# Machine Learning Application for CCUS and Fracture Analysis

Guoxiang (Gavin) Liu*, Abhash Kumar, William Bill Harbert, Hema Siriwardane, Evgeniy Myshakin, Vyacheslav Romanov, Dustin Crandall, Luciane Cunha

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF **ENERGY**

NETL NATIONAL ENERGY TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY

SMART

Reference: ARMA 24 – 1183

Disclaimer

Content

- Background and Introduction

- Machine Learning Use Cases:
  - ➢ 1. Fracture mapping for CO2 storage
  - ➢ 2. Multiple-level of fracture network study: HFTS1
  - ➢ 3. Frac-hit identification: Midland Basin

- Discussions and Remarks

- Future Work

Background

Science-informed Machine Learning for Accelerating Real-Time Decisions in Subsurface Applications (SMART) Initiative

Making Better Decisions

Phase 2

Transforming decisions through **clear vision** of the present and future subsurface.

Decision-makers

Project Engineers

Regulators

High-level Executives

Landowners/Public

Phases

Site/Field Selection

Permitting

Development

Operations

Closure

Questions

❶ Where is the CO_2 now?

❷ How do I move the CO_2 where I want it to be?

❸ Is the project safe?

- Will it leak, and if so, where?

- Will it cause induced seismicity?

Introduction

- Why does fracture/fault matter for CO_2 storage/sequestration?

- What are the impacts of fracture/fault for CO_2 storage in the reservoir?

- How can machine learning help in the process and overall carbon storage decision making?

- Use case: Illinois Basin – Decatur Project (IBDP)

IBDP (Illinois Basin – Decatur Project) Use Case 1

Methods

- Quantifying discrete microseismic time windows
- Microseismic triggering fronts identification
- ML-based microseismic cluster identification
- Quantification of best fitting fracture planes
  - Standard deviational ellipsoids
  - Eigen vector extraction

Microseismic Analysis

Spatial distribution of microseismic events at the IBDP site (center). (a) Magnitude of completeness, and (b-d) b-value variations for three separate regions.

Time Windows

Variations in average downhole pressure. Nineteen microseismic time windows (shaded boxes) marked by extended period of bottomhole pressure changes.

Name	Start Date/Time			Stop Date/Time			Number of Events
1	2011	12	15	2012	3	30	724
2	2012	4	1	2012	5	10	80
3	2012	5	12	2012	9	11	823
4	2012	9	11	2012	10	12	140
5	2012	10	13	2012	11	20	93
6	2012	11	20	2012	12	15	70
7	2012	12	15	2013	1	3	29
8	2013	1	9	2013	3	15	240
9	2013	3	16	2013	6	14	183

10	2013	6	14	2013	7	13	45
11	2013	7	14	2013	8	23	134
12	2013	8	24	2013	9	6	13
13	2013	9	7	2013	10	17	191
14	2013	10	18	2013	11	15	88
15	2013	11	16	2014	1	10	201
16	2014	1	11	2014	3	6	293
17	2014	3	6	2014	10	14	1357
18	2014	10	14	2014	12	2	152
19	2014	12	3	2015	3	30	210

Microseismic time windows statistics (Duration-Event Counts)

Triggering Fronts

Discrete triggering fronts (shaded rectangles) identified within each microseismic time window by hydraulic diffusivity analysis.

Microseismic Analysis (cont.)

Identified clusters of microseismic events within each triggering front of time window 17 (center plot).

Fracture Mapping

3D distribution of fracture planes (shaded 2-sigma ellipsoids) around the injection well (red line) for time windows: (a) time window 9, (b) time window 17, and (c) time window 19.

Fracture Mapping (cont.)

(A) Previously identified fault plane solutions (green lines) for the microseismic clusters. (B) 3D distribution of fracture network (green lines) around the injection well as determined using machine learning techniques in the current study.

Multi-Level Fracture Network Analysis and Visualization

HFTS-1 Dataset
- Microseismic Data   Well Layout/Distance   Log/Core Data   Fracking/Pumping Data
- Tracer Data   Production Data   Pressure Interference Testing   Flowback/DFI Data

Fracture network segmental level of ML testing

Use Case 2: HFTS-1 (Hydraulic Fracturing Test Site)

Well level

Segment level

Tracer Testing Layout

Stage level

- **Well level:** pressure interference test, DFIT/Flowback
- **Segment level:** Tracer data, pumping data, well trajectory/distance
- **Stage level:** Pumping data, microseimic data, log/core data

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

SMART

HFTS-1 (Hydraulic Fracturing Test Site) Use Case (Cont.)

Use Case 3: Fracture Interference

- Midland basin (local field with many active pads and a total of several hundred wells)

- Proprietary oil and gas field operations data:
  - Incomplete and partially accessed production details
  - Well distance
  - Pressure

Well Pads Selection

- Pad 137 was the point of interest in the **within-pad frac-hits** study
  - ➢ 12 interacting wells identified
  - ➢ Fracking was primarily done in two batches

- Pads 133 and 138 were selected to study **inter-pad interactions**

- Emphasis was made on the pressure and production anomalies and fracking time

Well Pads (Top View)

Methodology

- **Frac-hit probability:** Feature-weighted estimation,

  such as: $p = 0.1 * P + 0.8 * \left|\frac{dP}{dt}\right| + 0.01 * O + 0.04 * \left|\frac{dO}{dt}\right| + 0.01 * W + 0.04 * \left|\frac{dW}{dt}\right|$

- **Machine learning models:** LSTM + multilayer perceptron (MLP) structure

- **Frac-hit identification:** Pairs interaction (one-to-one); pad interaction (multiple-to-one)

Frac-Hit Instance Examples

$$p = 0.1 * P + 0.8 * \left|\frac{dP}{dt}\right| + 0.01 * O + 0.04 * \left|\frac{dO}{dt}\right| + 0.01 * W + 0.04 * \left|\frac{dW}{dt}\right|$$

- Effects of fracking well in pad 133 on production well in pad 137
- High probability of a frac-hit due to large pressure and production-rate swings
- Extra potential frac-hits outside of the selected fracking window
- Flexible probability definition based on the data features and operating conditions

Model Performance: Frac-Hit Identification

Frac-hit due to the inter-well interactions

Frac-hit due to the intra-well interactions

Frac-Hit Economic Impact

Well biography for the "Colt 45 5HB" well, indicating the range used to estimate lost oil production for the well.

With Lost Production calculated for complete dataset of 287 wells, historical oil price ($/bbl) was correlated with the collected dates of 'Shut-in' and 'Frac-hit' periods.

Estimated total loss: $30 million due to 'Shut-in' and 'Frac-hit' events

Details were reported in ML4SS FWP final report, 2022

Remarks

- Successful assimilation of data from multiple sources (microseismic, pumping, CO_2 flow rate, etc.)

- Implementation of physics-based machine learning algorithms to quantify the microseismic event clusters and time series production and pressure data are promising

- Spatial mapping of reservoir scale fracture network, enclosed volume measures, as well as frac-hit are benefitable from MLs

- Python based ML software tools for scalable deployment for field data processing and interpretation

Following Steps

- More features from other datasets well logs/core testing etc.

- Collaborate with other expertise from team/crossing-team

- Leverage fracture network results and outcomes to geological modeling, geomachenical & simulation studies

References

- Bauer, R.; Carney, M.; Finley, R.; Overview of microseismic response to CO2 injection into the Mt. Simon saline reservoir at the Illinois Basin-Decatur Project, International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control, Volume 54, Part 1, 2016, Pages 378-388, ISSN 1750-5836, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2015.12.015

- Finley, R. J. An overview of the Illinois Basin — Decatur Project. Greenh. Gases Sci. Technol. 4, 571–579 (2014).

- Kumar, Abhash, Harbert, William, Hammack, Richard, Zorn, Erich, Bear, Alexander and Carr, Timothy, 2021, Evaluating proxies for the drivers of natural gas productivity using machine-learning models, Interpretation, https://doi.org/10.1190/INT-2020-0200.1

- Liu, G., Kumar, A., Harbert, W., Crandall, D., Siriwardane, H., Bromhal, G., and Cunha, L., 2023, Machine Learning Application for CCUS Carbon Storage: Fracture Analysis and Mapping in The Illinois Basin, SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, San Antonio, Texas.

- Liu, G., Kumar, A., Zhao, S, Shih, C., Vasylkivska, V., Holcomb, P., Hammack, R., Ilconich, J., and Bromhal, G., Multi-Level of Fracture Network Imaging: A HFTS Use Case and Knowledge Transferring. Paper presented at the SPE/AAPG/SEG Unconventional Resources Technology Conference, Houston, Texas, USA, June 2022. doi: https://doi.org/10.15530/urtec-2022-3723466

- Liu, G.; Wu, X.; Romanov, V. Unconventional Wells Interference: Supervised Machine Learning for Detecting Fracture Hits. *Appl. Sci.* **2024**, *14*, 2927. https://doi.org/10.3390/app14072927

- Kumar A., Shih, C., Liu, G., Holcomb, P., Zhao, S., Hammack, R., Ilconich, J., and Bromhal, G., (2021), "Machine Learning Applications for a Qualitative Evaluation of the Fracture Network in the Wolfcamp Shale Using Tracer and Completion Data," *SEG Global Meeting*: 1924-1932. https://doi.org/10.15530/urtec-2021-5159

Acknowledgements

NETL
RESOURCES

VISIT US AT: **www.NETL.DOE.gov**

🐦 **@NETL_DOE**

📷 **@NETL_DOE**

f **@NationalEnergyTechnologyLaboratory**

CONTACT:
Guoxiang Liu
Guoxiang.Liu@netl.doe.gov