\mu$ and $\mu_{\text{dry}}$ are the effective shear modulus and the shear modulus of the dry rock, respectively, and $\rho$, $\rho_{\text{fluid}}$ and $\rho_{\text{solid}}$ are the average density, the fluid density and the density of the mineral making up the rock. The dry bulk modulus was parameterized using well data from CO2 Lab. From the effective elastic properties, the corresponding P-wave and S-wave velocities, and thus the reflectivity can be calculated.

2.1. Analytical PSDM filter with a local target approach

In creating a PSDM filter, an alternative to specifying a particular survey and full velocity model is to create an analytical PSDM filter from a maximum illumination dip and average velocity at the reference point [12]. The seismic response from such a filter is therefore independent from survey design and is a proxy for limited-aperture effects (survey and migration), as encountered in actual seismic acquisition. This method thus provides a simplified approach to test fundamental parameters, without the added complication of using a full background velocity model or specific survey design.

We generate an analytical PSDM filter and its corresponding PSF by combining a 30-Hz zero-phase Ricker wavelet with a maximum illumination dip of 30° (Fig. 1). For our target region, with a depth between 672 m to 697 m, such an illumination dip corresponds to a survey with approximately 800 m aperture. The resulting PSF is used with a local target approach (i.e. a single PSD throughout the target region).

The analytical filter and local target approach is used to first test the influence of reservoir porosity, CO2 concentration, and effectiveness of imaging CO2 plumes with different volumes. For the porosity and CO2 concentration cases, a hypothetical reservoir model is used as shown in Fig. 2, with the reservoir divided into five layers of equal thickness (420 m).

To test the effect of porosity we create PSDM seismic images for three different cases: 2%, 5% and 10% porosity values. For each of these cases, the PSDM images are computed first with all layers of the reservoir saturated with brine (a ‘pre-injection’ image), and then with the upper three layers (i.e. 1260 m) saturated with CO2, with brine in the layers below (a ‘post-injection’ image). A final image for each porosity case is computed to show the difference between the pre-injection and post-injection images.

For understanding the effect of CO2 concentration on the PSDM images, we follow a similar approach to the porosity testing. We first compute a ‘pre-injection’ PSDM image where the full reservoir is saturated with brine. We compare this result with the ‘post-injection’ images for CO2 concentrations of 5%, 10%, 15%, 20%, 25% and 100% within the upper three layers – again with brine saturating the layers below. For a final case, we apply a gradient concentration distributed over the upper four layers (with brine below), with CO2 concentrations of 100%, 75%, 50%, and 25% in the respective layers (from the top). In all of these cases, the porosity within the reservoir is kept constant at 5%.

To evaluate the impact of CO2 plumes of differing volume, we create five plume-shaped CO2 distributions as shown in Fig. 3. The increase in extent of each plume is analogous to the evolution of a CO2 plume over time from continuing CO2 injection. Each plume spans the full depth of the reservoir (at its centre), with maximum lateral extents of 1350 m, 1960 m, 2770 m, 3800 m, and 4370 m. In order to properly illuminate the steep sides of the CO2 plumes, the maximum dip used in the PSDM filter was increased from 30° (for the porosity and concentration testing) to 45°. This corresponds to an increase in seismic survey aperture to 1500 m from the original 800 m. For each of the plumes, the CO2 concentration is set to 100%, and the reservoir porosity to 5%. To demonstrate the effect on illumination angle (and hence survey aperture), we also show the effect on the PSDM images for illumination angles of 10° and 30° (survey apertures of 250 m and 800 m respectively).
Fig. 1. (a) 30-Hz zero-phase Ricker wavelet (time domain); (b) vertical cross-section of a 3D analytical PSDM filter with a 30° maximum illumination dip: reflectors dipping up to 30° will be illuminated; (c) corresponding point spread function (PSF) after inverse Fourier transform of the PSDM filter: the cross-pattern of the PSF filter is generated by the 30° borders of the PSDM filter, where the branches of this pattern are at 90° from the PSDM filter borders.

Fig. 2. Layered reservoir used in the seismic modelling to test the effect of porosity and CO₂ concentration.
3. Results

3.1. Influence of reservoir porosity

The PSDM images generated from the analytical PSDM filter workflow, and applied to the layered reservoir model in Fig. 2, are shown in Figs 4-6. Fig. 4 shows the results from using a porosity of 2%. On saturation of the upper three reservoir layers with CO₂, the CO₂/brine contact becomes visible within the seismic section. The difference plot between the CO₂ saturated section and the brine saturated reservoir shows a negative polarity at the top of the reservoir. This is due to a decrease in P-wave velocity with CO₂ saturation, which will therefore decrease the reflectivity. Conversely, at the base of layer 3, the introduction of the CO₂ creates an additional reflector with a positive impedance contrast, thus producing a positive polarity in the difference plot. As observed within Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 (porosity values of 5% and 10%, respectively), the greater the reservoir porosity, the higher the seismic amplitude this reflector will have.
Fig. 4. PSDM seismic sections for a reservoir with porosity of 2%. (a) all reservoir layers are saturated with brine; (b) the upper three layers are saturated with CO2 with brine below; (c) difference between (b) and (a).

Fig. 5. PSDM seismic sections for a reservoir with porosity of 5%. (a) all reservoir layers are saturated with brine; (b) the upper three layers are saturated with CO2 with brine below; (c) difference between (b) and (a).
3.2. Influence of CO₂ concentration

The effect of different CO₂ concentrations on the PSDM images is shown in Fig 7. For each of the cases where the CO₂ concentration is kept constant in the upper three layers (and above 0%), an additional reflector is observed at the layer 3 to layer 4 boundary. In the case of the gradient model, where CO₂ concentration varies from 100% at the top of the reservoir, down to 25% within layer 4, only the layer 4 to layer 5 boundary has a clear additional reflector, due to the high impedance contrast between the CO₂ and brine as compared with the gradual reduction in CO₂ within the top 4 layers.

Fig. 8 shows the difference plots between the different CO₂ concentrations, which illustrate how the biggest contrast for the reflector at the base of layer 3 occurs between the reservoir saturated with brine and then saturated with 10% CO₂ within the upper 3 layers. Further increases in the CO₂ concentration still show positive differences at this boundary, but the contrast is progressively reduced. This effect is due to the sensitivity of the bulk modulus to CO₂, so that going from no CO₂ to 10% has a large effect, but further increases have reduced effects on the bulk modulus, and thus reflectivity.

Fig. 8 also shows what was not apparent in Fig. 7 for the gradient CO₂ concentration case; that there are reflections between each of the individual layers. However, it reinforces the observation that increasing CO₂ concentration results in smaller increases in reflectivity – e.g. the reflection between the layer 1 and layer 2 boundary (100% and 75% CO₂ concentration, respectively), is much lower than between the layer 3 and layer 4 boundary (50% and 25% CO₂ concentration, respectively).

3.3. Imaging CO₂ plumes

The impact of CO₂ plumes with varying volume on the PSDM seismic sections is shown in Fig. 9. For each of the plumes, where the lateral extent ranges from 1350 m for plume 1 to 4370 m for plume 5, the shape could be fully recovered using the analytical PSDM filter with a 45° maximum dip. This indicates that a survey with an aperture of ~1500 m is sufficient to effectively image CO₂ plumes with these extents. The effect of reducing the maximum illumination dip and thus seismic survey aperture, is illustrated in Fig. 10. It shows the results for both a 10° and 30° maximum dip in the PSDM filter (equivalent to approximate survey apertures of 250 m and 800 m respectively).
Only the first four plumes are shown. For the first three plumes, the flanks are relatively steep. This results in the plume being imaged incompletely for the 10° PSDM filter images. There are also artefacts below the plume due to the lack of range in the illumination angle. For the 30° PSDM filter images, the results are improved, with the plume flanks imaged at least for the larger plumes. However, plume 1, with the smallest extent and steepest flanks is still incomplete within the image. The results are significantly poorer than observed for the 45° PSDM filter images in Fig. 9.

Fig. 7. PSDM seismic sections for a reservoir with different CO₂ concentrations (and a constant porosity of 5%). (a) no CO₂; (b) 5% CO₂ in the upper 3 layers; (c) 10% CO₂ in the upper 3 layers; (d) 15% CO₂ in the upper 3 layers; (e) 20% CO₂ in the upper 3 layers; (f) 25% CO₂ in the upper 3 layers; (g) 50% CO₂ in the upper 3 layers; (h) 100% CO₂ in the upper 3 layers; (i) a gradient from 100% CO₂ to 25% CO₂ in the upper 4 layers.
Fig. 8. Difference plots for PSDM seismic sections for a reservoir with different CO₂ concentrations (and a constant porosity of 5%). (a) difference between 0% and 5% CO₂ in the upper 3 layers; (b) difference between 5% and 10% CO₂ in the upper 3 layers; (c) difference between 10% and 15% CO₂ in the upper 3 layers; (d) difference between 15% and 20% CO₂ in the upper 3 layers; (e) difference between 20% and 25% CO₂ in the upper 3 layers; (f) difference between the reservoir fully saturated with brine and a gradient of CO₂ saturation from 100% CO₂ to 25% CO₂ in the upper 4 layers.
Fig. 9. PSDM seismic sections for 5 plumes with increasing CO$_2$ volume. The images are computed using an analytical PSDM filter with a maximum illumination dip of 45°. The CO$_2$ concentration within the plume is 100%, and the reservoir porosity is 5%.
Fig. 10. Difference plots for PSDM seismic sections for the first 4 plumes with increasing CO₂ volume. The difference is between a reservoir fully saturated with brine, and a reservoir with the CO₂ plumes at 100% concentration. Left: difference plots for a PSDM filter with a maximum illumination dip of 10°. Right: difference plots for a PSDM filter with a maximum illumination dip of 30°.
4. Discussion and conclusions

Seismic monitoring of CCS sites is critical for understanding the storage capabilities of a reservoir, the spatial evolution of an injected CO2 plume, and for the mitigation of potential seismic hazard. Key to such monitoring is an understanding of its limitations, and how the geology and seismic acquisition may affect the outcome. Seismic modelling provides an excellent means of testing such parameters without the need for expensive acquisitions.

In this study we have modelled the seismic response using an analytical PSDM filter to test the effect of reservoir porosity, CO2 concentration, and CO2 plumes of differing volume.

We have found that the introduction of CO2 into a reservoir generates a significant seismic response even with a reservoir porosity of 2%. Increasing the reservoir porosity increases this response. In the context of the CO2 Lab, where matrix porosity in the reservoir varies from 5-18%, this is clearly sufficient to observe a seismic response.

Testing the effect of increasing the CO2 concentration within the reservoir on the seismic response has shown that there is a limited influence due to the sensitivity of the bulk modulus to CO2. Low levels of CO2 (e.g. 5% concentration) result in a significant seismic response when compared to an ‘empty’ (brine filled) reservoir. Further increases to the CO2 concentration results in a reduction to the difference in the seismic response, due to a decay in the bulk modulus sensitivity. The implication for CCS monitoring is that seismic imaging will be limited in its ability to assess the amount of CO2 within a reservoir. However, because the contact between CO2 and brine is easily identifiable in the seismic response, the spatial extent of a CO2 volume can be effectively monitored.

Applying the seismic modelling to CO2 plumes of variable extent has shown that effective 3D illumination is required. In the case of using an analytical PSDM filter of 45°, which is equivalent to a seismic acquisition with a 1500 m aperture for our models, all five CO2 plumes could be imaged without any significant artefacts. However, reducing the illumination angle to 30° (an acquisition with 800 m aperture) and then to 10° (an acquisition of 250 m aperture), for the CO2 plumes with the steepest flanks it resulted in both artefacts in the images and incomplete imaging of the full extent of the plume volume. This highlights the importance of modelling to ensure that an effective seismic acquisition is designed in order for a CO2 plume to be monitored throughout its evolution.
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