



#### The bound growth of induced earthquakes could de-risk hydraulic fracturing

Ryan Schultz, Federica Lanza, Ben Dyer, Dimitrios Karvounis, Remi Fiori, Peidong Shi, Vanille Ritz, Linus Villiger, Peter Meier, & Stefan Wiemer





 $\succ$  Multiple models of M<sub>MAX</sub> vs V. **> Evolution of moment release**  $\succ$  Arrested rupture dynamics  $\succ$  Geometry of stress perturbation > Tectonic fault size limitations >Attractive, impactful for mitigation. > Similar response from statistics. > Can these be falsified (or verified)?



# **Definition of Catalogue Terms**

 $\succ$  Draw from a (doubly truncated) GR-MFD.

 $\succ$  Catalogue M,  $\Delta M$ , M<sub>LRG</sub>, &  $\Delta M_{LRG}$  (M<sub>MAX</sub>).



# Key Insight!





# **CAP-test Methods**

- $\succ$  Simple tests :
  - $\succ$  Visually examine GR-MFD.
  - $\succ$  Quantify expected-observed.
- > CAP-tests
  - > Hypothesis test for M<sub>MAX</sub>.
  - > MLE for M<sub>MAX</sub>.
  - > EW-test, select best M<sub>MAX</sub> model.
- Orders-of-magnitude more sensitive
  - to M<sub>MAX</sub> than traditional approaches.
- > Start testing on real data!



# **Refuted M<sub>MAX</sub>(V) for Large Cases**



# EGS & HF Cases

- > Apply CAP-tests to real data.
- Consider cases which are well documented, both for large catalogues and hydraulic
  - information.
    - > FORGE, Helsinki St1, SSFS
    - > PNR-2, PRN-1z



### **CAP at PNR-1z**

- Handle entire sequence as single, connected cluster.
- > Serious evidence for bound M<sub>MAX</sub>.
  - > Deficient in large events.
  - > 99.86% confident via KS-test.
  - > Small error (<0.01) via MLE-test.
  - >>100x odds ratio via EW-test.
- $\succ$  Earthquakes were managed (M<sub>L</sub> 1.6).



Case		Simple tests		CAP-tests			
Location	Cluster	<i>b</i> -value	$\delta M_{LRG}$	KS-test	MLE-test	EW-test	$\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{MAX}}$ model
PNR-1z	All	1.21±0.05	-0.57	99.86%	<0.01	>100	Galis

**CAP at PNR-1z** 



>>100x odds ratio via EW-test.

> Earthquakes were managed (M<sub>L</sub> 1.6).

### CAP at St1 (2019)

- > Handle entire sequence as single, connected cluster.
- > Serious evidence for bound M<sub>MAX</sub>.
  - $\succ$  Deficient in large events.
  - > 98.44% confident via KS-test.
  - > Small error (0.02) via MLE-test.
  - > 60x odds ratio via EW-test.
- > Earthquakes were managed (M<sub>w</sub> 1.9).



Case		Simple tests		CAP-tests			
Location	Cluster	<i>b</i> -value	$\delta M_{LRG}$	KS-test	MLE-test	EW-test	M <sub>MAX</sub> model
St1	All	1.34±0.06	-0.67	98.44%	0.02	~60	McGarr/Galis

### CAP at St1 (2019)



> Earthquakes were managed (M<sub>w</sub> 1.9).

#### **CAP at PNR-2**

 $\succ$  Handle as two independent clusters (E & W), separated by stage 4. **Bound M<sub>MAX</sub> at W-cluster.**  $\succ$  Deficient in large events. >>99.99% conf, <0.01 M, >100x b.  $\succ$  Unbound M<sub>MAX</sub> at E-cluster.  $\succ$  Overabundance of large events. > 33.7% conf, ~2.5 M, 0.01x b.  $\succ$  E-clust caused moratorium (M<sub>1</sub> 2.9).



Case		Simple tests		CAP-tests				
Location	Cluster	<i>b</i> -value	$\delta M_{LRG}$	KS-test	MLE-test	EW-test	M <sub>MAX</sub> model	
PNR-2	West	1.21±0.05	-1.24	>99.99%	< 0.01	>100	McGarr/Galis	
PNR-2	East	1.14±0.04	+0.84	33.7%	~2.50	0.01	Unbound	



### **CAP at FORGE**

 $\succ$  Handle as four clusters (E & W): s1s2, s3-2022, s3-s6, s7-s10.  $\succ$  Bound M<sub>MAX</sub> at clusters 1-2.  $\succ$  Deficient in large events. > 99% conf, <0.01 M, 26-100x b.  $\succ$  Unbound M<sub>MAX</sub> at cluster 3.  $\succ$  Overabundance of large events. > 65.3% conf, ~1.5, 0.02x b.  $\succ$  Largest event observed in cluster 3.



FORGE

3

 $1.83\pm0.10$ 

+0.11

65.34%

~1.53

0.02

Unbound



### Physical Interpretation

 $\succ$  Dependence on clustering of stages.  $\succ$  The role of hydraulic connectivity.  $\succ$  Insights driven by sensitivity testing. > PNR-1z remains bound when truncating end stages (less conf). > PNR-1z becomes unbound/mixed when truncating start stages.  $\succ$  Inferences for pre-existing faults.

Cluster Definition		VS tost	MIE tost	EW-test	Muna	
Start Stage	End Stage	K5-test	WILE-test	odds ratio	.vilkG	
1	1	>99.99%	< 0.01	~27	0.44 M <sub>W</sub>	
1	2	>99.99%	< 0.01	~2.6	$0.44 M_W$	
1	3	>99.99%	< 0.01	>100	$0.70 \ M_W$	
1	12	>99.99%	< 0.01	>100	$0.90 \ M_W$	
1	13	>99.99%	< 0.01	>100	$0.90 \ M_W$	
1	14	>99.99%	< 0.01	>100	$1.10 \ M_W$	
1	18	93.05%	< 0.01	>100	$1.10 \ M_W$	
1	22	>99.99%	< 0.01	>100	$1.10 \ M_W$	
1	30	>99.99%	< 0.01	>100	$1.30 \ M_W$	
1	31	>99.99%	< 0.01	>100	$1.40 \ M_W$	
1	32	99.56%	< 0.01	>100	$1.60 M_W$	
1	35	99.80%	< 0.01	>100	$1.60 M_W$	
1	37	>99.99%	< 0.01	>100	$1.60 \ M_W$	
1	38	99.62%	< 0.01	~93	$1.90 M_W$	
1	39	99.88%	< 0.01	~63	$1.90 \ M_W$	
1	40	99.80%	< 0.01	~85	$1.90 \ M_W$	
1	41	99.86%	<0.01	~45	1.90 M <sub>W</sub>	

Cluster D	Cluster Definition		MIE tost	EW-test	Mara	
Start Stage	End Stage	K5-test	WILE-test	odds ratio	TATERC	
1	41	99.86%	< 0.01	~45	1.90 M <sub>W</sub>	
2	41	99.50%	< 0.01	~33	1.90 M <sub>W</sub>	
3	41	99.80%	< 0.01	~35	1.90 M <sub>W</sub>	
12	41	98.20%	< 0.01	~2.2	1.90 M <sub>W</sub>	
13	41	98.70%	< 0.01	~25	1.90 M <sub>W</sub>	
14	41	97.80%	< 0.01	~16	1.90 M <sub>W</sub>	
18	41	98.40%	< 0.01	~1.4	1.90 M <sub>W</sub>	
22	41	94.26%	< 0.01	~7.6	1.90 M <sub>W</sub>	
30	41	87.35%	< 0.01	~1.1	1.90 M <sub>W</sub>	
31	41	58.90%	< 0.01	~1.5	$1.90 M_W$	
32	41	55.08%	0.02	~1.4	1.90 M <sub>W</sub>	
35	41	62.78%	< 0.01	~1.5	1.90 M <sub>W</sub>	
37	41	52.25%	< 0.01	~1.2	1.90 M <sub>W</sub>	
38	41	59.84%	0.04	~1.1	1.90 M <sub>W</sub>	
39	41	69.31%	0.01	~2.0	1.90 M <sub>W</sub>	
40	41	44.30%	0.02	~0.8	1.90 M <sub>W</sub>	
41	41	64.72%	0.01	~1.0	1.90 M <sub>W</sub>	

Physical	Start Stage End Stage	KS-test MLE-	test odds ratio	M <sub>LRG</sub> 0.44 M <sub>W</sub>	
30 +30 SHMAX				ation	
Interences for pre-existing faults.			41 69.31% 41 44.30%		1.90 M <sub>W</sub>

### Induced Seismicity: Driven or triggered?

> Driven: controlled by anthropogenic subsurface stress changes. > Triggered: small stress change releases stored tectonic stress. > Unbound-triggered, Bound-driven. > CAP-tests represent first test to separate these two categories.  $\succ$  Test M<sub>MAX</sub> models on driven cases.



# **Practical Implications for Operations**

Use EW-test (at 3x) to discern bound/unbound.

 $\succ$  Record all  $\Delta M_{LRG}$  after EW-test results.



### Operational Mitigation

>Additional tool to discern

problematic stages in real-time.

 $\succ$  Changes reaction when

approaching red-light:

Bound safer, unbound riskier.
 Divert injection away from faults

that hamper resource production.



After Konstantinovskaya et al., 2021



500 m



Applied a suite of tools for testing M<sub>MAX</sub>.
Able to clearly distinguish bound cases of IS.
Significant cluster-to-cluster variability, inferences for causation via fault reactivation.
Potential diagnostic tool, separating bound/unbound cases.
Implications for real-time hazard/risk mitigation.

http://www.seismo<u>.ethz.ch/en/about-us/all-employ</u>ees/Ryan-Schultz/



Schultz, Lanza, Dyer, ..., & Wiemer (2024). **The bound growth of induced earthquakes could de-risk hydraulic fracturing,**  *submitted*, doi: <u>xx</u>.

http://www.seismo<u>.ethz.ch/en/about-us/all-employ</u>ees/Ryan-Schultz/

#### Synthetic (Unbound)



24

#### Synthetic (Tectonic)



# Synthetic (McGarr)



26

#### Synthetic

(Galis)



#### PNR-1z



#### PNR-2



29







