

The Lesueur, SW Hub: Improving seismic response and attributes. Final Report

ANLEC R&D Project 7-0115-0241

Boris Gurevich, Stanislav Glubokovskikh, Marina Pervukhina, Lionel Esteban, Tobias M. Müller, Roman Pevzner, Peter Schaub, Sergey Shevchenko, Konstantin Tertyshnikov, Sinem Yavuz, Yanhua Zhang and Sasha Ziramov

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge financial assistance provided through Australian National Low Emissions Coal Research and Development (ANLEC R&D). ANLEC R&D is supported by Australian Coal Association Low Emissions Technology Limited and the Australian Government through the Clean Energy Initiative. In addition the authors thank SW Hub Project management and ODIN Geosciences Ltd for numerous interactions and support.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	2
Contents	3
List of Figures	5
List of Tables	10
Executive summary.....	11
1. Introduction.....	14
2. Advanced VSP Processing	18
2.1. The Harvey 2 well	19
2.2. The Harvey 3 well	29
2.3. The Harvey 4 well	40
2.4. Estimation of attenuation.....	51
2.4.1. The Harvey 2 well	53
2.4.2. The Harvey 3 well	59
2.4.3. The Harvey 4 well	62
2.5. Conclusions	67
3. Seismic Data Processing and Imaging.....	68
3.1. Composite line	68
3.1.1. Signal to Noise Ratio (SNR) improvement	75
3.1.2. Velocity analysis	77
3.1.3. Pre-stack time imaging	78
3.1.4. Pre-stack depth imaging	82
3.1.5. Conclusions	86
3.2. Reprocessing of Harvey 3D – Generation 2 volume.....	87
3.2.1. Pre-stack time imaging	88
3.2.2. Velocity model building using PSDM on Generation 2 Harvey data	93
3.2.3. Conclusions	96

4. Stochastic AVO Seismic Inversion along the Composite Line	98
4.1. Workflow and data conditioning.	98
4.2. Data QC and Well to Seismic Tie.....	101
4.3. Rock physics model and inversion analysis.	104
4.4. Conclusions	117
5. Stochastic Seismic Inversion of the Large 3D Survey	118
5.1. Inversion algorithm.....	119
5.1.1. A priori seismic model.....	120
5.1.2. Uncertainty of the seismic data	121
5.1.3. Final parameters of the inversion algorithm	125
5.2. Interpretation of the inversion results	126
5.2.1. Lithological classification.....	127
5.2.2. Porosity prediction	134
5.2.3. Comparison with the well data	136
5.3. Conclusions	138
6. Overall Conclusions	140
References	142
Appendix A – Check shot data	145
The Harvey 2 well.....	145
The Harvey 3 well.....	147
The Harvey 4 well.....	149
Appendix B – Acronyms and Notation.....	151
Appendix C – The Lesueur, SW Hub: Advanced well log analysis, constraints for the stress field and geomechanical modelling of CO2 injection - Milestone 6 Report.....	152

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Diagram of the workflow for seismic interpretation to constrain reservoir models.....	14
Figure 2 Number of shots per receiver level in the Harvey 2 well.....	20
Figure 3 The Harvey 2 well correlated ZVSP data (X, Y – horizontal components, Z – vertical).	21
Figure 4 The Harvey 2 well direct wave polarisation analysis used to orient horizontal components.....	22
Figure 5 The Harvey 2 well ZVSP data after 3C orientation. Red arrows indicate reflection from the fault plane.....	23
Figure 6 The Harvey 2 well ZVSP data, Z component, deconvolution and amplitude correction applied.	23
Figure 7 The Harvey 2 well ZVSP data, Z component, up-going PP waves.....	24
Figure 8 The Harvey 2 well ZVSP data, Interactive velocity analysis.....	25
Figure 9 The Harvey 2 well ZVSP data, velocity model.....	26
Figure 10 The Harvey 2 well ZVSP data, VSP-NMO and corridor stack trace	27
Figure 11 The Harvey 2 well ZVSP, the result of the seismic to well tie (principle reflectors are marked with red dashed lines).....	28
Figure 12 The Harvey 3 well: Number of shots per receiver level.....	30
Figure 13 The Harvey 3 well correlated ZVSP data	31
Figure 14 The Harvey 3 well direct wave polarisation analysis used to orient horizontal components....	31
Figure 15 The Harvey 3 well ZVSP data after 3C orientation.....	32
Figure 16 The Harvey 3 well ZVSP data, Z component, deconvolution and amplitude correction applied.	33
Figure 17 The Harvey 3 well ZVSP data, Z component, up-going PP waves.....	34
Figure 18 The Harvey 3 well ZVSP data, Interactive velocity analysis.....	35
Figure 19 The Harvey 3 well ZVSP data, velocity model.....	36
Figure 20 The Harvey 3 well ZVSP data, VSP-NMO and corridor stack trace.	37
Figure 21 The Harvey 3 well ZVSP, the result of the seismic to well tie (principle reflectors are shown marked with red dashed lines).....	39
Figure 22 The Harvey 4 well. Number of shots per receiver level.....	41
Figure 23 The Harvey 4 well correlated ZVSP data (X, Y – horizontal components, Z – vertical).	42

Figure 24 The Harvey 4 well direct wave polarisation analysis used to orient horizontal components.	43
Figure 25 The Harvey 4 well ZVSP data after 3C orientation.....	44
Figure 26 The Harvey 4 well ZVSP data, Z component, deconvolution and amplitude correction applied.	45
Figure 27 The Harvey 4 well ZVSP data, Z component, up-going PP waves.	46
Figure 28 The Harvey 4 well ZVSP data, Interactive velocity analysis.....	47
Figure 29 The Harvey 4 well ZVSP data, velocity model.....	48
Figure 30 The Harvey 4 well ZVSP data, VSP-NMO and corridor stack trace.	49
Figure 31 The Harvey 4 well ZVSP, the result of the seismic to well tie (principle reflectors are shown marked with red dashed lines).....	50
Figure 32 The Harvey 2 well. Attenuation of up-going waves using FX deconvolution.	54
Figure 33 The Harvey 2 well. Amplitude spectra estimations.	55
Figure 34 The Harvey 2 well. Amplitude decay at different frequencies.	56
Figure 35 The Harvey 2 well. Centroid frequency (top), its deviation (middle) and absolute amplitude decay curves.....	57
Figure 36 The Harvey 2 well. Centroid frequency (top) and energy decay curves. Q factor estimated in thick layered model.	58
Figure 37 The Harvey 2 well. Direct wave amplitude decay curve (red), amplitude decay due to attenuation (black) and amplitude decay curve after Q-compensation (blue).	59
Figure 38 The Harvey 3 well. Attenuation of up-going waves using FX deconvolution.	59
Figure 39 The Harvey 3 well. Amplitude spectra estimations.	60
Figure 40 The Harvey 3 well. Amplitude decay at different frequencies.	60
Figure 41 The Harvey 3 well. Centroid frequency (top), its deviation (middle) and absolute amplitude decay curves.....	61
Figure 42 The Harvey 3 well. Centroid frequency (top) and energy decay curves. Q factor estimated in thick layered model.	61
Figure 43 The Harvey 3 well. Direct wave amplitude decay curve (red), amplitude decay due to attenuation (black) and amplitude decay curve after Q-compensation (blue).	62
Figure 44 The Harvey 4 well. Attenuation of up-going waves using FX deconvolution.	63
Figure 45 The Harvey 4 well. Amplitude spectra estimations.	64

Figure 46 The Harvey 4 well. Amplitude decay at different frequencies.	64
Figure 47 The Harvey 4 well. Centroid frequency (top), its deviation (middle) and absolute amplitude decay curves.....	65
Figure 48 The Harvey 4 well. Centroid frequency (top) and energy decay curves. Q factor estimated in thick layered model.	66
Figure 49 The Harvey 4 well. Direct wave amplitude decay curve (red), amplitude decay due to attenuation (black) and amplitude decay curve after Q-compensation (blue).	66
Figure 50 Survey layout; Position of available seismic surveys in the area (A). All seismic vintages of a composite line (B).....	71
Figure 51 CMP fold coverage.....	72
Figure 52 Offset distribution plot and histogram.	73
Figure 53 Refraction statics for all receivers (A) and all source positions (B) displayed in milliseconds ...	74
Figure 54 Raw shot gather.....	76
Figure 55 Pre-processed shot gather.	77
Figure 56 Interactive velocity analysis, semblance on the left, imaged gather on the right.....	78
Figure 57 CDP arbitrary line embedded in regional Harvey 3D grid.	80
Figure 58 PSTM arbitrary section embedded in regional Generation 2 Harvey volume, view from NE....	81
Figure 59 PSTM arbitrary section embedded in regional Generation 2 Harvey volume, view from North.	81
Figure 60 PSDM Flowchart.....	82
Figure 61 Layer striping of a horizons, showing picked horizon, flatten horizon and RMO picks over semblance plot.....	83
Figure 62 Final velocity model from PSDM workflow.	84
Figure 63 Comparison of velocities: PSDM (brown), VSP (black) and LOG (red).	85
Figure 64 Final imaged section from PSDM workflow.	86
Figure 65 Isotropic pre-stack migration algorithm.	89
Figure 66 Residual velocity analysis of imaged gathers.	90
Figure 67 Original PSTM volume (top), Generation 2 PSTM volume (bottom).	91

Figure 68 Time slice 750 ms. Original Harvey PSTM volume (left) and Generation 2 Harvey PSTM volume	92
Figure 69 Time slice 1400 ms. Original Harvey PSTM volume (left) and Generation 2 Harvey PSTM volume (right).....	93
Figure 70 Harvey the large 3D survey area.....	94
Figure 71 Horizons picked on Generation 2 volume with colour corresponding to average similarity.....	95
Figure 72 Final velocity model from 3D PSDM	96
Figure 73 Full-stack two-way time composite seismic line with the interpreted horizons and the Harvey 1 well over imposed with gamma ray log.....	99
Figure 74 Finally processed and conditioned gathers used for the composite line AVO inversion.....	101
Figure 75 Two angle-dependant statistical wavelets were extracted from the super gathers.	102
Figure 76 The Harvey 1 well to seismic tie.	103
Figure 77 Low frequency model of the composite line as P-Impedance for the Harvey 1 well to seismic tie.	104
Figure 78 P-impedance – horizontal axis and V_p/V_s – vertical axis logs cross plot.	105
Figure 79 P-impedance – horizontal axis and V_p/V_s – vertical axis logs cross plot.	106
Figure 80 Lithology definition model for the Figure 79 cross plot.....	107
Figure 81 AVO inversion analysis for the Harvey 1 well and seismic.	108
Figure 82 P-impedance volume with the Harvey 1 well P-impedance log inserted.	109
Figure 83 V_p/V_s volume with the Harvey 1 well V_p/V_s log inserted.....	110
Figure 84 Composite line lithology prediction.....	111
Figure 85 Probability of the sand lithology on the composite line.	112
Figure 86 Probability of the shale lithology on the composite line. Harvey-1 is the gamma ray log curve of the Harvey 1 well.....	113
Figure 87 Porosity prediction from the inverted P-impedance, for the composite seismic line.....	114
Figure 88 High-resolution velocity volume in TWT. P-wave velocity is displayed as the Harvey 1 well colour log.....	115
Figure 89 Porosity prediction from the high-resolution tomographic velocities, applied to the composite seismic line.....	116

Figure 90 Vertical and horizontal slices through the porosity cube computed from the reflection tomography velocities.	116
Figure 91 Classification of 2 facies types based on gamma radioactivity	121
Figure 92 3D distribution of the seismic fold for the large3D seismic data	123
Figure 93 Stochastic well tie at the Harvey 4 well along with a segment of inline 223.	124
Figure 94 Log to seismic correlation at the Harvey 1 well with the reference wavelet extracted from the Harvey 4 well.....	125
Figure 95 Vertical section from the inverted acoustic impedance extracted along crossline 113 passing through the Harvey 4 and close to the Harvey 3 wells.....	128
Figure 96 Vertical sections of the mean acoustic impedance obtained from the low SNR (top row) and high SNR scenarios (bottom row).	129
Figure 97 Horizon slice of the mean acoustic impedance cube extracted at the top of Wonnerup Member.	130
Figure 98 The diagram summarizes testing of the number of inversion iterations.....	131
Figure 99 Vertical section of the probability of the impermeable facies obtained from the high SNR ...	132
Figure 100 Maps of the probability of the impermeable facies obtained from the high SNR	133
Figure 101 Cross-plot of the well estimates of the total porosity vs log acoustic impedance,	134
Figure 102 Vertical and horizontal slices going through the mean acoustic impedance	135
Figure 103 Comparison of the seismic facies probability (1 st from the left) with log facies interpretation (2 nd to the left) and two realizations of the seismic facies along the Harvey 3 (left), Harvey 4 (middle) and Harvey 1 (right) wells.....	137
Figure 104 Comparison of the seismic total porosity.....	137

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 The Harvey 2 well VSP acquisition parameters.	19
Table 2 The Harvey 3 well: VSP acquisition parameters	29
Table 3 The Harvey 4 well: VSP acquisition parameters	40
Table 4 Surface seismic pre-processing flow.	70
Table 5 Post-stack Migration Flow.	79
Table 6 PSTM workflow.	80

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The SW Hub Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) project is a leading initiative to reduce carbon dioxide emissions in Western Australia. It is a staged project that involves collecting and analysing data and samples from the Lesueur Sandstone formation, to test its feasibility as a CO₂ reservoir. The Lesueur Sandstone lies in the southern Perth Basin and is the type of saline aquifer identified by scientists around the world as a potential CO₂ storage reservoir.

Currently, the SW Hub has been going through a detailed pre-competitive site characterisation. As a part of this process the Harvey 1 stratigraphic well was drilled in 2012 and a 3D seismic survey was acquired in 2013-2014 over a 115 km² area in the vicinity of potential future injection sites (Geokinetics, 2014). This survey along with the Harvey 1 well data has been thoroughly analysed in ANLEC R&D Project 7-0314-0231. Since then new sources of the geophysical data became available:

- the new Harvey 2, 3 and 4 wells were drilled and a suite of well-logs have been acquired along with a zero-offset Vertical Seismic Profile (VSP);
- a high-resolution nested 3D seismic surveys around the Harvey 4 well (Urosevic et al., 2014) and, most recently, around the Harvey 3 well (Yavuz et al., 2018)

The objective of the Project 7-0115-0241 (Project) is to fill current information gaps by integrating all available geophysical data. Eventually, we interpreted the data in terms of subsurface distribution of petrophysical properties, relevant for the CO₂ sequestration modelling. These 3D cubes of properties should be used to constrain static and dynamic models, which form a core for feasibility studies of CO₂ sequestration at the SW Hub area.

The analysis started with advanced processing of VSP data. The results of VSP analysis were then used in the reprocessing of the entire 3D seismic dataset plus a composite 2D line that passes in proximity to three Harvey wells and has a relatively dense and uniform distribution of source-receiver offsets. Both of these datasets were then used for stochastic seismic inversion. Underpinning all of these analyses are well logs, which are comprehensively analysed in a separate report corresponding to the Milestone 6 of the Project (Pervukhina et al., 2018) which is also attached to this report.

The main findings of the overall study are as follows:

VSP data in the Harvey 2, 3 and 4 wells are of variable quality but sufficient to estimate vertical velocities for constraining the tomographic velocity model for surface seismic data. Anomalous

seismic attenuation ($Q=30$) is observed in the Yalgorup Member, while the contribution of scattering attenuation is minimal.

A composite line was created through the volumes, which incorporates a previously acquired 2D line with full complement of offsets and passes in proximity to the Harvey 1, 3 and 4 wells. This allowed building a relatively detailed velocity model that provided a sufficiently high quality seismic common-offset gathers and allowed the application of a stochastic Amplitude versus Offset (AVO) inversion. However, this inversion was still anchored at a single well (the Harvey 1 well) as other wells are too shallow for characterisation of the Wonnerup section. In order to validate the results, we compared them with the logs of the Harvey 3 well, which served as a blind test well. The match with this blind well is reasonably good. However, it is unclear if these results could be deemed reliable at such great distances from the Harvey 1 well. In addition, the results are limited to the composite seismic line.

The most comprehensive analysis was performed on the Geokinetics (2014) seismic volume, involving the stochastic rock physics inversion. To this end, the entire volume was first completely reprocessed. This allowed us to produce images far superior to those produced previously, with better reflection continuity and fault delineation. Furthermore, tomographic velocity analysis was undertaken to produce the velocity model for both final imaging and inversion.

The deterministic inversion of the Geokinetics 3D data showed very large uncertainty and hence requires a priori constraints. Hence, a quantitative interpretation workflow was developed, which implemented the Bayesian approach to stochastic seismic inversion. This workflow incorporates prior understanding of the subsurface features. Hence, the inversion gave us an opportunity to test if several geologically plausible hypotheses are consistent with seismic data.

The output of the inversion was controlled by (1) initial model and (2) our subjective estimate of the uncertainty of the initial model, well data and seismic amplitudes. The workflow involved a joint kinematic/amplitude inversion since the initial subsurface seismic model was based on high-resolution velocity analysis that captures both the loading trends derived from the well data and lateral variations of the seismic properties. Given the facies classification in the wells and correlation with petrophysical parameters, we converted the reference inversion output into reservoir characteristics.

The main findings are:

1. Despite the limitations of the Geokinetics (2014) 3D seismic, the inversion confidently delineates the Yalgorup/Wonnerup interface;

-
2. As expected, this horizon corresponds to the rapid transition of the impermeable rocks to reservoir sandstone. While the probability of the baffles exceeds 70%, it is never close to 100%, and thus, permits lateral discontinuity of the sealing interface along the horizon;
 3. Within the sufficient seismic quality areas, we observed two seismic lithology types within Wonnerup:
 - a. intense layering in the deeper parts towards western edge of the survey
 - b. uniform reservoir – the most typical appearance.
 4. We suggest that the quiescent Wonnerup Member may be due to the overlapping depth trends of the reservoir/baffles facies types, so they become seismically indistinguishable. Validation of this suggestion requires additional well information.