

#### **Coils or capacitors?** How should we measure motion?

Michael S. Hons, Robert R. Stewart, Don C. Lawton, Malcolm B. Bertram and Eric V. Gallant November 29, 2007



## Outline

- Sensor response
  - Accelerometer
  - Comparison to geophones
  - Noise floors
- Field Data (Violet Grove CO2 injection project)
  - Introduction
  - Noise floors
  - Gabor TVS
- Conclusions



# How geophones work

- Magnetic induction
  - Seismic Data = Sensitivity x Proof mass velocity
  - Resonance within seismic band: complicated response







# **Geophone response to velocity**

- Ground displacement
- Proof mass displacement relative to case
  Proof mass displacement relative to fixed reference





Animation by Helga Meier-Cortes and Fritz Keller, Technical University of Clausthal, Germany



# How MEMS work

- Capacitive detection
  - Seismic Data = Sensitivity x Proof mass displacement
  - Resonance well above seismic band: simple response





# 

#### Accelerometer response to acceleration

Ground displacement

Proof mass displacement relative to caseProof mass displacement relative to fixedreference





# CREWES

#### **Response curves**



$$V_{G} = S_{G} \frac{\partial X}{\partial t} = S_{G} \frac{\omega^{2}}{-\omega^{2} + 2i\lambda\omega\omega_{0} + \omega_{0}^{2}} \frac{\partial U}{\partial t}$$



#### **Response curves, redux**



$$V_{G} = S_{G} \frac{\partial X}{\partial t} = S_{G} \frac{-i\omega}{-\omega^{2} + 2i\lambda\omega\omega_{0} + \omega_{0}^{2}} \frac{\partial^{2}U}{\partial t^{2}}$$

# 

# • Geophone data (noise floor: ~0.7 μV)



# 

# **Noise floors**

#### • Correct to acceleration (noise ~215 ng at 10 Hz)





# Noise floors Compare to MEMS (noise floor ~806 ng)





Station 183

# Data acquisition



• 8 stations

- Single sensor stations
- 2 geophones, 1 DSU
  - 3 geophones at stations 183 and 184
- 1 m spacing xline, 20 m receiver spacing
- 3 shot lines
  - Dynamite
  - Line 1
    - 75 shots
    - Minimum offset ~300 m



# Sensor types

Manufacturer	Model	Element	Stations
Input/Output	IO-Spike	SM24 (coil)	5183-5190
OyoGeospace	GS-3C	GS-20DM (coil)	5183-5190
Sercel	DSU3	MEMS	5183-5190
OyoGeospace	OG-Nail	GS-32CT (coil)	5183-5184

Oyo (	GS-3C I/O S	Oyo Nail pike

Geophone recorder	<b>MEMS recorder</b>
ARAM Aries	Sercel 408XL
0.8 f(nyq) zero-phase AAF	0.82 f(nyq) minimum- phase AAF
2 ms sampling	2 ms sampling

# **CREWES**

# **Geophone accel**



# **CREWES**

#### MEMS





- All data shown in acceleration domain
- Before first breaks





#### • Before first breaks





























# 60 Hz Noise?

- Fairly equal on geophone and MEMS records
- More pronounced towards right (later shots)





# **Trouble at High Amplitudes**



# 

# **Normalized Spectral Difference**



# 

# **Normalized Spectral Difference**





# Conclusions

- Frequency content with both sensors is very similar
  - Especially 3 to 70 Hz range
- Separation of signal and noise essential
- Accelerometers should have a lower noise floor at high frequencies
  - Depending on ambient noise strength
- Both sensors record line noise at this location
- Significant difference also observed at high frequencies under strong motion
- Further studies at West Castle, Violet Grove pod test, and Spring Coulee



# Acknowledgements

• Thanks to Glenn Hauer of ARAM for constructive comments, and all the CREWES sponsors

## References

Cooper, N. M., 2002, Seismic Instruments-What's new? What's true? CSEG Recorder, Dec., 36-45

Lawton, D. C., Bertram, M. B., Margrave, G. F., and Gallant, E. V., 2006, Comparisons between data recorded by several 3-component coil geophones and a MEMS sensor at the Violet Grove monitor seismic survey, CREWES research report, 18, 2.1-2.24

http://www.ifg.tu-clausthal.de/java/seis/seis\_doc-e.html