# Methane Hydrate Production from Alaskan Permafrost

3D Vertical Seismic Profile Survey

## **Topical Report**

October 1, 2001 to January 31, 2005

by

Donn McGuire (Anadarko Petroleum Corp.) Thomas Williams (Maurer Technology Inc.) Bjorn Paulsson (Paulsson Geophysical Services, Inc.) Alexander Goertz (Paulsson Geophysical Services, Inc.)

February 2005

### DE-FC26-01NT41331 (Task 12)

Anadarko Petroleum Corp. 1201 Lake Robbins Drive The Woodlands, TX 77380

Maurer Technology Inc. 13135 South Dairy Ashford, Suite 800 Sugar Land, TX 77478

Paulsson Geophysical Services, Inc. 1215 West Lambert Road Brea, CA 92821

### Disclaimer

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

## Abstract

Natural-gas hydrates have been encountered beneath the permafrost and considered a drilling hazard by the oil and gas industry for years. Drilling engineers working in Russia, Canada and the USA have documented numerous problems, including drilling kicks and uncontrolled gas releases, in arctic regions. Information has been generated in laboratory studies pertaining to the extent, volume, chemistry and phase behavior of gas hydrates. Scientists studying hydrates as a potential energy source agree that the resource potential is great – on the North Slope of Alaska alone, it has been estimated at 590 TCF. However, little information has been obtained from physical samples taken from actual hydrate-bearing rocks.

This gas-hydrate project is a cost-shared partnership between Maurer Technology, Anadarko Petroleum, Noble Corporation, and the U.S. Department of Energy's Methane Hydrate R&D program. The purpose of the project is to build on previous and ongoing R&D in the area of onshore hydrate deposition to identify, quantify and predict production potential for hydrates located on the North Slope of Alaska.

The project team drilled and continuously cored the Hot Ice No. 1 well on Anadarko-leased acreage beginning in FY 2003 and completed in 2004. An on-site core analysis laboratory was built and used for determining physical characteristics of hydrates and surrounding rock.

After the well was logged, a 3D **vertical seismic profile (VSP)** was recorded to calibrate the shallow geologic section with seismic data and to investigate techniques to better resolve lateral subsurface variations of potential hydrate-bearing strata. Paulsson Geophysical Services, Inc. deployed their 80 level 3C clamped borehole seismic receiver array in the wellbore to record samples every 25 ft. Seismic vibrators were successively positioned at 1185 different surface positions in a circular pattern around the wellbore. This technique generated a 3D image of the subsurface. Correlations were generated of these seismic data with cores, logging, and other well data.

Unfortunately, the Hot Ice No. 1 well did not encounter hydrates in the reservoir sands, although brine-saturated sands containing minor amounts of methane were encountered within the hydrate stability zone (HSZ). Synthetic seismograms created from well log data were in agreement with reflectivity data measured by the 3D VSP survey. Modeled synthetic seismograms indicated a detectable seismic response would be expected in the presence of hydrate-bearing sands. Such a response was detected in the 3D VSP data at locations up-dip to the west of the Hot Ice No. 1 wellbore.

Results of this project suggest that the presence of hydrate-bearing strata may not be related as simply to HSZ thickness as previously thought. Geological complications of reservoir facies distribution within fluvial-deltaic environments will require sophisticated detection technologies to assess the locations of recoverable volumes of methane contained in hydrates. High-resolution surface seismic data and more rigorous well log data analysis offer the best near-term potential.

The hydrate resource potential is huge, but better tools are needed to accurately assess their location, distribution and economic recoverability.

## **Table of Contents**

Disc	laimer	·ii			
Abst	Abstractiii				
1.	Introduction				
2.	Expe	rimental4			
	2.1	Task Statement			
	2.2	Survey Design4			
	2.3	Survey Equipment			
3.	Resu	Its and Discussion10			
	3.1	Field Operations			
	3.2	Data Processing			
	3.3	Integration with Well Data15			
	3.4	VSP Interpretation19			
4.	Conc	lusions24			
5.	Ackn	owledgements25			
6.	Refer	ences			
Anne	andix	A - Subsurface Fold Coverage			
Appe		R = Substitute Fold Coverage			
Abbe					
Appe	endix	C – VSP Sweep Tests			
Appe	endix	D – VSP Hodogram Analysis			
Appe	Appendix E – Three-Component Processing				
Appendix F – First Break Picks					
Appe	endix	G – Three-Component Wavefield Separation			
Appe	endix	H – VSP Statics			
Appe	endix	I – Deconvolution			
Арре	Appendix J – Amplitude Recovery				
Арре	Appendix K – 3D Velocities				
Арре	endix	L – L-Plot Correlation between VSP and Log Data			
Арре	endix	M – VSP Interpretation			

## 1. Introduction

Efforts described here are part of a large gas-hydrate project structured as a cost-shared partnership between Maurer Technology, Anadarko Petroleum, Noble Corporation, and the U.S. Department of Energy's Methane Hydrate R&D program. The overall purpose of the project is to plan, design and implement a program to safely and economically drill/core and produce natural gas from arctic hydrates. The project team has documented planning, operations and lessons learned to assist in future hydrate research and field operations to make an objective technical and economic assessment of this promising natural gas reservoir potential. Specifically described here are results from a special 3D **vertical seismic profile (VSP)** recorded to calibrate the shallow geologic section with seismic data and to investigate techniques to better resolve lateral subsurface variations of potential hydrate-bearing strata.

On February 7, 2004, the Hot Ice No. 1 hydrate well reached its planned depth of 2300 ft, about 300 ft below the zone where temperature and pressure conditions would theoretically permit hydrates to exist (i.e., the hydrate stability zone (HSZ)). Although significant gas shows were encountered in highly porous sandstones, no methane hydrates were found. The continuous coring rig used in the project proved to be a safe and efficient drilling system, with 93% of core recovered.

This project used a special purpose on-site core laboratory to help analyze hydrate cores. Live data and images were transmitted from the rig over the internet, which reduced the number of engineers and scientists required to oversee the project. Additionally, the well was drilled from a special purpose-built arctic platform designed for minimal environmental impact.



## **VSP Reflections**

Figure 1. In a VSP, each borehole receiver records down-going and up-going energy from each surface shot-point location

A massive 3D VSP survey was conducted to investigate lateral variations of the potential hydrate reservoir. The VSP survey at Hot Ice No. 1 was designed to calibrate the shallow geologic section with seismic data and to investigate techniques to better resolve lateral subsurface variations of potential hydrate-bearing strata in the vicinity of the wellbore.

Basic operation of a VSP is to deploy seismic receivers in the well bore at regular intervals and record energy transmitted by seismic equipment on the surface. Receivers in the wellbore record not only energy that travels directly from the seismic sources, but also energy reflected by subsurface rock layer boundaries and energy that reflects between layers of rock (multiples) (**Figure 1**). Recorded data are processed by computer to extract reflected compressional wave data, resulting in a high-resolution, three-dimensional image of the subsurface seismic reflectors in a radius around the wellbore. Massive 3D VSP's significantly increase the resolution of 3D images compared to those obtained from surface seismic surveys. Use of downhole receivers usually results in doubling of useful seismic frequency bandwidth as compared to surface receivers. Bandwidth is doubled because seismic waves recorded on downhole receivers only travel once through the highly attenuating weathering layer.

The 3D VSP has a considerable advantage over traditional VSP methods which produce either a zero-offset, single-fold subsurface image or (in the case of a walk-away or offset VSP) a few traces in a single offset direction from the wellbore. A 3-D VSP can be economically feasible through the use of Paulsson Geophysical Services, Inc.'s (P/GSI) massive array that deploys 80 receivers in the wellbore (**Figure 2**) to sample the entire vertical section with respect to each surface shot point.



Figure 2. Deploying VSP Receiver Array into the Wellbore

This technique requires that each surface shot point be occupied only once by the seismic source (**Figure 3**), thereby greatly reducing time required to record a three-dimensional survey. Systems based on using fewer receivers require multiple deployments of the receivers in the wellbore and each deployment would necessitate reoccupying each surface shot-point location, greatly increasing the time and cost of a 3D VSP survey.



Figure 3. VSP "Thumper" Truck

# 2. Experimental

### 2.1 Task Statement

#### Task 12.0 – Shallow Seismic Survey(s)

As stated in the original Statement of Work, the project team was to conduct vertical seismic profiles (VSP) to characterize the hydrate-bearing strata and to calibrate the shallow stratigraphy to existing seismic data. Acquisition, processing, and interpretation were to be designed for optimum imaging of shallow stratigraphy (i.e, less than 3500 ft). The team was to correlate VSP data with core, log, other well data, existing non-proprietary seismic data, and other well data generated.

### 2.2 Survey Design

In the vicinity of the Hot Ice No. 1 location, the nearby ARCO Cirque #2 well in Sec.17 of T9N, R7E had encountered several hydrate-bearing sands within the zone of penetration of the Hot Ice No. 1 well. In the survey design phase, wireline logs from the Cirque #2 well were used to model expected seismic response at Hot Ice No. 1 to determine shot-point spacing and fold. As expected, modeling showed that the seismic fold would be highest near the wellbore and decrease away from the wellbore (**Figure 4**). Radius of the Fresnel zone would also increase with offset. For more details on the fold estimates for various offset angles and targets, see **Appendix A**.



Multiple surface shot-point grids were tested on the model to study effects of shot-point spacing and azimuthal coverage. The final surface shot-point design deployed 1185 shot points in a circular pattern with variable shot-point spacing ranging from 120 ft near the wellbore and increasing to 175 ft at the maximum offset of 2749 ft (**Figure 5**). This pattern of concentric rings was designed to concentrate more seismic energy near the wellbore where the fold would be highest and increase shot-point spacing to accommodate the increase in the Fresnel zone with offset. The maximum offset was chosen to ensure adequate coverage below the wellbore to image reflectors observed on surface 3-D seismic data. This provided a full azimuth survey with full offset coverage out to offsets equivalent to the depth of the wellbore. This design would provide a P-wave reflection image with a radius of 1000 ft at a depth of 2000 ft (approximate depth of the base of the hydrate stability zone (HSZ)), and a maximum radius of 1435 ft at 2870 ft and deeper.





## 2.3 Survey Equipment

Paulsson Geophysical Services, Inc. (P/GSI) was retained as the primary contractor for acquisition and processing of the 3D VSP survey. P/GSI subcontracted PGS Onshore Inc. (PGS) to provide surface source and support equipment and personnel; and Geometrics to provide data-recording equipment and personnel.

P/GSI deployed their third-generation cable (80-006) with eighty 15-Hz OYO SMC1850 geophones arrayed in three-component pods (one vertical and two orthogonal horizontal axes) (**Figure 6**). The 80 3-C pods were deployed at 25-ft intervals on the cable from 294.35 ft to 2269.15 ft in the wellbore (see **Appendix B**).



Figure 6. Installing Receiver into Pod

P/GSI also provided a ProMax processing system for on-site, real-time processing and QC of recorded data (**Figures 7–9**). GeoMetrics provided an RX-132 seismograph recording system and required personnel to record the three-component VSP data (**Figure 8**).



Figure 7. P/GSI Recording Hut near Hot Ice Platform



Figure 8. Recording Equipment inside Recording Hut



Figure 9. Data QC during Parameter Testing

PGS provided three AHV4 (62,000 lb) surface vibrator seismic source vehicles, plus support vehicles and personnel (**Figures 10 and 11**). Two vibrators were used for recording the survey and a third vibrator was on stand-by to minimize delays due to equipment problems. Parameters included:

- > 2 x 8, 220 Hz, 10 sec linear sweeps, 0.2 sec cosine taper
- > Adaptive circular pattern based on estimated Fresnel Zone size
- Source point interval: 120-175 ft, max. offset 2750 ft, for a total of 1185 shot points



Figure 10. PGS Vibrator during VSP Production Recording



Figure 11. PGS Vibrator near Hot Ice Platform

# 3. Results and Discussion

## 3.1 Field Operations

All equipment and personnel were on location at the Hot Ice No. 1 well on February 12, 2004. Parameter testing began that day and continued until 5 a.m. the next day. A parameter testing program was undertaken to determine optimal frequency range, record length, signal taper and number of sweeps to use for the production recording of the VSP (see Testing Program below) (see also **Appendix C**). As a result of these tests, the final sweep parameters were two sweeps per shot point, each sweep 10 seconds long, running from 8-220 Hz with a 0.3 cosine taper.

#### Testing Program for Hot Ice No. 1 VSP

**Objective:** Determine optimum signal parameters (sweep length, frequency range and number of sweeps) for a maximum offset of 2600 ft for the VSP

#### **Critical Issues:**

- 1. Vibrator frequency range capability
- 2. Ground roll effects
- 3. Tube waves
- 4. Move-up time between surface points

#### **Testing Sequence:**

- 1. Record a 32 sec 10-200 Hz sweeps for harmonics filtering analysis
- 2. Test sweep lengths with 10-200 Hz sweep frequency range at near offset (off ice pad)

16 sec x 1 sweep	0.3 cosine taper
12 sec x 1 sweep	0.3 cosine taper
10 sec x 2 sweeps	0.2 cosine taper
8 sec x 2 sweeps	0.2 cosine taper
6 sec x 2 sweeps	0.1 cosine taper

3. Test sweep frequency ranges using best sweep length

6-160 Hz	10-160 Hz	14-160 Hz
6-180 Hz	10-180 Hz	14-180 Hz
6-200 Hz	10-200 Hz	14-200 Hz
6-220 Hz	10-220 Hz	14-220 Hz
6-240 Hz	10-240 Hz	14-240 Hz

4. Test <u>number of sweeps</u> using best sweep length and frequency range

16 sec x 1	16 sec x 2	
12 sec x 1	12 sec x 2	
10 sec x 1	10 sec x 2	
8 sec x 1	8 sec x 2	8 sec x 4
6 sec x 1	6 sec x 2	6 sec x 4

5. Do walk-away using sweep parameters with 500 ft intervals

Production recording ran from 5:10 a.m. February 13 until 3:35 a.m. February 14 (**Figure 12**). Energy from a total of 1185 shot-point locations was recorded by 80 receiver positions containing three geophones each for a total of 284,400 traces.

1	0-10				
	Date	IIIIe	comments	LGS	Plusi
	10-Feb	16:00 17:30 18:30 19:30	Arrive at Hot lee location w/ PGSI & PGS personnel. Safety meeting. Went outside - blowing snow. Went to rig floor	Vibes ∽14 mi out - stopped for poor visibility Dicussed vib capabilities, lesting program, etc. Scripting up the testing program in Excursion.	Need to relocate recording shack Looked at logs & discussed program & hydrates w/PGSI personnel Pods unpacked: Tight quarters for deployment
	-	20;15	Temp -10 w/wind (-50 WC).		Reported snow had blown into computer shack - door not fully latched (faulty latch). Should be tripping in soon & warming up computer shack. Expect -6 hrs to trip in
	11-Feb	6:00 8:00	Phase III travel advisory (wind & blowing snow) Conference call to Houston on Hot Ice operations	Vibes may try moving.	No trip in - problems with slipd & bottom hole assembly
		10:00 11:30		Crew trying to move. Tucker abandoned - bad transmission No contact with crew - not on site	Tripping out tubing
		12:30	Phase III travel advisory (wind & blowing snow)	Vibes stopped ~13 mi out. will wait until dark for wind to die down.	Tripped out all gear & circulating - probabilitof freezing up w/o circulating. Can't circulate wPGSI equip in hole. Computers OK from snow
	12-Feb	21:00 5:00		Vibes moving Vibes 6 mi. out, 1.5 mph	POOM & circulate. Should trip in ~midnight (5-6 hrs to trip) 10 pods in - running slow. Should be in hole when Vibes arrive
F		8:00		Vibes at South end of pipeline & will cross to east side to avoid pipeline crossing & power line Turker arr on site. Waithon on vibes	20 pods in hole & pressure testing
igu		11:00 13:15		Tucker with back to escort vibes Vibes on site	40 pods in hole & pressure testing Should be in hole in 2-3 hrs
re		17:00			Array in hole whop pod @ surface. Need to set spool on ground near shack. Need to refuel drilling rid before moving spool
12.		20:40	Shut off some rig motors to reduce noise Will do test program with 1 vibe (not walkaway).	Vibes need adjustment to reduce distortion at high frequencies Will hard-wire production sweep parameters & then record walkaway	Pod clamping pressure 95 psi - will check hourly PGSI will record start VSPs w/whes close to rig, then refeation array to horthom
VS		21:30	Inner ina is Line 1. outer rina is Line 20.	w/ production sweeps Vibe ready for resting	
SP		22:26 22:36	Test 1 32 sec sweep 10-200 Test 2 14 sec-2 sec listen (not enouch disc for 16 sec)	D	
Fi		22:59	10-200, 12 sec (+2), .3 taper		
elo		23:15 23:23	10-200, 10 sec (+2) 10-200, 8 sec (+2)		
d (		23:34	10-200, 6 sec (+2)		
Op		23:37 23:39	10-200, 8 sec x 2 (+2) 10-200, 6 sec x 2 (+2)		
be		200	spectrum comparison for 10-220 Hz 6, 10, 14 sec better than 8 & 12.		
era	Ļ	10.0	6 sec sweep too short (deeper notches) 10&14 look the same		
ati	13-Feb	0:02	lest 3 10 sec (+2) 6-200 (0.2) - more distortion & baseplate warning		
or		0:10	14 Sec (+2) 6-200 (0.3) 14 Sec (+2) 6-200 (0.3)		
าร		0:20	10 sec (+2) 14-200 (0.2)		
۶L		0:25	14 sec (+2) 14-200 (0.3)		
.0		0:35	10 sec 14-200 looks lower frequency than 10-200 10 sec(+2) 8-200 (0.2) - better than 6 or 14 low end but not as good as 10 Hz		
g		0:42	10 sec (+2) 8-160 (0.2) - baseplate warning		
		0:43	10 sec (+2) 8-180 (0.2) - baseplate warning		
		0:47 0:48	10 sec (+2) 8-220 (0.2) 10 sec (+2) 8-240 (0.2) - more distortion on vibe but better spectrum than 220 Hz		
		0:58	10 sec (+2) 8-220 (0.2)x2 (0 & 180 phase) correlate then stack -		
		10.1	very little difference between single sweep & variphase		
		c0:1	10 sec (+2) 8-220 (0.2)X2 - stacked traces better than single or variphase Production sweep = 10 sec (+2) 8-220 (.2)	Will hard-wire production sweep parameters	Will trip in array to bottom
		4:35	Pulse test		
		4:40	Walkaway test with production sweep @ 500 ft.		
		4:49	1000 ft offset		
		4:53	2000 ft offset 2500 ft offset		
		5:10	Production survey started - Line 01 VP 001, & Line 20 VP001 working each vibe to center		
		12:00	Approx 1/3 survey recorded in 7 hrs - slower than expected. Expect survey completion by midnight. Have to manually start vibes. Geometrics unit adding delays		
		0502	Left location on tuel and water trucks		
	14-Feb	3:35	Last shot recorded - VSP completed		

## 3.2 Data Processing

Processing of the VSP data was designed to focus on the up-going P-P (primary to primary) reflection data. No additional processing for the P-S (primary to shear) or S-S (shear to shear) data was included.

The processing flow consisted of the following steps:

- 1. Tape Input
- 2. Trace Editing

#### 3. Geometry Assignment

Assign x, y, z location information to each receiver using the well deviation survey with 2D inversion of VSP data as a quality check.

Receiver relocation is based on a 2D inversion in the vicinity of the respective receiver level. As such it is of limited accuracy (5-10 ft, depending on the accuracy of the first break picks) and usually cannot replace an accurate deviation survey. It is used for quality control of the deviation survey. As seen in **Figure 13** top view, both the inverted locations and the deviation survey locations show the same general trend, and are located close to each other. This confirms the accuracy of the deviation data.



Figure 13. VSP Receiver Location and Borehole Deviation

#### 4. 3-C Orientation

As receiver pods in the array are deployed, their directional orientation is random. It is critical to determine the receiver orientations to focus the energy in the direction of the source position. Hodogram analysis (see **Appendix D**) is used to determine the angle of maximum energy and, therefore, true receiver orientation. This is used to separate total recorded energy into the vertical and two orthogonal horizontal directions (see **Appendix E**).

#### 5. Pick First Breaks on 3-C Oriented Data

After the three-component data have been properly oriented, the first break arrivals are picked on the P-component data for all of the shot points for use in developing the velocity model and for separating the three-component data into oriented volumes. (See **Appendix F**.)

#### 6. Wavefield Separation using 3-C Oriented Data

Wavefield separation is performed by subtracting the (source-rotated) H1 component from the vertical component (this enhances up-going P energy). (See **Appendix G**.)

#### 7. Statics

Shot statics are designed to correct travel-time undulations caused by local changes in the near surface which are unique to individual shot locations or a small patch of shots, i.e. short wavelength. Longer wavelength components are due to other causes (e.g., topography, lateral heterogeneity, anisotropy, etc.), and these corrections should not be included in the shot statics. (See **Appendix H**.)

#### 8. Deconvolve 3-C Oriented Data

Deconvolution is designed to remove multiples and other undesirable components (noise) from the signal spectrum. A source-signature deconvolution (zero-phase wavelet inversion) method was chosen with a 500-ms operator length and notch filters to compensate for 60-Hz rig noise and harmonics. (See **Appendix I**.)

#### 9. Amplitude Recovery

Amplitude recovery is used to compensate for a number of effects in the recorded data. This is used to compensate for decay of seismic energy strength with distance from the source, i.e., with offset from the wellbore or depth from the surface. Amplitude recovery can also reduce contamination from tube waves which result from energy traveling along the surface to the wellbore and propagating down the well casing to the receivers. Some methods can be too aggressive and negatively impact the desired signal, so care must be taken in testing and selection. After testing several methods of amplitude recovery, the team's final choice was to use a 250-ms Automatic Gain Control (AGC) function. (See **Appendix J**.)

#### 10. Migration Velocity Field Derivation

The first pass of migration was done with a single velocity function derived from well control and trend extraction for the deeper data. The 3-D migration velocity volume was generated by integrating the sonic well log with interpreted horizons from the VSP data and local surface seismic data. The shallow section within the radius of investigation of the Hot Ice No. 1 VSP is essentially planar with monoclinal dip to the east. Reflectors in

the VSP volume were approximated by planes, and sonic log velocities were populated in the model with these horizon constraints (see **Appendix K**).

#### 11. 3D Kirchhoff Prestack Depth Migration of P-P Data

The final stage of processing is to position the seismic reflectors at their proper locations subsurface. A 3D Kirchhoff prestack depth migration algorithm was used for this step. This algorithm is an integral form of the wave equation and is applied along a diffraction curve for each reflection point sampled in the subsurface. The algorithm operates in the pre-stack domain using the 3D migration velocity model, and converts the final processed data from time to depth.

#### 12. Output to Tape and Preparation of Report on Results and Analysis

The final depth-migrated seismic data volume was adjusted to a datum of mean sea level. The final shot point interval was 15 ft with a vertical sample rate of 5 ft to a depth extent of 4500 ft (approximately 2200 ft below the well TD). The 3D migration velocity volume was used to convert depth data to a time volume with a datum of mean sea level and a vertical sample rate of 1 ms to a time extent of 1100 ms.

An "L-plot" was produced to document the correlation between VSP and log data (see **Appendix L**). This figure also shows the correlation between the VSP corridor stack and a synthetic seismogram from wireline log data.

## 3.3 Integration with Well Data

Wireline well logs from the surface to 1260 ft MD (approximate base of permafrost) were unreliable due to washouts in unconsolidated sediments (**Figure 14**).



Figure 14. Hot Ice No. 1 Log Showing Washout Effects in Upper Wellbore

Washouts occurred during the drilling phase when the 5%-inch cored hole was enlarged to 8½ inches for logging and casing and the mud chiller was offline for mechanical problems. No potential reservoir sands were seen in this section and no hydrates were observed in the cores.

Below 1260 ft MD, there were several potential reservoir sands. The thickest sand is seen between 1480 ft and 1508 ft MD (Sand A). This sand is well within the HSZ and was determined to be brine-saturated with some gas in solution.

Sonic and density logs can be combined to create an acoustic impedance log, which can then be convolved with a seismic wavelet to create a synthetic seismogram. This creates an approximation of a seismic trace at the wellbore location. A synthetic seismogram can be used to correlate geologic formations and interfaces with the reflection seismic data recorded by a VSP or surface seismic survey. Accuracy of the correlation depends on the quality of the wireline log data and the seismic wavelet. For the Hot Ice No. 1 well, the quality of the upper 1260 ft of log data is very poor, resulting in unreasonable acoustic impedance values, which in turn create invalid synthetic seismic reflection events.

Compressional velocity, shear velocity and density logs from lowermost 900 ft of the Hot Ice No. 1 well were used to generate an offset-stacked synthetic seismogram to investigate the seismic character of the strata penetrated (**Figure 15**). Sand A (indicated by horizontal lines in Figure 5) is a fining-upward sandstone with very little acoustic impedance contrast with the overlying shale. This results in a very weak trough event (negative reflectivity) for the top of the sand. Sand A has a fairly sharp base with a good impedance contrast with the underlying shale. This combination results in a moderate peak event (positive reflectivity) at the base. Very little

change is observed in the offset traces, other than the normal decrease in frequency content with offset distance.



Figure 15. In-Situ Synthetic Seismogram (Sand A indicated by horizontal lines)

Offset traces in Figure 5 show computed seismic response for different offset distances away from the energy source. Shapes of the traces change, primarily because frequency content decreases with distance (higher frequencies are absorbed and scattered by the earth), and because elastic properties of the earth (especially shear impedance) are more influential for energy propagation and reflection with offset. The stack traces in the seismogram are the result of summing the offset traces into a single trace. In this display, there is one offset trace for each distance noted at the header plus six identical summed traces.

A second offset-stacked synthetic seismogram was constructed to investigate changes in seismic response due to the presence of methane hydrates in Sand A. Compressional velocity, shear velocity and density values were replaced with values for a hydrate saturation of approximately 70% (**Table 1**).

Condition	Vp	Vs	Density
Brine sand	7150 ft/sec	2850 ft/sec	2.03 g/cc
Hydrate sand	12464 ft/sec	7216 ft/sec	2.01 g/cc

 Table 1. Properties for Synthetic Seismograms

The pseudo-hydrate-bearing sand would have a strong peak event at the top and a weak trough event at the base (**Figure 16**). There is a modest decrease in amplitude with offset as well as normal frequency decrease. For Sand A (gamma ray < 75), substituted hydrate values are Vp = 12,465 ft/sec, Vs = 7216 ft/sec, and density = 2.01 g/cc.



Figure 16. Hydrate Synthetic Seismogram (Sand A indicated by horizontal lines)

A comparison of these modeled seismograms (**Figure 17**) shows that the presence of methane hydrates within the reservoir sand would be seen as an observable reflection event with a different polarity at the top and base than that of the brine-saturated sand. (These traces have been reduced to emphasize the area surrounding Sand A.) The final migrated VSP data provide the vehicle to investigate the presence of polarity or other seismic character changes away from the wellbore that might indicate the presence of hydrates in the reservoir Sand A.



Figure 17. Comparison of Synthetic Seismic Responses from Well Log Data and Reservoir Sand if Methane Hydrates were Present

## 3.4 VSP Interpretation

The final depth-migrated VSP data and wireline log data from the well were loaded into an interpretation project for analysis using Paradigm's VoxelGeo interpretation software. The first step in interpreting the VSP data was integration of the well log data. Since both wireline data and VSP data were in the depth domain, this task was straightforward. Sand A can be seen by selectively color-filling the Vshale curve for values less than 50% and the porosity log for values greater than 15% (**Figure 18**). (In the figure, "Base HSZ" refers to the base of the hydrate stability zone.)



Figure 18. East-West profile of VSP Data Through Hot Ice No. 1. (filled log curves identify Sand A, where Vshale <50% and porosity >15%)

One of the major challenges to interpreting the Hot Ice No. 1 VSP volume is the stratigraphic nature of the geology represented by the seismic reflectors. Since the Ugnu and West Sak are predominantly fluvial-deltaic deposits, rock layers may be expected to thin, thicken, pinch out, truncate, and change dip direction throughout the section. Small faults may exist in such an environment as well. Such stratigraphy should result in discontinuous and variable reflectors that may not be widely extensive.

A second interpretation challenge is identification of any polarity reversals in the Sand A reflection interval which might indicate the presence of methane hydrates in the sand. Interpretation techniques that track amplitudes will naturally follow a consistent polarity event (peak or trough) throughout a volume. The only hints of polarity changes in an amplitude-tracked reflection event would be dip changes, which also could be caused by reflector terminations at faults or facies boundaries, in addition to polarity shifts.

In light of the challenges in interpreting a stratigraphically variable reflection package with possible polarity changes, an interpretation technique was devised for the Hot Ice No. 1 VSP volume (see **Appendix M**). Several laterally continuous geologic markers were identified above and below Sand A and two of these were coarsely interpreted and gridded. Three dimensional planes were fit to these marker horizons to reduce the uncertainty due to edge effects of the transversely anisotropic velocities, as seen in Appendix H. Because of slight dip and azimuth differences in the two marker planes bracketing Sand A, an average marker plane was computed and then positioned at the Sand A level. Amplitude values were displayed on the geologic marker plane where it intersected the VSP volume.

As seen in **Figure 19**, the amplitude display on the geologic marker plane at the top of Sand A shows little or no amplitude strength at the well location (yellow). To the west, the amplitudes are strong peaks (blue). This amplitude variation is the same response seen in the synthetic seismograms when the in-situ case is substituted for a hydrate-bearing case. *Therefore, the change in amplitude may indicate the presence of methane hydrates in Sand A only a few hundred feet west, and updip, of the wellbore.* 



Figure 19. VSP Amplitude Data Displayed on a Seismic Marker at top of Sand A. (Amplitude values at the well are approximately zero. To the west, amplitudes are strong peaks.)

The amplitude display on the geologic marker at the base of Sand A, however, does not show the response expected for a change from brine-saturated sand to hydrate-bearing sand. There is no peak reflector at the base of Sand A at the well location, although a weak to moderate trough, indicative of the base of a hydrate-bearing sand, is seen in the same area west of the well as the strong peak at the top of Sand A.

#### Finding Hydrates

As mentioned, we did not find hydrates in the Hot Ice well, much to the disappointment of the entire team. The question became, "What would hydrates look like if they are nearby?" Using the well logs below the washouts, we created a set of synthetic seismograms to investigate this question. The synthetic seismogram for the in-situ case is shown in the upper half of Figure 17. On offset gathers, the top and base of the in-situ brine sand should have little change in reflectivity with offset. On stacked, zero phase data, this sand should have little reflectivity at the top and a weak to moderate peak at the base.

We then performed a fluid substitution with rock properties calculated for this sand with a 70% saturation of hydrates.

Condition	Vp	Vs	Density
Brine Sand	7150 ft/sec	2850 ft/sec	2.03 g/cc
Hydrate Sand	12464 ft/sec	7216 ft/sec	2.01 g/cc

The resulting synthetic seismogram is shown in the lower half of Figure 17.

On offset gathers, the top of a hydrate-bearing sand should be represented by a strong peak and the base by a strong trough, both decreasing in amplitude with offset. On stacked, zerophase data, this sand should have a strong peak at the top and little or no reflectivity at the base.

We then transferred this expectation to the VSP data to see if these differences could be discerned. Color-filled log data are shown in Figure 18. On the left is the V shale log with values less than 50% in magenta. On the right is the porosity log with values greater than 15% in yellow. These cutoffs were used to identify the most sand-prone units. There is one thicker sand at around 1400 ft and several thinner sands below it.

The primary challenge in interpreting the VSP volume is how to pick a horizon in a predominantly fluvial setting where sands and shales interfinger and where we are looking for a change in polarity if hydrates are present. Fortunately, there is a regional shale marker immediately above the main sand; the team created a plane to fit that shale. That shale plane was then moved down to the sand and used as a pseudo-sand horizon. The amplitudes from the 3D VSP were then draped onto the sand horizon.

In plan view, these amplitudes are shown in Figure 19. Recall from the synthetic seismograms that in-situ sand at the wellbore had very little amplitude information; it is shown in Figure 19 in yellow, according to the colorbar. Also recall that hydrates would have a strong peak at the top of the sand. The blue patch northwest of the wellbore fits that description and may indicate the presence of hydrates near the well.

## 4. Conclusions

The Hot Ice No. 1 massive 3D VSP was a highly innovative survey with several first-time applications of recently developed technology. It was the first survey recorded using Paulsson Geophysical Services (P/GSI) third-generation 80 level 3C downhole seismic array, and the first P/GSI survey using 25 ft spacing between the 3C pods. It was also P/GSI's first deployment in a partially uncased hole. P/GSI's processing system was first networked directly with the recording system for real-time field processing and data QC. The production sweep was the highest-frequency sweep (8-220 Hz) used thus far on a P/GSI survey. It was also the Industry's first acquisition geometry using circular pattern shooting with variable shot spacing for an onshore 3D VSP.

The 3D VSP successfully imaged the volume surrounding the Hot Ice No. 1 well consisting of a sequence of deltaic fluvial deposits. The anticipated resolution could be met with the average dominant frequency of the processed data to reach between 110-130 Hz.

Since Hot Ice No. 1 was dry (no producible volume of methane hydrates was found), one of the goals was to map a potential hydrate-bearing horizon into the surrounding volume and investigate the reflective properties for evidence of hydrates. This proved to be a difficult task, mainly because gas hydrates generally produce only weak AVO anomalies. This task could not be accomplished since AVO/AVA studies would have to be carried out in the depth domain for a 3D VSP survey and (although being developed) P/GSI does not currently have a suitable true-amplitude prestack migration algorithm for this purpose.

#### **Recommendations for Future Work**

Several areas of investigation can be undertaken to derive additional information from the 3D VSP survey. Other methods of separating up-going and down-going energy may give different images of the subsurface. Processing the shear energy may provide additional insights into rock properties of the potential reservoir sands and help identify any changes in the pore-filling materials within the VSP survey area.

# 5. Acknowledgements

This project could not have been completed without input from Dr. Alexander Goertz of P/GSI who did all data processing, including numerous parameter tests and evaluations; and Ms. Shari Houston of Anadarko who performed the synthetic seismogram modeling.

## 6. References

(No references were cited in this report)



Appendix A

# Subsurface Fold Coverage







Pre-Survey Modeling Steps

- 1. Generation of four different shot patterns based on a maximum source offset of 2,600 ft (220, 175,165 and 150 ft)
- 2. Construction of simple 1D model using Cirque 2 sonic log
- 3. Walk-away line fold estimation using ray tracing in layered media based on:
  - 1. Fresnel zone due to 100 Hz seismic signal
  - 2. Pure ray hit

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information. Version 12/11/02

Slide 2 of 38





Data Displays:

- Velocity model at the well location
- Fold estimates for each source spacing (220, 175,165 and 150 ft) for target depths of 2,600 ft, 2,000 ft and 1,000 ft, each with 30 and 45° incident angles
- For the target depth of 2,000 ft, estimates are shown with and without the Fresnel zone width parameter in the fold computation

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information. Version 12/11/02

Slide 4 of 38

Walk-Away Line Fold Estimation



Target depth for the following estimates is 2,600 ft



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information. Version 12/11/02





This presentation contains P/GSI processing information. Version 12/11/02

Slide 8 of 38





This presentation contains P/GSI processing information. Version 12/11/02

Slide 10 of 38





This presentation contains P/GSI processing information. Version 12/11/02

Slide 12 of 38


Slide 13 of 38

P/GSI<sup>™</sup>

Walk-Away Line Fold Estimation

## Target depth for the following estimates is 2,000 ft

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information. Version 12/11/02







Slide 16 of 38





Slide 18 of 38





Slide 20 of 38





Slide 22 of 38





Slide 24 of 38







Slide 26 of 38

P/GSI<sup>™</sup>





Slide 28 of 38

Walk-Away Line Fold Estimation



Target depth for the following estimates is 1,000 ft







Slide 32 of 38





Slide 34 of 38





Slide 36 of 38



#### Slide 38 of 38

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information. Version 12/11/02



Appendix B

# P/GSI Equipment

# **Deployment and Retrieval**



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 2 of 32



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information

Slide 3 of 32



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information

Slide 4 of 32



## Deployment of P/GSI's 3rd Generation 80 Level 3C Downhole Seismic Array



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information

Slide 6 of 32



Deployment of cable spool into the drilling room



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information

Slide 7 of 32



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information

Slide 9 of 32



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information

Slide 10 of 32



Pulley for cable deployment into the wellbore



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information

Slide 11 of 32

P/GSI



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information



Cable and centralizers on production tubing



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information

Slide 13 of 32





This presentation contain P/GSI processing information

Receiver and cable



Deploying receiver array into the wellbore



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information

Slide 15 of 32



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information

Slide 17 of 32



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information



Attaching production tubing to a receiver pod



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information

Slide 19 of 32



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information

Slide 21 of 32



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information



BOP cable feedthrough assembly



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information

Slide 23 of 32



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information

Slide 24 of 32



Cable and tubing deploying into the wellbore



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information

Slide 25 of 32

P/GSI



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information

Slide 26 of 32



## Retrieval of P/GSI's 3rd Generation 80 Level 3C Downhole Seismic Array



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information



Pulling equipment out of the wellbore



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information

Slide 29 of 32



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information

Slide 31 of 32



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information



Appendix C

# VSP Sweep Tests



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 2 of 62



### **Compilation of sweep parameter tests**

- Test 1 Uncorrelated 32 s sweep 10-200 Hz to check harmonics
- Test 2 Sweep length
  - 14 s, 12 s, 10 s, 8 s, 6 s, all 10-200 Hz
- Test 3 Sweep frequency range using 10 s
  - 6-200Hz, 8-200Hz, 14-200Hz
  - 8-160Hz, 8-180Hz, 8-220Hz, 8-240Hz
- Test 4 Number of sweeps using 10s, 8-220 Hz
  - 2 sweeps 180 degree phase rotated (varisweep)
  - 2 sweeps in phase
- Walkaway test
  - 500 ft, 1000 ft, 1500 ft, 2000 ft, 2500 ft



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 4 of 62



### **Compilation of sweep parameter tests**

- Test 1 Uncorrelated 32 s sweep 10-200 Hz to check harmonics
- Test 2 Sweep length
  - 14 s, 12 s, 10 s, 8 s, 6 s, all 10-200 Hz
- Test 3 Sweep frequency range using 10 s
  - 6-200Hz, 8-200Hz, 14-200Hz
  - 8-160Hz, 8-180Hz, 8-220Hz, 8-240Hz
- Test 4 Number of sweeps using 10s, 8-220 Hz
  - 2 sweeps 180 degree phase rotated (varisweep)
  - 2 sweeps in phase
- Walkaway test
  - 500 ft, 1000 ft, 1500 ft, 2000 ft, 2500 ft









## **Compilation of sweep parameter tests**

- Test 1 Uncorrelated 32 s sweep 10-200 Hz to check harmonics
- Test 2 Sweep length
  - 14 s, 12 s, 10 s, 8 s, 6 s, all 10-200 Hz
- Test 3 Sweep frequency range using 10 s
  - 6-200Hz, 8-200Hz, 10-200Hz, 14-200Hz
  - 8-160Hz, 8-180Hz, 8-220Hz, 8-240Hz
- Test 4 Number of sweeps using 10s, 8-220 Hz
  - 2 sweeps 180 degree phase rotated (varisweep)
  - 2 sweeps in phase
- Walkaway test
  - 500 ft, 1000 ft, 1500 ft, 2000 ft, 2500 ft






440 460

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Ш

Slide 16 of 62







## **Compilation of sweep parameter tests**

- Test 1 Uncorrelated 32 s sweep 10-200 Hz to check harmonics
- Test 2 Sweep length
  - 14 s, 12 s, 10 s, 8 s, 6 s, all 10-200 Hz
- Test 3 Sweep frequency range using 10 s
  - 6-200Hz, 8-200Hz, 14-200Hz
  - 8-160Hz, 8-180Hz, 8-220Hz, 8-240Hz
- Test 4 Number of sweeps using 10s, 8-220 Hz
  - 2 sweeps 180 degree phase rotated (varisweep)
  - 2 sweeps in phase
- Walkaway test
  - 500 ft, 1000 ft, 1500 ft, 2000 ft, 2500 ft

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 20 of 62





This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 23 of 62











Slide 29 of 62











Slide 35 of 62



## **Compilation of sweep parameter tests**

- Test 1 Uncorrelated 32 s sweep 10-200 Hz to check harmonics
- Test 2 Sweep length
  - 14 s, 12 s, 10 s, 8 s, 6 s, all 10-200 Hz
- Test 3 Sweep frequency range using 10 s
  - 6-200Hz, 8-200Hz, 14-200Hz
  - 8-160Hz, 8-180Hz, 8-220Hz, 8-240Hz
- Test 4 Number of sweeps using 10s, 8-220 Hz
  - 2 sweeps 180 degree phase rotated (varisweep)
  - 2 sweeps in phase
- Walkaway test
  - 500 ft, 1000 ft, 1500 ft, 2000 ft, 2500 ft

This presentation contains  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{P}}\xspace{-}/\ensuremath{\mathsf{GSI}}$  processing information

Slide 36 of 62





## **Compilation of sweep parameter tests**

- Test 1 Uncorrelated 32 s sweep 10-200 Hz to check harmonics
- Test 2 Sweep length
  - 14 s, 12 s, 10 s, 8 s, 6 s, all 10-200 Hz
- Test 3 Sweep frequency range using 10 s
  - 6-200Hz, 8-200Hz, 14-200Hz
  - 8-160Hz, 8-180Hz, 8-220Hz, 8-240Hz
- Test 4 Number of sweeps using 10s, 8-220 Hz
  - 2 sweeps 180 degree phase rotated (varisweep)
  - 2 sweeps in phase
- Walkaway test
  - 500 ft, 1000 ft, 1500 ft, 2000 ft, 2500 ft









### **Additional Spectra and Data**



Zero Offset shot, array deployed 0-2000 ft @ 25 ft spacing:

- Spectra of time windows out of a uncorrelated record of a 32-sec sweep:
  - Whole record: 32 sec, 10-200 Hz
  - Harmonics Analysis:
    - 0-4 s, 4-8s, 8-12 s, 12-16 s, 16-20 s, 20-24 s, 24-32 s
- Sonogram from PGS
- 8 220 Hz sweep
  - Upper half of array (0-1000 ft)
  - Lower half of array (1000-2000 ft)



### **Additional Spectra and Data**



Zero Offset shot, array deployed 0-2000 ft @ 25 ft spacing:

- Spectra of time windows out of a uncorrelated record of a 32-sec sweep:
  - Whole record: 32 sec
  - Harmonics Analysis:
    - 0-4 s, 4-8s, 8-12 s, 12-16 s, 16-20 s, 20-24 s, 24-32 s
- Sonogram from PGS
- ♦ 8 220 Hz sweep
  - Upper half of array (0-1000 ft)
  - Lower half of array (1000-2000 ft)



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 50 of 62



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 51 of 62







Slide 53 of 62





This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 55 of 62



Slide 56 of 62



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 57 of 62

## **Additional Spectra and Data**



Zero Offset shot, array deployed 0-2000 ft @ 25 ft spacing:

- Spectra of time windows out of a uncorrelated record of a 32-sec sweep:
  - Whole record: 32 sec
  - 0-4 s, 4-8s, 8-12 s, 12-16 s, 16-20 s, 20-24 s, 24-32 s

#### Sonogram from PGS

- ◆ 8 220 Hz sweep
  - Upper half of array (0-1000 ft)
  - Lower half of array (1000-2000 ft)

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 58 of 62



## **Additional Spectra and Data**



Zero Offset shot, array deployed 0-2000 ft @ 25 ft spacing:

- Spectra of time windows out of a uncorrelated record of a 32-sec sweep:
  - Whole record: 32 sec
  - 0-4 s, 4-8s, 8-12 s, 12-16 s, 16-20 s, 20-24 s, 24-32 s
- Sonogram from PGS
- ♦ 8 220 Hz sweep
  - Upper half of array (0-1000 ft)
  - Lower half of array (1000-2000 ft)

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 60 of 62



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 61 of 62





Appendix D

# **VSP** Hodogram Analysis



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 2 of 20



Hodogram Analysis for Orientation Angles

- Determine H1: show which horizontal component is H1 / H2 (definition: H1 <sup>(S)</sup> 90 degrees to the right of H2)
- Hodogram Analysis: Example Hodograms
- Hodogram analysis: Histograms of resulting orientation angles for selected pods



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 4 of 20





Hodogram Analysis for Orientation Angles

- Determine H1: show which horizontal component is H1 / H2 (definition: H1 <sup>(1)</sup> 90 degrees to the right of H2)
- Hodogram Analysis: Example Hodograms ٠
- Hodogram analysis: Histograms of resulting orientation angles for selected pods

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 6 of 20



Slide 8 of 20



Slide 9 of 20





Hodogram Analysis for Orientation Angles

- Determine H1: show which horizontal component is H1 / H2 (definition: H1 <sup>(S)</sup> 90 degrees to the right of H2)
- Hodogram Analysis: Example Hodograms
- Hodogram analysis: Histograms of resulting orientation angles for selected pods

	This presentation contains P/GSI processing information	Slide 11 of 20
		P/GSI <sup>™</sup>
Hodogram Analysis for Orientation Angles		

- The orientation of the geophone pod (azimuth w/ respect to North) was determined automatically using a maximum number of sources. The resulting orientations from each source point were first edited for outliers, then averaged over all sources.
- On the following slides, the left side shows histograms of all pod orientations as determined for each source point. A sharp gaussian distribution should be seen around the true orientation angle whereas the width of the distribution should depend linearly on the signal-to-noise ratio. Therefore the peaks should widen with depth as the signalto-noise ratio deteriorates. This is clearly visible. High noise levels also can be attributed to bad coupling due to widening of the hole (as indicated by the caliper log)
- The right hand side shows the deviations of the individual orientation angles from the mean value plotted at the respective shotpoint locations. Any strong colouring shows strong deviation from the mean. Recurring patterns would indicate biased results due to heterogeneity, interference, anisotropy etc.

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 12 of 20



Slide 14 of 20





Slide 16 of 20





Slide 18 of 20





Slide 20 of 20



Appendix E

# **Three-Component Processing**



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 2 of 8

#### **Three-Component Processing**



- For a shot point due North, the energy of the horizontal components should be moved to the N (North) component. Any remaining energy on the E (East) component is due to either bad rotation or SH energy
- Likewise, if the shot point was due East, all horizontal energy should be moved to the E component




Slide 5 of 8



### **Three-Component Processing**

- 3-Component Rotation to true XYZ:
  - Shot point due N of well
  - Shot point due E of well

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information



P/GSI **Rotated to XYZ: Shot point due East** SOURCE SIN n An N An Ann 16 (c.) 2000 (c.) -60 -200 -220 ime (ms -240 Time -280 aan ( ) ( ) Maximized energy Minimized energy No change in energy 

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 8 of 8



Appendix F

### First Break Picks



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 3 of 8



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 4 of 8



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 5 of 8



### **First Break Picks**

- Data rotated to source (downgoing P), unfiltered for near, mid and far offsets, FB picks displayed
- FB picks from near-offset shot at the beginning of survey compared to FB picks of same shot at the end of survey:
  - Note how high velocity precursors in the open-hole section diminish over time

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information





### Three-Component Wavefield Separation



The following slides show the raw (AGC'd) wavefield and the upgoing wavefield for a near, mid and far offset shotpoint. Also shown is a FK spectrum of the upgoing wavefield for the near-offset shotpoint.

This presentation contain P/GSI processing information



•Downgoing p-waves are attenuated with a dipole response in the Q1 quadrant, with total attenuation at 45° inclination from the vertical.

Downgoing s-waves are amplified with a double-dipole response in the Q1 quadrant.
Upgoing p-waves are amplified with a double-dipole response in the Q2 quadrant.
Upgoing s-waves are attenuated with a dipole response in the Q2 quadrant.



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information



This presentation contain P/GSI processing information

Slide 5 of 6





Appendix H

### **VSP Statics**

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 1 of 12



### Shot statics

Shot statics are designed to correct local traveltime undulations caused in the near surface which are unique to one shot location or a small patch of shots. It is therefore necessary to retain the short (spatial) wavelength component of the raw shot statics. Longer wavelength components are due to other causes, e.g., topography, lateral heterogeneity, anisotropy, etc., and these corrections should not be included in the shot statics.

The empirical part of computing the shot statics is to attenuate the longer wavelength components in the raw statics by smoothing the raw statics and subtracting them from the original to obtain a low-cut filtered residual which is the shot static correction.

The shot statics calculation is partially model based and partially empirical: The model based part is to raytrace the direct arrival times from all sources into all receivers. The first break picks are then subtracted from the computed arrival times. These traveltime differences are converted into surface consistent shot point statics by averaging over the lower 40 receiver levels for each shot.

The results are raw, or full bandwidth, shot statics. A variety of phenomena contribute to the traveltime differences over all (spatial) wavelengths. If the velocity model was exact then the full bandwidth statics could be applied without further modification.

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

### Shot statics



### • Plots shown in the following:

 Topography: Shot statics should not mimic topographic features, since the topography is implicitly taken into account during a prestack depth migration.

- Raw Difference between first-break picks and forward-computed firstbreak times: this plot shows
  - 1. the overall correctness of the (1D) velocity model
  - 2. The ring of positive residuals at the perimeter is a clear indication of TIV anisotropy. For now, we might get away with an isotropic model if we skip the outer 3 rings of data (where the picks are less accurate anyway due to higher S/N ratio)
- Final Shot static values: The raw FB residuals are substracted from the smoothed values to yield the final (short-wavelength) shot statics. A smoothing length of 1000 ft was used. Most static values are within +/- 1 ms, exept the outer three rings
- Receiver gathers for certain azimuths for QC purposes before and after application of the statics



Use the average of several travel time differences between ray traced and picked first breaks, common to each shot, into a group of (n) lower receiver levels.

FBdiff =  $1/n \bullet \Sigma$ (Fbcomputed – Fbpicked)

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 4 of 12











Appendix I

### Deconvolution

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 1 of 11

# Deconvolution and spectral bandwidth Two alternative methods of deconvolution are shown for sample shotgathers at near/mid/far offsets: Predictive Deconvolution (Wiener/Levinson) 60-ms operator length 11-ms prediction distance Trailing Butterworth bandpass filter (15-4-180-20) Three trailing notch filters at 30, 40 and 60 Hz Source-signature deconvolution (zero-phase wavelet inversion) Leading Butterworth Bandpass filter (60-8-180-24) Filter generation based on downgoing wavefield

- 500-ms operator length
- Trailing Butterworth bandpass filter (65-6-150-6)
- Trailing notch filters at 30, 40, 60, 120 and 180 Hz

Source-signature deconvolution was chosen for the Hot Ice VSP

The following slides show shot gathers aligned on first breaks and average amplitude spectra over the time window shown.

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 3 of 11





This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 5 of 11





This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 7 of 11





This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 9 of 11



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 10 of 11



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 11 of 11



Appendix J

### **Amplitude Recovery**



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information



Slide 3 of 10



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 4 of 10



Slide 6 of 10

-950

950









Slide 8 of 10



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 9 of 10



This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 10 of 10



Appendix K

### **3D Velocities**

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 1 of 12



### **Prestack Depth Migration**

- Zero-Offset single velocity function migration with planar approximations of reflectors
- Cube of planar approximations to constrain velocity distributions
- 3D velocity model
- Images of 3D migrated data
- Common incidence angle (CIA) gathers

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information



### Horizon picked at 2800 ft depth

This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 4 of 12





This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 7 of 12





This presentation contains P/GSI processing information

Slide 10 of 12







6		<sup>1</sup> ,										
190	2000	210	220	230								
				12000 Migrated	1D Velocity Model							
				8000 (ft/sec)								
				800 Migrated 1D	2WT Model							
				400 (ms)								
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~				2.5 Density								
				1.5 (gm/cc)								
NM	Ma Jamba Aus	mune and have	m - monthe	150 Gamma Rav								
- how we way we				100 (API) 50								
				12000 10000 Sonic Vel	ocity							
in provident	ternanter	who make the		8000 (ft/sec)	oony							
8	8	8	8	2								
-19(	-200	-21(	-22(	-23(		e.	Moc					
		500				I Moc						
					locity /	0 2WT	V CI					
				(sm)	ic Ve ec) 1a Ray	(y c) ted II		(sm)				(oral)
				(ff) Time	Son Gamn API)	Densit gm/o	Mig (ft/s	(ff)	Corridor Stack	synthetic +	synthetic -	(H)
00	00	00	00	000 Jepth ( -Way		2 I 2 0 0		-Way		Syndictic	Synanouc	)epth (
-12	-20	-21	-3		8855 258	0 5 5 7			-0.0400000	-26460680	-264600	
				100-				- 100				100-
				200-		24		-200				200-
				200		J.		200				200
				300 400-		- All						300- 400-
				500-100		The second		100-500				500-1
				600-		MAN MAN		- 600				600
				700-		howard		- 700	TATATATA			700
				800-	MAL	And here		- 200	1111111			800-
				000	The second	-			<b>WEEKE</b>			000
				900		R		200-				900-
				1000-				- 1000				1000-2
				1100-		1		- 1100				1100-
					- Jun	adjon-			******			
				1200-	NV N	-		- 1200	*******			1200-
				1300-	and a second	and s		- 1300		******		1300-
				1400-				- 1400			******	1400-
				1400	and the second					*****		1400
				1500-	and the second			1500	- \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	******	<b></b>	1500
				1600-		Ţ.		- 1600	********	11111111		1600-
				1700 - 100	and the second s	2		400- 4-00		11111111	******	4=00 -4
				1700- 400	MW	K.		400 - 1700			4444444	1700 4
				1800-	March 1			- 1800			*****	1800-
				1900-	A.A.	Y-C		- 1900	-			1900-
				2000	and the second	5		- 2000				2000
}}}	3			2000	ary taken			500-				2000
				2100-	8	3		2100			****	2100-5
£13	$\mathcal{M}$			2200-	and the second	down your		-2200	<u>}}}}</u>			2200-
<b>{{}}</b>	351			2300-	And And	- MAR		-2300		****	*****	2300-
<u>}}</u> }		1111		0.400								2400
114	<b>.</b>	1111		2400				600-2400				2400
	1	1111	{ <b>{</b> {	2500-				2500				2500-0
111		444	{ <b>[5</b> ]	2600-				-2600	{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{{}}}}			2600-
$\{ \{ \} \}$	335			2700-				2700				2700-
<b>{</b> {}}}	311		<b>8</b> 53	2800-				- 2000				2000-
<u>}}</u> }	334	6445	<u>{}</u>	-700				700-	55555555			2000
<u>}</u> }}	311		<u>}</u>	2900-				-2900				2900-
<b>855</b>				3000-				- 3000	*****			3000-
111			444	3100-				-3100				3100-
	311		555	3200-				- 3200	11111111			3200-
				- 200				800-				-0
<b>,</b> ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		3331		3300				-3300				3300 8
1111				3400-				-3400				3400-
		[{}}		3500-				-3500				3500-
14				3600-				- 3600	1111111111			3600-
[[]]				3700				3700				3700-0
133				2000-				2000				2000-9
				3800				3800	111111			5800
133				3900-				-3900				3900-
31			88 S S -	4000-				-4000				4000-
	<u>}}</u>	[]]}	<u>}}</u> }	4100-				4100				4100
				-1000				1000				-1





showing correlation between VSP and log data

# Hot Ice 1 Hydrate Well

Appendix M

## **VSP** Interpretation



Slide 2 of 13

Slide 1 of 13



Slide 4 of 13






Well log colorfill: Left: Vshale < 50% Right: Porosity > 15%

Slide 8 of 13

125.00

150.00

296.60

225.08

250.00

175.00

3D VSP Seismic Volume with Geologic Marker



Slide 9 of 13



Slide 10 of 13



## Amplitudes on Geologic Marker at Top of Sand A



Slide 13 of 13