Sub-basalt imaging, using CSEM & MT to constrain the velocity model

May 2014, ROSE meeting

Martin Panzner, Wiktor W. Weibull, Jan Petter Morten



Seismic imaging challenges when basalt is present

line offset [m]

45000

50000

- Strong impedance contrast at top basalt interface
- Weak sub-basalt reflections
- Interbed multiples

30000

 Rough top and base basalt interfaces can cause complicated

10000

35000





NW

time [s]

20000

25000

6104/21-1

Seismic imaging – West of Shetland





Seismic imaging – West of Shetland

- Supra-basalt sediments from semblance analysis
- Below top basalt flooded with average basalt velocity from refracted waves





Seismic imaging – West of Shetland

- Sub-basalt reflections appear at small angles -> small moveout
- Difficult to use for velocity analysis



Ray geometry:





CSEM & MT basics

Controlled Source
Electromagnetic Method (CSEM)



• Magnetotellurics (MT)





CSEM inversion– synthetic study

- Vertical Resistivity [Ωm] 0.0 AAAAAAA N Original model: • [Ωm] 1000.0 1.5 0 100 2000.0 <u>3000.0</u> 2000 4000.0 0.5 80 5000.0 6000.0 4000 60 7000.0 0.0 5000.0 10000.0 15000.0 20000.0 Horizontal Resistivity [Ωm] 6000 0.0 ~~~~~ 0.8 40 1000.0 0.6 2000.0 8000 <u>3000.0</u> 0.4 20 0.2 4000.0 0 10000 5000.0 -0.2 6000.0 Rł 0 5000 10000 20000 15000 7000.0 10000.0 0.0 5000.0 15000.0 20000.0
- Synthetic study by Herredsvela et al. (2012)
 - CSEM inversion result:

emgs Introduced Introduced International Int

X [m]

MT inversion– synthetic study

Original Model:

MT inversion result



CSEM/MT imaging – West of Shetland

Real data CSEM & MT joint inversion



Well log analysis – correlation v_p and ρ

- Linear correlation for v_p<5000, driven by the porosity and pore fluid properties
- Asymptotic behavior for v_p > 5000, driven by the matrix properties
- $\delta v_p(\rho)/v_p \ll \delta \rho(v_p)/\rho$





🔤 emgs 🛛 NTNU

Updated velocity model





emgs 🛛 NTNU

Improved seismic image - detail





Correlation CSEM/MT and Seismic





Discussion

- $v_p \rho$ correlation from the well
 - Different lithology sub basalt, not necessarily the same correlation
 - Measured at well "log scale"
 - Also valid on "CSEM/Seismic scale" ?
- Geometry
 - CSEM line not at same location as Seismic line
- Seismic data quality
 - Available dataset very coarse sampled



Conclusions

- Resistivity models from CSEM & MT inversion can be used to map the thickness and extend of basalt layers
- The resistivity model can also be used to update the velocity model using v_p-ρ correlations from a nearby well
- Co-visualization can improve the seismic interpretation

Acknowledgements

- We wish to thank EMGS for the permission to publish these results.
- Børge Arntsen and the seismic depth imaging group at the IPT department at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU)
- Rune Mittet at EMGS for interesting discussions.

