The relationship between fluid injection volumes and uncontrolled fracture ascent.
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ABSTRACT

Hydro-fracturing is a routine industrial technique whose safety depends on fractures remaining confined within the target rock volume. Both observations and theoretical models show that pockets of fluid can propagate large distances in the Earth’s crust, in a self-sustained, uncontrolled manner, providing that the fluid volume is large enough. Existing models that describe when self-sustaining ascent starts are difficult to use for predictions, as they are mostly two-dimensional (2D) and depend on parameters (typically the fracture length) that are hard to assess, even a posteriori. Here we constrain, both analytically and numerically in three-dimensions (3D), scale-independent critical volumes as a function of only rock and fluid properties. We apply our model to laboratory, industrial and natural settings, showing that our critical volumes are consistent with observations and can be used as a conservative estimate in geological applications. We find typical injection volumes exceed the limit we define for the start of self-sustaining fracture ascent. We describe a number of other processes that may work to arrest fractures with volumes exceeding this limit. This appears to have resulted in a false sense of operational safety when working with large injection volumes. In
the context of our findings we outline the quantitative work that would be required to better elucidate the processes causing fracture arrest, which could help to assess more comprehensively the safety of such operations.

**INTRODUCTION**

Official guidelines for hydraulic fracturing (EPA, 2016; Mair et al., 2012) outline safe operational practices for regulators. Such reports often state that during routine operations fractures are unlikely to grow out of the target rock formation, as typical injection pressures are too low for this to occur. These claims are substantiated with empirical observations from closed access microseismic data of scarce vertical fracture growth following injection (Fisher and Warpinski, 2012). Evidence for unsafe vertical migration of such fluids remains ambiguous (Vidic et al., 2013).

Natural analogues of fluid migration by hydro-fracturing include drainage crevasses in melting glaciers and magma transport by dyking. Field and experimental observations provide some indication of typical rates of fracture ascent, in the order of mm/s to around half a m/s. (Das et al., 2008; Tolstoy et al., 2006). For water-filled fractures in rock this has not been observed; estimates from geochemical analysis supply similar rates of ~0.01-0.1 m/s, (1 km/day) (Okamoto and Tsuchiya, 2009). Theoretical arguments suggest that the migration velocity should have a dependency on volume (Dahm, 2000; Heimpel and Olson, 1994).

According to theory, tip-propagation occurs when a critical amount of fluid has accumulated inducing enough stress to overcome the medium’s fracture toughness, $K_c$ (Secor and Pollard, 1975). So far, critical ‘volumes’ are given in terms of the fracture length, which is not directly observable and difficult to estimate from observations (Dahm, 2000; Secor and Pollard, 1975; Taisne et al., 2011); moreover, such analyses have been carried out in 2D only, not capturing the fracture’s 3D shape and scaling of volume vs length.

Here, after deriving a theoretical model and validating it with numerical simulations, we apply this to cracks filled with air, water, oil and magma in solids of varying stiffness and toughness, across a wide range of length scales.
METHODS

Hydrofracturing and stress gradients

We consider a pressurised penny-shaped crack of radius \( c \) and volume \( V \) in an elastic medium. The crack can only grow when the stress intensity \( K_I \) at its tip-line exceeds \( K_c \). The elastic parameters of the medium (shear modulus, \( \mu \), and Poisson’s ratio, \( \nu \)) control the fracture’s aperture. The internal pressure \( p_0 \) must overcome the stress normal to the crack walls (generally the minimum compressive stress, \( \sigma_{min} \)) by an amount accommodating the volume \( V \) against the elastic forces, Fig. 1A/B.

When the crack is vertical, the gradient in the normal stress acting to close the crack and the gradient in the load due to the overlying fluid acting to open the crack, i.e. \( \rho_r g \) and \( \rho_f g \) in Fig. 1A, where \( \rho_r \) and \( \rho_f \) are the densities of the host rock and fluid, respectively, result in a net stress gradient \( \Delta \gamma \) acting to push open the crack walls in an inverse ‘teardrop’ shape, Fig. 1B/C. When the crack is inclined \( \Delta \gamma \) needs to be adjusted by \( \cos(\theta) \), where \( \theta \) is the cracks’ angle away from vertical. Quantitative formulations used to assess industrial fracture heights neglect stress gradients e.g. Xu et al. (2019); Yue et al. (2019). This contrasts with routine observations of stress gradients from industry data (Fig. 1A) and the fact that these gradients are considered in the well design of industrial operations (Lecampion et al., 2013; Mair et al., 2012). When this gradient is included in formulations, stress intensity varies around the fracture’s tip-line (Fig. 2). Where \( K_c \) is exceeded, the upper tip-line advances. The contained fluid flows into this newly created fracture surface while the bottom edge of the fracture is pinched shut as the internal pressure drops. With a great enough volume this fluid movement maintains a critically stressed upper tip-line and the fracture reaches a state of ‘self-sustaining propagation’. Fluid viscosity will cause some fluid to stay trapped in the tail trailing behind the fracture; if fluid viscosity is low enough, the contained fluid is virtually all transported. Provided the fracture’s
shape and volume are maintained, no additional forces, such as pressure from injection, are required to aid this state of propagation.

**Analytical formulation**

Secor and Pollard (1975) define in 2D the size and pressure inside a vertical fracture subject to \( \Delta \gamma = (\rho_r - \rho_f)g \) such that at the upper tip \( K_I^+ = K_c \) and at the lower tip \( K_I^- = 0 \). They assume that the crack is filled with incompressible inviscid (uniform fluid pressure) fluid and sits within an infinite homogeneous linear elastic medium; where both the fluid and rock have a uniform density. We adapt this formulation to 3D (see Supplementary Material), finding the pressure and size of a penny-shaped crack where the stress intensity at the top is equal to the fracture toughness and the fractures basal tip is bordering on closure, the rest of the tip-line is sub-critically stressed (Fig. 1b and c). We then convert this size and internal pressure to the volume of fluid inside this penny-shaped fracture:

\[
V_{an} = \frac{(1 - \nu)}{16\mu} \left( \frac{9\pi^4 K_c^8}{\cos(\theta) \Delta \gamma^5} \right)^{1/3}.
\]  

(1)

This equation for the critical volume before self-sustaining ascent, requires validation in order to evaluate the bias due to approximating the shape of the propagating crack as circular (Fig. 1D/E).

[Figure 2 about here.]

**Numerical model**

To simulate propagation, we use a 3D Boundary Element program where each element is a triangular dislocation with constant displacement (Fig. 2). We start the simulation with a vertical penny-shaped crack. We fix the number of elements, \( K_c, \Delta \gamma, \mu, \nu \) and the volume of fluid, \( V \). We set the initial radius to 0.4\( c \), where \( c \) is the analytical critical crack radius, derived in the Supplementary Material. In our 350+ simulations we use variables spanning several orders of magnitude: \( G=190–5\times10^{10} \cdot \text{Pa}, \nu=0.25–0.49, \Delta \gamma=7.8\times10^2–2.2\times10^4 \cdot \text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}^{-1} \) and \( K_c=1-1\times10^8 \cdot \text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}^{0.5} \). We state the
fracture has reached self-sustaining ascent when its upper tip has travelled $4c$ upwards. Our numerical method assumes an inviscid fluid. During each iteration the critically stressed portions of the tip-line advance proportionally to the local value of $K_I/K_c$. For a full description of the numerical methods, accuracy and results, see the Supplementary Material.

For all simulations, independent of mesh sampling, we find that if $V = 0.7V_{c}^{an}$ the numerical code returns a trapped fracture and if $V = 0.8V_{c}^{an}$ the fracture always reaches self-sustaining propagation. Therefore, scaling Eq. [1] by 0.75 supplies the numerical estimate of $V_c$, independent of the scale we use:

$$V_{c}^{num} = \frac{3(1 - \nu)}{64\mu} \left(\frac{9\pi^4 K_c^5}{\cos(\theta) \Delta \gamma^5}\right)^{1/3}. \quad (2)$$

**APPLICATIONS**

**Analog gelatine experiments**

The analog study of Heimpel and Olson (1994) inspects critical volumes of fluids ascending in gelatine blocks of different stiffness and fracture toughness (Fig. 3). The slope of volume vs speed from their experimental results shows an obvious increase in speed past a certain volume that may indicate the transition away from the sub-critical propagation regime. Heimpel and Olson (1994) interpret the transition away from sub-critical propagation at crack-tip velocities of $\sim 0.7 \text{ cm/s}$, crosses in Fig. 3. Using $\rho_c=1000 \text{ kg/m}^3$, $\nu=0.5$ and setting $\mu$, $\rho_f$ and $K_c$ to match their experiments, we find that our value of $V_{c}^{num}$ captures the transition described above. This result shows our equation works can describe observations for idealised experimental data.
**Magmatic dykes**

We consider magma propagation volumes at Piton de la Fournaise, La Réunion, to see how our equation matches observed dyke volumes. Among the dyke intrusions observed between 1998-2016, the smallest volume inferred from crustal deformation data is $0.05 \times 10^6 \text{m}^3$ (Fukushima et al., 2010). Using $\rho_r - \rho_f = 100 \text{kg/m}^3$, $\mu = 5 \text{GPa}$, $\nu = 0.25$ (Fukushima et al., 2010) and $K_c$ ranging from 29 to 112 MPa·m$^{1/2}$ (Delaney and Pollard, 1981), we retrieve $V_{num} = 0.05 \times 10^6$ and $2 \times 10^6 \text{m}^3$, respectively. These critical volumes are consistent with that of the minimum observed dyke size. As such our approximation predicts the correct scale in natural settings, provided $K_c$ values estimated from field data are used.

**Water injection into stiff rock**

The UK government defines hydraulic fracturing as operations that use over 1,000 m$^3$ of fluid per frack stage. During a hydro-fracturing procedure, proppant is injected in the final phase to maintain an open fracture (e.g. spherical quartz grains). After the operation, not all injected fluid is recovered when the wellhead valve is opened: Vidic et al. (2013) report an average of only 10% fluid recovery in flowback waters, noting that this recovery volume decreases when shut-in times are longer. Using $\rho_r = 2700 \text{kg/m}^3$, $\rho_f = 1000 \text{kg/m}^3$, $\mu = 8.9 \text{GPa}$, $\nu = 0.25$ and $K_c$ in the range $0.36 - 4.05$ to $7 - 25 \text{MPa/m}^{1/2}$, we obtain $V_c^{num} = 6 \times 10^{-2}$ and $500 \text{m}^3$ respectively. These $K_c$ values are for laboratory-sized shale samples from 100 to 1000 m confining pressure and effective $K_c$ values estimated for veins in the field, respectively (Gehne et al., 2020; Olson, 2003). Current operations use volumes around double our highest predicted limit. Few observations attest to the fact that industrial operations can cause ascent of fluids in fractures. One such example, are the spectacular surface fissures created due to steam injection documented in Schultz (2016); additional examples can be found in Schultz et al. (2016).Geochemical data from aquifers above fracking operation sites has shown some evidence of the contamination of overlying units, which is attributed to poor well casing design, rather than fracture ascent (Vidic et al., 2013). Usually, microseismic monitoring of actual fracking operations show limited...
vertical extents of the fractures, however, these data are proprietary and methodological descriptions are scarce (Fisher and Warpinski, 2012). Experimental fracturing data is of little help as volumes injected are typically below or close to our volumetric limit, with injected volumes of 2 to 20 m$^3$ (Pandurangan et al., 2016; Warpinski et al., 1982).

Natural degassing, such as CO$_2$ in the Cheb basin, Czech Republic, has chemical signatures of fluids that have ascended over 20 km through the crust (Weinlich, 2014). This migration is hard to explain by deep vertically extensive permeable zones. Supercritical CO$_2$ at depth has a similar density to water, and as such may be a good natural analog for water filled fracture ascent. We saw that in analogue and magmatic examples Eq. 2 predicts the correct order of magnitude of critical volumes; at the same time, it appears that this equation is conservative for high volume water injection as fracture ascent in these settings has rarely been observed.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In summary, Eq. 2 provides an estimate of the minimum fluid volume for self-sustained propagation of fluid-filled fractures, ranging from cm to tens of km. $V_c$ is dependent on $K_c^{8/3}$; since $K_c$ is often poorly constrained $V_c$ suffers from large uncertainties. Values of $K_c$ obtained in laboratory experiments show a strong dependency on pressure and temperature. Field estimates of effective $K_c$ from trapped fractures can be orders of magnitude larger. An effective way to estimate $K_c$ in Eq. 2 incorporating all processes affecting the energy needed to extend the fracture at different scales would clearly be beneficial for any fracture mechanics based analysis of rock masses and the resultant interpretations.

In our derivation we have neglected the effects of viscosity. Whether these effects will dominate over toughness in determining fracture growth can be assessed by evaluating the time scale needed for the fluid pressure to equilibrate within the crack, as this will mean that viscous dissipation is low and crack growth will be toughness-dominated (Bunger and Detournay, 2007). The model of (Bunger and Detournay, 2007) assumes a constant injection rate with no stress gradients, we assume this still provides a rough estimate of the timescale until this transition. Typical industrial operations use fluid viscosity of 0.0005–0.001 Pa·s, injection rates between 0.5–10 m$^3$/min and stiffness of 10–
40 GPa. Using low values of $K_c$ from laboratory experiments in shale, $0.36 \text{ MPa} \cdot \text{m}^{1/2}$, this transition time ranges between 10 seconds to times exceeding the end of injection. Whereas, setting $K_c$ higher, values for shale at depth, e.g. $4 \text{ MPa} \cdot \text{m}^{1/2}$ this significantly reduces this range to below milliseconds to a maximum of 1 minute. This suggests that, depending on $K_c$, Eq. 2 can be a relevant estimate of $V_{num}$, independent of viscous forces.

While theory and experiments support Eq. 2 this appears to be overly conservative in practice, as injections of quantities of fluid exceeding this do not result in significant ascent in most cases. In part, this discrepancy results from our simplification of the process, as mass conserving propagation in a homogeneous linear-elastic medium. Fig. 4 shows a schematic of processes not quantified in relation to critical fluid volumes which we review in detail below.

1. A series of mechanisms can reduce $V$ during propagation and thus promote crack arrest. These include leak-off from the fractures faces, the fracture becoming multistranded/compartmentalised, fluid recovery (extraction), or fluid remaining in the tail of the fracture due to added proppant or viscous forces (Taisne and Tait, 2009).

2. Mechanisms that can lead to an effective increase of $K_c$, and thus also promote crack arrest, include plastic tip processes, the fracture entering in a zone of damage of the host rock (Kaya and Erdogan, 1980; Sih et al., 1965) or seismicity surrounding the fracture, causing reduction in the system’s energy/blunting the fracture’s tip (Rivalta et al., 2015).

3. Heterogeneous $\mu$ or $K_c$ or stress barriers may also lead to arrest of fractures by deflection or promoting lateral growth (Bunger and Lecampion, 2017; Maccaferri et al., 2011; Warpinski et al., 1985).

4. Eq. 2 has a clear dependency on the fracture’s dip. If the minimum compressive stress is vertical, this promotes flat lying fractures.

Quantification of processes acting to halt fracture ascent, especially in the context of the variables in our equation, are critical to understand which volumetric limits can be deemed safe. In particular, the gradient in stress with depth
must be included to assess this process. Without such quantification, regulation of this industrial process will continue to rely on empirical evidence for safe rates, volumes and depths from select operations that may not be representative.
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FIGURE CAPTIONS

1. A) Stress vs depth in the crust, data from (Bell et al., 1990), crack shown in red with length 2c. B) Stress boundary conditions and 3D crack wall displacement. C) Cross sections of crack wall displacement, tip=interpenetration.

2. Numerical simulation of crack propagation (from left to right), looking at the fractures’ face (left) and cross section (right). Grey points are edges that closed in the previous iteration.

3. \( V^* \mu \) vs \( K_c \) from (Heimpel and Olson, 1994). Eq. 2 predictions shown as black lines. The thickness of the grey filled patches represents the velocity of the crack as the volume increases, normalised by maximum observed velocity.

4. Processes that can hinder fracture ascent, \( K \) and \( V \) relate to effective \( K_c \) and \( V_c \) operating in Eq. 2.
Figure 1: A) Stress vs depth in the crust, data from [Bell et al., 1990], crack shown in red with length $2c$. B) Stress boundary conditions and 3D crack wall displacement. C) Cross sections of crack wall displacement, itp=interpenetration.
Figure 2: Numerical simulation of crack propagation (from left to right), looking at the fractures' face (left) and cross section (right). Grey points are edges that closed in the previous iteration.
Figure 3: $V^*\mu$ vs $K_c$ from Heimpel and Olson [1994]. Eq. 2 predictions shown as black lines. The thickness of the grey filled patches represents the velocity of the crack as the volume increases, normalised by maximum observed velocity.

\[
\rho_{\text{rock}} = 1000 \text{ kg/m}^3
\]

\[
g = 9.81 \text{ m/s}^2
\]

\[
\nu = 0.5
\]
Figure 4: Processes that can hinder fracture ascent, $K$ and $V$ relate to effective $K_c$ and $V_c$ operating in Eq. 2.