# 4 D refraction analysis – status and future applications





M. Landrø, NTNU

## References

- Landrø, Nguyen and Mehdizadeh, 2004, Time lapse refraction seismic
  a tool for monitoring carbonate fields?, SEG Abstracts, 23, 2295.
- Artola, Batante and Figueiro, **2008**, Time-lapse critical reflection: Does it really work in seismic monitoring of low porosity and high effective stress conditions, RBGf, 26, 327-330.
- Hansteen, Wills, Hornman and Jin, **2010**, Time-lapse refraction seismic monitoring, SEG Abstracts, 20, 4170.
- Hilbich, **2010**, Time-lapse refraction seismic tomography for the detection of ground ice degradation, The Cryosphere, 4, 243-259.
- Zadeh, Landrø and Barkved, **2011**, Long-offset time-lapse seismic: Tested on the Valhall LoFS data, Geophysics, 76, O1-O13.
- Zadeh and Landrø, **2011**, Monitoring a shallow subsurface gas flow by time-lapse refraction analysis, Geophysics, 76, O35-O43.

## **Time lapse refraction seismic**

## a tool for monitoring carbonate fields?



by

#### M. Landrø (NTNU), A. K. Nguyen, (SINTEF) and H. Mehdizadeh, (NTNU)

SEG, 2004





Simple relation between critical offset shift and velocity change

# Change in critical offset due to a velocity change in the reservoir layer:

$$\Delta x_c \approx -\frac{\Delta v_2}{v_{RMS}} \frac{v_2}{v_{RMS}} \frac{2z}{\left(\frac{v_2^2}{v_{RMS}^2} - 1\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}}$$

Typical values:



A 50 m/s velocity change => a shift of 170 m

For small velocity changes the reflectivity changes at normal offsets are small – but the shift in critical angle is more pronounced...



### The synthetic model:

	Thick- ness (m)	Vp(m/s)	Vs(m/s)	Density (kg/m3)
Water	210	1480	0	1000
Layer 1	800	1700	600	1500
Layer 2	700	1900	1000	1700
Layer 3	500	2000	1400	2000
Reservoir	100	2500 (base) 2550 (model 1) 2600 (model 2)	1800	2200
Half plane	Infinity	2300	1600	2300

### 2% and 4% velocity increase for TL model 1 and 2

## **Baseline and difference data**

(Finite difference modeling)



RMS (whole trace) versus offset for base and the two monitor surveys – clear shift and amplitude increase observed



## Valhall LoFS-data – Example 1



Systematic decrease in  $X_M$  from LOFS-1 to LOFS-8

## Valhall LoFS-data – Example 2



No change from LOFS-1 to LOFS-6, followed by a significant change

## 4 D refraction timeshift analysis



### 4 D refraction timeshift analysis



# 4D refraction examles: Peace River heavy oil field, Alberta



#### Hansteen et al., SEG, 2010

### 4D refraction examle: Peace River heavy oil field, Alberta



Hansteen et al., SEG, 2010

### Monitoring ground ice degradation by time-lapse refraction





Hilbich, 2010, The Cryosphere



Hilbich, 2010, The Cryosphere

## Well log from Grane field



## **Time lapse refraction radar**



Reservoir monitoring:

- Refractions from top/base reservoir
- Rig source fired every day
- Measure 4D time shifts and amplitudes
- Multiazimuthal analysis

Leakage detection:

- Use shallow refraction to detect shallow gas leakage or abnormal pressure build ups

Crustal monitoring:

- Detect crustal stress changes
- Limited to max refraction depths
- Conventional 4D for this purpose?

Method is sensitive to *velocity* variations

### Shot gather – Grane Field, seabed hydrophone data

Water depth: 128 m



### **Grane: Shallow refraction – lateral variation**

Approximately 25 m between each CDP-position



# Grane – refracted signals at 5000 m offset, 20 adjacent shots separated by 25 m



### Difference between adjacent pairs – shifted by 25 m NRMS = 33 %



### Permanent arrays: Source at platform or sparse shooting



Example: a=8 km, b = 24 km and c=1 km => 9 hours shooting

## Summary

- 4-5 examples of succesful use of refracted events for 4D analysis
- Clean velocity change estimation
- Complementary to traditional 4D analysis
- Both amplitude and traveltime information useful
- More noise at ultra-long offsets
- Permanent arrays makes it possible to design a time lapse refraction radar monitoring daily changes