

On the role of processes interaction in the triggering of post-injection seismicity in Enhanced Geothermal Systems

Silvia De Simone, Jesús Carrera and Víctor Vilarrasa

Grupo de Hidrología Subterránea (GHS). IDAEA, CSIC - Universitat Politecnica de Catalunya UPC

Induced Seismicity Workshop - Davos, 10-13 March 2015

INTRODUCTION

Motivation



Basel (Häring et al., 2008)

- Induced seismicity greater than the expected
 - Post-injection seismicity still not completely understood



Soultz-sous-Forêts (Majer et al., 2007)

Modeling of induced seismicity



heterogeneous host rock

- Pressure variations (HM coupling)
- Temperature variations (THM coupling)
- Fracture failure and seismic shear slip
- Permeability increase (elastic + dilation)
- Chemical reactions



fracture network

Realistic but the complexity hinders the conceptual understanding of the processes

Aim

Identify how each process affect the stress field and the reservoir stability during and after injection





Seismic slip movement

Not so trivial !!!

METHODOLOGY

Hydraulic and thermal effects



Numerical simulation with CODEBRIGHT (Olivella et al, 1994; 1996)



After 9d of injection

After 9d of injection

10d after shut-in

Hydraulic effects (HM) ∆P (MPa) $\Delta \sigma'_{x}$ (MPa) $\Delta \sigma'_{v}$ (MPa) 1500 1500 1500 1000 1000 1000 500 500 500 0 0 0 -500 -500 -500 -1000 -1000-1000 2 -1500 0.5 -1500 -1000 -500 500 00 0 500 1000 1500 0 1 0 0 1500 1000 -0.5 Δα **δ** -2 σ'. 500 σ', х × ۷ 0 -1 y -3 -500 -1.5 -1000 -4 10 20 0 -1500 time (day) -1500 -1000 -500 500 00 500 1000 1500 0 0 Х

0.0 2.5 5.0 7.5 10.0 12.5 15.0 17.5 20.0 22.5

-8.1 -7.2 -6.3 -5.4 -4.5 -3.6 -2.7 -1.8 -0.9 0.0 -18 -16 -14 -12 -10

-8 -6 -4 -2 0

After 9d of injection

10d after shut-in

8



-0.5 -0.4 -0.3 -0.2 -0.1 0.0 0.1 0.2 0.3

-32.4 -28.8 -25.2 -21.6 -18.0 -14.4 -10.8 -7.2 -3.6 0.0

-90

-80

-70

-60

-50

-40

-30

-20

-10

0

METHODOLOGY





Superposition of effects

Mohr-Coulomb failure criterion

 $CFS = \tau - (c + \mu \cdot \sigma'_n)$

CFS > 0 means failure

 $\Delta CFS = CFS^t - CFS^0$

CFS increase (Δ CFS>0) correspond to stability worsening



Superposition of effects: Stability variation



ΔCFS for orientation y



After 9d of injection

10d after shut-in

Superposition of effects: failure



CFS for orientation x







12

18

24

-24

-30

-18

-12

-6

0

6

After 9d of injection

10d after shut-in

Conclusions

- Hydraulic effects produce seismicity in the vicinity of the well and along the main fault zone, but also stabilize fractures placed far away from the injection point, thus delaying their failure;
- Hydraulic effects rapidly disappear after the injection stop, but at early times they may induce seismicity in previously stabilized fractures;
- Thermal effects remain for long times after injection stop and reduce stability along not optimally oriented fractures, but they are localized to the area close to the injection well;
- Slip stress transfer may sensibly rotate the stress tensor;
- The superposition of these effects may induce seismicity along not optimally oriented fractures.

Thank you for the attention!!



Aknowledgements: "FI-DGR 2012" Grant - AGAUR



gencat.cat