Role of Fluid Injection in Induced Seismicity

Jerry Latvi

April 27, 2024

Role of Fluid Injection in Induced Seismicity

Authors

Jerry Latvi

Date: 24/04/2024

Abstract

It has drawn a great deal of attention and concern in recent years to consider the role that fluid injection plays in generated seismicity. The objective of this research is to investigate the mechanisms and contributing elements that relate to generated seismic events and fluid injection activities, specifically related to hydraulic fracturing and wastewater disposal. The study investigates the geological and operational parameters that impact the seismic response to fluid injection through an extensive assessment of the literature and case studies that have already been published. The study emphasizes that the main variables influencing generated seismicity are changes in pore pressure, fault reactivation, and subsurface stress distribution. The study also assesses possible ways to mitigate the danger of induced seismic events related to fluid injection activities, as well as monitoring strategies that may be used. The study's conclusions advance knowledge of the intricate relationships that exist between fluid injection and seismic activity and offer guidance for the creation of better operational and regulatory procedures that reduce the seismic risk connected to fluid injection activities.

Introduction

In areas with frequent fluid injection operations, induced seismicity—the phenomenon of earthquakes caused by human activity—has become a major environmental and social concern. Seismic activity has been linked more and more to fluid injection, especially from wastewater disposal and hydraulic fracturing (fracking), in many regions of the world. The methods by which fluid injection might cause earthquakes, as well as the possible risks and consequences for communities and business, are all seriously called into question by this phenomena. In order to evaluate and reduce the seismic hazards connected to energy production and waste management operations, it is imperative to comprehend the function that fluid injection plays in induced seismicity. Injecting fluids into the subsurface can interact with it to change stress conditions, trigger seismic events, and activate pre-existing faults. These effects could be dangerous for public safety, infrastructure, and environmental quality. The purpose of this work is to investigate the mechanisms and variables that relate fluid injection operations to seismicity that is caused. We will investigate the geological, operational, and regulatory factors that control induced seismicity related to fluid injection by a thorough analysis of the body of current research, case studies, and regulatory frameworks. The results of this study will help to clarify the intricate relationships that exist between fluid injection and seismic activity and offer guidance for the creation of better operational and regulatory procedures that will reduce the seismic risk connected to fluid injection activities.

Mechanisms of Induced Seismicity

In areas where hydraulic fracturing (fracking) and wastewater disposal are common, induced seismicity—the phenomenon of earthquakes caused by human activity—has gained significant attention. The intricate and diverse mechanisms that underlie fluid injection-induced seismicity involve interactions between subsurface rock formations, pre-existing faults, and injected fluids. For the purpose of evaluating the hazards connected to fluid injection activities and creating practical mitigation solutions, it is imperative to comprehend these mechanisms.

Changes in Pore Pressure

1. Impact on Conditions of Subsurface Stress

By raising the pore pressure in the subsurface, fluid injection modifies the stress conditions and lowers the effective stress on faults. Because of the decreased effective stress, the fault may be less able to withstand sliding, increasing the likelihood that it will fail and cause seismic activity. A larger area may be affected by the subsurface rise in pore pressure, which may also cause seismic activity farther away from the injection point.

2. Impact on Stability of Faults

By decreasing frictional resistance and encouraging fault sliding, elevated pore pressure can destabilize pre-existing faults. Trenching back of faults as a result of elevated pore pressure has the potential to trigger seismic activity. Faults' orientation, alignment, and closeness to the injection site all affect how susceptible they are to reactivation; faults with the best orientations are more likely to cause induced seismicity.

B. Reactivation of Faults

1. The Fault Activation Mechanisms

Fluid injection has the potential to cause subsurface stress changes, which could reactivate previously established faults. The possibility of fault reactivation and induced seismicity is significantly influenced by the orientation and alignment of faults with respect to the injection location. Seismic activity is more likely to be generated by faults that are ideally positioned with respect to the stress field created by fluid injection.

2. The connection between seismicity and fault orientation

The pattern and strength of induced seismicity are significantly influenced by the spatial distribution and fault alignment with respect to injection wells. Favorably oriented faults are more likely to slip and cause seismic occurrences if they are oriented with respect to the produced stress field. Predicting the possibility of fault reactivation and induced seismicity requires an understanding of the subsurface's geological features and stress regime.

C. Distribution of Stress in the Subsurface

1. Fluid Pressure's Effect on Stress

   The subsurface stresses are redistributed as a result of fluid injection, which impacts fault stability and triggers seismic activity. The distribution of stress can be altered by the interaction of injected fluids with subsurface rock formations, which can lead to fault slippage and seismic activity. Because fluid injection modifies the stress distribution, it can cause fault slip and surpass the shear strength of the fault, which can set off seismic occurrences.

2. Effects on Earthquake Activity
   The subsurface geological features and the stress changes brought about by fluid injection have an impact on the temporal and spatial distribution of induced seismicity. Shifts in the distribution of stress can affect the intensity and scope of induced seismicity as well as cause seismic events to begin. For the purpose of evaluating the seismic risk related to fluid injection activities, it is imperative to monitor and comprehend the stress regime and subsurface conditions.

Types of Fluid Injection Activities

In many parts of the world, fluid injection operations like hydraulic fracturing (fracking), which is used to extract natural gas and dispose of wastewater, have been linked more and more to induced seismicity. The potential for causing seismic events is mostly dependent on the kinds and amounts of fluids injected as well as the sub surface's geological features. Knowing the various kinds of fluid injection activities and how they work will help you gain important understanding of the dangers and variables that lead to induced seismicity.

A. Fracking, or hydraulic fracturing

1. Fluid Volumes and Process

Fracking, also known as hydraulic fracturing, is a process that involves high-pressure subterranean injection of a solution including chemicals, sand, and water to extract oil and gas from shale formations. From thousands to millions of liters per well, the fluid amounts required in fracking operations might vary greatly. The process of extracting oil and gas involves injecting high-pressure fluids into the rock to cause fractures.

3. Seismicity Linked to Hydraulic Fracturing

Because massive amounts of fluid are injected into the subsurface during fracking, this can change the stress conditions and increase pore pressure, which has been connected to induced seismicity. Fluids can be injected quickly to promote fault slip and reactivate pre-existing faults, which can cause seismic occurrences. Fracking-related induced seismicity can have different spatial distributions and intensities based on the volume of fluids injected, injection depth, and subsurface geological features.

B. Disposal of Wastewater

1. Volume and Methods of Disposal

Produced water, a byproduct of the extraction of oil and gas, is injected into disposal wells underground in order to dispose of wastewater. Significant amounts of wastewater may be produced, and one way to dispose of it is by injecting it into deep subterranean formations where it will be stored for an extended period of time.

2. Earthquakes Associated with Wastewater Injection

Because enormous amounts of fluid are injected into the subsurface, which can change the stress conditions and increase pore pressure, wastewater injection has been linked to induced seismicity. High pressure wastewater disposal can cause earthquakes by reactivating pre-existing faults and encouraging fault slip. The amount of wastewater injected, the velocity of injection, and other factors can all affect the likelihood of induced seismicity.

C. Systems for Enhanced Geothermal (EGS)

1. Procedure and Used Fluids

Water is injected into hot, dry rock formations as part of enhanced geothermal systems (EGS) in order to extract heat and produce energy. Though it might vary, water is usually utilized in EGS along with additives to improve heat extraction.

2. Earthquake Related to EGS

Because EGS projects inject fluids into the subsurface, which can change the stress conditions and raise pore pressure, they have been linked to induced seismicity. By increasing fault slide and reactivating pre-existing faults, the injection of fluids under high pressure can cause seismic occurrences. The volume and pace of fluid injection, the injection depth, and the geological features all affect the possibility of induced seismicity in EGS projects.

Case Studies

The occurrence of induced seismicity as a consequence of fluid injection operations has attracted noteworthy interest owing to its possible implications for environmental quality, infrastructure, and public safety. The intricate relationship between fluid injection and induced seismicity is highlighted by a number of noteworthy case studies from around the globe, which also provide important insights into the mechanics, contributing variables, and associated dangers of this phenomena.

1. The Oklahoma Case: Seismicity and Wastewater Injection

Oklahoma has seen a notable spike in seismic activity in recent years, which has been linked to the massive injection of wastewater related to oil and gas extraction. There has been a sharp increase in seismic activity in the state, including multiple earthquakes with magnitudes greater than 5.0, raising questions about the possible dangers and effects of fluid injection operations.

The Mechanisms at Work

Changes in Pore Pressure: The large-scale wastewater injection into deep disposal wells raised the subsurface's pore pressure, which changed the stress conditions and encouraged the reactivation of faults.

Fault Reactivation: Seismic occurrences were triggered throughout the region as a result of pre-existing faults becoming active again as a result of increased pore pressure.

Effect and Reaction:

The public's awareness was heightened by the increase in seismic activity, which also led to the development of stronger laws for the disposal of wastewater and the limitation of injection volumes in seismically active locations.

The Oklahoman case emphasizes how crucial it is to keep an eye on and regulate fluid injection operations in order to reduce the possibility of induced seismicity and guarantee the sustainability and safety of oil and gas production.

2.The Netherlands Case: Seismicity and Gas Production

Because of the massive natural gas extraction and the accompanying underground reinjection of produced water, the Groningen gas field in the Netherlands has been linked to induced seismicity.

The Mechanisms at Work

Redistribution of Stress: The subsurface stress distribution was changed by the extraction of natural gas and the reinjection of generated water, which encouraged fault slippage and sparked seismic activity.

Fault Reactivation: Seismic events in the Groningen region were caused by the reactivation of faults as a result of shifting stress conditions.

Impact and Response

The induced seismicity in Groningen resulted in damage to buildings and infrastructure, leading to public concern and the implementation of mitigation measures, including the reduction of gas production rates and the introduction of seismic monitoring and early warning systems.

The case of Groningen underscores the importance of considering the geological characteristics and stress regime of the subsurface in managing the seismic risks associated with fluid injection and extraction activities.

3.The United States Case:

Hydraulic Fracturing and Seismicity Several states in the United States, including Texas, Ohio, and Colorado, have experienced induced seismicity associated with hydraulic fracturing (fracking) operations.

The Mechanisms at Work

Changes in Pore Pressure: The subsurface pore pressure was raised by the massive volumes of fracking fluids injected, which changed the stress conditions and encouraged fault sliding.

Fault Reactivation: Seismic events occurred in regions where fracking is now underway as a result of the reactivation of faults brought on by variations in stress conditions.

Effect and Reaction:

Due to the induced seismicity in these states, regulatory procedures were put in place, such as monitoring injection volumes and pressures and setting up seismic monitoring networks, in order to address concerns about the possible hazards and effects of fracking activities.

In order to reduce seismic risk and guarantee the safe and responsible execution of oil and gas extraction, it is crucial to monitor and manage fluid injection activities, as demonstrated by the cases of induced seismicity linked to fracking in the United States.

Mitigation Measures and Monitoring Techniques

The occurrence of induced seismicity as a consequence of fluid injection operations has sparked serious worries about environmental sustainability, infrastructural integrity, and public safety. In order to manage the seismic hazards associated with fluid injection operations and ensure the safe and responsible conduct of these activities, it is imperative to adopt adequate mitigation measures and monitoring procedures.

A. Countermeasures

1. Management of Injection Rate and Volume

Optimizing Injection Rates: Reducing the induced pore pressure and lowering the chance of causing seismic events can be accomplished by limiting the injection rate and fluid volume.
Pressure Management: By keeping an eye on and regulating the injection pressure, you can reduce the chance of causing seismic activity and keep the subsurface stress conditions within safe bounds.

2. Zonal Isolation and Well Integrity

Well Construction and Integrity: Making sure injection and production wells are constructed and maintained correctly will assist stop fluid movement and lower the chance of triggering seismic activity.
Zonal Isolation: By putting zonal isolation techniques—like cementing—into practice, one can lessen the chance of causing seismic activity and stop communication between various subterranean strata.

3. Early Warning and Seismic Monitoring Systems

Establishing and keeping up a thorough seismic monitoring network can aid in the identification

and characterization of induced seismic events, the assessment of the seismic risk, and the prompt implementation of mitigation measures.
Early Warning Systems: By putting in place early warning systems that are based on real-time seismic monitoring, it will be possible to respond quickly to seismic events and take mitigating measures.

B. Techniques for Monitoring

1. Monitoring using Microseismic

Identification and Description of Induced Seismic Events: Using specialized seismic arrays and data analysis methods, microseismic monitoring entails the identification and description of small-scale seismic events caused by fluid injection.
Evaluation of Seismic Risk: By analyzing the microseismic data, one may determine which fault systems are active, evaluate the seismic risk, and optimize the injection settings to reduce the chance of causing seismicity.

2. Methods of Surface and Subsurface Monitoring

Surface Deformation Monitoring: Using methods like GPS and InSAR to track surface deformation can assist in identifying and measuring the uplift and subsidence brought on by fluid injection as well as evaluating the possible effects on the environment and infrastructure.
Fluid Pressure and Flow Monitoring: Using downhole pressure gauges and flow meters to monitor the fluid pressure and flow rates in injection and production wells can help optimize injection parameters, evaluate subsurface conditions, and reduce the chance of causing seismicity.

3. Monitoring both geo-mechanically and geo-physically

Stress and Strain Monitoring: By using geomechanical monitoring techniques, such as hydraulic fracturing tests and borehole stress measurements, it is possible to reduce the danger of causing seismicity, optimize injection parameters, and assess the stress conditions beneath the surface.
Monitoring Seismic Velocity and Attenuation: By employing seismic refraction and reflection surveys to track seismic velocity and attenuation, one may better evaluate the risk of causing seismicity, define the subsurface characteristics, and optimize injection parameters.

Regulatory Framework and Policy Implications

In particular, hydraulic fracturing (fracking) and wastewater disposal have caused a surge in induced seismicity that has drawn the attention and concern of regulatory agencies, legislators, and the general public. The intricate correlation between fluid injection and induced seismicity demands the establishment of strong regulatory frameworks and policies to efficiently handle and alleviate the related hazards. The current regulatory framework, difficulties in controlling induced seismicity, and policy implications for controlling the seismic risk related to fluid injection operations are all examined in this study.

Regulatory Framework in Place at the Moment:

1. Control of Fluid Injection Activities

Many jurisdictions have quite different regulatory control policies for fluid injection operations, which are sometimes managed by a mix of federal, state, and local laws. In order to manage the possible dangers of induced seismicity, regulations usually cover well construction and integrity, injection rates and volumes, and monitoring and reporting requirements.

2. Requirements for Seismic Monitoring and Reporting

Operators are required by numerous regulatory frameworks to keep an eye on and report any seismic activity connected to fluid injection operations. To evaluate the seismic risk and successfully apply mitigation measures, real-time seismic monitoring, assessments of the seismic hazard, and reporting thresholds for induced seismic events are frequently required.

3. Evaluation of Risk and Mitigation Strategies

In order to manage the seismic risk associated with fluid injection activities, regulatory frameworks frequently require operators to carry out seismic hazard assessments and put mitigating measures in place. To lessen the danger of induced seismicity, mitigation methods can include cutting injection volumes and rates, altering injection procedures, and putting early warning and seismic monitoring systems in place.

Difficulties in Controlling Induced Seismicity

1. Intricacy of Mechanisms for Induced Seismicity

The intricate and diverse mechanisms that underlie fluid injection-induced seismicity present formidable obstacles to regulatory supervision. It is essential to comprehend the ways in which underlying geology, pre-existing faults, and fluid injection activities interact in order to evaluate seismic risk and create efficient regulation plans.

2. Variability in Earthquake Reaction

The subsurface's geological features, the amount and rate of injection, and the operational procedures can all have a substantial impact on the seismic response to fluid injection. Effective management of seismic risk necessitates adaptive and adaptable regulatory measures because to the heterogeneity in seismic response, which makes the construction of standardized regulatory frameworks challenging.

Implications for Policy and Suggestions

1. Strengthened Requirements for Monitoring and Reporting
   Enhancing seismic monitoring and reporting requirements for fluid injection activities will help to better understand the mechanisms underlying induced seismicity, boost the effectiveness of assessing the seismic risk, and make it easier to execute targeted mitigation measures in a timely manner.

2. Flexible and Adaptive Regulatory Strategies

   The effectiveness of regulatory oversight can be improved, and the implementation of risk-informed and proportionate regulatory measures can be facilitated, by developing adaptive and flexible regulatory approaches that take into account the variability in seismic response and the developing understanding of induced seismicity mechanisms.

3. **Education and Public Involvement**

   Increasing public participation and education programs to raise knowledge and comprehension of the induced seismicity linked to fluid injection operations can help decision-makers make well-informed choices, establish confidence, and promote productive communication and cooperation between the public, industry stakeholders, and regulators.

Conclusion

As a crucial environmental and social issue, the involvement of fluid injection in induced seismicity has drawn intense scientific attention, public outcry, and regulatory scrutiny. There has been a great deal of research done to explore the intricate interaction between fluid injection activities—specifically hydraulic fracturing, or fracking—and wastewater disposal. The goal is to identify the dangers, evaluate the mechanisms, and create proactive mitigation plans. The main conclusions, ramifications, and suggestions based on our present knowledge of the function of fluid injection in induced seismicity are outlined in this article.

Principal Discoveries

1. Induced Seismicity Mechanisms
   Complex interplay between subsurface geology, pre-existing faults, and fluid injection activities underlie the mechanisms causing induced seismicity. Important variables affecting induced seismicity include changes in pore pressure, fault reactivation, and stress distribution in the subsurface. Comprehending these mechanisms is essential for evaluating the seismic risk and creating successful mitigation plans.

2. The Impact of the Regulatory Framework on Policy
   Controlling the induced seismicity linked to fluid injection operations is a difficult and multifaceted undertaking that necessitates an adaptable and diverse strategy. The current regulatory frameworks cover seismic monitoring and reporting requirements, well construction

and integrity, injection rates and volumes, risk assessment, and mitigation strategies. These frameworks differ greatly throughout jurisdictions. To effectively manage the seismic risk associated with fluid injection activities, it is imperative to develop adaptive and flexible regulatory measures, enhance seismic monitoring and reporting requirements, and promote public education and engagement.

Consequences and Suggestions

1. Improved Tracking and Documentation
   Enhancing seismic monitoring and reporting requirements for fluid injection activities will help to better understand the mechanisms underlying induced seismicity, boost the effectiveness of assessing the seismic risk, and make it easier to execute targeted mitigation measures in a timely manner. Assessing the seismic risk and successfully executing mitigation measures depend on seismic hazard assessments, reporting criteria for induced seismic events, and real-time seismic monitoring.

2. Flexible and Adaptive Regulatory Strategies
   The effectiveness of regulatory oversight can be improved, and the implementation of risk-informed and proportionate regulatory measures can be facilitated, by developing adaptive and flexible regulatory approaches that take into account the variability in seismic response and the developing understanding of induced seismicity mechanisms. Developing and putting into practice well-informed and efficient regulatory plans and regulations requires adaptive management techniques as well as ongoing monitoring and assessment of induced seismicity and related risks.

3. Education and Public Involvement
   Increasing public participation and education programs to raise knowledge and comprehension of the induced seismicity linked to fluid injection operations can help decision-makers make well-informed choices, establish confidence, and promote productive communication and cooperation between the public, industry stakeholders, and regulators. fostering accountability and openness, resolving public issues, and fostering public trust.

Reference

Conde, Oliver Rojas, and Siddharth Misra. "Role of Fluid Injection in Induced Seismicity." *International Petroleum Technology Conference*. IPTC, 2024.

Role of Fluid Injection in Induced Seismicity. (2024, February 12). *Oliver Rojas Conde Oliver Rojas Conde*, D021S081R001. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=BeQ_VeoAAAAJ&citation_for_view=BeQ_VeoAAAAJ:Tyk-4Ss8FVUC

Conde, O. R., & Misra, S. (2024, February). Role of Fluid Injection in Induced Seismicity. In International Petroleum Technology Conference (p. D021S081R001). IPTC.