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Abstract  Injection into the subsurface is carried out by industry for a variety of reasons, for example, storing wastewater, enhanced oil recovery, and hydraulic fracture stimulation. By increasing subsurface pressures, injection can trigger felt seismicity (i.e., sufficient magnitude to be felt at the surface) on pre-existing faults. As the number of cases of felt seismicity associated with hydraulic fracturing (HF) has increased, strategies for mitigating induced seismicity are required. However, most hydraulic stimulation activities do not induce felt seismicity. Therefore, a mitigation strategy is required that is capable of differentiating the normal case from abnormal cases that trigger larger events. In this article, we test the ability of statistical methods to estimate the largest event size during stimulation, applying these approaches to two datasets collected during hydraulic stimulation in the Horn River Shale, British Columbia, where HF was observed to reactivate faults. We apply these methods in a prospective manner, using the microseismicity recorded during the early phases of a stimulation stage to make forecasts about what will happen as the stage continues. We do so to put ourselves in the shoes of an operator or regulator, where decisions must be taken based on data as it is acquired, rather than a post hoc analysis once a stimulation stage has been completed. We find that the proposed methods can provide a reasonable forecast of the largest event to occur during each stage. This means that these methods can be used as the basis of a mitigation strategy for induced seismicity.

Electronic Supplement: Simulated $M_{\text{MAX}}$ values for each injection stage.

Introduction

Hydraulic Fracturing-Induced Seismicity

Any human activity that alters the stress state in the Earth’s crust has the potential to induce seismic activity. Induced seismicity has been associated with mining (e.g., Li et al., 2007), impounding reservoirs (e.g., Gupta, 1985), conventional oil and gas extraction (e.g., Segall, 1989), and subsurface fluid injection, whether for hydraulic fracturing (HF; e.g., Bao and Eaton, 2016), disposal of waste fluids (e.g., Keranen et al., 2013), carbon capture and storage (e.g., Stork et al., 2015), or geothermal energy (e.g., Häring et al., 2008).

It has been conclusively demonstrated that injecting fluids into the subsurface can trigger seismicity, where increased pore-fluid pressures lead to the activation of critically stressed faults (e.g., Raleigh et al., 1976). However, it should be noted that the overwhelming majority of such operations are not thought to cause earthquakes. Nevertheless, as the above practices have increased in scale and become more widespread, the issue of injection-induced seismicity has grown in significance.

Although much of the recent focus has been on wastewater disposal, several cases of HF-induced seismicity (HF-IS) have been identified (e.g., B.C. Oil and Gas Commission 2012, 2014; Clarke et al., 2014; Darold et al., 2014; Friberg et al., 2014; Schultz, Mei, et al., 2015; Schultz, Stern, et al., 2015; Skoumal et al., 2015; Atkinson et al., 2016; Bao and Eaton, 2016; Wang et al., 2016). It is vital that our understanding of HF-IS improves such that industrial operators are capable of mitigating against triggering seismic activity. However, for many of these case examples monitoring arrays were not deployed until after large events had occurred, or available monitoring arrays consisted solely of regional networks, where the nearest station may have been many kilometers from the site. This means that there is often little useful data that can be used to study the processes that happened in the lead-up to these events, and thereby which mitigation steps might have been possible.

The number of cases of HF-IS is very small when compared with the overall number of wells that have been hydraulically stimulated. As such, any mitigation scheme should be capable of quickly differentiating the normal case,
where HF does not cause fault reactivation leading to larger events, from the abnormal case where large events may be triggered, and therefore where mitigating strategies such as reducing injection volumes or ceasing injection altogether may be necessary.

Mitigation of HF-IS

At present, where regulations pertaining to HF-IS have been applied, they take the form of traffic-light schemes (TLSs), whereby operators take actions based on the magnitude of events induced during operations. These schemes have the advantage of being relatively simple to administer and can be understood by the public. However, they are somewhat reactive in their nature (as opposed to proactive): an operational response is required, such as reducing or stopping injection, only after an event of a given size has occurred.

The purpose of this article is not to argue against the use of TLSs, which can play a useful role in the regulation of HF-IS. However, it is our view that, in addition to complying with TLS regulations, operators should seek to mitigate induced seismicity in a more proactive manner. If nothing else, operators will wish to ensure that they remain within the specified TLS thresholds during their operations because reaching “red lights” entails the imposition of operational constraints, and may also affect operator reputation and confidence with the public.

To take a proactive approach to HF-IS, operators must develop the capacity to model their activities, allowing them to make forecasts about the HF-IS that may occur as their operations continue. In the broadest sense, two types of modeling approaches are available: physical and statistical. Physical models aim to simulate the processes that occur during hydraulic stimulation, usually using numerical methods such as finite elements (e.g., Maxwell et al., 2015), discrete elements (e.g., Yoon et al., 2014), rate and state approaches based on modeled stress changes (e.g., Hakimheshemi et al., 2014), or by resolving modeled stress changes onto pre-existing fault and fracture networks (e.g., Verdon et al., 2015). However, such models often require extensive site characterization to identify and characterize both nearby faults and the local stress state. Such models also come with a significant number of free parameters that must be tuned to provide a reasonable representation of reality. As such they are better suited for understanding the physical processes that have occurred at a site a posteriori. For HF operators who might be required to manage induced seismicity in real time at a significant number of active well sites, simple models with a relatively small number of free parameters are required. In this respect, statistical models become more favorable.

Statistical approaches seek to characterize the observed seismic event population via a statistical model, usually the Gutenberg and Richter (1944) (hereafter, G-R) distribution. Such a model can then be extrapolated to estimate the event population that is expected to have occurred by the end of the injection period. Several such models have been proposed (e.g., Shapiro et al., 2010; Hallo et al., 2014; McGarr, 2014; van der Elst et al., 2016).

These models are similar in their underlying assumptions: event magnitudes can be characterized by the G-R distribution, and the rate of seismicity is linked in some way to the injection volume. This relationship is then extrapolated based on recorded seismicity during the early stages of injection to estimate what the resulting event population would be once the total volume has been injected. From this estimated population, the largest event size can be forecasted. These models have the advantage that they require only a few parameters, which can be measured as operations progress. This makes them better suited for the task of providing a priori mitigation of induced seismicity.

Although these models have been tested at several sites (e.g., Hallo et al., 2014; Hajati et al., 2015), the crucial aspect investigated in this article is that we seek to apply these methods in a prospective manner (e.g., Langenbruch and Zoback, 2016). We do not apply these models using the overall event population that has been acquired during hydraulic stimulation in a post hoc manner. Instead, we put ourselves into the shoes of an operator or regulator, where forecasts must be made using only the data that has been acquired prior to a given point in time. Evidently, the underlying assumption for these methods is that the parameters used to characterize the seismicity as a function of injection volume remain unchanged during a given operation.

We apply these methods to two datasets collected during hydraulic stimulation in the Horn River Shale. These multiwell multistage sites were monitored using downhole microseismic arrays, producing very high-quality datasets. These datasets are described in the Datasets section, after which we describe the methods of Shapiro et al. (2010) and Hallo et al. (2014) in greater detail and apply them to the datasets.

Datasets

In our case example, we examine microseismic datasets from two multiwell multistage HF treatments conducted in the Horn River Shale formation in British Columbia, Canada. The pads from which the two sets of wells were drilled are ~7 km apart from each other. In the following, we refer to the two datasets as HR1, which was completed in 2011, and HR2, which was completed in 2013. These datasets were provided by the operating company; they are proprietary and cannot be released to the public.

HR1 Microseismic Data

A total of nine horizontal wells were drilled from the HR1 pad. A total of 146 stages were stimulated, with between 15 and 18 stages per well. Microseismic data were recorded by arrays of up to 100 three-component geophones placed in boreholes adjacent to those being stimulated (in both the vertical and horizontal sections of the wells). The
positions of the geophones were varied as stimulation progressed along the wells, in at least 21 configurations.

Data were provided from 76 of the stages, consisting of a total of 140,100 events. These were the stages closest to the heels of the wells, where they are in closest proximity to the monitoring array (and therefore are expected to provide the best-quality data). A map and cross section of the HR1 events are shown in Figure 1. Event magnitudes were calculated by fitting an idealized source model to the event displacement spectra to determine the seismic moment (e.g., Stork et al., 2014). Throughout this article, when referring to magnitude our implication is moment magnitude $M_w$. In both cases, this processing of the data was performed by a service provider, ESG Solutions.

HR2 Microseismic Data

A total of 10 wells were drilled from the HR2 pad. 237 stages were stimulated, with between 23 and 24 stages per well. Microseismic data were recorded by an array of 96 three-component geophones placed in three adjacent boreholes. Data were provided from 119 stages, consisting of 92,700 events. As with the HR1 pad, data were provided for the stages nearest to the heels of the wells, where they are in closest proximity to the monitoring array (and therefore are expected to provide the best-quality data). A map and cross section of the HR2 events are shown in Figure 2.

In both case studies, examination of event locations reveals evidence for the interaction between HF and faults in the form of planar features extending downward into the underlying Keg River limestone formation. At HR1, the largest event has a magnitude $M_w 1.3$, whereas at HR2 the largest event has a magnitude $M_w 0.5$. In both cases, these magnitudes are larger than what is typically observed when hydraulic fractures propagate through shale gas reservoirs, where magnitudes are generally less than 0 (e.g., Maxwell et al., 2010).

Using Event Population Statistics to Forecast the Largest Event Size

We refer to $M_{MAX}^O$ as the largest magnitude event observed during a particular stage, and $M_{MAX}^M$ as the expected largest magnitude as estimated by a modeling strategy. Ideally, modeling strategies should aim to produce conservative estimates of $M_{MAX}^M$, such that $M_{MAX}^O \leq M_{MAX}^M$. Here, we examine the abilities of two published methods, Shapiro et al. (2010) and Hallo et al. (2014), to forecast $M_{MAX}^M$ during hydraulic stimulation.

Seismogenic Index (Shapiro et al., 2010)

Shapiro et al. (2010) define the seismogenic index $S_T$ as

$$S_T = \log_{10} \left( \frac{N_t(M)}{V_t} \right) + bM,$$

in which $N_t(M)$ is the number of events that have occurred at time $t$ that are larger than a given magnitude $M$, $b$ is the G-R

Figure 1. (a) Map and (b) cross-section views of microseismic events recorded during hydraulic fracturing (HF) at HR1. Events are shaded by the number of the stage with which they are associated. The black lines mark the horizontal wells. The color version of this figure is available only in the electronic edition.
To provide a mitigation strategy, we are interested in establishing an upper bound for $M_{\text{MAX}}$, that is to establish what size of earthquake will not occur (or is unlikely to occur). Therefore, for the entirety of this study we consider the upper bound of the distribution described by Shapiro et al. (2010), setting $\chi = 0.95$.

Seismic Efficiency (Hallo et al., 2014)

McGarr (2014) proposed that the cumulative seismic moment released during injection $\Sigma M_0$ is determined by the total cumulative volume of fluid injected

$$\Sigma M_0 = 2\mu V_T,$$  
(4)

in which $\mu$ is the rock shear modulus. However, this equation can be considered as a worst-case scenario, where all the strain induced by a volume change is released as seismic energy. In reality, much of the deformation induced by injection will be released aseismically. Hallo et al. (2014) therefore define a seismic efficiency ratio $S_{\text{EFF}}$, which describes the ratio of observed cumulative moment release to the theoretical maximum given by $\mu V_T$. Equation (3) is thereby modified to

$$\Sigma M_0 = S_{\text{EFF}}\mu V_T,$$  
(5)

in which $S_{\text{EFF}}$ can be estimated at a given time from the cumulative moment release and the cumulative injected volume up until this time.

For a given cumulative seismic moment release, size of the largest event will be determined by the $b$-value. Hallo et al. (2014) show that $\Sigma M_0$ can be related to the $b$-value, the largest event detected $M_{\text{MAX}}$, and the minimum magnitude of completeness $M_{\text{MIN}}$:

$$\Sigma M_0 = \frac{b \times 10^9}{1.5 - b} \left(10^{(M_{\text{MAX}}(1.5 - b))} - 10^{(M_{\text{MIN}}(1.5 - b))}\right),$$  
(6)

in which

$$a = b M_{\text{MAX}}^b - \log(10^{0.6} - 10^{-b \delta}),$$  
(7)

and $\delta$ is the probabilistic half-bin size defined around $M_{\text{MAX}}$, as described by Hallo et al. (2014). Based on equation (5), we can determine the total expected $\Sigma M_0$ based on the observed seismic efficiency $S_{\text{EFF}}$ and the planned total injection volume $V_T$. Once we have estimated $\Sigma M_0$, we invert equa-

$M_{\text{MAX}}^b = \left(S_T - \log\left(-\frac{\ln(\chi)}{V_T}\right)\right)/b.$  
(3)
a value based on equations (6) and (7) that also take into account uncertainties inherent in the approach.

To do this, we consider synthetic, stochastically generated event populations. By randomly sampling from a G-R distribution, we generate event populations with a given $b$-value and $\Sigma M_0$ chosen randomly from $0.8 < b < 3.5$ and $9 < \log_{10} \Sigma M_0 < 14$. We then compare the largest sampled event (which we refer to as the synthetic $M_{\text{MAX}}^O$) with the forecast from the given $b$ and $\Sigma M_0$ values using equations (6) and (7) (the forecast $M_{\text{MAX}}^F$). Our results for 1000 such realizations are shown in Figure 3. We find that for 98% of model realizations, the forecast value of $M_{\text{MAX}}^F$ is within 0.5 magnitude units of the synthetic $M_{\text{MAX}}^O$. Because we are primarily concerned with setting a conservative envelope that is not exceeded, in the Results section we take as $M_{\text{MAX}}^F$ the value computed using the Hallo et al. (2014) method (equations 6 and 7) +0.5.

There is currently some debate as to whether there really is a link between injection volume and the rate and/or size of induced earthquakes (e.g., Atkinson et al., 2016; van der Elst et al., 2016). This debate stems from fundamental questions as to the nature of rupture mechanics during induced seismicity. Gischig (2015) describes two end members for rupture behavior. In the first case, rupture may initiate within the zone of increased pressure, but uncontrolled rupture can continue along faults outside of this zone, releasing tectonically accumulated strain energy. Event size will be therefore determined by tectonic factors such as fault dimensions and in situ stress conditions. In the second case, the rupture is spatially limited to the zone of increased pore pressure, in which case the injection volume places an a priori deterministic limit on the maximum event size.

The second case, where the injection volume places a deterministic limit on event size, is often characterized by the McGarr (2014) limit (equation 4). However, observations of events that appear to breach this limit (e.g., Atkinson et al., 2016) indicate that, at least in certain cases, the first of the Gischig (2015) end members applies. Therefore, an a priori deterministic limit on event size cannot be assumed based on injection volume.

However, in our approach there is no requirement that $S_{\text{EFF}} \leq 1$, and therefore there is no a priori deterministic limit to event size. If $S_{\text{EFF}} > 1$, this indicates that the cumulative moment released is larger than the strain energy introduced by injection, and therefore the tectonically accumulated strain energy is also being released. Equation (5) requires simply that there is proportionality between $V_T$ and $\Sigma M_0$, in which $S_{\text{EFF}}$ is to be determined by observation for a given site. Van der Elst et al. (2016) examined a range of case studies to investigate whether the number of earthquakes induced during injection is proportional to injection volume, and found strong evidence that this was indeed the case, with the implication that the event nucleation rate is controlled by the injection volume. If $b$-values are constant, then this implies that the cumulative moment release will also be proportional to injection volume.
Application to Microseismic Data

To compute $b$-values, we use the maximum-likelihood approach described by Aki (1965). To estimate $M_{\text{MIN}}$, we follow the method described by Clauset et al. (2009) to assess the quality of fit between the observed EMD and the G-R relationship using a Kolmogorov–Smirnov test, choosing as $M_{\text{MIN}}$ the smallest magnitude at which the null hypothesis (that the observed distribution can be modeled by the G-R relationship) is not rejected at a 10% significance level. Fitting a G-R relationship to an observed EMD can be unreliable for low event numbers. Therefore, we require a minimum of 50 events with magnitudes larger than $M_{\text{MIN}}$ for a reliable measurement. This means that our approach will only provide an estimate for $M_{\text{MAX}}$ once sufficient microseismic events have occurred.

Figure 4 shows an example of how we apply these methods to the microseismic datasets. Plots for every stage are available in the electronic supplement to this article. We proceed at intervals of 120 s. After each interval has elapsed, we recalculate the $b$, $S_{\text{EFF}}$, and $S_T$ parameters based on the total volume injected and the events recorded up until this time. We then use equations (3), (6), and (7) to estimate, using the Shapiro et al. (2010) and Hallo et al. (2014) methods, the expected value of $M_{\text{MAX}}$ given the injection volume that is planned to take place during the next 120 s interval.

In the lower panel of Figure 4, we plot the measured values of $b$, $S_{\text{EFF}}$, and $S_T$ with time. In the upper panel of Figure 4, we compare the resulting forecasts of $M_{\text{MAX}}$ with observed event magnitudes. We note that in the example shown in Figure 4, the forecasted largest event size stabilizes at a value of approximately $M_{\text{MAX}} = 0.2$ within 40 min of the start of injection. This is slightly larger than the largest observed event, which has a magnitude of $M_{\text{MAX}} = 0.0$ and occurs 140 min after the start of injection.

In the Results section, we compare $M_{\text{MAX}}$ with the value of $M_{\text{MAX}}$ at the time that the largest event occurred. We also compare $M_{\text{MIN}}$ with $M_{\text{MAX}}$ at a time 60 min and then 30 min before the largest event occurred. We do this to identify the capacity of such methods to provide an opportunity for mitigation by giving an operator sufficient warning to alter (or cease) their stimulation program.

Before considering the results of our method as applied to all stages of both datasets, we note several features from Figure 4. First, we note the similarity between the two curves for $S_T$ and $\log_{10}(S_{\text{EFF}})$. This is to be expected given how the two parameters are defined. If $M_{\text{MIN}}$ is used as the "M" term in equation (3), then the difference $S_T - \log_{10}(S_{\text{EFF}})$ will be given by

$$S_T - \log_{10}(S_{\text{EFF}}) = \log(N_t(M_{\text{MIN}})/V_t) + bM_{\text{MIN}} - \log(\Sigma M_0/\mu V_t). \quad (8)$$

Rearranging this equation and substituting $\Sigma M_0 = N_t < M_0>$, in which $< M_0 >$ is the mean moment release per event, we get

$$S_T - \log_{10}(S_{\text{EFF}}) = bM_{\text{MIN}} - \log(M_0/\mu). \quad (9)$$

In the case studies presented here, $M_{\text{MIN}}$ is typically approximately $-1.5$, $b$ is typically 2, $< M_0 >$ is typically of the order $10^7$ N·m (equivalent to a magnitude of approximately $-1$) and we approximate the shear modulus as $\mu = 20 \times 10^6$ Pa. Hence the similarity in values between $S_T$ and $\log_{10}(S_{\text{EFF}})$. We also note that the values of $M_{\text{MAX}}$ computed by the two methods are similar. This gives us confidence that both independent methods provide similar results.

Results

Before showing the results using the two methods described above, in Figure 5 we compare the observed values for $M_{\text{MAX}}$ for each stage with the values of $M_{\text{MAX}}$ forecast using the McGarr (2014) equation $M_{\text{MAX}} = \mu V_T$. We do this primarily to demonstrate that there does not appear to be any correlation between the observed $M_{\text{MAX}}$ of each stage and the volume injected at the time of occurrence of each event. We also note that the observed magnitudes are far smaller than those estimated by the McGarr (2014) equation.
In Figure 6, we compare the observed and forecasted $M_{\text{MAX}}$ values using the Hallo et al. (2014) method. As per Figure 4, we compare the forecasted $M_{\text{MAX}}$ values at the time that the largest event occurred, but also compare the forecasted $M_{\text{MAX}}$ values 30 and 60 min before the occurrence of the largest event. In Figure 7, we do the same for the Shapiro et al. (2010) method.

We note several features from these results. First, as required, in general, $M^M_{\text{MAX}} \geq M^O_{\text{MAX}}$ for almost every stage. Not only this, but stages that produced smaller events have smaller values of $M^M_{\text{MAX}}$, i.e., there is clear correlation between $M^M_{\text{MAX}}$ and $M^O_{\text{MAX}}$. This is encouraging, as it implies that these methods do have some forecasting power, unlike the results provided by the McGarr (2014) approach shown in Figure 5. This correlation is present even for the $T−60$ min measurements, implying that these methods are capable of identifying stages that may induce larger events a significant period of time before such events occur.

There is only one stage, at HR2, where both the Shapiro et al. (2010) and Hallo et al. (2014) methods significantly underestimate $M^O_{\text{MAX}}$. We note that this stage had only 131 events in total, making it one of the smallest stages in terms of the number of events. The robustness of statistical techniques such as these will be dependent on the number of events sampled, so it is perhaps unsurprising that stages with fewer events might produce less reliable results.

**Discussion**

**Do Seismicity Parameters Vary during Injection Stages?**

The models we use to forecast $M^M_{\text{MAX}}$ are entirely statistical and do not incorporate any geological information.

![Figure 5. Comparison between the observed $M^O_{\text{MAX}}$ for every stage of both datasets, and that estimated using the McGarr (2014) equation, in which $M^M_{\text{MAX}}$ is directly determined by the injected volume. Symbols are shaded by log$_{10}(N)$, in which $N$ is the total number of events per stage. The dashed line indicates a 1:1 ratio.](image-url)

![Figure 6. Comparison between the observed $M^O_{\text{MAX}}$ for every stage of both datasets, and that estimated using the Hallo et al. (2014) approach. The upper panels show crossplots of observed and modeled $M^M_{\text{MAX}}$ values, whereas the lower panels show histograms of $M^M_{\text{MAX}} − M^O_{\text{MAX}}$. For each case, we show the values of $M^M_{\text{MAX}}$ at the time that the largest event occurred, and at 30 and 60 min prior to this time. The symbols are shaded by log$_{10}(N)$, in which $N$ is the total number of events per stage. The dashed lines in the upper panels represent $M^O_{\text{MAX}} = M^M_{\text{MAX}}$. Note that for a handful of stages, robust estimates are only obtained within 30 or 60 min of the largest event. In such cases, no $M^M_{\text{MAX}}$ value is returned at the $T−30$ or $T−60$ cases, and so there are slightly fewer points plotted for these cases.](image-url)
The major advantage of these statistical approaches is that they are relatively simple to use (requiring only that the volume injected, and the number and magnitude of seismic events, can be measured). The principal assumption that underpins this type of approach is that both $b$, $S_{EFF}$, and/or $S_f$ will remain consistent throughout the injection period. It is by no means clear that this will always be the case.

These parameters might be affected by a range of factors; including, the in situ stress conditions, the lithology of the rock through which hydraulic fractures are propagating, and the presence of pre-existing fracture networks and/or faults. Generally speaking, the volume of rock influenced by injection increases as the pressure front moves out from the injection well. Therefore, the pressure pulse induced by injection may begin to act on different layers and/or structures as injection continues. It is easy to imagine scenarios where a growing hydraulic fracture intersects with a pre-existing fault, or propagates into an underlying or overlying layer that is more seismogenic, resulting in a change in the rate of seismicity and/or $b$-value.

The key question then becomes whether such changes are rapid, or whether there will be a more gradual evolution. If the seismicity changes suddenly, then larger events may occur that cannot be anticipated based on the preceding microseismicity. It would therefore be very difficult for an operator to mitigate induced seismicity, as larger events would occur “out of the blue.” In contrast, if such changes occur relatively gradually then an operator may be able to identify an increase in the seismicity rate, or a decrease in the G-R $b$-value, that would indicate an increasing probability of the occurrence of a larger event. If closely monitored, this might allow an operator to take appropriate mitigating action (reducing pumping rates and/or pressures, or indeed ceasing to pump altogether).

Incidentally, this assumption is also implicit in existing schemes that are used to mitigate induced seismicity such as TLSs, although this assumption is rarely stated explicitly. If large events are triggered immediately when an HF intersects a fault, then TLSs will be ineffective, because an event that is much larger than the red-light threshold could occur without any prior TLS-based mitigation actions having been taken. In contrast, if there is a more gradual buildup of seismicity upon intersection between a hydraulic fracture and a fault, then the amber and red lights will progressively be triggered, and the appropriate mitigation steps taken.

We note that both Dinske and Shapiro (2013) and van der Elst et al. (2016) observed remarkably constant values of $S_f$ during fluid injection, across a wide variety of settings including HF, stimulation of geothermal reservoirs, and during wastewater disposal. There are also sound physical reasons to expect a gradual increase in seismic magnitudes as a hydraulic fracture impinges on a fault, as opposed to a sudden jump. When a fracture first meets a fault, both the area of the fault is affected and the volume of fluid injected into the fault will be small. As such, we might expect the initial events to be smaller. As injection continues, the area of the fault affected will increase, as will the volume of fluid injected into it, which would be expected to increase the event magnitudes as injection continues.

This assumption is borne out in the results we present here, most notably in the fact that the forecast $M_{MAX}^O$ values tend to anticipate the observed largest events by at least 60 min (Figs. 6 and 7). It is also apparent when the evolution
of these parameters is examined in detail during each stimulation stage (see electronic supplement). The implication is that large induced events do not occur “out of the blue,” but are accompanied by a buildup in seismicity as the stimulation impinges on a pre-existing fault.

Strategy for Mitigation of Induced Seismicity

Based on the above results, we suggest the following strategy for the mitigation of induced seismicity. Prior to the start of operations, an acceptable threshold for $M_{\text{MAX}}^M$ is set, based on the vulnerability of nearby populations, buildings and infrastructure to seismic activity, and the expected ground motion that would be caused by events of a given size.

In this case, we arbitrarily set our thresholds as $M_{\text{MAX}}^M > 1$. Given the relative lack of buildings, local populations, or infrastructure near to this site, this is a relatively conservative threshold, but nevertheless affords a clear demonstration of the approach. Because the results for the Hallo et al. (2014) method show a tighter correlation between $M_{\text{MAX}}^M$ and $M_{\text{MAX}}^O$ (compare to Figs. 6 and 7), we use this approach as our preferred method to compute $M_{\text{MAX}}^M$. If $M_{\text{MAX}}^M$ exceeds this threshold during a stage, then mitigating actions should be taken. In this case, we suggest that the mitigating action would be to cease injection and move on to the next stage.

Based on our results, we divide the stages into three categories: stages where the $M_{\text{MAX}}^M > 1$ threshold is never reached and therefore no mitigation action is indicated (Fig. 8a,b); stages where the $M_{\text{MAX}}^M > 1$ threshold is reached only after the occurrence of the largest observed event (Fig. 8c,d); and stages where the $M_{\text{MAX}}^M > 1$ threshold is reached before the occurrence of the largest event (Fig. 8e,f).

The first category of stages, where the $M_{\text{MAX}}^M > 1$ threshold was not exceeded at any time, is represented in Figure 8a. An example of such a stage is shown in Figure 8b: 159 out of 195 total stages (82%) fall into this category, the largest event to occur in a stage where the $M_{\text{MAX}}^M > 1$ threshold was not reached had a magnitude $M_w$ 0.4.

The second category of stages is where the $M_{\text{MAX}}^M > 1$ threshold was exceeded but only after the occurrence of the largest event (Fig. 8c). An example of such a stage is shown in Figure 8d: in this stage the largest event, which has a magnitude of $M_{\text{MAX}}^O = 0.58$, occurs after ~1 hr. The $M_{\text{MAX}}^M > 1$ threshold is reached after 2 hrs of injection. Because the threshold is reached after the occurrence of the largest event, any mitigation steps that might have been taken would not affect the size of the largest event to occur during these stages. A total of 16 stages (8%) fall into this category, and $M_{\text{MAX}}^O$ for each of these stages is depicted in Figure 8c. The largest magnitude event to occur during these stages had a magnitude $M_w$ 0.88.

The third category of stages is where the $M_{\text{MAX}}^M > 1$ threshold was exceeded prior to the occurrence of the largest event. An example of such a stage is shown in Figure 8f: in this stage, the $M_{\text{MAX}}^M > 1$ threshold is reached after ~1 hr of injection. This is over 2.5 hrs before the occurrence of the largest event, which had a magnitude of $M_{\text{MAX}}^O = 1.24$. In other words, the potential for an $M_w > 1$ event is identifiable at a relatively early point during the stage, and it is therefore possible that actions could have been taken that might have mitigated the occurrence of this event. A total of 20 stages (10%) fall into this third category, where the $M_{\text{MAX}}^M > 1$ threshold was reached prior to the occurrence of the largest event. These stages are depicted in Figure 8e, in which the squares indicate the size of the largest event to occur prior to reaching the $M_{\text{MAX}}^M > 1$ threshold, whereas triangles indicate the eventual largest event to occur. Within this category of stages, three had events with magnitudes larger than $M_w 1$. However, the largest event to occur before reaching the $M_{\text{MAX}}^M > 1$ threshold had a magnitude $M_w 0.65$.

Overall, we note that for all the stages where the largest event was smaller than $M_{\text{MAX}}^O < 0$, no mitigation actions were indicated. For some stages $0 < M_w < 1$ mitigation actions were indicated, whereas in others they were not. For all the stages where the largest event exceeded $M_{\text{MAX}}^O > 1$, mitigation actions were always indicated prior to the occurrence of these events. The result is that for our mitigated population there are no stages where the largest event exceeds $M_w > 1$.

Mitigating Actions and Postinjection Seismicity

The major caveat that applied to the results described above is the assumption that ceasing injection can prevent the subsequent larger events from happening. In reality, injection was not stopped, and so we cannot know whether cessation of injection during a stage would actually have mitigated the larger events that occurred later in the stage. In other cases of induced seismicity, events have continued with increasing magnitudes even after injection had ceased (e.g., Häring et al., 2008). It is certainly possible that this would have been the case at this site. Therefore, it is not possible to definitively conclude that, even if mitigation steps had been taken, further seismicity would not have occurred. Nevertheless, we believe that it is important that operators develop scientific criteria to guide operational decisions with respect to mitigating induced seismicity, and that the results presented here clearly indicate that the methods described in this article do provide such a basis.

Conclusions

We have presented case studies from two sites where microseismic monitoring has imaged pre-existing faults being activated during HF. We investigate the use of two statistical methods found in the literature (Shapiro et al., 2010; Hallo et al., 2014) to forecast the largest event size that might be
Figure 8. Testing the ability of the proposed approach to mitigate induced seismicity. (a) $M_{\text{MAX}}^M$ for each stage that did not reach the $M_{\text{MAX}}^M > 1$ threshold. An example of such a stage, where no mitigation actions would have been taken, is shown in (b). (c) $M_{\text{MAX}}^M$ for each stage that reached the mitigation threshold, but only after the largest event had occurred. In such cases, any mitigation steps would not affect $M_{\text{MAX}}^M$ (because the largest event has already occurred). (d) An example of such a stage; (e) $M_{\text{MAX}}^M$ for each stage that reached the $M_{\text{MAX}}^M > 1$ threshold prior to the occurrence of $M_{\text{MAX}}^M$. The triangles show the values of $M_{\text{MAX}}^M$ that actually occurred. The squares show the largest event that occurred prior to reaching the threshold. (f) An example of such a stage. The color version of this figure is available only in the electronic edition.
expected during an HF stage. The basis of these two methods is to characterize the rate of seismicity with respect to the injection volume, and thereby extrapolate to an expected event distribution once the planned total volume has been injected.

Rather than examining these case studies post hoc, we explore the potential of these methods to work in a prospective manner: at each given timestep, we only make use of information that is available prior to this time. We do this to put ourselves in the shoes of an operator or regulator, where decisions must be taken in real time as injection proceeds. We find that the proposed methods can forecast the largest event magnitudes with a reasonable degree of accuracy. This enables us to propose a strategy to mitigate HF-IS, whereby alterations to the injection strategy should be made if $M_{\text{MAX}}$ exceeds a given threshold. We show that this strategy may have been able to mitigate the larger events that occurred at our case study sites.

The underlying assumption for these methods is that the rate of seismicity with respect to the injection volume will not alter during injection, or that if a fault is encountered, it will evolve gradually, allowing mitigation actions to be taken if real-time monitoring is used. We find that this assumption appears to hold for the datasets considered here. However, further study is required to examine whether this is the case more generally. This highlights the need for good-quality seismic monitoring if the science around injection-induced seismicity is to advance. In many of the most well-known case examples, local monitoring arrays were only installed after the largest events had occurred. It is therefore difficult to determine with any certainty what happened in the time leading up to the triggering, and whether an operator could have made observations that in turn might have allowed them to take mitigating actions.

The most effective types of monitoring systems are either downhole arrays (e.g., Maxwell et al., 2010), as per both case studies in this article, or very large very dense surface arrays, over which data are migrated and stacked (e.g., Chambers et al., 2010). Unfortunately, the costs of these types of deployment are high, and it is unlikely that such systems will be deployed at every injection project. However, novel processing methods using smaller arrays of seismometers placed at the surface (e.g., Skoumal et al., 2015; Verdon et al., 2017) are used to improve the quality of datasets available.

Injection-induced seismicity is a growing concern for various industries, and regulators are increasingly requiring operators to deploy monitoring arrays, usually to meet a TLS requirement of some form. We anticipate that, as more case studies become available, our understanding of injection-induced seismicity will grow, and our ability to mitigate such events will therefore improve.

Data and Resources

The datasets presented in this article were acquired by the operating company and are proprietary. Therefore, they cannot be released to the public.
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