Fault activation by hydraulic fracturing in overpressured shale formations

David W. Eaton¹, Xuewei Bao² and Burns A. Cheadle³

¹University of Calgary ²Zhejian University ³Western University



Schatzalp 2nd Induced Seismicity Workshop 14-17 March 2017



Horizontal drilling and multi-stage hydraulic fracturing





http://crudeoiltrader.blogspot.ca/2012/09/pad-drillingand-rig-mobility-lead-to.html

Adapted from Induced Seismicity Potential in Energy Technologies, U.S. National Academy of Sciences, 2012

Western Canada Sedimentary Basin seismicity



Seismicity clusters with inferred link to hydraulic fracturing

- Horn River basin (BC Oil and Gas Commission, 2012)
- 2. Montney (BC Oil and Gas Commission, 2013)
- 3. Duvernay (Schultz et al., GRL, 2015)
- 4. Alberta Bakken (Schultz et al., BSSA, 2014)

Source: inducedseismicity.ca/catalogues/ $M_L \ge 2.5$ (probable quarry blasts removed)

Is hydraulic-fracturing (HF) induced seismicity more prevalent in Canada than in the U.S. midcontinent?



Summary of Seismicity Associated with Wells in the Western Canada Sedimentary Basin

5	Disposal	HF	Tectonic M≥3
Number of candidate wells (1985–2015)	1236	12,289	-
Number of wells associated with M≥3	17	39	-
Association % for wells (M ≥3)	~1%	~0.3%	_
Number of M ≥3 (1985–2009)	126*	13*	14
Number of M ≥3 (2010–2015)	33*	65*	7
Association % for M ≥3 (2010–2015)	31%	62%	7%

Atkinson et al., SRL (2016)

Comparison with Ohio

<u>Ohio</u>

1400 HF wells: 6 cases of induced seismicity = 0.4%200 disposal wells: 3 cases of induced seismicity = 1.5%

Skoumal et al., JGR (2015)

Western Canada

12,300 HF wells: 39 cases of induced seismicity = 0.3% 1240 disposal wells: 17 cases of induced seismicity = 1.4%

Atkinson et al., SRL (2016)

Maximum magnitude and injected volume



Atkinson et al., SRL (2016)



Bao and Eaton, Science (2016)

- Winter 2015 Duvernay completions at 6 pads
- Template matching + doubledifference relocations
- Seismicity strongly clustered near HF operations
- Cluster 1 suggests two fault strands



Duvernay shale



Comparison with injection data



Comparison with injection data



Fault activation

- ~ optimally oriented fault strands extending into crystalline basement
- More persistent west strand projects to location between two zipper-frac'd horizontal wells
- Transient response of east strand is best explained by stress, not pore pressure



Distance of target formation to basement

- Proximity of basement appears to raise likelihood of induced seismicity
- In central US, basement primarily hosts faults capable of M>2 seismicity



Montney Fairway: Pore Pressure



Montney Fairway: HFIS



Duvernay Fairway: Pore Pressure



Duvernay Fairway: HFIS



Random chance? Unlikely

Bootstrap Analysis



Petroleum system fault-valve model¹





Conclusions

- In western Canada and Ohio (Utica play), HF induced seismicity is associated with ~0.3-0.4% of MFHW completions and ~1.4-1.5% of disposal wells
- 2. In some cases, maximum magnitude exceeds a predicted limit based on net injected volume (McGarr 2014)
- 3. Distinct activation signatures of poroelastic stress triggering (transient) and fluid-pressurized faults (more persistent)
- 4. Spatial correlation of seismicity clusters with shale overpressure; petroleum system fault-valve model?



Acknowledgements



Western