

List of Figures

2.1	Hypocenters of the microseismic events induced during the fluid injection experiments of the Fenton Hill experiment, 1983. Color correspond to the event occurrence times after the start of the injection. The solid line corresponds to the injection borehole.	7
2.2	Hypocenters of the microseismic events induced during the fluid injection experiments of the Soultz-sous-Forêts experiment, 1993. Color correspond to the event occurrence times after the start of the injection. The solid line corresponds to the injection borehole.	7
2.3	Power spectrum of an rectangle pulse. The time-function of this pulse is given in the upper right plot in this figure (taken from Shapiro et al. [2002]).	8
2.4	Distances of events from the injection source versus their occurrence time for a) the Fenton Hill experiment, 1983 and b) the Soultz-sous-Forêts experiment, 1993. Taken from Shapiro et al. [2002].	10
2.5	a) a view of the Fenton Hill microseismicity cloud from the South. b) the same view of the cloud in the coordinate system scaled in accordance with equation (2.9). c) cloud in the scaled coordinate system together with an fitting ellipsoid.	11
2.6	a) a view of the Soultz microseismicity cloud from the South. b) the same view of the cloud in the coordinate system scaled in accordance with equation (2.9). c) cloud in the scaled coordinate system together with an fitting ellipsoid.	11

- 2.7 A perspective projection of the 3-D distribution of microseismic events registered during the Soultz-sous-Forêts experiment: Borehole GPK1, September 1-22, 1993. The color corresponds to the event occurrence time. The axes X,Y and Z point to the East, the North and the earth surface, respectively. The vertical and horizontal sizes of the shown spatial frame ($X \times Y \times Z$) are $802.5m \times 1274m \times 1943m$. The depth of the frame's bottom is $3503m$. The surface shown is the triggering front of microseismicity for the arrival time of 100h. The vertical and horizontal scales of the figure are equal. 16
- 2.8 An example of the hydraulic diffusivity reconstruction in 3-D for the Soultz-1993 data set. For the inversion isotropic variant of the method has been used. The diffusivity is given in the logarithmic scale. It changes between 0.001 and $1.0 m^2/s$. Light gray corresponds to cells with no diffusivity value resolved. The geometry corresponds to that given in figure 2.7. 20
- 3.1 Scheme of numerical modeling. Based on FEM algorithms, the time-dependent equation of diffusion is solved for an arbitrary hydraulic model with simulated pressure perturbation. Comparing the solution with a statistically computed criticality, synthetic clouds of events can be obtained and analyzed using the SBRC inversion algorithms. In step 1, the set-up of the hydraulic model is shown. Colors denote hydraulic diffusivities used in the model. In step 2 the model is divided into a FEM grid where the solution of the diffusion equation is solved on (colors correspond to the pressure amplitudes). In step 3, the distribution of criticality is shown spatially uncorrelated and correlated using Gaussian autocorrelation functions. Colors correspond to the criticality value, blue colors denote unstable zones, red colors denote stable zones in the medium, respectively. Comparing steps 2 and 3, numerical microseismicity clouds are obtained when the pressure exceeds the criticality in a point of the medium (shown in step 4, colors correspond to the event occurrence time). In step 5, the analysis of the event clouds is performed in terms of the SBRC approach. Hydraulic diffusivity of the medium is estimated and reconstructed in 2D and 3D space (color correspond to the reconstructed diffusivities). 24
- 3.2 Deviation of numerical and analytical solution obtained for a 2D homogeneous model with scalar hydraulic diffusivity of $D = 1m^2/s$. For the finite element scheme, a circular shaped pressure perturbation source of size $r_{src} = 0.001m$ and amplitude $A = 10$ was used. The mean errors are given in table 3.1. Left: normalized amplitude of time-dependent pore pressure perturbation for different distances from the source. Right: distance-dependent pore pressure for different solution times t 28

- 3.3 Deviation of numerical and analytical solution obtained for a 3D homogeneous model with scalar hydraulic diffusivity of $D = 50\text{m}^2/\text{s}$. For the finite element scheme, a circular shaped pressure perturbation source of size $r_{src} = 0.1\text{m}$ and amplitude $A = 10$ was used. The mean errors are given in table 3.2. Left: normalized amplitude of time-dependent pore pressure perturbation for different distances from the source. Right: distance-dependent pore pressure for different solution times t 30
- 3.4 Comparison of eikonal equation and numerical diffusion models. (a) Traveltime of the phase front of the sinusoidal signal versus distance from the source point. (b) Reconstructed hydraulic diffusivities from the traveltimes shown in (a) according to equation (3.9) for two different frequencies. The solid line corresponds to the hydraulic diffusivity distribution in the model (Gaussian shaped). 32
- 3.5 Numerical modeling in 2D. Left: Set-up of the hydraulic model with pressure perturbation source in the center. The medium is divided into triangular finite elements and the parabolic equation of diffusion is solved. The blue rectangle gives the area of investigation during further analysis steps. Right: Pressure perturbation after 100 seconds using a source amplitude of $A = 10$. The circles correspond to isolines of constant amplitudes. 33
- 3.6 (a) and (c) Two examples for criticality (C) distributions in 2D. Random numbers are distributed in rectangular cells within a definite range of amplitudes. For the two criticality fields, different distribution types were used which are shown in (b) and (d). For (a) an even distribution was used, for (c) a normal distribution, respectively. 35
- 3.7 Clouds of events after triggering in a homogeneous, isotropic 2D medium. (a) Cloud triggered using the criticality shown in figure 3.6a. (b) Cloud triggered using the criticality shown in figure 3.6c. Colors correspond to the event occurrence times. 35
- 3.8 Estimation of effective scalar hydraulic diffusivity using the hypocenter and time coordinates of the event clouds shown in figure 3.7. The blue envelope is calculated according to equation (2.6) using the hydraulic diffusivity of the model ($D = 1\text{ m}^2/\text{s}$). (a) Estimation using the cloud of events shown in figure 3.7a, (b) estimation using the cloud of events shown in figure 3.7b. 36
- 3.9 Distribution of criticality C using a spatial autocorrelation function of exponential type according to equation (3.10). From left to right: increasing correlation length a (1m, 5m, 10m and 15m). The colorbar gives the criticality value. 37
- 3.10 Event clouds triggered in a hydraulically homogeneous, isotropic medium with $D = 1\text{ m}^2/\text{s}$ using the criticality distributions shown in figure 3.9. . . . 38

- 3.11 Distribution of the criticality C using a spatial autocorrelation function of Gaussian type according to equation (3.10). From left to right: increasing correlation length a (1m, 5m, 10m and 15m). The colorbar gives the criticality values. 38
- 3.12 Event clouds triggered in a hydraulically homogeneous, isotropic medium with $D = 1 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$ using the criticality distributions shown in figure 3.11. . . 38
- 3.13 Estimation of effective scalar hydraulic diffusivity using the hypocenter and time coordinates of the event clouds shown in figures 3.10 (1-4) and 3.12 (5-8). The envelope is calculated according to equation (2.6) using the hydraulic diffusivity of the model ($D = 1 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$). 39
- 3.14 Left: Hydraulically heterogeneous model consisting of a cross structure shaped area of high and borders of low hydraulic diffusivities. Right: Event cloud triggered after 100 seconds of modeling. Colors correspond to event occurrence times. 40
- 3.15 Reconstruction of effective hydraulic diffusivity and diffusivity distributions in 2D for the hydraulic heterogeneous medium shown in figure 3.14 according to equations (2.6) and (2.34). Left: The two envelope functions were computed using the two different hydraulic diffusivities of the heterogeneous model. 40
- 3.16 Second example for a hydraulic heterogeneous model. (a) Schematical sketch of the numerical model. Within a homogeneous background of $D_1 = 5\text{m}^2/\text{s}$, a circle of increased hydraulic diffusivity ($D_1 = 50\text{m}^2/\text{s}$) is embedded. The heterogeneity has a radius of $r=20\text{m}$ centered at $x=-25\text{m}$, $y=0\text{m}$. (b) Solution of the pressure perturbation after $t=100\text{s}$. The color denotes the pressure amplitude. Isosurfaces are shown as solid lines. 41
- 3.17 Left: Distribution of the criticality. It was distributed between 0 and 2 with a normal distribution function. Right: Cloud of events after numerical triggering. The color denotes the event occurrence times. A total amount of 41908 events were triggered. 42
- 3.18 Reconstruction of hydraulic diffusivity in 2D for different cell sizes. (a) 100% of the events were used, (b) the first 5% of the earliest events were removed for the analysis. The red circle denotes the heterogeneity used in the hydraulic model. 43

3.19 Distribution of the criticality in 3D using no correlation function (a), an exponential ACF with $a=10m$ (b) and a Gaussian ACF with $a=10m$ (c). (b) and (c) are computed according to equation (3.10). The color corresponds to the criticality value. 44

3.20 Event clouds triggered in a 3D hydraulically homogeneous, isotropic medium with $D = 5 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$ using the criticality distributions shown in figure 3.19. Color corresponds to the event occurrence times. 45

3.21 Estimation of effective scalar hydraulic diffusivity using the hypocenter and time coordinates of the 3D event clouds shown in figure 3.20. The envelope is calculated according to equation (2.6) using the hydraulic diffusivity of the model ($D = 5 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$). 45

3.22 Model m002: Statistical analysis of the percentages of events below the parabolic envelope according to equation (2.6). Left: Models 1-16 without correlation of criticality. Middle and right: different models with varying criticality and Kaiser effect (see below, chapter 3.5.6). 47

3.23 Estimation of effective scalar hydraulic diffusivity according to equation (2.6) for models (a) m011, (b) m012, (c) m013 and (d) m014 and each sub-model. Colors correspond to different percentage criteria for the number of events that satisfy equation (2.6). Note, that the group of outliers in figure (a) is an effect of the submodels 23-28 of m011, where the Kaiser effect has been modeled (see chapter 3.5.6). This effect resulted in a very small number of events triggered. The statistical analysis of the event clouds failed because of insufficient data. 47

3.24 Numerically computed event numbers and analytically predicted event numbers versus criticality maximum for model m002. Numbers at the stars denote the 'submodel' number where statistical model parameters like distribution type and spatial correlation of criticality (C_{max}) changed (compare table A.2). 48

3.25 Pore pressure perturbation after $t = 100s$ for 3D diffusivity model m007. Here, hydraulic diffusivity was distributed anisotropically with the diagonal elements of the tensor $D_{xx} = 1\text{m}^2/\text{s}$, $D_{yy} = 2\text{m}^2/\text{s}$ and $D_{zz} = 5\text{m}^2/\text{s}$, respectively. Additionally, the tensor is rotated by 60° , 30° and 0° around the x -, y - and z -axis according to equation (3.15). In (b)-(d) two isosurfaces of pressure were added. 49

- 3.26 (a) and (b): Anisotropic pressure perturbation for model m007 together with the cloud of events triggered after numerical modeling. (c) Estimation of effective scalar hydraulic diffusivity from $r-t$ -plot. The envelopes were computed using the mean value of the diagonal tensor of hydraulic diffusivity $\bar{D} = \frac{D_{11}+D_{22}+D_{33}}{3}$. The red (lower) envelope was calculated using equation (2.6), the magenta (upper) envelope using a corrected factor there of 6π , respectively. 50
- 3.27 Data for model m007 in the a) unscaled and b) scaled coordinate system. . . 50
- 3.28 Reconstructed tensor of hydraulic diffusivity for the event cloud shown in figure 3.27 in the scaled coordinate system. a) View from the south, b) from the east and c) from the top. The original tensor components used for modeling were $D = \text{diag}(1, 2, 10)$. The reconstructed hydraulic diffusivity tensor after 'unsaling' was $D = \text{diag}(1.12, 2.10, 8.64)$ 51
- 3.29 Different source functions used for modeling. a) Step function of constant amplitude for all time steps, b) constant pressure perturbation exponentially turned off at $t = 40\text{s}$ and $t = 20\text{s}$, c) source function interpolated from a real hydraulic injection experiment (KTB 1994, see chapter 4). 52
- 3.30 Event rates for the source functions shown in figure 3.29. In all cases a strong correlation of the source shape function and event rate can be observed. 53
- 3.31 Estimation of effective scalar hydraulic diffusivities for models created by using the source functions shown in figure 3.29. The blue and red dots correspond to the events. The two solid envelopes were calculated using the scalar diffusivity of the hydraulic model with and without corrected heuristic factor (see equation 3.12). 53
- 3.32 3D model for an extended pressure perturbation source. In the center of the model, a cylinder of length 30m and radius 0.5m is located. A constant pressure perturbation is defined as boundary condition. 54
- 3.33 Solution of the diffusion equation for different time steps of modeling. As source, a cylindrical pressure perturbation of constant amplitude was used. . 55
- 3.34 Cloud of events induced for the cylindrical pressure perturbation source model. The locations of the events are shown for the same times as in figure 3.33. 56
- 3.35 Estimation of effective scalar hydraulic diffusivity from the cloud shown in figure 3.34. At the left: original form of the algorithms without a correction for the cylindrical source. Right: modified algorithm with source correction (equation 3.12). 57

- 3.36 Simple sketch illustrating the repetition rate of a seismic multiplet. The ratio of shear to effective normal stress resolved on two different fracture planes is plotted against time under the assumption that fluid pressure on these fractures increases with time (bottom plot). If the coseismic stress drop $\Delta\sigma$ is small the same fracture will be ruptured several times while the other fracture plane remains inactive (from Baisch and Harjes [2003]). 58
- 3.37 Simulation of the Kaiser effect for one numerical model (m002). a) Submodel no. 10 without kaiser effect. b) Submodel no. 25 with 15% of C_{max} , c) submodel 33 with 10% of previous cell values. For all models $C_{max}=5$ was used. 60
- 4.1 Location of the German Continental Deep Drilling site in SE Germany at the contact zone of the Saxothuringian and the Moldanubian (from Harjes et al. [1997]). Besides the drilling location and the geological units, the location of seismic profiles are shown. The blue line corresponds to the 2D seismic reflection profile KTB8502, the black rectangular area denotes the 3D reflection profile ISO89-3D. 64
- 4.2 Injection rate (top), well head pressure (middle) and rate of induced events (bottom) as a function of time for the KTB fluid-injection experiment in (a) 1994 and (b) 2000. Taken from Zoback and Harjes [1997b] and Baisch and Harjes [2003]. 65
- 4.3 (a) Difference of onset times of seismic P and S phase ($S - P$) plotted against time for injection-induced events recorded at a downhole seismometer during the experiment in 2000. Hypocentral depth estimates can be obtained directly by $S - P$ times (from Baisch and Harjes [2003]). (b) Location of seismic events induced during the two fluid injection experiment in 1994 and 2000 at the KTB site. Events triggered in 1994 are shown as red rectangles, events triggered in 2000 in green spheres. 66
- 4.4 Estimation of the scalar hydraulic diffusivity for the two main depth domains where microseismicity occurred. a) Estimation for the depth domain around 9 km for data of 1994 and b) for 2000 data. c) Estimation for the depth domain around 5.4 km. In spite of the small event number, the magnitude of hydraulic diffusivity is found to be much lower in the shallower domain compared with the deeper domain. Note also the different time scale in figures a)and b). 67

- 4.5 (a) Part of the 2D pre-stack migration of the profile KTB8502, from Buske [1999]. (b) 3D pre-stack Kirchhoff depth migration of profile ISO89-3D. The seismic reflection intensities are shown in grayscale on three slices: one horizontal slice at 11 km depth and two vertical slices with an offset of 6.7 km. The left hand slice is passing through the location of the main borehole. Light colors correspond to large reflection intensities and darker colors with lower intensities. The SE1 reflector is clearly visible as a steeply dipping event. The EB appears with strong reflectivity at a depth of 10-14 km. The dimension of the whole migrated volume is $21 \times 21 \times 15$ km. 69
- 4.6 3D migration (view from NW) together with the microseismic hypocenters (events 1994=red/dark tetrahedra, events 2000=yellow/light spheres, Baisch et al. [2002]) and the tensor of permeability estimated from the 1994 data set (Rindschwentner [2001]). The volume of rock where the sphere-shaped upper cloud occurred is characterized by comparatively low reflectivity. The lower cloud of events seems to be preferentially orientated along the directions of the highly reflective (SE1) zone. 70
- 4.7 Stress tensor at the KTB with depth after Brudy et al. [1997]. Left: Stress magnitudes estimated using hydraulic fracturing and a combined analysis (compare figure 11 in Brudy et al. [1997] and the comments therein). S_H , S_h and S_v correspond to maximum and least principal horizontal and maximum vertical stress, respectively. Right: Profile of the orientation of maximum horizontal principal stress S_H in the depth section 3.2 km to 8.6 km using the most reliable stress orientation data from any depth. Except an abrupt change in stress orientation at about 7200m, the orientation of S_H is quite constant over the entire depth interval (figure 8 after Brudy et al. [1997]) 71
- 4.8 Depth-dependent stress tensor after Brudy et al. [1997] at the KTB site together with microseismic events induced during the two injection experiments and seismic reflection amplitudes. Top: view from south-west, middle: view from north-east, bottom: view from the top. Note the change in stress orientation at about 7200m. Elsewhere, the orientation of S_H is quite constant over the entire depth interval. Tensors are shown for every 200m for the depth interval 1 km to 2.6 km and at 3km, 3.4km, 3.6km, 4km, 4.4km, 5km, 5.4km, 6km, 6.4km, 7km, 7.2km, 7.4km, 7.6km, 7.8km, 8km and 9km. 73
- 4.9 (a) Source function used for modeling in a hydraulically homogeneous and isotropic 3D medium. Interpolation of the signal was done according to the real injection signal measured during the 1994 experiment (see Zoback and Harjes [1997b]). (b) Event rate for a cloud consisting of 1679 events after numerical triggering. (c) Event rate observed during the 1994 injection experiment at the KTB. 74

4.10	Hydraulic model used for numerical simulation. Colors correspond to hydraulic diffusivities, the yellow solid line represents the main KTB borehole. The red circle denotes the injection source point.	75
4.11	Time-dependent solution of pore pressure perturbation for the numerically simulated hydraulic KTB model using a step-function-like injection source. Colors correspond to pressure amplitudes, solid lines to isolines of constant pressures. The yellow solid line denotes the KTB main borehole. The red circle corresponds to the position of the injection point in the model.	76
4.12	Time-dependent solution of pore pressure perturbation for the numerically simulated hydraulic KTB model using the real 1994 injection source function (figure 4.9a). Colors correspond to pressure amplitudes, solid lines to isolines of constant pressures (see caption in figure 4.11). The yellow solid line denotes the KTB main borehole. The red circle corresponds to the position of the injection point in the model.	76
4.13	(a) Hydraulic model used for simulation together with the event cloud induced after numerical triggering. Blue colors correspond to hydraulic diffusivities used for modeling. (b) Hypocenter locations of events observed in 1994 (Zoback and Harjes [1997a]; Jost et al. [1998]). Colors correspond to the seismic reflection amplitudes. In both figures, the spherical clustering of events around the injection source (1) as well as the preferential alignment of hypocenters along the dominant SE1 structure (2) is visible.	77
4.14	(a) Cloud of events of the numerical modeling. A total of 817 events was triggered. (b) Estimation of effective scalar hydraulic diffusivity using the SBRC approach.	78
4.15	(a) Event rate for the data shown in figure 4.14. (b) Event rate for real data observed during the fluid injection experiments at the KTB in 1994.	79
5.1	Hydraulic fracture treatment data and histogram of the induced microseismic events. BH Pressure is the measured bottom-hole pressure. Taken from Rutledge and Phillips [2003].	83
5.2	The cloud of events from the 1997 injection experiment at the Cotton Valley site (USA) looking from the top, south and east, respectively. The color of the events corresponds to the event occurrence time. The injection took place at a depth of 2750-2850m, the total spatial extend in x-direction is approx. 900m. The solid line indicates the borhole.	84
5.3	Estimation of scalar hydraulic diffusivity at Cotton Valley yielding the estimate $D = 0.36 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$. Events lying above the fitting envelope are shown in green color.	84

- 5.4 Cloud of events of the Cotton Valley injection experiment. Events lying above the fitting envelope corresponding to $D=0.36 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$ in figure 5.3 (shown in green there) are denoted by large spheres. Colors correspond to the event occurrence time. 85
- 5.5 Cloud of events in the scaled coordinate system together with the ellipsoid representing the hydraulic diffusivity tensor looking from the top, south and east, respectively. 86
- 5.6 Cloud of events from the Cotton Valley injection experiment in the unscaled coordinate system together with the ellipsoid representing the hydraulic diffusivity tensor looking from the top, south and east, respectively. 86
- 5.7 3D-reconstruction of hydraulic diffusivity for Cotton Valley together with the microseismic events. Blue colors indicate low diffusivities, red colors indicate high values. The diffusivity ranges from 0.001 to $1 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$. A high-permeable channel can be identified in the EW-direction (x-direction) from this data set. 87