

Shear enhanced decompaction weakening and its effects on formation of seismic chimney

Lawrence Hongliang Wang Viktoriya Yarushina, Yury Podladchikov

Department of Environmental Analyses, Institute of Energy Technology, Norway University of Lausanne, Institute of Earth Sciences, Lausanne, Switzerland

CO2 Path project: Prediction of CO2 leakage from reservoirs during large scale storage





Seismic chimneys from observations



Cartwright and Santamarina, 2015

Offshore Namibia

- Seismic chimeys and pockmark field
- Focalized fluid flow
- Cross section From nearly circular to elliptical
- Long axis from ~100 m to 900 m



Nyegga area, mid-Norwegian continental margin



IF2



CO₂ plumes at Sleipner



Seismic observation shows that arising plume of CO₂ flow forms within the reservoir and spread out underneath the caprock. Would it cause CO₂ leakage in the future? What is the mechanism and how to avoid it ?

~250 m nordland GP shale as the seal 26 m Pliocene sand wedge 6m shale layer Utsira formation (reservior)

Furre, et al., 2019



Potential Mechanisms

- 1. Hydralic fracture: i.e brittle rock
- 2. erosive fluidization
- 3. Capillary invasion



asymmetric bulk viscosity for compaction and decompaction

Decompaction

Compaction

Cartwright and Santamarina, 2015

4. Porous waves with decompaction weakening: Two-phase flow theory: solid + fluid Fluid migration through opening (decompaction) and closing (compaction) poro-space in the solid matrix



Richard & Schmeling. 2008





Governing equations and numerical methods

Mass balance

$$\frac{\partial \rho_s (1-\varphi)}{\partial t} + \nabla (\rho_s (1-\varphi)v_s) = 0$$
$$\frac{\partial \rho_f \varphi}{\partial t} + \nabla (\rho_f \varphi v_f) = 0$$

Force balance

$$\frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}^{eff}}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial p_f}{\partial x_i} = g \,\overline{\rho} \,\hat{z}$$

Darcy flow

$$\varphi(v_f - v_s) = -\frac{k(\varphi)}{\mu_f} \nabla \left(p_f + \rho_f g z \right)$$

Permeability

$$k = k0 \ (\frac{\phi}{\phi_0})^3$$

Bulk viscosity

$$\eta_{\phi} = f(Pe, \phi, \tau)$$

?

Yarushina & Podladchikov. 2015

17.06.2019

Pseudo-Transient method

add Pseudo time-derivative at right side

$$\nabla_{k} v_{k}^{s} + \frac{P_{e}}{\eta_{\phi}(1-\phi)} = 0 \qquad \qquad = \frac{dP}{d\tau_{p}} \qquad \qquad \text{Local physics}$$

$$\nabla_{j}(\tau_{ij} - P\delta_{ij}) - \bar{\rho}g_{i} = 0 \qquad \qquad = \frac{dv_{i}^{s}}{d\tau_{v}} \qquad \qquad \text{No matrix}$$

$$\nabla_{k}(v_{k}^{f} - v_{k}^{s})\phi - \frac{P_{e}}{\eta_{\phi}(1-\phi)} = 0 \qquad \qquad = \frac{dP^{f}}{d\tau_{p}^{f}} \qquad \qquad \text{Less memory}$$
Numerical dampening: use the physics of the damped wave propagation to speed up the iteration.
$$\operatorname{Err} = A e^{-\lambda t} e^{kx}$$



Bulk Viscosity : Type 1 and 2

Type 1 $\eta_{eff} = \eta_{\phi} (1 + \frac{1}{2} (\frac{1}{R} - 1)(1 + \tanh(-\frac{Pe}{\lambda_n}))$

Bulk viscosity is R times smaller, when effective pressure (Pe=Pf-Pt) is positive (decompaction).



17.06.2019

Type 2

$$\eta_{eff} = \eta_{\varphi} \begin{cases} 1, & -k_d < P_e < k_c \\ \\ \frac{|P_e|}{k_e} \exp\left(1 - \frac{|P_e|}{k_e}\right) & k_e = \begin{cases} k_c, when P_e > 0 \\ k_d, when P_e < 0 \end{cases}$$

Different compressive strength (k_c) and tensile strength (kd), from experiment data.



Yarushina et al. 2019 (in preparation)



Bulk Viscosity : Type 3 = Type 2 + shear enhancement

Type 3

Further weakening by shear stress

$$\begin{split} \eta_{eff} &= \eta_{\varphi} \begin{cases} 1 , \\ \frac{|P_e|}{k_e} \exp\left(1 - \frac{|P_e|}{k_e}\right) \left(1 + \left(\frac{\tau}{\tau_e}\right)^n\right)^{-1} \\ F &= \left(1 + \left(\frac{\tau}{\tau_c}\right)^n\right) \exp\left(\frac{P_e}{k_c} - 1\right) k_c - k_c > 0 \\ F &= \left(1 + \left(\frac{\tau}{\tau_c}\right)^n\right) \exp\left(\frac{P_e}{k_d} + 1\right) k_d - k_d > 0 \\ \tau_e &= \begin{cases} \tau_c, when P_e > 0 \\ \tau_d, when P_e < 0 \end{cases} \quad k_e = \begin{cases} k_c, when P_e > 0 \\ k_d, when P_e < 0 \end{cases} \end{split}$$

Yarushina et al. 2019 (in preparation)

17.06.2019













Result: Type 1 (R=10,100,1000)

40

35

30

25

20

15

10

5

0

R= 10





time=0.040 0 10^{-3}

17.06.2019

R= 100

R= 1000

9

Result: Type 2 (R_v=10, 30, 100)

 $R_{v} = 30$

 $R_{v} = 100$

10

Result: Type 3 (R_v=20, 30, 100)

 $R_v = 30$

17.06.2019

 $R_v = 100$ τ_d 120

Type 3 rheology with $R_v=30$ produces two channels that has slightly different geometry than Type 1 and 2 models. The wave fronts at the top of the channels are sharper than previous models. We also observe new and fine porosity structures within the channels.

17.06.2019

- Our 2D models show that the width of the fluid flow depends on the shear viscosity
- (compare to bulk viscosity) and the shear-enhanced effect may further induce more
- focused fluid flow.

17.06.2019

luid flow depends on the shear viscosity enhanced effect may further induce more

Scaling to the geological time and space scales

• Length scale: $L_{\text{compaction}} = \sqrt{k \frac{\eta_{\phi}}{\mu_{f}}} = \sqrt{10^{-20} \frac{10^{14}}{8*10^{-4}}}$

• Wave velocity scale : $V_{\text{wave}} = \frac{\Delta \rho g L_{\text{compactio}}^2}{\eta_{\phi}}$

• Time scale: $\tau_{compaction} = \frac{L_{compaction}}{V_{wave}}$

	Shale	Sandstone	Units	
Bulk viscosity	$10^{11} - 10^{14}$	$10^{11} - 10^{14}$	[Pa s]	
Permeability	$10^{-20} \sim 10^{-15}$	$10^{-14} \sim 10^{-13}$	[<i>m</i> ²]	
Brine+CO ₂ viscosity	$8 * 10^{-4}$	$8 * 10^{-4}$	[Pa s]	Dong Rass
Brine+CO2 density	1020	1020	$[kg m^{-3}]$	Rass

17.06.2019

0.035 m for shale ~35 m for sandstone

$$\frac{\partial n}{\partial f} = k \frac{\Delta \rho g}{\mu_f} = 10^{-20} \frac{10^4}{8 \cdot 10^{-4}}$$

$$\sim 4 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ m/year for shale}$$

$$\sim 4 \text{ m/year for sandstone}$$

$$\sim 8750 \text{ year for shale}$$

$$\sim 8.75 \text{ year for sandstone}$$

et al 2010 et al. 2014 et a. 2017

GPU Acceleration

17.06.2019

Numerical method for large-scale modeling

- Finite difference
- Staggered grid
- Pseudo-Transient method
- Dampening scheme
- Multi-device implementation: Matlab + C-cuda

The scaling of computation complexity

2D case

Total nodes: N=nx*nx

Iteration times: O (nx)

Computational complexity: O (n x^3) or O($N^{\frac{3}{2}}$)

3D case

Total nodes: N=nx*nx*nx

Iteration times: O (nx)

Computational complexity: O (nx^4) or O($N^{\frac{1}{3}}$)

Conclusion

- Three types of rheology produce quite similar fluid channels under the condition that enough weakening is applied in our models.
- In order to form channelized fluid flow, the tensile strength need to be significantly weaker than the compressive strength.
- The width of the fluid channels are largely depend on the shear viscosity and bulk viscosity, while the shear-enhanced effects may further localized the fluid flow.
- Pseudo-Transient method with GPU computing provides a promising way of 3D modelling.

Further work

- 1. GPU speed up
- 2. 3D modelling
- 3. Material layers (reservoir and caprock layers) in the models: n (n>2) layer with different material properties (ϕ ,k, η_{ϕ})

geological input from seismic data

- 4. modelling the spreading of fluid underneath the caprock.
- 5. Elasticity and microseismicity

Scaling to the geological time and space scales

> Length scale

$$L_{compaction} = \sqrt{k \frac{\eta_{\varphi}}{\mu_{f}}} = \sqrt{1000 \cdot 2 \cdot 10^{-18} \frac{10^{11}}{8 \cdot 10^{-4}}} \approx 0.5 \text{[r}$$

$$> \text{Wave velocity scale}$$

$$V_{porosity wave} = \frac{\Delta \rho g L_{compaction}^{2}}{\eta_{\varphi}} = k \frac{\Delta \rho g}{\mu_{f}} = 1000 \cdot 2 \cdot 10^{-18} \frac{10^{11}}{8}$$

> Time scale

$$\tau_{\text{compaction}} = \frac{L_{\text{compaction}}}{V_{\text{porosity wave}}} \approx 0.5 \text{[yr]}$$

used symbols				
g	gravity	μ_f	fluid shear viscosity	
k	fluid permeability	77 =	effective bulk viscosity	
μ_{z}	solid shear viscosity	$\Delta \rho$	$(\rho_i - \rho_j)$ density contrast	

17.06.2019

m]

due to dynamic permeability increase

 $\frac{10^4}{3 \cdot 10^{-4}} \approx 1.0 [\text{m/yr}]$

	Nordland Shales	Units
Effective bulk viscosity	1 • 10 ¹¹	(Pa s)
Permeability	2·10 ⁻⁶	[Darcy]
Brine + CO, viscosity	8.10-4	[Pa s]
Brine + CO ₂ density	1020	[kg m ^{-a}]

Values from:

- Dong et al., Mech. Mining Sci., 2010

- Sone and Zoback, Int. J. Rock Mech. Mining Sci., 2014

- Hagin and Zoback, Geophysics, 2004

- Cavanagh, Energy Procedia 37, 2013

See: Räss et al., Energy Procedia 63, 2014 for details

Result: Type 1 (R=1000,100,10)

17.06.2019

IF₂

17.06.2019

21

- Fluid flow instability in viscously deforming porous rocks, commonly known as solitary
- porosity waves, has been used to explain formation of seismic chimneys. Experimen
- -tal data show that volumetric deformation of rocks is strongly coupled with shear
- deformation, which leads to shear-induced decompaction at low confining pressure and
- shear-enhanced compaction at higher confining pressure. In this study, we introduce a
- new viscoplastic rheology that takes account on different compressive and tensile
- strengths (different critical pressures for the onset of pore collapse and pore generation)
- and the shear-enhanced weakening of the bulk viscosity. In order to compare with previous
- studies and study the shear-enhanced effects, three types of rheology are used for model
- calculation. The model results shows that our new rheology produces fluid channels
- similar to previous studies that use a simple decompaction weakening factor of R. We
- found that the tensile strength needs to be 30~100 times lower than the compressive
- strength for the formation of focused fluid flow. The shear-enhanced effects introduce
- substantial weakening (i.e. a factor of >100) of bulk viscosity, which reduces the effective
- pressure significantly in the model. Fine porosity structures within the fluid channel are

17.062919erved. This suggests that the shear enhancement of volumetric deformation might be

IF2