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Summary

A three-layer model was built using vertically laminated Phenolic overlain by Plexiglas to represent a fractured reservoir overlain by an isotropic overburden. HTI planes of phenolic have an orientation in northern half of the model that is orthogonal to HTI planes in southern half. A third layer of water is added to the model. 3D seismic data is acquired in patches. The data are processed and deconvolved with surface-consistent true relative amplitudes so they can be used for amplitude analysis. The third reflector, in the CDP domain, is very weak due to attenuation of anisotropic phenolic and low fold of data. After sectoring the data, orientation and intensity of anisotropy is estimated by VVAz. Results of anisotropy orientation matches the physical model.

Introduction

Understanding fracture orientation and intensity is often challenging, yet important for the optimal development for fractured reservoirs. Fractures can act as conduits for fluid flow. Seismic anisotropy can assist in understanding fractures, even though sometimes it is related to the regional stress regime. In this report, we are interested in fracture-induced seismic anisotropy, and more specifically in vertical fractures or Horizontal-Transverse Isotropy (HTI). Azimuthal anisotropy makes numerical modeling difficult and introduces uncertainties in the numerical results. On the other hand, physical modeling provides a reliable alternative. This report is a continuation to previous CREWES work (e.g. Wong et al., 2012; Mahmoudian, 2013; Al Dulaijan et al., 2014) that utilizes physical modeling, and is an in-progress work. Mahmoudian (2013) and Al Dulaijan et al. (2014) have drawn conclusions about the stiffness coefficients of phenolic medium. Those conclusion were used in this report.

A three-layer model was built using vertically laminated Phenolic overlain by Plexiglas to represent a fractured reservoir overlain by an isotropic overburden. HTI planes of phenolic have an orientation in northern half of the model that is orthogonal to HTI planes in southern half. A third layer of water is added to the model. The physical model is shown by Figure 1. Notice that the two layers of phenolic will not affect only traveltimes and amplitude, but also act as a fault in CDP time stacks as can be seen later.

In order to use the data for velocity and amplitude variations with azimuth, we implemented a standard 3D processing workflow described in this report. We faced and addressed several challenges to image the bottom of the Phenolic; these challenges were due to three reasons: 1. Fold was not large enough, 2. Phenolic generates very strong mode-converted PS waves, and 3. Phenolic is attenuative.

Seismic data acquisition and processing

The 3D seismic data was acquired over the physical model shown in Figure 1. The laboratory to field scale is 1:10,000 in both length and time. Scaled thicknesses of the three layers are: 300 m, 510 m, and 650 m. 3D seismic data were acquired over a scaled area of 4,000 m². Pizopin transducers were used as P-wave sources and receivers, with a central frequency at 2.38 MHz. Source and receiver
transducers were positioned with a robotic system that has an error of less than 0.1 mm in laboratory scale. Just like conventional 3D seismic acquisition, data was acquired in patches. For each shot, 10 receivers were alive with a specific maximum offset. Receiver lines are east to west and have spacing of 50 m. Source lines are north to south and have spacing of 100 m. Source and receiver spacings are 100 m and 50 m respectively.

For Amplitude Variations with Azimuth (AVAz) we are interested in the second reflector which is strong and there should not be an issue. On the other hand for Velocity Variations with Azimuth (VVAz), we are interested in the third reflector which is very weak because P waves have to travel through the phenolic layer twice. The phenolic layer is observed to create very strong mode-converted waves (Al Dulaijan et. al., 2014). Also, it is P-wave attenuative. One solution to these issues is to increase the fold that can be achieved only by acquisition. In this report, attempts to overcome the issues caused by inadequate spatial sampling are made by processing in time-domain and involve two main steps:

1. A common-offset stack for a complete half of the model where anisotropy orientation is known to be constant.

2. An FK filter designed to attenuate PS mode-converted waves.

A spherical divergence correction was applied, as shown by Figure 3. Then, surface-consistent amplitude scaling was calculated and applied. Four scalars (source, receiver, offset, and CDP) were specifically calculated and applied. A surface-consistent deconvolution was applied, followed by another pass of surface-consistent amplitude. Velocity analysis was done by creating semblance coherency of super gathers. The maximum semblance (stacking response) were picked Figure 2 shows a N-S inline (left) and E-W crossline (right). The three strong reflectors are: top of plexiglas, top of phenolic and bottom of phenolic. HTI planes of phenolic have an orientation in northern half of the model that is orthogonal to HTI planes in southern half. CMP stacks are created using isotropic NMO velocities. From the geometry of the model, crosslines are always parallel to HTI planes. Crosslines are perpendicular to HTI planes in southern half of the model, as can be seen by the third reflector (bottom of phenolic). That seam can be considered as a fault, as well, in CDP stack time domain. If non-hyperbolic NMO, or anisotropic time migration, had been applied, then the seam might be unnoticeable.

Results

Because the bottom of phenolic reflection is very weak, we have created a common-offset stacks for the two halves of the model where the anisotropy orientation of the phenolic is constant. To strengthen the energy of the third reflector, we have also designed and applied an FK filter in attempt to attenuate the strong PS mode-converted waves. Figure 3 shows a common-offset stack of all azimuths: before (left) and after (right) application of FK filter for the attention of PS mode-converted wave at top of the phenolic. The reflector is significantly improved at time 1140 ms and near offset. Prior to stacking offset bins, the data were sectored every 30° from -90° to 90°. Figure 4 shows two common-offset stacks: 0° sector (left) and ± 90° (right). Also, picks of the bottom of the phenolic is indicated by red.

A VVAz method is applied to sectored azimuthal common-offset gathers. Zero-offset two-way traveltimes \( T_0 \) obtained by VVAz is displayed for both halves of the model in the second column of Table. 1. \( T_0 \) was calculated using interval velocities from Al Dulaijan et. al. (2014). For the phenolic layer, \( V_{33} \) was used because it describes P-wave velocity at normal incidence. We found the \( T_0 \) values for the northern half of the model to be very accurate. The azimuth of the slow RMS velocity, \( \beta_2 \), is accurate for both parts of the model. The slow and vast RMS velocities were obtained by VVAz and calculated as well. To calculate them, we have used \( V_{11} \) and \( V_{22} \), from Al Dulaijan et. al. (2013), for the fast and slow RMS velocities respectively and the interval to RMS velocity relation:
\[ V_{RMS}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{V_i^2 \Delta t_i}{\Delta t_i} \]

where \( n \) is the number of layers and equal to 3. \( V \) is the interval velocity. Fast and slow RMS velocities obtained by VVAz are more accurate for the north part of the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Half</th>
<th>1.1617</th>
<th>89.809</th>
<th>2454</th>
<th>2641.1</th>
<th>7.3</th>
<th>Actual ( T_0 )</th>
<th>Calc. ( V_{slow} )</th>
<th>Calc. ( V_{fast} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1616</td>
<td>2473.3</td>
<td>2764.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| South Half | 1.1759 | 0.6368 | 2133.1 | 2623.2 | 20.6 | 0 | 1.1616 | 2473.3 | 2764.7 |

| Table. 1. Comparison between VVAz results and calculated results |

**Conclusions and future work**

Physical modeling can be a valuable tool that tests and evaluates geophysical methods, especially for anisotropic media where numerical modeling becomes complicated and may require validation by experimental observations. For the study described in this report, a 3D pre-stack physical modeling dataset was acquired, processed, and used to evaluate a method for analyzing VVAz. The most serious shortcoming in this study is that, because of inadequate spatial sampling during acquisition, there is not enough fold to overcome by normal processing the fact that the reflection of bottom of the phenolic layer is weak and contaminated by strong mode-converted PS waves generated by the top of the anisotropic layer. We devised an extra time-domain processing method to overcome this issue, and it was necessary to use it to advance the VVAz analysis of the physically-modeled data. Results of the analysis proved to be very accurate for the north part of the model, and less accurate for the south part of the model.

We believe that the use of interval velocity has an advantage over the use of RMS velocities because it will make VVAz less sensitive to overburden properties. Therefore, we plan to improve our code by using a Dix-type formula to obtain interval NMO ellipses (Grechka et al., 1999). We plan to further use the data for Amplitude Variations with Azimuth AVAz using Rüger (2001) and Fourier coefficients to estimate fractures intensity and directions maps. We will apply these extended techniques to a new dataset to be acquired with increased spatial sampling (i.e., source and receive line spacings = 50m, source and receiver intervals = 50m along each line).
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Fig. 1. A three-layer physical model. The model is constructed using vertically laminated Phenolic overlain by Plexiglas to represent a fractured reservoir overlain by an isotropic overburden. HTI planes of phenolic have an orientation in northern half of the model that is orthogonal to HTI planes in southern half. A third layer of water is added to the model. Laboratory to field scale is 1:10,000 in both length and time. Scaled thicknesses of the three layers are: 300 m, 510 m, and 650 m.

Fig 2. CDP Stacks: a N-S inline (left) and E-W crossline (right). The three strong reflectors are: top of plexiglas, top of phenolic and bottom of phenolic. HTI planes of phenolic have an orientation in northern half of the model that is orthogonal to HTI planes in southern half. CMP stacks are created using isotropic NMO velocities. From the geometry of the model, crosslines are always parallel to HTI planes in the northern half of the model. Crosslines are perpendicular to HTI planes in southern half of the model, as can be seen by the third reflector (bottom of phenolic). That seam can be considered as a fault.
Fig 3. Common-offset stack of all azimuths: before (left) and after (right) application of FK filter for the attenuation of PS mode-converted wave at top of the phenolic. The reflector is significantly improved at time 1140 ms and near offset.

Fig. 4. Common-offset stacks with top of phenolic picks of 0° sector (left) and ± 90° (right).
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