A sensitivity analysis of stress changes related to geothermal direct heat production in clastic reservoirs and potential for fault reactivation and seismicity

Arjan Marelis[1,2], Loes Buijze[2], Brecht Wassing[2], Fred Beekman[1], Jan-Diederik van Wees[1,2]

[1] Department of Earth Sciences, Utrecht University, Princetonlaan 8a, NL-3584 CB Utrecht, The Netherlands

[2] TNO, Energy division, P.O. Box 80015, NL-3508 TA Utrecht, The Netherlands

Introduction

In the Netherlands, geothermal energy is considered an important future heat source, the aim is to accelerate and upscale its development by development of hundreds of geothermal doublet systems by 2050 for sustainable heating in the built environment (Stichting Platform Geothermie et al., 2018, Van Wees et al., 2020). For safe and effective application of geothermal energy, assessment of the effects of long-term cooling on reactivation and seismicity potential of faults near a geothermal doublet are required. Geomechanical models allow for understanding and evaluation of the influence and sensitivity to key subsurface processes, geological properties and operational settings affecting fault reactivation and seismic hazard.

This work presents the preliminary results of a detailed analysis of the sensitivity for fault reactivation and induced seismicity in a three-dimensional framework, taking into account both the spatial and temporal evolution of the cold-water front in the vicinity of the geothermal doublet.

Model

Two three-dimensional model scenarios for a geothermal doublet are considered with a fault in between the injector and producer well, **Model 1** without fault offset, the **Model 2** with a normal offset of half the reservoir thickness, and their results are compared. The 3D stress and seismicity potential analysis is performed based on an uniaxial stress solution compared to MACRIS (Mechanical Analysis of Complex Reservoir for Induced Seismicity). MACRIS is a TNO-proprietary tool that allows for poro- and thermo-elastic stress evolution in complex reservoir models (van Wees et al., 2019). In both approaches the stress changes are calculated based on finite volume changes ΔV, related to pressure and temperature changes in the reservoir:

$$\Delta V = (\,\varepsilon_{Tz} + \varepsilon_{Pz}\,)\, dV, \qquad \varepsilon_{Tz}(t) = \Delta T(t)\alpha\frac{(1+\nu)}{(1-\nu)}, \qquad \varepsilon_{Pz}(t) = \Delta P(t)\frac{(1-\nu-2\nu^2)}{(1-\nu)E}$$

In the uniaxial stress solution, the effective stress changes follows directly from the change in pressure and temperature as (van Wees et al., 2014; Buijze et al., 2019):

$$\Delta\sigma_v'(t) = -\Delta P(t), \qquad \Delta\sigma_{hH}'(t) = \Delta\sigma_{Hh}'(t) = (\varepsilon_{Tz}(t) + \varepsilon_{Pz}(t))\frac{E}{(1+\nu)} - \Delta P(t)$$

In both models in-situ stress, thermo-mechanical, and frictional **parameters** are varied to study the sensitivity of induced stresses. **Potential magnitudes** are determined from the induced stresses. Preliminary results show the potential for fault reactivation to be predominantly affected by the thermo-elastic reservoir parameters. In addition, the intersection area of the cold-water volume in direct contact with the fault plane is shown to be the main driver for fault reactivation.

Parameter	Value	Description
θ	$70\ [°]$	Fault dip
$\Delta\sigma_v/\Delta z$	$22\ [MPa/km]$	Vertical stress gradient
σ_h/σ_v	$0.75\ [-]$	Stress ratio
σ_H/σ_h	$0.9\ [-]$	Horizontal stress ratio
α	$1e^{-5}\ [°C^{-1}]$	Linear thermal expansion coefficient
ν	$0.2\ [-]$	Poisson ratio
E	$15\ [GPa]$	Young's modulus
μ	$0.52\ [-]$	Friction coefficient
C	$0\ [MPa]$	Cohesion
k	$500\ [mD]$	Permeability
$k_{seal,base}$	$3e^{-5}\ [mD]$	Over- and under-burden permeability
q	$286\ [m^3/h]$	Injection flowrate
ρ_r	$2240\ [kg/m^3]$	Rock density
K_r	$3\ [W/m.K]$	Rock thermal conductivity
K_f	$0.6\ [W/m.K]$	Fluid thermal conductivity
c_r	$850\ [J/kg.K]$	Rock specific heat capacity
c_f	$3774\ [J/kg.K]$	Fluid specific heat capacity
μ_f	$0.5e^{-3}\ [Pa.s]$	Fluid viscosity

Model 1: No fault offset – stress and strain

In absence of stress arching effects, i.e. the reservoir is not offset by the fault, analytical approaches based on an uniaxial stress solution for a layered medium can be used as approximation for the stress response.



Fault plane intersection of temperature solution

White line indicative of reactivated area on the fault plane, illustrating a minimum degree of cooling required for the fault to be reactivated.



Stress solutions at center of fault plane

Uniaxial solution deviates less than 1% from absolute Coulomb stress peaks. Note the difference in shear stress; arching effect (van Wees et al., 2014)



Map of potential recoverable heat in The Netherlands

(ThermoGIS.nl)



Model 2: Normal fault offset – stress and strain

Considering the reservoir to be offset by the fault, the structural complexity of the model increases and the uniaxial solution is likely no longer valid.



Fault plane intersection of temperature solution

White line indicative of reactivated area on the fault plane, illustrating a minimum degree of cooling required for the fault to be reactivated.



Stress solutions at center of fault plane

Uniaxial solution deviates less than 15% from absolute Coulomb stress peaks. Note the difference in shear stress; arching effect (van Wees et al., 2014)



Ensemble Monte Carlo simulation



Comparison of seismic evolution

The evolution of seismic event magnitude is truncated by its theoretical maximum.



Seismic magnitude prediction

The potential cumulative seismic moment is determined from the elastic stress solution as proposed by van Wees et al. (2018), which states that the seismic moment density $M0_m\ [N]$ of the fault per unit length of strike becomes

$$M0_m = \Delta\sigma\frac{l^2}{\sqrt{\pi}}$$

which applies to plane-strain dip-slip conditions in a normal faulting regime. This simplified approach discards the dynamic effects of slip and slip weakening, and assumes all incremental slip is released seismically and instantaneously. The magnitude of the seismic event can be obtained from the cumulative seismic moment CSM by (van Wees et al., 2014)

$$M_L = \frac{2}{3}\log(CSM) - 6.07$$

where CSM is the integration of the seismic moment over fault strike. Rather than assuming CSM is released in a single seismic event, CSM can be released in N events based on a Gutenberg-Richter relationship with constant b-value to provide a more realistic approach.

Additional details

For further details on this work please follow the QR code to the conference's extended abstract. For any future questions please contact me at:

a.a.marelis@uu.nl

Conclusions

Comparison of both model scenarios illustrates the additional complexity in stress response when normal fault offset is introduced. It was shown that the analytical uniaxial solution serves as a good approximation for Coulomb stress and seismic hazard prediction for the cases considered. This implies that the effect of variations in mechanical parameters can be effectively determined from the equations presented above, and their effect is found to be in line with results presented in Buijze et al., 2022.

The presented maximum possible seismic event magnitudes of $M{\sim}2$ are subject to significant uncertainty, in view of the uncertainty in the chosen model parameters, including in-situ stress, mechanical and frictional properties.

Buijze et al. (2022) report wide magnitude ranges considering a comprehensive range of uncertainties, and the magnitudes obtained in this work are in close agreement with the reported range in Buijze et al., 2022.

Results show MACRIS to be an effective tool in seismic hazard assessment as its solution can handle structurally complex reservoir and is in good accordance with analytical and numerical model solutions. In conclusion, the extent to which the cold-water front intersects the fault plane within a given initial stress field is shown to be the main driver for fault reactivation and subsequent seismic potential.

References

Buijze et al. (2019). Review of induced seismicity in geothermal systems worldwide and implications for geothermal systems in the Netherlands, *Netherlands Journal of Geosciences*, 98.

Buijze et al. (2022). Quantification of induced seismicity potential of geothermal operations: Analytical and numerical model approaches. *WarmingUP report,* available online.

Stichting Platform Geothermie, DAGO, Stichting Warmtenetwerk, and EBN. (2018), *Masterplan Aardwarmte in Nederland*.

Van Wees et al. (2014). Geomechanics response and induced seismicity during gas field depletion in the Netherlands, *Geothermics*, 52, 206-219.

Van Wees et al. (2019). 3-D mechanical analysis of complex reservoirs: a novel mesh-free approach, *Geophysical Journal International*, 219 (2), 1118-1130.