



The seismo-hydromechanical behavior during deep geothermal reservoir stimulations: open questions tackled in a decameter-scale in situ stimulation experiment

Florian Amann^{1,a}, Valentin Gischig², Keith Evans², Joseph Doetsch², Reza Jalali², Benoît Valley³, Hannes Krietsch², Nathan Dutler³, Linus Villiger², Bernard Brixel², Maria Klepikova², Anniina Kittilä², Claudio Madonna², Stefan Wiemer², Martin O. Saar², Simon Loew², Thomas Driesner², Hansruedi Maurer², and Domenico Giardini²

¹Chair of Engineering Geology and Hydrogeology, RWTH Aachen, Lochnerstrasse 4–20, 52064 Aachen, Germany

²Department of Earth Sciences, ETH Zurich, Sonneggstrasse 5, 8092 Zurich, Switzerland

³Centre for Hydrogeology and Geothermics (CHYN), Laboratory of Geothermics and Reservoir Geomechanics, University of Neuchatel, 2000 Neuchâtel, Switzerland

^aformerly at: Department of Earth Sciences, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

Correspondence: Florian Amann (amann@lih.rwth-aachen.de)

Received: 21 July 2017 – Discussion started: 7 August 2017

Revised: 3 January 2018 – Accepted: 7 January 2018 – Published: 21 February 2018

Abstract. In this contribution, we present a review of scientific research results that address seismo-hydromechanically coupled processes relevant for the development of a sustainable heat exchanger in low-permeability crystalline rock and introduce the design of the In situ Stimulation and Circulation (ISC) experiment at the Grimsel Test Site dedicated to studying such processes under controlled conditions. The review shows that research on reservoir stimulation for deep geothermal energy exploitation has been largely based on laboratory observations, large-scale projects and numerical models. Observations of full-scale reservoir stimulations have yielded important results. However, the limited access to the reservoir and limitations in the control on the experimental conditions during deep reservoir stimulations is insufficient to resolve the details of the hydromechanical processes that would enhance process understanding in a way that aids future stimulation design. Small-scale laboratory experiments provide fundamental insights into various processes relevant for enhanced geothermal energy, but suffer from (1) difficulties and uncertainties in upscaling the results to the field scale and (2) relatively homogeneous material and stress conditions that lead to an oversimplistic fracture flow and/or hydraulic fracture propagation behavior that is not representative of a heterogeneous reservoir. Thus, there is a need for intermediate-scale hydraulic stimulation experiments with high experimental control that bridge the vari-

ous scales and for which access to the target rock mass with a comprehensive monitoring system is possible. The ISC experiment is designed to address open research questions in a naturally fractured and faulted crystalline rock mass at the Grimsel Test Site (Switzerland). Two hydraulic injection phases were executed to enhance the permeability of the rock mass. During the injection phases the rock mass deformation across fractures and within intact rock, the pore pressure distribution and propagation, and the microseismic response were monitored at a high spatial and temporal resolution.

1 Introduction

The necessity to produce carbon dioxide neutral electricity, ideally as baseload power (i.e., 24 h a day, year-round) and the increased aversion to nuclear power generation have motivated global efforts to optimize methods for extracting deep geothermal energy for electricity production. However, currently, geothermal power production is limited to distinct geological conditions, where fluid flow rates in geothermal reservoirs carry sufficient heat (Saar, 2011) and/or pressure for economic power generation (Randolph and Saar, 2011a; Breede et al., 2013; Adams et al., 2015). It is widely agreed that the earth's crust holds substantially more geothermal re-

sources than are presently being exploited (e.g., Tester et al., 2006). However, standard water- or brine-based geothermal power generation requires persistently high reservoir permeabilities of at least 10^{-16} m^2 (Manning and Ingebritsen, 1999) and ideally temperatures of over about 170°C (e.g., Evans, 2014; Saar, 2017), as otherwise the process is not economic. Wells have to be drilled to at least 5 to 6 km depth into crystalline hard rock to reach formation temperatures of approximately $170\text{--}200^\circ\text{C}$ in regions with standard geothermal gradients of about 30°C km^{-1} , although such temperatures are often reached at shallower depth if there is a low thermal conductivity sedimentary cover. Presently, rotary drilling to such depths is uneconomic on a routine basis. Moreover, at this depth permeability is often much less than 10^{-16} m^2 (e.g., Manning and Ingebritsen, 1999; Saar and Manga, 2004; Achziger-Zupančič et al., 2017), so that permeability has to be artificially enhanced to permit circulation of fluids to advectively extract the heat energy economically. Such systems are referred to as enhanced or engineered geothermal systems (EGSs), originally termed hot dry rock (HDR) systems (Brown et al., 2012). EGSs virtually always require hydraulic stimulation to enhance the permeability to such a degree that economic geothermal power generation becomes possible. However, the goal of controlling the permeability enhancement process has not yet been achieved in a sustained way, despite attempts since the 1970s (Evans, 2014). Additionally, induced seismicity, which almost invariably accompanies hydraulic stimulation because of high fluid injection pressure, can be problematic inasmuch as it may reach felt or even damaging intensities (e.g., Giardini, 2009).

In this contribution, we focus on how a subsurface heat exchanger may be constructed between boreholes at depth within low-permeability rock to form EGS, where a fluid, typically water or brine, may then be circulated more easily than before. The artificially enhanced permeability needs to be high enough to reach flow rates that are commercially relevant for power production, depending on the subsurface working fluid. Larger permeability enhancements are required for water or brine than for CO_2 , as the latter can utilize lower temperatures and lower permeabilities for economic geothermal power generation, due to its higher energy conversion efficiency (Brown, 2000; Pruess, 2006, 2007; Randolph and Saar, 2011a, b; Adams et al., 2014, 2015; Garapati et al., 2015; Buscheck et al., 2016). Moreover, fluid flow should occur within a large number of permeable fracture pathways that sweep a large surface area of the rock, thereby providing longevity to the system and avoiding early thermal breakthrough, such as occurred at the Rosemanowes Project (Parker, 1999) and the Hijiori Project (Tenma et al., 2008). The construction of such systems (i.e., an artificial reservoir with sufficient permeability for energy extraction) is one of the key research challenges for unlocking the large potential of deep geothermal energy. The creation of a subsurface heat exchanger between the boreholes in the low-permeability rock mass typically involves hydraulic stimulation, i.e., fluid

injections, during which the pore pressure is raised in the rock mass, leading to the enhancements of permeability of natural fractures and faults and perhaps the creation of new fractures.

Hydraulic stimulation is inevitably accompanied by induced seismicity (e.g., Zoback and Harjes, 1997; Evans et al., 2005a; Davies et al., 2013; Bao and Eaton, 2016) because the slip triggered by the elevated pore pressure arising from injections may be sufficiently rapid to generate seismic waves. In shale gas- and EGS-related stimulations, clouds of small induced (micro-)seismic events are important monitoring tools for delineating the location, where rock mass volume is undergoing stimulation (e.g., Wolhart et al., 2006). Unfortunately, seismic events induced by the stimulation injections may be large enough to be felt by local populations and even to cause infrastructure damage (e.g., in Basel, 2006; Giardini, 2009). In the past few years, induced seismicity has been recognized as a significant challenge to the widespread deployment of EGS technology. From a reservoir engineering perspective, EGS faces two competing but related issues: (1) rock mass permeability must be significantly enhanced by several orders of magnitude within a sufficiently large volume to enable sustainable heat extraction over many years (i.e., 20–30 years) while (2) keeping the associated induced seismicity below a hazardous level (Evans et al., 2014). Designing reservoir stimulation practices that optimize permeability creation and minimize induced seismicity requires a greatly improved understanding of the seismo-hydromechanical (SHM) response of the target rock mass volume. Seismo-hydromechanical processes relevant for stimulation involve (1) hydromechanically coupled (HM-coupled) fluid flow and pressure propagation, (2) transient pressure- and permanent slip-dependent permeability changes, (3) fracture formation and interaction with pre-existing structures, (4) rock mass deformation around the stimulated volume due to fault slip, failure processes and poroelastic effects, and (5) the transition from aseismic to seismic slip.

In 2017, a decameter-scale, in situ, stimulation and circulation (ISC) experiment was conducted at the Grimsel Test Site (GTS), Switzerland, with the objective of improving our understanding of the aforementioned HM-coupled processes in a moderately fractured crystalline rock mass. The ISC experiment activities aim to support the development of EGS technology by (1) advancing the understanding of fundamental processes that occur within the rock mass in response to relatively large-volume fluid injections at high pressures, (2) improving the ability to estimate and model induced seismic hazard and risk, (3) assessing the potential of different injection protocols to keep seismic event magnitudes below an acceptable threshold, (4) developing novel monitoring and imaging techniques for pressure, temperature, stress, strain and displacement as well as geophysical methods such as ground-penetrating radar (GPR) and passive and active seismics, and (5) generating a high-quality benchmark dataset

that facilitates the development and validation of numerical modeling tools.

This paper presents a literature review that highlights key research gaps concerning hydraulic reservoir stimulation and discusses which of the aforementioned research questions can be addressed in our decameter underground stimulation experiment. We then provide an overview of the ISC project that describes the geological site conditions, the different project phases and the monitoring program.

2 Literature review

2.1 Stimulation by hydraulic shearing

The concept of mining heat from hot, low-permeability rock at great depth was first proposed at Los Alamos National Labs in the 1970s and was called hot dry rock system (Brown et al., 2012). They initially envisioned creating a reservoir by applying oil and gas reservoir hydro-fracture technology to build a heat exchanger between two boreholes. Subsequent field tests have demonstrated that hydraulic stimulation injections are effective in enhancing the permeability of a rock mass by several orders of magnitude by producing irreversible fracture opening, whilst also increasing the connectivity of the fracture network (Kaieda et al., 2005; Evans et al., 2005b; Häring et al., 2008). Two different “end-member” mechanisms commonly appear in discussions of permeability creation processes through hydraulic injections: (1) hydraulic fracturing as the initiation and propagation of new tensile fractures and (2) hydraulic shearing, i.e., the reactivation of existing discontinuities in shear with associated irreversible dilation that is often referred to as the self-propping mechanism. Hydraulic shearing is of particular relevance for EGS as it has been shown that slip along fractures can generate a permeability increase by up to 2–3 orders of magnitude (Jupe et al., 1992; Evans et al., 2005a; Häring et al., 2008). If the rock mass in the reservoir is stressed to a critical level (e.g., Byerlee, 1978), then a relatively small reduction in effective normal stress would be sufficient to cause shearing along preexisting discontinuities that are optimally oriented for failure (Hubbert and Rubey, 1959; Raleigh et al., 1976; Zoback and Harjes, 1997; Evans et al., 1999; Evans, 2005). Thus, shearing and the associated permeability enhancement can occur at large distances from the injection point, even though the causal pressure increases may be low (Evans et al., 1999; Saar and Manga, 2003; Husen et al., 2007). In contrast, hydraulic fracture initiation and propagation (i.e., the original concept of EGS to connect two boreholes) requires high pressures exceeding the minimum principal stress to propagate hydro-fractures away from the wellbore. The high pressure in the fracture may interact with natural fractures and stimulate them, leading to leak-off (i.e., the extent of hydro-fractures is influenced by pressure losses and the existence of preexisting fractures). Therefore, hydraulic frac-

turing is often only considered relevant in the near field of a wellbore, where it improves the linkage between the borehole and the natural fracture system. Rutledge et al. (2004) showed that shear activation of existing fractures and creation of new fractures can occur concomitantly, dependent on the in situ stress conditions, injection pressure, initial fracture transmissivity, fracture network connectivity and fracture orientation (e.g., McClure and Horne, 2014). Regardless of which process is dominant, the direction of reservoir growth, and therefore the geometry of the stimulated volume, depends to a considerable degree on the in situ stress gradient, stress orientation and the natural fracture network.

Pressurized fractures may open due to a reversible, compliant response to pressure (Rutqvist, 1995; Rutqvist and Stephansson, 2003; Evans and Meier, 1995) or due to largely irreversible shear dilation (Lee and Cho, 2002; Rahman et al., 2002). As a consequence of the coupling between pressure, fracture compliance and permanent fracture aperture changes, the pressure field does not propagate through the reservoir as a linear diffusive field, but rather as a pressure front (Murphy et al., 2004). The fracture normal and shear dilation that occurs in response to elevated fluid pressure thus has a major influence on the magnitude and profile of the propagating pressure perturbation in the rock mass during hydraulic stimulations (Evans et al., 1999; Hummel and Müller, 2009). As a consequence, fracture compliance and normal or shear dilation characteristics have an impact on the size and geometry of the reservoir created during hydraulic stimulation.

Although the aforementioned processes are conceptually well understood, the quantification and detailed understanding required for designing stimulations and truly engineering geothermal reservoirs are insufficient. There remains considerable uncertainty as to how the above processes interact and what rock mass characteristics and injection metrics control the dominant mechanisms (Evans et al., 2005a; Jung, 2013). Thermo-hydromechanically coupled numerical models have become widely used for analyzing relevant aspects of reservoir stimulation in retrospective (e.g., Baujard and Bruel, 2006; Rutqvist and Oldenburg, 2008; Baisch et al., 2010; Gischig and Wiemer, 2013) or as prospective tools for predicting reservoir behavior or alternative stimulation strategies (e.g., McClure and Horne, 2011; Zang et al., 2013; Gischig et al., 2014; McClure, 2015; Yoon et al., 2014). The fact that such numerical models must be parameterized from sparse quantitative field-scale data is a major limitation of all those studies. In the following we present an overview of the experimental observations of hydromechanical coupling that are relevant to the parameterization of numerical models. These stem from reservoir-scale (i.e., hectometer) stimulation operations, such as in EGS demonstration projects or oil and gas reservoirs, intermediate-scale (i.e., decameter) in situ experiments and small-scale laboratory experiments.

2.1.1 Reservoir-scale experiments

The paucity of high-quality data on the stimulation process from reservoir-scale projects is largely a result of the considerable depth of typical geothermal resources (e.g., several kilometers), which prohibits the observation of hydromechanical processes from instrumentation installed within the reservoir. In the geothermal domain, such projects constitute expensive experiments and thus are relatively few in number, whereas, in the oil and gas domain, where hydro-fracture operations are frequent and routine, the data tend to be proprietary. Nevertheless, some notable datasets have been acquired for deep brine injection projects (Ake et al., 2005; Block et al., 2015), deep scientific drilling projects such as the German KTB project (Zoback and Harjes, 1997; Emmermann and Lauterjung, 1997; Jost et al., 1998; Baisch and Harjes, 2003), and hydraulic fracturing for oil and gas production enhancement (Warpinski, 2009; Das and Zoback, 2011; Dusseault et al., 2011; Pettitt et al., 2011; Vermilyen and Zoback, 2011; Boroumand and Eaton, 2012; van der Baan et al., 2013; Bao and Eaton, 2016) and during the stimulation of deep geothermal boreholes (Parker, 1989; Jupe et al., 1992; Cornet and Scotti, 1993; Tezuka and Niitsuma, 2000; Asanuma et al., 2005; Evans et al., 2005a; Häring et al., 2008; Brown et al., 2012; Baisch et al., 2015). Well-documented hydraulic stimulation datasets generally include microseismic observations as well as injection pressures and flow rates and, occasionally, tilt monitoring (Evans, 1983; Warpinski and Teufel, 1997). Although much information can be gained from these datasets, including imaging of microseismic structures (Niitsuma et al., 1999; Maxwell, 2014), energy balance between injected fluids and seismic energy release (Boroumand and Eaton 2012; Zoback et al., 2012; Warpinski, 2013), and source mechanisms (Jupe et al., 1992; Deichmann and Ernst, 2009; Warpinski and Du, 2010; Horálek et al., 2010), the constraints placed on the processes are insufficient to resolve details of the hydromechanical processes that underpin permeability enhancement, flow-path linkage, channeling or the interaction with natural fractures. Many of these processes possibly also depend on rock type. For instance, case studies analyzed by Evans et al. (2012) support the notion that injection into sedimentary rock tends to be less seismogenic than in crystalline rock. Moreover, it is likely that a significant part of the permeability creation processes take place in an aseismic manner (Cornet et al., 1997; Evans, 1998; Guglielmi et al., 2015b; Zoback et al., 2012), implying that seismic monitoring may only illuminate parts of the stimulated rock volume. In many deep hydraulic stimulation projects the rock mass is only accessed by one or at most a few boreholes, and the structural and geological models of the reservoir are not well defined. In general, the displacements on fractures arising from the injection can only be directly measured where they intersect the boreholes, and deformation occurring within the rock mass is poorly resolved.

Despite limitations in reservoir characterization and monitoring, significant insights into the stimulation process can be gleaned from the experience from the EGS projects that have been conducted to date. Two examples in crystalline rock are studies of stimulation-induced fault slip and changes in flow conditions in the fracture network associated with the permeability creation processes at the Soultz-sous-forêt (Cornet et al., 1997; Evans et al., 2005b) and the Basel EGS projects (Häring et al., 2008). At both sites, it has been shown that permeability in the near-wellbore region increased by 2–3 orders of magnitude. At Basel, a single initially impermeable fracture has been shown to take at least 41 % of the flow during the 30 L s^{-1} injection stage (Evans and Sikaneta, 2013), whereas at Soultz-sous-forêt, the stimulation of the 3.5 km deep reservoir served to enhance the injectivity of a number of naturally permeable fractures (Evans et al., 2005b). These fractures tended to be optimally oriented for fault slip, as also found elsewhere by Barton et al. (1995, 1998) and Hickman et al. (1998). At Soultz-sous-forêt, it was possible to estimate stimulation-induced slip and the normal opening of fractures that cut the borehole by comparing pre- and post-stimulation acoustic televiewer logs (Cornet et al., 1997; Evans, 2005). Shearing of fractures was also proposed as the predominant mechanism of permeability enhancement in granite at the Fjällbacka site in Sweden, by Jupe et al. (1992), based upon focal mechanism analysis. The above observations provide evidence of a link between shearing and permeability changes.

An additional, important lesson from deep stimulation projects is that the stress conditions in reservoirs may be strongly heterogeneous and that this influences the flow field (e.g., Hickman et al., 2000). For instance, profiles of horizontal stress orientation defined by wellbore failure observations commonly show significant fluctuations whose amplitude varies systematically with scale (Shamir and Zoback, 1992; Valley and Evans, 2009; Blake and Davatzes, 2011), even though that may have an average trend consistent with the tectonic stress field. Strong deviations may occur in the vicinity of faults, indicating past fault slip and complex fault zone architecture (Valley and Evans, 2010; Hickman et al., 2000). Similarly, the hydromechanical properties of faults depend on the fault architecture, which itself depends on lithology and the damage history accumulated over geological time (Caine et al., 1996; Faulkner and Rutter, 2008; Guglielmi et al., 2008; Faulkner et al., 2010; Jeanne et al., 2012). Within a fault zone, permeability and compliance contrasts can vary by several orders of magnitude (Guglielmi et al., 2008), thus complicating the predictability of hydromechanical responses to stimulations. In some EGS projects, it was observed that the hydraulic communication between injection and production boreholes may be unsatisfactory for efficient exchange of heat, either because of high flow impedance, such as in granite rock at Ogachi, Japan, (Kaieda et al., 2005), or because of flow channeling, as inferred from early thermal drawdown in granitic rock at Rosemanowes,

UK (Nicol and Robinson, 1990) and in granodiorite at Hijiori, Japan (Tenma et al., 2008).

2.1.2 Laboratory-scale experiments

On the laboratory scale, considerable effort has been devoted to experiments that address the role of effective stress changes in normal fracture opening and closure, shear dilatancy and related permeability changes (Goodman, 1974; Bandis et al., 1983; Yeo et al., 1998; Esaki et al., 1999; Gentier et al., 2000; Olsson and Barton, 2001; Samuelson et al., 2009). These experiments have demonstrated that the relationships between fluid pressure change, fracture opening and flow within rough natural fractures are strongly nonlinear. Even though significant progress has been made on defining permeability changes during normal opening and shear slip on the laboratory scale, the nonlinear relationships between fracture opening, changes in effective normal stress, shearing and the resulting permeability are not yet well constrained (Esaki et al., 1991; Olsson and Barton, 2001; Vogler et al., 2015). One common approach is to represent the fracture as two parallel plates whose separation, the hydraulic aperture, gives the same flow rate per unit pressure gradient as would apply for the natural fracture. For parallel plates and laminar flow, the flow rate per unit pressure gradient is proportional to the cube of hydraulic aperture. However, for rough-walled fractures, the hydraulic aperture, a_h , is generally only a fraction of the mean mechanical aperture, a_m (i.e., the mean separation of two surfaces), the fraction tending to decrease with smaller apertures, although the precise relationship is difficult to derive from fracture geometry alone (Esaki et al., 1999; Olsson and Barton, 2001; Vogler et al., 2015). With larger mechanical apertures, limited evidence suggests that an incremental form of the cubic law might hold such that changes in mechanical aperture give rise to equal changes in hydraulic aperture, at least for normal loading (e.g., Schrauf and Evans, 1986; Evans et al., 1992; Chen et al., 2000). For shear-induced dilation, an additional complication arises from channel clogging due to gouge production (e.g., Lee and Cho, 2002). Particle transport through fluid flow (Candela et al., 2014) and mineralogy (Fang et al., 2017) may additionally influence permeability changes in a complex manner. Deviations from the cubic law also occur when flow becomes non-laminar, which tends to occur at high flow velocities (Kohl et al., 1997) or at feed points in boreholes (e.g., Hogarth et al., 2013; Houben, 2015).

Dilatancy associated with shearing is often expressed in terms of a dilation angle, which is a property describing the relationship between mean mechanical aperture and slip. Dilation angle depends on the fracture surface characteristics, the effective normal stress and the amount of slip. The dependence of dilation on effective normal stress is particularly important within the stimulation context, the dilation angle tending to decrease at higher effective normal stress, in large part because shorter wavelength asperities are sheared

off (Evans et al., 1999). Thus, shearing-induced dilation is likely to be more effective at low effective normal stress, such as in the near field of the injection where fluid pressures are relatively high. Clearly, insights from laboratory experiments into the relationships describing fracture dilation and permeability changes are important for understanding field observations in EGS reservoirs (e.g., Robinson and Brown, 1990; Elsworth et al., 2016; Fang et al., 2018) and also for parameterizing numerical models.

2.1.3 Intermediate-scale experiments

In situ experiments on the intermediate scale (i.e., decameter scale) serve as a vital bridge between laboratory and reservoir scales. As such, they can contribute to an improved understanding of reservoir behavior during stimulation and enable upscaling of hydromechanical information obtained from laboratory experiments (Jung, 1989; Martin et al., 1990; Rutqvist, 1995; Schweisinger et al., 2007; Cornet et al., 2003; Murdoch et al., 2004; Cappa et al., 2006; Derode et al., 2013; Guglielmi et al., 2014, 2015a, b). Much experience has been gained from stress testing using the hydraulic methods of hydro-fracturing (HF), hydraulic testing of preexisting fractures (HTPF) (Haimson and Cornet, 2003) and hydro-jacking (Evans and Meier, 1995; Rutqvist and Stephansson, 1996). Hydraulic tests have been commonly used to quantify pressure-sensitive permeability changes (Louis et al., 1977) and normal stiffness in natural fractures or faults (Rutqvist, 1995). Evans and Wyatt (1984) estimated the closure of a fracture zone from observed surface deformations induced by drilling-related drainage of fluid pressure within the structure. Similarly, Gale (1975), Jung (1989), Martin et al. (1990), Guglielmi et al. (2006) and Schweisinger et al. (2009) used borehole caliper sondes to monitor changes in fracture aperture and pressure during hydraulic jacking tests. The resulting displacements and the flow and pressure responses allowed relationships between mechanical and hydraulic aperture changes to be established and helped to constrain the fracture/fault normal compliance on larger scales.

Irreversible permeability increases arising from slip-induced dilation of natural fractures are particularly relevant for the stimulation of EGS and hydrocarbon reservoirs. To study the phenomenon in situ, Guglielmi et al. (2014) developed a novel double packer system (Step-Rate Injection Method for Fracture In-Situ Properties, SIMFIP) that allows the simultaneous measurement of pressure, flow rates and three-dimensional relative displacements occurring across a fracture isolated within the interval in response to injection. The device was successful in reactivating a fault zone in a limestone formation in southeast France (Derode et al., 2013; Guglielmi, et al., 2015a, b). Pressure, injection rate and 3-D displacements in the SIMFIP interval were measured, together with microseismic activity, tilt and fluid pressure in the vicinity of the injection borehole. The dataset is unique and provided quantitative insights into the relationships be-

tween (i) fault dislocation including shear and permeability changes, (ii) fault normal compliance and static friction, and (iii) slip velocities and magnitudes and their relation to aseismic and seismic slip. Recently, a similar experiment was conducted in a series of interacting complex fault zones in shale (Guglielmi et al., 2015a, b). Distributed pore pressure and strain sensors across the faults allowed the evolution of the pressurized and slipped areas to be constrained, which was not previously possible. Such experiments provide a useful methodology for advancing our understanding of the hydronechanically coupled processes in complex faults.

2.2 Stimulation by hydraulic fracturing

Experience gained from large-scale stimulation of EGS reservoirs in crystalline rock suggests that hydraulic shearing is the dominant mechanism for permeability creation, at least several tens of meters distance from the injection point (e.g. Evans, 2014). However, the initiation and propagation of hydraulic fractures may be an important mechanism in the near field of the wellbore to connect the wellbore to the pre-existing fracture network in the reservoir (Cornet and Jones, 1994). Considerable effort has been devoted to understanding the initiation and propagation of hydraulic fractures on both the laboratory and intermediate field scale.

2.2.1 Laboratory-scale hydraulic fracturing experiments

Many well-controlled, small-scale laboratory experiments on hydro-fracture are documented in the literature (Jaeger, 1963; Zoback et al., 1977; Warpinski et al., 1982; Bruno and Nakagawa 1991; Johnson and Cleary 1991; Song et al., 2001; Jeffrey and Bunger, 2007; Bunger et al., 2011). For such experiments, samples of various shapes (e.g., hollow cylinders and perforated prisms) are loaded along their boundaries and the internal fluid pressure is increased until a hydraulic fracture initiates and propagates. For some tests, transparent materials like polymethyl methacrylate (PMMA) were used to image fracture growth. Some experimental setups include multi-material “sandwiches” to study the effect of stress contrast on hydraulic fracture containment (Jeffrey and Bunger, 2007; Warpinski et al., 1982). Others study the interaction of propagating hydro-fractures with preexisting fractures (Zoback et al., 1977; Meng, 2011; Hampton et al., 2015) or rock textures (Ishida, 2001; Chitrala et al., 2010), the impact of injection fluids with different viscosities (Bennour et al., 2015) or the role of stress anisotropy (Doe and Boyce, 1989) on the geometry and orientation of generated fractures or the interaction between multiple fractures (Bunger et al., 2011). These laboratory studies provide important results relevant for EGS. For instance, in the common situation where a family of natural fractures is not normal to the minimum principal stress, injections with high-viscosity fluids (viscosity-dominated regime) may help maintain tensile fracture prop-

agation normal to the minimum principal stress despite the presence of cross-cutting fractures (Zoback et al., 1977), whereas low-viscosity fluids (toughness-dominated regime) such as water will promote leak-off into the cross-cutting natural fractures, whose permeability may be increased by shear (Rutledge et al., 2004). This leak-off will tend to limit hydro-fracture propagation. Laboratory studies also give insights into the influence of shear stress shadow and transfer on hydraulic fracture growth (Bunger et al., 2011). Laboratory tests have also been essential for providing well-controlled fracture initiation and propagation datasets to benchmark hydraulic fracture simulation codes (Bunger et al., 2007).

2.2.2 Intermediate-scale hydraulic fracturing experiments

Intermediate-scale experiments have been performed to study the initiation and propagation of hydraulic fractures. Typically, they are conducted from boreholes drilled from excavations to facilitate dense near-field instrumentation and secure good experimental control. An early example is the series of experiments that took place at the Nevada Test Site in soft, bedded volcanic tuff with high porosity and high permeability (Warpinski, 1985; Warren and Smith, 1985). The pressure, flow and fracture aperture were monitored during the experiments, and the fractures were mined back at the end of the experiments. The mine-back revealed that stress contrasts were the predominant influence on hydraulic fracture containment and that the fractures consisted of multiple fracture strands and thus differed significantly from simple shapes assumed in theoretical studies. This complexity of the fracture shape impacts the flow and pressure distribution within the propagating hydraulic fractures. Another notable series of in situ tests on hydraulic fracture propagation within the context of coal-seam mining and block cave mine preconditioning have been performed by the hydraulic fracture group of CSIRO (Chacón et al., 2004; Jeffrey et al., 1993, 1992, 2009; Jeffrey and Settari, 1995; van As et al., 2004; van As and Jeffrey, 2002, 2000). The block cave mining experiments were performed in hard rock media and thus are more relevant to EGS. Those conducted in the quartz monzonite porphyries at the Northparkes mine in Australia are probably the most detailed and densely instrumented tests executed to date and included tiltmeter monitoring, a microseismic network and pore pressure sensors as well as detailed rock mass and stress characterization (Jeffrey et al., 2009). Hydro-fractures were formed with water and cross-linked gels, with colored plastic proppants added in order to facilitate their identification once the test volume was mined back. The mapped trajectories of the hydraulic fractures exhibited complex geometries, sometimes with multiple branching and crossing of joints, veins and shear zones, with and without offset. Subparallel propped sections accounted for 10 to 15 % of the total fracture extent, which microseismic activity indicated was more than 40 m from the injection point. The re-

sults demonstrate that the geometry of the fractures is much more complex than typically obtained in small-scale laboratory experiments in a homogeneous material and uniform stress field. The complexity close to the injection point is controlled by the near-well stress perturbation and the interaction with natural fractures and rock mass fabric.

Natural fractures also have a strong influence on the propagation of hydraulic fractures. The propagation regime (i.e., viscosity-dominated or toughness-dominated; Detournay, 2016) can be controlled by the injection rate and injected fluid rheology and will have likely a strong influence on the interaction with natural fractures and the final complexity of the hydraulic fractures, although this has not been validated by in situ experiments. Another relevant aspect that has not been investigated with in situ tests is the problem of proppant transport and distribution within the created fractures. Indeed, in the case of hydraulic fractures, the self-propping mechanism, which results in a permanent aperture increase, is unlikely to be effective, and so proppant placement is necessary for ensuring permanent permeability enhancement. Finally, the nature of the microseismicity generated by hydraulic fracturing is not adequately understood. Moment tensor analyses can offer insight into the nature of the failure in a microseismic event (Warpinski and Du, 2010; Eyre and van der Baan, 2015). For example, they can help resolve whether the seismic radiation is primarily generated by shear on preexisting fractures that are intersected by the propagating fracture, with relatively little energy generated by the advancing mode I tip of the hydraulic fracture (Sileny et al., 2009; Horálek et al., 2010; Rutledge et al., 2004).

2.3 Rock mass deformation and stress interaction

Injection of fluid into a rock mass invariably leads to the deformation of the surrounding rock mass due to poroelasticity (Biot, 1941) or slip-related stress changes (McClure and Horne, 2014). Numerical studies have suggested that stress interaction between adjacent fractures can have a significant impact on the stimulation results (e.g., Preisig et al., 2015; Gischig and Preisig, 2015). In most reservoir stimulations, the microseismic clouds exhibit an oblate shape, due primarily to the interaction between the strongly anisotropic stress field with the natural fracture population. This tendency to form an oblate ellipsoidal shape instead of a sphere may also be promoted by stress transfer from slipped fractures, which tends to inhibit slip on neighboring fractures (Gischig and Preisig, 2015). Schoenball et al. (2012) and Catalli et al. (2013) have demonstrated that induced earthquakes preferably occur where stress changes generated by preceding nearby earthquakes render the local stress field to be more favorable for slip. Similar effects have been observed for natural earthquakes (Stein, 1999). The effect becomes more important during stimulation as time goes on, especially at the margin of the seismicity cloud. Direct observation of deformation associated with fluid injection has

been observed in several intermediate-scale in situ experiments. Evans and Holzhausen (1983) report several case histories of using tiltmeter arrays to observe ground deformation above high-pressure hydraulic fracturing treatments. The results show clear evidence of the self-propping of the induced fractures (van As et al., 2004). Jeffrey et al. (2009) used a tiltmeter array to monitor a hydro-fracturing treatment at the Northparkes mine in Australia. The pattern of tilting indicated that the induced fracture was subhorizontal, which was confirmed by excavating the fracture traces. Evans and Wyatt (1984) modeled strains and tilts occurring around a well during air drilling and found that the deformation was due to the opening of a preexisting fracture zone in response to fluid pressure changes. Derode et al. (2013) observed tilts of 10^{-7} – 10^{-6} radians some meters away from small-volume injections into a fault in limestone. In contrast, Cornet and Deroches (1989) monitored surface tilts with a six-instrument array during injections of up to 400 m³ of slurries into granite at 750 m depth at the Le Mayet test site in France and report no resolved signal associated with the injections.

Rock mass deformation during stimulation injections necessarily leads to stress changes in the rock mass. Small but nonzero residual stress changes induced by hydraulic fracturing were measured using a stress cell by van As et al. (2004). Stress changes during injections are recognized as playing a potentially important role in determining the pattern of fracture and slip that develops during the injection (e.g., Preisig et al., 2015; Catalli et al., 2013).

2.4 Seismic and aseismic slip

A significant fraction of the slip that occurs on fractures within a reservoir undergoing stimulation may be aseismic, depending upon in situ stress and geological conditions. That aseismic slip has occurred is often inferred indirectly from changes in the hydraulic characteristics of a reservoir without attendant microseismicity (Scotti and Cornet, 1994; Evans, 1998). Direct detection of aseismic slip is difficult as it requires relative displacements across fractures to be resolved from borehole or near-field deformation measurements (e.g., Maury, 1994; Cornet et al., 1997; Evans et al., 2005b). For example, Cornet et al. (1997) compared borehole geometry from acoustic televiewer logs run before and after the 1993 stimulation at the Soultz-sous-forêt site and found that 2 cm of slip had apparently occurred across a fracture. The cumulative seismic moment of events in the neighborhood of the fracture was insufficient to explain the observed slip magnitude, thereby suggesting that a large portion of the slip had occurred aseismically. Indeed, almost all fracture zones that were hydraulically active during the stimulation showed evidence of shear and opening-mode dislocations of millimeters to centimeters (Evans et al., 2005b).

The transition from aseismic to seismic slip was directly observed by Guglielmi et al. (2015a) during fluid injection into a well-instrumented fault in limestone in a rock labo-

ratory at 280 m depth. Some 70 % of a 20-fold permeability increase occurred during the initial aseismic slip period. The transition to seismic slip coincided with reduced dilation, and the inference is that slip zone area exceeded the pressurized area, suggesting that the events themselves lay outside the pressurized zone. Modeling the observed slip as occurring on a circular fracture with total stress drop gave a radius of 37 m and a moment release of 65×10^9 Nm, far larger than the estimated seismic moment release of the order of 1×10^6 Nm, again indicating that most slip was aseismic. Guglielmi et al. (2015a) concluded that the aseismic behavior is due to an overall rate-strengthening behavior of the gauge-filled fault and seismicity occurs due to local frictional heterogeneity and rate-softening behavior. These results are consistent with laboratory experiments performed by Marone and Scholz (1988) on fault gauge, which suggest that slip at low effective normal stresses (as anticipated in the near field of a high-pressure injection) and within thick gouge layers tends to be stable (aseismic).

Apart from these observations, aseismic slip has been mostly discussed from the perspectives of semi-analytical or numerical models. Garagash and Germanovic (2012) used a slip-weakening model to show that aseismic slip depends on the stress conditions and injection pressure. Zoback et al. (2012) used McClure's (2012) rate-and-state friction model to show that aseismic slip becomes more prominent for stress states farther from the failure limit. Using the same model, Gischig (2015) demonstrated that slip velocity depends on fault orientation in a given stress field. For non-optimally oriented faults, aseismic slip becomes more prominent and the seismicity is less pronounced for lower slip velocities and shorter rupture propagation distances. These model results suggest that aseismic slip and low slip velocities may be promoted by avoiding the stimulation of optimally oriented critically stressed faults. Clearly, a more detailed understanding of the conditions that result in aseismic slip may be a basis for less hazardous stimulations.

2.5 Induced seismicity

Keeping induced seismicity at levels that are not damaging or disturbing to the population continues to be a major objective for EGS (Giardini, 2009; Bachmann et al., 2011; Majer et al., 2012; Evans et al., 2012) and other underground engineering projects (oil and gas extraction, liquid waste disposal, gas and CO₂ storage). Man-made earthquakes are not a new phenomenon (Healy et al., 1968; McGarr, 1976; Pine et al., 1987; Nicholson and Wesson, 1951; Gupta, 1992). However, the occurrence of several well-reported felt events near major population centers has served to focus attention on the problem (Giardini, 2009; Ellsworth, 2013; Davies et al., 2013; Huw et al., 2014; Bao and Eaton, 2016). Some even led to infrastructure damage, such as following the Mw5.7 event in Oklahoma, USA (Keranen et al., 2013), or the suspension of the projects (e.g., the geothermal projects

at Basel (Häring et al., 2008) and St. Gallen (Edwards et al., 2015) in Switzerland). As a consequence, a substantial research effort has been initiated to understand the processes that underlie induced seismicity. Examples are the numerous studies that have been performed using the high-quality seismic dataset collected during the Basel EGS experiment. Kraft and Deichmann (2014) and Deichmann et al. (2014) analyzed waveforms of the seismicity to determine reliable source locations. Terekawa et al. (2012) used an extended catalogue of the focal mechanism solutions of Deichmann and Ernst (2009) to estimate the stress field at Basel and to infer the pore pressure increase required to trigger the events. Goertz-Allmann et al. (2011) determined stress drop for the Basel seismicity and found higher stress drops at the margin of the seismic cloud than close to the injection borehole. A similar dependency for Gutenberg–Richter *b* values was found by Bachmann et al. (2012) – lower *b* values tended to occur at the margin of the seismicity cloud and at later injection times.

There are numerous analyses of induced seismicity at other EGS sites. Pearson (1981) and Phillips et al. (1997) analyzed microseismicity generated during the stimulation of the 2930 m deep “large Phase 1” and the 3460 m deep Phase 2 reservoirs, respectively, at the Fenton Hill EGS site, New Mexico. Batchelor et al. (1983) summarize microseismicity observed during the stimulation injections into the Phase 2a and 2b reservoirs at Rosemanowes in Cornwall, UK. Tezuka and Niitsuma (2000) examined clusters of microseismic events generated during the stimulation of the 2200 m deep reservoir at the Hijiori EGS site in Japan. Baisch et al. (2006, 2009, 2015) analyzed data from different stages of the stimulation of the Habanero EGS reservoir in the Cooper Basin, Australia. Calò et al. (2011) used microseismicity generated during the stimulation of the 5 km deep EGS reservoir at Soultz-sous-forêt to perform time-lapse P-wave tomography to infer pore pressure migration during injection. Various authors also explored the vast induced seismicity dataset of > 500 000 events recorded since the 1960s at the Geysers geothermal site, where recently also an EGS demonstration stimulation has been performed (Garcia et al., 2012; Jeanne et al., 2014). The observed seismicity was partly related to injections (Jeanne et al., 2015) and thermoelastic stress changes (Rutqvist and Oldenburg, 2008). Here, local variability in the stress field (Martínez-Garzón et al., 2013) and volumetric source components (Martínez-Garzón et al., 2017) were inferred from detailed analysis of injection-induced seismicity.

Another major focus of induced seismicity research has been the development of hazard assessment tools for injection-related seismicity. The primary goal of these efforts is to develop a dynamic, probabilistic and data-driven traffic light system that can provide real-time hazard estimates during injections (Karvounis et al., 2014; Király-Proag et al., 2016), as opposed to the traditional, static traffic light system (Bommer et al., 2006). Bachmann et al. (2011) and

Mena et al. (2013) developed several statistical models and tested them in a pseudo-prospective manner using the Basel seismicity dataset. More complex models including physical considerations and stochastic processes (so-called hybrid models) were developed to include information on the reservoir behavior and from the spatiotemporal evolution of seismicity (Goertz-Allmann and Wiemer, 2013; Gischig and Wiemer, 2013; Király et al., 2018). Mignan et al. (2015) evaluated reported insurance claims arising from the Basel induced seismicity in order to infer procedures for evaluating risk based on induced seismic hazard estimates.

The Gutenberg–Richter b value, which describes the reduction in the frequency of the occurrence of events with increasing earthquake magnitude, plays a key role in induced seismic hazard analysis. Schorlemmer et al. (2005) examined the b values of earthquakes in different stress regimes and found that lower values correlated with areas of higher differential stress. Similar trends have been reported for induced seismicity (Bachmann et al., 2012) but also in tectonic earthquakes (Tormann et al., 2014, 2015; Spada et al., 2013) and laboratory experiments (Amitrano, 2012; Goebel et al., 2012). Thus, it was hypothesized that b values are related to local stress conditions (Scholz, 2015), or – in the context of induced earthquakes – to a combination of pressure and stress conditions. Considering standard scaling laws between magnitudes and earthquake source dimensions (i.e., slip and slipped area), it has to be expected that seismicity with high b values may have an indirect but strong impact on permeability enhancement (Gischig et al., 2014). However, these observations have so far only been qualitatively established, as the absolute stress state within the rock volume that hosts the seismicity whose b value is estimated has not been quantitatively determined.

Whilst the hazard associated with induced seismicity is clearly an important factor for reservoir engineering, it should not be forgotten that the shearing of fractures and fracture zones, which is the source of the seismicity, is a key process in the irreversible permeability enhancement that is the objective of the stimulation injections. Furthermore, precise mapping of the 3-D distribution of events provides an indication of the direction of fluid pressure propagation and hence the geometry (i.e., size, shape, degree of anisotropy) of the distribution of permeability enhancement – information that is vital for drilling a subsequent well (Niitsuma et al., 1999). Managing induced seismic hazard also requires considering the design of reservoir attributes such as size, system impedance and heat exchanger properties that control system longevity (e.g., Gischig et al., 2014). Currently, few case studies consider both seismicity and the related changes that occurred in the reservoir (e.g., Evans et al., 2005a), and relatively few studies even report both permeability changes or well injectivity (e.g., Häring et al., 2008; Evans et al., 2005b; Kaieda et al., 2005; Petty et al., 2013). More work is needed to quantitatively link the spatial, temporal or magnitude distribution of seismicity with the thermo-hydraulic–

mechanical properties of the rock mass under stimulation conditions. We believe controlled experiments on the intermediate (in situ test site) scale supported by laboratory-scale experiments could be key in making progress towards this end.

2.6 Open research questions in hydraulic stimulation research

Research on reservoir stimulation for deep geothermal energy exploitation has been largely performed through laboratory observations, large-scale projects and numerical models. Observations of full-scale reservoir stimulations have yielded important observations. However, the difficulty in observing the processes occurring within the reservoir under stimulation conditions severely limits the understanding of the permeability creation processes in a way that aids future stimulation design.

Laboratory experiments are attractive because they are controllable and readily repeatable, but they suffer from two main limitations. (1) Upscaling results to the field scale is affected by large uncertainties (Gale, 1993). Although there is evidence that the roughness of fresh fracture surfaces obeys well-defined scaling over many orders of magnitude (Power and Tullis, 1991; Schmittbuhl et al., 1995), complications arise in upscaling the aperture distribution and hence permeability of two semi-mated rough surfaces due to the effects of damage and wear of the asperities during shearing and gouge formation (Amitrano and Schmittbuhl, 2002; Vogler et al., 2016). (2) Laboratory tests are typically performed on single fractures in relatively homogeneous materials and uniform stress conditions, which makes upscaling to structures with multiple fractures such as fracture zones challenging. Similarly, hydraulic fracture propagation behavior is usually studied with homogeneous rock samples under uniform stress, and this can lead to an oversimplified fracture flow and/or hydraulic fracture propagation behavior. In an EGS reservoir, for example, the stress may be heterogeneous on the meter to decameter scale (Evans et al., 1999; Valley and Evans, 2009; Blake and Davatzes, 2011) and the rock mass may contain various heterogeneities such as stiffness contrasts, fractures or faults (Ziegler et al., 2015).

Because of the large uncertainties in upscaling, many numerical studies make direct (i.e., not upscaled) use of laboratory results to parameterize HM-coupled models for EGS because so few field-scale relationships are available (e.g., Rutqvist, 2011; McClure, 2012; Gischig et al., 2014). This impacts the reliability of the numerical simulation studies because the descriptions of the processes and the input parameter values may be inappropriate for the scale of the simulation.

Clearly there is a need for field-scale hydraulic stimulation experiments that bridge the various scales and are performed with the target rock mass equipped with a comprehensive monitoring system to capture details of the processes. Re-

cently several intermediate-scale hydro-shearing and hydro-fracturing experiments have been performed in a densely instrumented rock mass (i.e., Guglielmi et al., 2008, 2014, 2015a, b; Jeffrey et al., 2009). The hydro-shearing experiments by Guglielmi et al. (2008) have all been in sedimentary rock types at shallow depth. No such densely instrumented experiments have been performed in fractured and faulted crystalline basement rocks faults, the target rocks for most EGS, where a variety of complex fault architectures and stress-fracture system configurations need to be investigated. The In situ Stimulation and Circulation (ISC) experiment addresses these research gaps, with a focus on the following research questions (RQs).

- RQ1: What is the relationship between pressure, effective stress, fracture aperture, slip, permeability and storativity (i.e., the hydrromechanically coupled response of fractures)?
- RQ2: How does the transient pressure field propagate in the reservoir during stimulation?
- RQ3: How does the rock mass deform as a result of rock mass pressurization, fracture opening and/or slip?
- RQ4: How does stress transfer inhibit or promote permeability enhancement and seismicity along neighboring fractures?
- RQ5: Can we quantify the transition between aseismic and seismic slip and the friction models (such as rate-and-state friction) describing slip evolution and induced seismicity?
- RQ6: How do hydraulic fractures interact with preexisting fractures and faults and how can the interaction be controlled?
- RQ7: How does induced seismicity evolve along faults and fractures of different orientation?
- RQ8: How does induced seismicity along stimulated faults compare to induced seismicity along newly created hydraulic fractures?
- RQ9: Can we quantify the link between spatial, temporal and magnitude distribution of induced seismicity and HM-coupled properties of fractures and faults?

3 The ISC experiment

The objective of the ISC experiment was to find answers to the abovementioned research questions by (1) stimulating a naturally fractured crystalline rock volume on the decameter scale that is exceptionally well characterized in terms of its structural, geomechanical and hydraulic conditions and

(2) providing a dense network of sensors within the test volume so as to establish a 3-D dataset at high spatial resolution that will yield detailed insight into geomechanical processes associated with induced micro-earthquakes, fracture shearing, permeability creation and fluid circulation. The experiment was planned and prepared during 2015 and 2016 and executed during two series of experiments in February and May 2017. Here we give a general overview of the experiment site, the main concepts and the design of the experiment, without detailing results; these are to be published in future work.

3.1 The in situ rock laboratory

The ISC experiment was performed at the GTS, near the Grimsel Pass in the Swiss Alps (Fig. 1a). The GTS is owned by the National Cooperative for the Disposal of Radioactive Waste (NAGRA) and was developed to host in situ experiments relevant to nuclear waste repository research. The facility consists of a complex of tunnels at a mean depth of 480 m that penetrate crystalline rock with well-documented structures. The rock type is considered representative of the Alpine crystalline basement that is a main target for EGS. The test site for the ISC experiment is located in the southern part of the GTS (marked in blue in Fig. 1b) between a tunnel that is called AU tunnel in the west and one that is called the VE tunnel in the east.

The rock at the GTS consists of Grimsel granodiorite and Central Aar granite. Both show an alpine foliation that strikes northeast and dips steeply at $\sim 77^\circ$ towards the southeast. The moderately fractured rock mass is intersected by ductile and brittle shear zones, as well as brittle fractures and metabasic dykes. Within the ductile shear zones, numerous fractures that are commonly partially filled with gouge are present.

3.2 Experimental phases

The ISC experiment was divided into three phases (Fig. 2). The first phase (2015–2016) was a pre-stimulation phase that aims to characterizing the rock volume in terms of geological and structural conditions, the local stress state (Gischig et al., 2018), hydraulic and thermal properties, and fracture connectivity, all of which are essential for the design of the experiment and the interpretation of experimental results. In addition, during the pre-stimulation phase, a monitoring system was established that allows capturing the seismo-hydrromechanical response at high spatial and temporal resolution. The second phase (February–May 2017) – the main hydro-shearing and hydro-fracturing experiment – was concerned with enhancing the permeability of the rock mass with high-pressure fluid injections. A third and final phase (June–December 2017), the post-stimulation phase, was dedicated to characterize the rock mass in great detail after stimulation




Figure 1. (a) GTS is located in the Swiss Alps in the central part of Switzerland. (b) The ISC experiment is implemented in the southern part of the GTS in a low fracture-density granitic rock.




Figure 2. The three test phases of the ISC experiments with listings of the main activities during each phase.

to quantify changes in permeability, fracture connectivity and heat exchanger properties.

3.2.1 Pre-stimulation phase – rock mass characterization and instrumentation

Boreholes, rock mass characterization and geological model

The governing aspects for designing the instrumentation of the decameter-scale ISC experiment were (1) a detailed understanding of the geological settings in three dimensions

(e.g., fracture and fault orientation and intersections, fracture density) (2) the in situ state of stress, (3) the pre-stimulation hydraulic conditions, including the flow field, preferential fluid flow-path ways and transmissivities, (4) the borehole sections used for stimulation, (5) the type of hydraulic injection (i.e., hydraulic shearing or hydraulic fracturing), and (6) anticipated quantities and spatial distributions of strain, tilt and pressure within the rock volume during stimulation.

During the pre-stimulation phase a series of 15 cored boreholes with a length of between 18 and 50 m and diameters of between 86 and 146 mm were drilled within or at about the experimental volume (Fig. 3). Three boreholes were ded-




Figure 3. The 15 boreholes drilled for the ISC experiment (view steeply inclined towards the southeast).

icated to stress measurements (SBH), two to the stimulation injections (INJ), four to geophysical characterization and monitoring (GEO), three to strain and temperature measurements (FBS), and another three to pore pressure, strain and temperature measurements (PRP). The boreholes were characterized in terms of geologic structures, hydraulic properties and inter-borehole connectivity. Various geological (i.e., core logging), geophysical (i.e., optical televiewer logs, resistivity logs, full-wave sonic logs, GPR surveys and active seismic measurements between the injection boreholes) and single-hole and cross-hole hydraulic methods (i.e., packer tests such as pressure-pulse, constant-rate and constant head injection tests, oscillating pumping tests, and tracer tests using various solutes, DNA-encoded nanoparticles and heat) were used. In addition to borehole-based characterization methods, the experimental rock volume was characterized using detailed tunnel maps, reflection GPR from the tunnel walls and active seismic data acquisition between the AU and VE tunnels (Fig. 1b). The trajectories of the subsequent boreholes were chosen based on these preliminary geological and hydraulic data and simplified numerical HM-coupled models (i.e., using 3DEC; Itasca 2014) for stimulation scenarios that provided an estimate of the deformation field and pore pressure propagation along geological structures.

The joint interpretation of all geophysical, geological and hydrogeological observations was used to constrain a 3-D structural model of the experimental volume (Krietsch et al., 2017, Fig. 4). The 3-D model illustrates the intersection of the shear zones within the experimental volume. Two major metabasic dykes (S3.1 and S3.2) up to 1 m thick with a spacing of 2 m crosscut the volume in an east–west direction. These metabasic dykes form the boundary of a zone with a high fracture density and partly open fractures, which




Figure 4. Three-dimensional model showing the boreholes drilled towards the rock volume for the in situ stimulation experiment; S1- (red) and S3- (green) oriented shear zones as well as the dextral shear sense at the S3 shear zones indicated by the black arrows.

together with the dykes define the S3 shear zone. The majority of brittle fractures within and outside the S3 shear zone are oriented parallel to the boundaries of the sheared metabasic dykes, which strike east–west in the test volume. Very few fractures penetrate into the dykes.

Rock mass instrumentation

In addition to a detailed characterization of the test volume for the design and interpretation of the in situ experiment, a dense sensor network was required to collect the necessary data at a sufficient spatial resolution that were needed to address the previously mentioned research questions (RQ1–9). This includes pore pressure monitoring, strain and tilt, and microseismic monitoring. Instrumentation design was also governed by the types of hydraulic injection treatments that were performed in the ISC experiment, i.e., hydraulic shearing (pressurization and reactivation of natural fractures and faults) and hydraulic fracturing (i.e., initiation and propagation of new fractures).

Pore pressure, deformations and temperature

To address questions related to hydromechanics (RQ1), pressure propagation (RQ2), and interaction between preexisting and hydraulic fractures (RQ6), four pressure monitoring boreholes (three PRP boreholes and SBH15.004; Fig. 3) were instrumented at points where they cut relevant structures. The boreholes were drilled approximately normal to the strike of the main geological features (S1 and S3 shear zones). They were completed with cement and resin-grouted packer systems with fixed open pressure monitoring intervals that record the pressure within fracture zones or fault zones. Pressure was also recorded in the INJ borehole that was not used for stimulation (Fig. 3) with a straddle packer system

similar to the one used for high-pressure fluid injections. The PRP boreholes were also equipped with prestressed distributed fibre optics (FO) cables for strain and temperature measurements. Strain recordings give information on the hydromechanical response to pressurization across preexisting fractures (RQ1) and help to detect propagation of new fractures during hydro-fracturing experiments (RQ6). Distributed temperature measurements were used during pre- and post-stimulation thermal tracer tests.

To address research questions related to rock mass deformations (RQ3–6), three boreholes (FBS16.001–3 in Fig. 3) were equipped with both distributed and fiber Bragg grating (FBG) strain-sensing optical fibers that were grouted in place. One borehole (FBS16.001) is approximately normal to the strike of the main geological features and intersects both the S3 and S1 fault zones. Another borehole is parallel to the strike of the S3.1 fault and intersects the S1.1 fault (FBS16.002), and one is parallel to the S1.2 faults and intersects the S3 fault zone (FBS16.003). The FBG sensors record axial strain across borehole sections that span potentially active fractures or the “intact” rock mass. Distributed strain-sensing optical fibers allow a dense spatial coverage and thus are more likely to observe the propagation and opening of a hydraulic fracture.

The borehole strain monitoring system was complemented with an array of three biaxial tiltmeters installed on the margins of the test volume along the VE tunnel near the S3 fault zone (Fig. 3). The tilt sensors were mounted in shallow holes drilled into the tunnel floor and record horizontal tilt. Together, the tilt measurements and the longitudinal strain in the FO boreholes were capable of describing the deformation field around the stimulated rock volume and allowed constraining the characteristics of the stimulated fault zones (i.e., dimension, dislocation direction and magnitude).

Microseismicity

Questions related to induced seismicity (RQ5, 7, 8) were tackled using a microseismic monitoring system, which consists of a sensor network with 14 piezosensors affixed to the tunnel walls and 8 sensors that were pressed pneumatically against the borehole wall in the geophysical monitoring boreholes (GEO16.001–4, Figs. 3 and 5). The uncalibrated piezosensors were complemented with calibrated accelerometers (as done by Kwiatak et al., 2011) at five locations on the tunnel surface to enable the calculation of absolute magnitudes. A real-time event detection gave provisional event hypocenters.

The sensor network was also used to record periodic active seismic experiments. Highly reproducible sources (i.e., piezoelectric pulse sources in boreholes and hammers installed at the tunnel walls with predefined constant fall height; Fig. 5) were triggered roughly every 10 min during the stimulation experiments with the goal of recording systematic changes in the waveform characteristics that allow

inferring changes in seismic velocity, attenuation and scattering properties. Such measurements can give additional constraints on 3-D pressure propagation and deformation characteristics (RQ1–4, 9).

3.3 Stimulation phase

The stimulation experiments were performed in two experiment sequences. (1) In February 2017, six hydraulic shearing experiments were performed including high-pressure water injection into existing faults or fracture zones so as to reduce effective normal stress and trigger shearing. (2) In May 2017, six hydraulic fracturing experiments were conducted with high-pressure injection into fracture-free borehole intervals so as to initiate and propagate hydraulic fractures.

Two 146 mm diameter, downwardly inclined boreholes (INJ 1 and INJ 2 in Fig. 3) were dedicated to the injections from packer-isolated intervals. For the stimulation operations, water or gel was injected into a 1–2 m interval in one borehole, and the second borehole was used to additionally monitor the fluid pressure response. The maximum injected volume for the stimulation at each interval was limited to about 1000 L. This value was determined as part of a pre-experiment hazard and risk study (Gischig et al., 2016) and was found to be acceptable regarding the estimated likelihood of inducing seismic events that could be felt in the tunnels, as well as the disturbance to ongoing experiments elsewhere in the GTS. We used standardized injection protocols for HS and HF (i.e., we did not test different injection strategies) so that the variability in the rock mass response arises from differences in local hydromechanical conditions as well as geological settings and not from different injection strategies.

3.3.1 Hydro-shearing experiments

The stimulation injections targeted natural fracture zones in the rock volume. Each interval stimulation consisted of four cycles (Fig. 6). The objective of the first cycle was to measure initial transmissivity and jacking pressure and break down the interval. Initially (Cycle 1), pressure was increased in small steps until breakdown occurred, as evidenced by a disproportionate increase in flow rate. This first cycle allowed quantifying the initial injectivity. After venting, the test was repeated with refined pressure steps (Cycle 2) in a narrow range to identify the jacking pressure. After Cycle 2 the interval was shut in to capture the pressure decline curve before the interval was vented. The purpose of the third cycle was to increase the extent of the stimulation away from the injection interval. For this purpose, a step-rate injection test with four or more steps was utilized. The interval was then shut in and the pressure decline was monitored for 40 min before initiating venting for 30 min. The purpose of the fourth cycle was to determine post-stimulation interval transmissivity and jacking pressure for comparison with pre-stimulation




Figure 5. Outline of seismic monitoring network including hammer sources and borehole piezo sources for active seismic surveys.




Figure 6. Injection protocol for hydro-shearing experiments. Red curves denote pressure controlled injections. (Cycle 1), blue curves flow rate controlled injections (Cycle 2 and 3). The total volume injected is 1 m³.

values. Thus, a step-pressure test was conducted, initially taking small pressure steps to define the low-pressure Darcy trend, with the deviation from it defining the jacking pressure. Following this cycle, the interval was shut in for 10 min before venting. An important aspect for the quantification of irreversible changes in the reservoir was to run acoustic televiewer logs across each interval before and after the stimulation to attempt to resolve any dislocation that may occur across the fractures in the interval.

3.3.2 Hydraulic fracturing experiment

The protocol for hydraulic fracturing tests in borehole intervals without natural fractures is shown in Fig. 7. Each interval stimulation consisted of three cycles. First, the packed interval was tested with a pulse for integrity. The objective of

the first cycle was to break down the formation (i.e., to initiate a hydraulic fracture) using low flow rates (i.e., around 5 L min⁻¹ injections for 60 s). The second cycle aimed to propagate the hydraulic fracture away from the wellbore and connect to the preexisting fracture network using progressively increasing flow rates (up to 100 L min⁻¹). The purpose of the third cycle was to quantify the final injectivity and jacking pressure using a pressure step injection similar to the pressure step injection considered for Cycle 4 in the fault slip experiments. Both pure water and a gel (i.e., a xanthan–water–salt mixture with 0.025 weight percent of xanthan and 0.1 weight percent of salt with a viscosity between 35 and 40 cP) were used for fracture propagation. The two injection fluids allowed investigating two different propagation regimes (i.e., toughness-dominated and viscosity-




Figure 7. Injection protocol for hydro-fracturing experiments. The blue solid curve denotes flow-rate-controlled injection and the red solid curve pressure-controlled injection.

dominated). Further, a cyclic injection sequence was included in the fracture propagation cycle to test it as an alternative injection protocol as proposed by Zang et al. (2013).

3.4 Post-stimulation phase

In the last experiment phase, the changes to the hydrology and rock mass properties that occurred because of each of the two stimulation phases (i.e., the hydraulic shearing and hydraulic fracturing phases) were investigated. Accordingly, after each phase, a characterization program was performed. The hydraulic properties of the rock mass were determined using single-hole and cross-hole hydraulic methods similar to those methods used during the pre-stimulation phase. In addition, single-hole, cross-hole and cross-tunnel active seismic and GPR measurements were conducted.

4 Summary and conclusion

The review of scientific research results showed that carefully analyzed data from large-scale experiments (i.e., EGS projects) and laboratory-scale experiments provide a fundamental understanding of processes that underpin permeability creation and induced seismicity in EGS. The results from large-scale experiments suffer from accessibility and resolution, which does not permit us to resolve the details of seismo-hydromechanically coupled processes associated with the stimulation process. Laboratory-scale experiments provide a fundamentally improved understanding of these processes but suffer from scalability and test conditions that may lead to oversimplistic fracture flow and/or hydraulic fracture propagation behavior that is not representative of a heterogeneous reservoir. Intermediate-scale experiments can serve to bridge the gap between the laboratory and the large scale and may enable the upscaling of results gained from small-scale experiments. However, only few intermediate-scale hydro-shearing and hydro-fracturing experiments have recently been performed in a densely instrumented rock mass

and no such measurements have been performed on faults in crystalline basement rocks.

We have provided here an overview of the intermediate-scale hydro-shearing and hydro-fracturing experiment (i.e., ISC experiment) that was executed in 2017 in the naturally fractured and faulted crystalline rock mass at the Grimsel Test Site (Switzerland). It was designed to fill some of the key research gaps and thus contribute to a better understanding of seismo-hydromechanical processes associated with the creation of enhanced geothermal systems. As this contribution is only meant to provide a literature review and an overview of our ISC experiment at the Grimsel Test Site, several other publications will provide more detailed descriptions and analyses of this intermediate-scale hydro-shearing and hydro-fracturing experiment.

Data availability. All data acquired within the ISC project will be made available at <http://www.research-collection.ethz.ch>.

Competing interests. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements. The ISC is a project of the Deep Underground Laboratory at ETH Zurich, established by the Swiss Competence Center for Energy Research – Supply of Electricity (SCCER-SoE) with the support of the Swiss Commission for Technology and Innovation (CTI). Funding for the ISC project was provided by the ETH Foundation with grants from Shell and EWZ and by the Swiss Federal Office of Energy through a P&D grant. Hannes Krietsch is supported by SNF grant 200021_169178. The Grimsel Test Site is operated by Nagra, the National Cooperative for the Disposal of Radioactive Waste. We are indebted to Nagra for hosting the ISC experiment in their GTS facility and to the Nagra technical staff for on-site support. We also thank two anonymous reviewers for their valuable input.

Edited by: Charlotte Krawczyk

Reviewed by: two anonymous referees

References

- Achtziger-Zupančič, P., Loew, S., and Mariéthoz, G.: A new global database to improve predictions of permeability distribution in crystalline rocks at site scale, *J. Geophys. Res.-Sol. Ea.*, 122, 3513–3539, 2017.
- Adams, B. M., Kuehn, T. H., Bielicki, J. M., Randolph, J. B., and Saar, M. O.: On the importance of the thermosiphon effect in CPG (CO₂ Plume Geothermal) power systems, *Energy*, 69, 409–418, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2014.03.032>, 2014.
- Adams, B. M., Kuehn, T. H., Bielicki, J. M., Randolph, J. B., and Saar, M. O.: A Comparison of Electric Power Output of CO₂ Plume Geothermal (CPG) and Brine Geothermal Systems for Varying Reservoir Conditions, *Appl. Energ.*, 140, 365–377, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2014.11.043>, 2015.
- Ake, J., Mahrer, K., O'Connell, D., and Block, L.: Deep-Injection and Closely Monitored Induced Seismicity at Paradox Valley, Colorado, *B. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, 95, 664–683, <https://doi.org/10.1785/0120040072>, 2005.
- Amitrano, D.: Variability in the power-law distributions of rupture events, *Eur. Phys. J. Spec. Top.*, 205, 199–215, 2012.
- Amitrano, D. and Schmittbuhl, J.: Fracture roughness and gouge distribution of a granite shear band, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 107, 2375, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2002JB001761>, 2002.
- Asanuma, H., Soma, N., Kaieda, H., Kumano, Y., Izumi, T., Tezuka, K., Niitsuma, H., and Wyborn, D.: Microseismic monitoring of hydraulic stimulation at the Australian HDR project in Cooper Basin, in: *Proceedings World Geothermal Congress*, 24–29 April 2005, Antalya, Turkey, 24–29, 2005.
- Bachmann, C. E., Wiemer, S., Woessner, J., and Hainzl, S.: Statistical analysis of the induced Basel 2006 earthquake sequence: Introducing a probability-based monitoring approach for Enhanced Geothermal Systems, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 186, 793–807, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.2011.05068.x>, 2011.
- Bachmann, C. E., Wiemer, S., Goertz-Allmann, B. P., and Woessner, J.: Influence of pore pressure on the size distribution of induced earthquakes, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 39, L09302, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012GL051480>, 2012.
- Baisch, S. and Harjes, H. P.: A model for fluid-injection-induced seismicity at the KTB, Germany, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 152, 160–170, 2003.
- Baisch, S., Weidler, R., Vörös, R., Wyborn, D., and DeGraaf, L.: Induced seismicity during the stimulation of a geothermal HFR reservoir in the Cooper Basin (Australia), *B. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, 96, 2242–2256, 2006.
- Baisch, S., Vörös, R., Weidler, R., and Wyborn, D.: Investigation of fault mechanisms during geothermal reservoir stimulation experiments in the Cooper Basin (Australia), *B. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, 99, 148–158, 2009.
- Baisch, S., Vörös, R., Rothert, E., Stang, H., Jung, R., and Schellschmidt, R.: A numerical model for fluid injection induced seismicity at Soutz-sous-Forêt, *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min.*, 47, 405–413, 2010.
- Baisch, S., Rothert, E., Stang, H., Vörös, R., Koch, C., and McMahon, A.: Continued Geothermal Reservoir Stimulation Experiments in the Cooper Basin (Australia), *B. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, 105, 198–209, 2015.
- Bandis, S., Lumsden, A. C., and Barton, N. R.: Fundamentals of rock joint deformation, *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min.*, 20, 249–268, 1983.
- Bao, X. and Eaton, D. W.: Fault activation by hydraulic fracturing in western Canada, *Science*, 354, 1406–1409, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aag2583>, 2016.
- Barton, C. A., Zoback, M. D., and Moos, D.: Fluid-flow along potentially active faults in crystalline rock, *Geology*, 23, 683–686, 1995.
- Barton, C. A., Hickman, S., Morin, R., Zoback, M. D., and Benoit, R.: Reservoir-scale fracture permeability in the Dixie Valley, Nevada, Geothermal Field, in: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Workshop on Geothermal Reservoir Engineering*, 26–28 January 1998, Stanford, USA, Society of Petroleum Engineering, 299–306, 1998.
- Batchelor, A. S., Baria, R., and Hearn, K.: Monitoring the effects of hydraulic stimulation by microseismic event location: a case study, in: *Proceedings of the 58th Ann. Tech. Conf. and Exhibition of SPE*, 5–8 October 1983, San Francisco, USA, Society of Petroleum Engineers, 1983.
- Baujard, C. and Bruel, D.: Numerical study of the impact of fluid density on the pressure distribution and stimulated volume in the Soultz HDR reservoir, *Geothermics*, 35, 607–621, 2006.
- Bennour, Z., Ishida, T., Nagaya, Y., Chen, Y., Nara, Y., Chen, Q., Sekine, K., and Nagano, Y.: Crack extension in hydraulic fracturing of shale cores using viscous oil, water, and liquid carbon dioxide, *Rock Mech. Rock Eng.*, 48, 1463–1473, 2015.
- Biot, M. A.: General theory of three dimensional consolidation, *J. Appl. Phys.*, 12, 155–164, 1941.
- Blake, K. and Davatzes, N.: Crustal stress heterogeneity in the vicinity of COCO geothermal field, CA, in: *Proceedings of the 36th Workshop on Geothermal Reservoir Engineering*, 31 January–2 February, 2011, Stanford, USA, 2011.
- Block, L., Wood, C., Yeck, W., and King, V.: Induced seismicity constraints on subsurface geological structure, Paradox Valley, Colorado, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 200, 1170–1193, <https://doi.org/10.1093/gji/ggu459>, 2015.
- Bommer, J. J., Oates, S., Cepeda, J. M., Lindholm, C., Bird, J., Torres, R., Marroquín, G., and Rivas, J.: Control of hazard due to seismicity induced by a hot fractured rock geothermal project, *Eng. Geol.*, 83, 287–306, 2006.
- Boroumand, N. and Eaton, D.: Comparing Energy Calculations – Hydraulic Fracturing and Microseismic Monitoring, in: *Proceedings of the 74th EAGE Conference and Exhibition incorporating Europec 2012 (GeoConvention)*, 4 June 2012, Copenhagen, Denmark, 2012.
- Breede, K., Dzebisashvili, K., Liu, X., and Falcone, G.: A systematic review of enhanced (or engineered) geothermal systems: past, present and future, *Geothermal Energy*, 1, 4, <https://doi.org/10.1186/2195-9706-1-4>, 2013.
- Brown, D. W.: A hot dry rock geothermal energy concept utilizing supercritical CO₂ instead of water, in: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Workshop on Geothermal Reservoir Engineering*, 24–26 January 2000, Stanford, USA, 2000.
- Brown, D. W., Duchane, D. V., Heiken, G., and Hrisco, V. T.: *Mining the Earth's heat: hot dry rock geothermal energy*, Vol. 1, Springer Science & Business Media, Berlin Heidelberg, Germany, 658 pp., 2012.
- Bruno, M. S. and Nakagawa, F.: Pore pressure influence on tensile fracture propagation in sedimentary rock, *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min.*, 28, 261–273, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-9062\(91\)90593-B](https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-9062(91)90593-B), 1991.

- Bunger, A., Detournay, E., Garagash, D., and Peirce, A.: Numerical simulation of hydraulic fracturing in the viscosity dominated regime, in: *Proceedings of the SPE Hydraulic Fracturing Technology Conference*, 29–31 January 2007, Texas, USA, Society of Petroleum Engineers, 2007.
- Bunger, A. P., Jeffrey, R. G., Kear, J., and Zhang, X.: Experimental Investigation of the Interaction among Closely Spaced Hydraulic Fractures, in: *Proceedings of the 45th US Rock Mech./Geomechanics Symposium*, 26–29 June 2011, San Francisco, USA, American Rock Mech. Association, 2011.
- Buscheck, T. A., Bielicki, J. M., Edmunds, T. A., Hao, Y., Sun, Y., Randolph, Y. B., and Saar, M. O.: Multifluid geo-energy systems: Using geologic CO₂ storage for geothermal energy production and grid-scale energy storage in sedimentary basins, *Geosphere*, 12, 678–696, <https://doi.org/10.1130/GES01207.1>, 2016.
- Byerlee, J.: Friction of rocks, *Pure Appl. Geophys.*, 116, 615–626, 1978.
- Caine, J. S., Evans, J. P., and Forster, C. B.: Fault zone architecture and permeability structure, *Geology*, 24, 1025–1028, 1996.
- Calò, M., Dorbath, C., Cornet, F. H., and Cuenot, N.: Large-scale aseismic motion identified through 4-DP-wave tomography, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 186, 1295–1314, 2011.
- Candela, T., Brodsky, E. E., Marone, C., and Elsworth, D.: Laboratory evidence for particle mobilization as a mechanism for permeability enhancement via dynamic stressing, *Earth Planet. Sc. Lett.*, 392, 279–291, 2014.
- Cappa, F., Guglielmi, Y., Rutqvist, J., Tsang, C.-F., and Thoraval, A.: Hydromechanical modeling of pulse tests that measure fluid pressure and fracture normal displacement at the Coaraze Laboratory site, France, *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min.*, 43, 1062–1082, 2006.
- Catalli, F., Meier, M.-A., and Wiemer, S.: Coulomb stress changes at the Basel geothermal site: can the Coulomb model explain induced seismicity in an EGS?, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40, 72–77, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012GL054147>, 2013.
- Chacón, E., Barrera, V., Jeffrey, R., and van As, A.: Hydraulic fracturing used to precondition ore and reduce fragment size for block caving, in: *Proceedings of the MassMin*, 22–25 August 2004, Santiago, Chile, Instituto de Ingenieros, 2004.
- Chen, Z., Narayan, S. P., Yang, Z., and Rahman, S. S.: An experimental investigation of hydraulic behaviour of fractures and joints in granitic rock, *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min.*, 37, 1061–1071, 2000.
- Chitrala, Y., Moreno, C., Sondergeld, C. H., and Rai, C. S.: Microseismic mapping of laboratory induced hydraulic fractures in anisotropic reservoirs, in: *Proceedings of the Tight Gas Completions Conference*, Antonio, USA, 2–3 November 2010, Society of Petroleum Engineers, 2010.
- Cornet, F. H. and Desroches, J.: The problem of channeling in Hot Dry Rock reservoirs, in: *Hot Dry Rock Geothermal Energy*, Robertson Scientific Publishers, Llandudno Cornwall, UK, 398–421, 1989.
- Cornet, F. H. and Jones, R. H.: Field evidence on the orientation of forced water flow with respect to the regional principal stress directions, in: *Proceedings of the 1st North American Rock Mechanics Symposium*, 1–3 June 1994, Austin, USA, 61–69, 1994.
- Cornet, F. H. and Scotti, O.: Analysis of induced seismicity for fault zone identification, *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min.*, 30, 789–795, 1993.
- Cornet, F. H., Helm, J., Poitrenaud, H., and Etchecopar, A.: Seismic and Aseismic Slips Induced by Large-scale Fluid Injections, *Pure Appl. Geophys.*, 150, 563–583, 1997.
- Cornet, F. H., Li, L., Hulin, J.-P., Ippolito, I., and Kurowski, P.: The hydromechanical behaviour of a fracture: an in situ experimental case study, *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min.*, 40, 1257–1270, 2003.
- Das, I. and Zoback, M. D.: Long-period, long-duration seismic events during hydraulic fracture stimulation of a shale gas reservoir, *The Leading Edge*, 30, 778–786, <https://doi.org/10.1190/1.3609093>, 2011.
- Davies, R., Foulger, G., Bindley, A., and Styles, P.: Induced seismicity and hydraulic fracturing for the recovery of hydrocarbons, *Mar. Petrol. Geol.*, 45, 171–185, 2013.
- Deichmann, N. and Ernst, J.: Earthquake focal mechanisms of the induced seismicity in 2006 and 2007 below Basel (Switzerland), *Swiss J. Geosci.*, 102, 457–466, 2009.
- Deichmann, N., Kraft, T., and Evans, K. F.: Identification of faults activated during the stimulation of the Basel geothermal project from cluster analysis and focal mechanisms of the larger magnitude events, *Geothermics*, 52, 84–97, 2014.
- Derode, B., Cappa, F., Guglielmi, Y., and Rutqvist, J.: Coupled seismo-hydromechanical monitoring of inelastic effects on injection-induced fracture permeability, *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min.*, 61, 266–274, 2013.
- Detournay, E.: *Mechanics of Hydraulic Fractures*, *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, 48, 311–339, 2016.
- Doe, T. W. and Boyce, G.: Orientation of hydraulic fractures in salt under hydrostatic and non-hydrostatic stress, *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min.*, 26, 605–611, 1989.
- Dusseault, M. B., McLennan, J., and Shu, J.: Massive multi-stage hydraulic fracturing for oil and gas recovery from low mobility reservoirs in China, *Petroleum Drilling Techniques*, 39, 6–16, 2011.
- Edwards, B., Kraft, T., Cauzzi, C., Kaestli, P., and Wiemer, S.: Seismic monitoring and analysis of deep geothermal projects in St Gallen and Basel, Switzerland, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 201, 1020–1037, 2015.
- Ellsworth, W. L.: Injection-induced earthquakes, *Science*, 12, 1225942, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1225942>, 2013.
- Elsworth, D., Fang, Y., Gan, Q., Im, K. J., Ishibashi, T., and Guglielmi, Y.: Induced seismicity in the development of EGS – benefits and drawbacks, in: *Rock Dynamics: From Research to Engineering*, CRC Press, Suzhou, China, 13–24, 2016.
- Emmermann, R. and Lauterjung, J.: The German Continental Deep Drilling Program KTB: Overview and major results, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 102, 18179–18201, <https://doi.org/10.1029/96jb03945>, 1997.
- Esaki, T., Hojo, H., Kimura, T., and Kameda, N.: Shear-Flow Coupling Test on Rock joints, in: *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress on Rock Mech.*, Vol. 1: Rock Mechanics and Environmental Protection, 16–20 September 1991, Aachen, Germany, International Society for Rock Mechanics and Rock Engineering, 1991.
- Esaki, T., Du, S., Mitani, Y., Ikusada, K., and Jing, L.: Development of a shear-flow test apparatus and determination of coupled properties for a single rock joint, *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min.*, 36, 641–650, 1999.
- Evans, K. F.: Some examples and implications of observed elastic deformations associated with the growth of hydraulic fractures in

- the Earth, in: Hydraulic Fracturing Stress Measurements, edited by: Zoback, M. D. and Haimson, B. C., National Academy Press, Monterey, USA, 246–259, 1983.
- Evans, K. F.: Does significant aseismic slip occur on fractures in HDR systems under stimulation conditions?, Proceedings, 4th Int. HDR Forum, 28–30 September 1998, Strasbourg, France, 1998.
- Evans, K. F.: Permeability creation and damage due to massive fluid injections into granite at 3.5 km at Soultz: 2. Critical stress and fracture strength, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 110, 1–14, 2005.
- Evans, K. F.: Reservoir Creation, in: Energy from the Earth – Deep Geothermal as a Resource for the Future?, edited by: Hirschberg, S., Wiemer, S. and Burgherr, P., Zentrum für Technologiefolgen-Abschätzung, Bern, Switzerland, 82–118, 2014.
- Evans, K. and Holzhausen, G.: On the development of shallow hydraulic fractures as viewed through the surface deformation field: Part 2 – case histories, *J. Petrol. Technol.*, 35, 411–420, 1983.
- Evans, K. F. and Meier, P.: Hydro-jacking and hydrofracturing tests in a fissile schist in south-west Switzerland: In-situ stress characterisation in difficult rock, in: Proceedings of the 2nd Int. Conf. on the Mechanics of Jointed and Faulted Rock, 10–14 April 1995, Vienna, Austria, 1995.
- Evans, K. F. and Sikaneta, S.: Characterisation of natural fractures and stress in the Basel reservoir from wellbore observations (Module 1), in: GEOTHERM – Geothermal Reservoir Processes: Research towards the creation and sustainable use of Enhanced Geothermal Systems, Swiss Federal Office of Energy Publication, Bern, Switzerland, 290900, 9–18, 2013.
- Evans, K. F. and Wyatt, F.: Water table effects on the measurement of earth strain, *Tectonophysics*, 108, 323–337, 1984.
- Evans, K. F., Kohl, T., Rybach, L., and Hopkirk, R. J.: The effect of fracture normal compliance on the long-term circulation behaviour of a hot dry rock reservoir: A parameter study using the new fully coupled code fracture, *Geoth. Res. T.*, 16, 449–456, 1992.
- Evans, K. F., Cornet, F. H., Hashida, T., Hayashi, K., Ito, T., Matsuki, K., and Wallroth, T.: Stress and rock mechanics issues of relevance to HDR/HWR engineered geothermal systems: review of developments during the past 15 years, *Geothermics*, 28, 455–474, 1999.
- Evans, K. F., Moriya, H., Niitsuma, H., Jones, R. H., Phillips, W. S., Genter, A., Sausse, J., Jung, R., and Baria, R.: Microseismicity and permeability enhancement of hydrogeologic structures during massive fluid injections into granite at 3 km depth at the Soultz HDR site, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 160, 388–412, 2005a.
- Evans, K. F., Genter, A., and Sausse, J.: Permeability creation and damage due to massive fluid injections into granite at 3.5 km at Soultz: 1. Borehole observations, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 110, B04203, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2004JB003168>, 2005b.
- Evans, K. F., Zappone, A., Kraft, T., Deichmann, N., and Moia, F.: A survey of the induced seismic responses to uid injection in geothermal and CO₂ reservoirs in Europe, *Geothermics*, 41, 30–54, 2012.
- Evans, K., Wieland, U., Wiemer, S., and Giardini D.: Deep Geothermal Energy R&D Roadmap for Switzerland, Swiss Competence Centers for Energy Research, Zurich, Switzerland, 1–43, 2014.
- Eyre, T. S. and van der Baan, M.: Overview of moment-tensor inversion of microseismic events, *The Leading Edge*, 34, 882–888, <https://doi.org/10.1190/tle34080882.1>, 2015.
- Fang, Y., Elsworth, D., Wang, C., Ishibashi, T., and Fitts, J. P.: Frictional stability-permeability relationships for fractures in shales, *J. Geophys. Res.-Sol. Ea.*, 122, 1760–1776, 2017.
- Fang, Y., Elsworth, D., and Cladouhos, T. T.: Reservoir permeability mapping using microearthquake data, *Geothermics*, 72, 83–100, 2018.
- Faulkner, D. R. and Rutter, E. H.: Can the maintenance of overpressured fluids in large strike-slip fault zones explain their apparent weakness?, *Geology*, 29, 503–506, 2008.
- Faulkner, D. R., Jackson, C., Lunn, R., Schlische, R., Shipton, Z., Wibberley, C., and Withjack, M.: A review of recent developments concerning the structure, mechanics and fluid flow properties of fault zones, *J. Struct. Geol.*, 32, 1557–1575, 2010.
- Gale, J. E.: A numerical, field and laboratory study of flow in rocks with deformable fractures, PhD, University of California, Berkeley, USA, 255 pp., 1975.
- Gale, J. E.: Fracture properties from laboratory and large scale field tests: evidence of scale effects, in: Scale Effects in Rock Masses. Proc. 2nd Int. Workshop on Scale Effects in Rock Masses, 25 June 1993, Lisbon, Portugal, 341–352, 1993.
- Garagash, D. I. and Germanovich, L. N.: Nucleation and arrest of dynamic slip on a pressurized fault, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, B10310, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012JB009209>, 2012.
- Garapati, N., Randolph, J. B., and Saar, M. O.: Brine displacement by CO₂, energy extraction rates, and lifespan of a CO₂-limited CO₂ Plume Geothermal (CPG) system with a horizontal production well, *Geothermics*, 55, 182–194, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geothermics.2015.02.005>, 2015.
- Garcia, J., Walters, M., Beall, J., Hartline, C., Pingol, A., Pistone, S., and Wright, M.: Overview of the northwest Geysers EGS demonstration project, in: Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh Workshop on Geothermal Reservoir Engineering, 30 January–1 February 2012, Stanford, USA, 2012.
- Gentier, S., Hopkins, D., and Riss, J.: Role of fracture geometry in the evolution of flow paths under stress, in: Dynamics of Fluids in Fractured Rock, *Geophys. Monogr. Ser.*, vol. 122, edited by: Faybishenko, B., Witherspoon, P. A., and Benson, S. M., AGU, Washington, D.C., USA, 169–184, 2000.
- Giardini, D.: Geothermal quake risks must be faced, *Nature*, 462, 848–849, 2009.
- Gischig, V. S.: Rupture propagation behavior and the largest possible earthquake induced by fluid injection into deep reservoirs, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 42, 7420–7428, 2015.
- Gischig, V. S. and Preisig, G.: Hydro-fracturing versus hydro-shearing: a critical assessment of two distinct reservoir stimulation mechanisms, in: Proceedings of the International Congress of Rock Mechanics, 10–13 May 2015, Montréal, Canada, International Society for Rock Mech. and Rock Engineering, 2015.
- Gischig, V. S. and Wiemer, S.: A stochastic model for induced seismicity based on non-linear pressure diffusion and irreversible permeability enhancement, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 194, 1229–1249, 2013.
- Gischig, V. S., Wiemer, S., and Alcolea, A. R.: Balancing reservoir creation and seismic hazard in enhanced geothermal systems, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 198, 1585–1598, <https://doi.org/10.1093/gji/ggu221>, 2014.
- Gischig, V. S., Jalali, M., Amann, F., Krietsch, H., Klepikova, M., Esposito, S., Broccardo, M., Obermann, A., Mignan, A., Doetsch, J., and Madonna, C.: Impact of the ISC Experi-

- ment at the Grimsel Test Site-Assessment of Potential Seismic Hazard and Disturbances to Nearby Experiments and KWO Infrastructure, ETH Zurich, <https://doi.org/10.3929/ethz-b-000189973>, 2016.
- Gischig, V. S., Doetsch, J., Maurer, H., Krietsch, H., Amann, F., Evans, K. F., Nejati, M., Jalali, M., Valley, B., Obermann, A. C., Wiemer, S., and Giardini, D.: On the link between stress field and small-scale hydraulic fracture growth in anisotropic rock derived from microseismicity, *Solid Earth*, 9, 39–61, <https://doi.org/10.5194/se-9-39-2018>, 2018.
- Goebel, T. H. W., Becker, T. W., Schorlemmer, D., Stanchits, S., Sammis, C., Rybacki, E., and Dresen, G.: Identifying fault heterogeneity through mapping spatial anomalies in acoustic emission statistics, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, B03310, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JB008763>, 2012.
- Goertz-Allmann, B. P. and Wiemer, S.: Geomechanical modeling of induced seismicity source parameters and implications for seismic hazard assessment, *Geophysics*, 78, KS25–KS39, 2013.
- Goertz-Allmann, B. P., Goertz, A., and Wiemer, S.: Stress drop variations of induced earthquakes at the Basel geothermal site, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 38, L09308, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011GL047498>, 2011.
- Goodman, R. E.: The mechanical properties of joints, in: Proceedings of the 3rd Int. Congr. International Society of Rock Mechanics, 1–7 September 1974, Denver, USA, National Academy of Sciences, 127–140, 1974.
- Guglielmi, Y., Cappa, F., Rutqvist, J., Tsang, C.-F., and Thoraval, A.: Field and numerical investigations of free-water surface oscillation effects on rock slope hydrromechanical behaviour – consequences for rock slope stability analyses, in: Proceedings of the GEOPROC 2006: 2nd International Conference on Coupled Thermo-hydro-mechanical-chemical processes in geosystems & engineering, May 2006, Nanjing, China, 174–182, 2006.
- Guglielmi, Y., Cappa, F., Rutqvist, J., Tsang, C.-F., and Thoraval, A.: Mesoscale characterization of coupled hydrromechanical behavior of a fractured-porous slope in response to free water-surface movement, *Int. J. Rock. Mech. Min.*, 42, 852–878, 2008.
- Guglielmi, Y., Cappa, F., Lancon, H., Janowczyk, J. B., Rutqvist, J., Tsang, C. F., and Wang, J. S. Y.: ISRM Suggested Method for Step-Rate Injection Method for Fracture In-Situ Properties (SIMFIP): Using a 3-Components Borehole Deformation Sensor, *Rock Mech. Rock Eng.*, 47, 303–311, 2014.
- Guglielmi, Y., Cappa, F., Avouac, J.-P., Henry, P., and Elsworth, D.: Seismicity triggered by fluid injection induced aseismic slip, *Science*, 348, 1224–1226, 2015a.
- Guglielmi, Y., Henry, P., Nussbaum, C., Dick, P., Gout, C., and Amann, F.: Underground Research Laboratories for conducting fault activation experiments in shales, in: Proceedings of the 49th US Rock Mech./Geomechanics Symposium, 28 June–1 July 2015, San Francisco, USA, American Rock Mechanics Association, 2015b.
- Gupta, H. K.: Reservoir-induced Earthquakes, vol. 64, Elsevier, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, 382 pp., 1992.
- Haimson, B. C. and Cornet, F. H.: ISRM suggested methods for rock stress estimation – Part 3: hydraulic fracture (HF) and/or hydraulic testing of pre-existing fractures (HTPF), *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min.*, 40, 1011–1020, 2003.
- Hampton, J. C., Matzar, L., Hu, D., and Gutierrez, M.: Fracture dimension investigation of laboratory hydraulic fracture interaction with natural discontinuity using acoustic emission, in: Proceedings of the 49th US Rock Mech./Geomechanics Symposium, 28 June–1 July 2015, San Francisco, USA, American Rock Mech. Association, 2015.
- Häring, M. O., Schanz, U., Ladner, F., and Dyer, B. C.: Characterization of the Basel 1 enhanced geothermal system, *Geothermics*, 37, 469–495, 2008.
- Healy, J. H., Rubey, W. W., Griggs, D. T., and Raleigh, C. B.: The Denver earthquakes, *Science*, 161, 1301–1310, 1968.
- Hickman, S. H., Zoback, M. D., and Benoit, R.: Tectonic controls on fault-zone permeability in a geothermal reservoir at Dixie Valley, Nevada, in: Proceedings of the SPE/ISRM Eurock '98, 8–10 July 1998, Trondheim, Norway, Society of Petroleum Engineering, 1998.
- Hickman, S. H., Zoback, M. D., Barton, C. A., Benoit, R., Svitek, J., and Summer, R.: Stress and permeability heterogeneity within the Dixie Valley geothermal reservoir: recent results from well 82-5, in: Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Workshop on Geothermal Reservoir Engineering, 24–26 January 2000, Stanford, USA, 2000.
- Hogarth, R., Holl, H., and McMahon, A.: Flow testing results from Habanero EGS Project, in: Proceedings of the Australian Geothermal Energy Conferences, 14–15 November 2013, Brisbane, Australia, 2013.
- Horálek, J., Jechumtálová, Z., Dorbath, L., and Sýleny, J.: Source mechanisms of micro-earthquakes induced in a fluid injection experiment at the HDR site Soultz-sous-Forets (Alsace) in 2003 and their temporal and spatial variations, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 181, 1547–1565, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.2010.04506.x>, 2010.
- Houben, G.: Review: Hydraulics of water wells – flow laws and influence of geometry, *Hydrogeology J.*, 23, 1633–1657, 2015.
- Hubbert, M. K. and Rubey, W. W.: Role of fluid pressure in mechanics of overthrust faulting i. mechanics of fluid-filled porous solids and its application to overthrust faulting, *Geol. Soc. Am. Bull.*, 70, 115–166, 1959.
- Hummel, N. and Müller, T. M.: Microseismic signatures of non-linear pore-fluid pressure diffusion, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 179, 1558–1565, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.2009.04373.x>, 2009.
- Husen, S., Bachmann, C., and Giardini, D.: Locally triggered seismicity in the central Swiss Alps following the large rainfall event of August 2005, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 171, 1126–1134, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.2007.03561.x>, 2007.
- Huw, C., Eisner, L., Styles, P., and Turner, P.: Felt seismicity associated with shale gas hydraulic fracturing: The first documented example in Europe, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 41, 8308–8314, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GL062047>, 2014.
- Ishida, T.: Acoustic emission monitoring of hydraulic fracturing in laboratory and field, *Constr. Build. Mater.*, 15, 283–295, 2001.
- Jaeger, J. C.: Extension Failures in Rocks subject to fluid Pressure, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 68, 6066–6067, 1963.
- Jeanne, P., Guglielmi, Y., and Cappa, F.: Dissimilar properties within a carbonate-reservoir's small fault zone, and their impact on the pressurization and leakage associated with CO₂ injection, *J. Struct. Geol.*, 47, 25–35, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsg.2012.10.010>, 2012.
- Jeanne, P., Rutqvist, J., Vasco, D., Garcia, J., Dobson, P. F., Walters, M., Hartline, C., and Borgia, A.: A 3D hydrogeological and ge-

- omechanical model of an Enhanced Geothermal System at The Geysers, California, *Geothermics*, 51, 240–252, 2014.
- Jeanne, P., Rutqvist, J., Rinaldi, A. P., Dobson, P. F., Walters, M., Hartline, C., and Garcia, J.: Seismic and aseismic deformations and impact on reservoir permeability: The case of EGS stimulation at The Geysers, California, USA, *J. Geophys. Res.-Sol. Ea.*, 120, 7863–7882, 2015.
- Jeffrey, R. G. and Bungler, A.: A Detailed Comparison of Experimental and Numerical Data on Hydraulic Fracture Height Growth Through Stress Contrasts, in: *Proceedings of the SPE Hydraulic Fracturing Technology Conference*, 29–31 January 2007, College Station, USA, Society of Petroleum Engineers, 2007.
- Jeffrey, R. G. and Settari, A.: A Comparison of Hydraulic Fracture Field Experiments, Including Mineback Geometry Data, with Numerical Fracture Model Simulations, in: *Proceedings of the SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition*, 22–25 October 1995, Dallas, USA, Society of Petroleum Engineers, 1995.
- Jeffrey, R. G., Brynes, R. P., Lynch, P. J., and Ling, D. J.: An Analysis of Hydraulic Fracture and Mineback Data for a Treatment in the German Creek Coal Seam, in: *Proceedings of the SPE Rocky Mountain Regional Meeting*, 18–21 May 1992, Casper, USA, Society of Petroleum Engineers, 1992.
- Jeffrey, R. G., Enever, J., Phillips, R., Ferguson, T., Davidson, S., and Bride, J.: Small-Scale Hydraulic Fracturing and Mineback Experiment in Coal Seams, in: *Proceedings of the 1993 International Coalbed methane Symposium*, 17–21 May 1993, Birmingham, UK, 1993.
- Jeffrey, R. G., Bungler, A. P., LeCampion, B., Zhang, X., Chen, Z. R., van As, A., Allison, D. P., De Beer, W., Dudley, J. W., Siebrits, E., Thiercelin, M. J., and Mainguy, M.: Measuring Hydraulic Fracture Growth in Naturally Fractured Rock., in: *Proceedings of the SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition*, 4–7 October 2009, New Orleans, USA, Society of Petroleum Engineers, 2009.
- Johnson, E. and Cleary, M. P.: Implications of recent laboratory experimental results for hydraulic fractures, in: *Proceedings of the Low Permeability Reservoirs Symposium*, 15–17 April 1991, Denver, USA, Society of Petroleum Engineers, 1991.
- Jost, M., Büßelberg, T., Jost, Ö., and Harjes, H.: Source parameters of injection-induced microearthquakes at 9 km depth at the KTB Deep Drilling site, Germany, *B. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, 88, 815–832, 1998.
- Jung, R.: Hydraulic in situ investigations of an artificial fracture in the Falkenberg Granite, *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min.*, 26, 301–308, 1989.
- Jung, R.: EGS – Goodbye or Back to the Future, in: *Effective and Sustainable Hydraulic Fracturing*, edited by: Bungler, A. P., McLennan, J., and Jeffrey, R., *InTech*, 95–121, <https://doi.org/10.5772/56458>, 2013.
- Jupe, A., Green, A. S. P., and Wallroth, T.: Induced Microseismicity and Reservoir Growth at the Fjällbacka Hot Dry Rocks Project, Sweden, *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min.*, 29, 343–354, 1992.
- Kaieda, H., Jones, R., Moriya, H., Sasaki, S., and Ushijima, K.: Ogachi HDR reservoir evaluation by AE and geophysical methods, in: *Proceedings of the World Geothermal Congress 2005*, 24–29 April 2005, Antalya, Turkey, 3755–3760, 2005.
- Karvounis, D. C., Gischig, V. S., and Wiemer, S.: Towards a Real-Time Forecast of Induced Seismicity for Enhanced Geothermal Systems, in: *Proceedings of the 2014 Shale Energy Engineering Conference*, 21–23 July 2014, Pittsburgh, USA, 246 pp., 2014.
- Keranen, K. M., Savage, H. M., Abers, G. A., and Cochran, E. S.: Potentially induced earthquakes in Oklahoma, USA: Links between wastewater injection and the 2011 Mw 5.7 earthquake sequence, *Geology*, 41, 699–702, <https://doi.org/10.1130/G34045.1>, 2013.
- Király-Proag, E., Zechar, J. D., Gischig, V., Wiemer, S., Karvounis, D., and Doetsch, J.: Validating induced seismicity forecast models – Induced Seismicity Test Bench, *J. Geophys. Res.-Sol. Ea.*, 121, 6009–6029, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JB013236>, 2016.
- Kohl, T., Evans, K. F., Hopkirk, R. J., Jung, R., and Rybach, L.: Observation and simulation of non-Darcian flow transients in fractured rock, *Water Resour. Res.*, 33, 407–418, 1997.
- Kraft, T. and Deichmann, N.: High-precision relocation and focal mechanism of the injection induced seismicity at the Basel EGS, *Geothermics*, 52, 59–73, 2014.
- Krietsch, H., Gischig, V., Jalali, R., Amann, F., Evans, K. F., Doetsch, J., and Valley, B.: Stress measurements in crystalline rock: Comparison of overcoring, hydraulic fracturing and induced seismicity results, in: *Proceedings of the 51st US Rock Mechanics/Geomechanics Symposium*, 25–28 June 2017, San Francisco, USA, American Rock Mech. Association, 2017.
- Kwiatak, G., Plenkers, K., and Dresen, G.: Source Parameters of Picoearthquakes Recorded at Mponeng Deep Gold Mine, South Africa: Implications for Scaling Relations, *B. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, 101, 2592–2608, <https://doi.org/10.1785/0120110094>, 2011.
- Lee, H. S. and Cho, T. F.: Hydraulic Characteristics of Rough Fractures in Linear Flow under Normal and Shear Load, *Rock Mech. Rock Eng.*, 35, 299–318, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00603-002-0028-y>, 2002.
- Louis, C., Dessene, J.-L., and Feuga, B.: Interaction between water flow phenomena and the mechanical behavior of soil or rock masses, in: *Finite elements in geomechanics*, edited by: Gudehns, G., Wiley, New York, USA, 479–511, 1977.
- Majer, E., Nelson, J., Robertson-Tait, A., Savy, J., and Wong, I.: Protocol for addressing induced seismicity associated with enhanced geothermal systems, U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Washington, D.C., USA, 1–46, 2012.
- Manning, C. and Ingebritsen, S.: Permeability of the continental crust: Implications of geothermal data and metamorphic systems, *Rev. Geophys.*, 37, 127–150, 1999.
- Marone, C. and Scholz, C. H.: The depth of seismic faulting and the upper transition from stable to unstable slip regimes, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 15, 621–624, <https://doi.org/10.1029/GL015i006p00621>, 1988.
- Martin, C. D., Davison, C. C., and Kozak, E. T.: Characterizing normal stiffness and hydraulic conductivity of a major shear zone in granite, in: *Rock joints – Proceedings of the International Symposium on rock joints*, edited by: Barton, N. and Stephansson, O., Balkema, Rotterdam, the Netherlands, 549–556, 1990.
- Martínez-Garzón, P., Bohnhoff, M., Kwiatak, G., and Dresen, G.: Stress tensor changes related to fluid injection at The Geysers geothermal field, California, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40, 2596–2601, 2013.
- Martínez-Garzón, P., Kwiatak, G., Bohnhoff, M., and Dresen, G.: Volumetric components in the earthquake source related to fluid

- injection and stress state, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 44, 800–809, 2017.
- Maurly, V.: Rock failure mechanisms identification: A key for wellbore stability and reservoir behaviour problem, in: *Proceedings of the Rock Mechanics in Petroleum Engineering (Eurock 94)*, 29–31 August 1994, Delft, the Netherlands, 175–182, 1994.
- Maxwell, S.: *Microseismic Imaging of Hydraulic Fracturing: Improved Engineering of Unconventional Shale Reservoirs*, Distinguished Instructor Series, 17, Society of Exploration Geophysicists, Tulsa, USA, 214 pp., 2014.
- McClure, M. W.: Modelling and characterization of hydraulic stimulation and induced seismicity in geothermal and shale gas reservoirs, PhD, Stanford University, Stanford, California, USA, 369 pp., 2012.
- McClure, M. W.: Generation of large postinjection-induced seismic events by backflow from dead-end faults and fractures, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 42, 6647–6654, 2015.
- McClure, M. W. and Horne, R. N.: Investigation of injection-induced seismicity using a coupled fluid flow and rate/state friction model, *Geophysics*, 76, 181–198, 2011.
- McClure, M. W. and Horne, R. N.: An investigation of stimulation mechanisms in Enhanced Geothermal Systems, *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min.*, 72, 242–260, 2014.
- McGarr, A.: Seismic moments and volume changes, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 81, 1487–1494, 1976.
- Mena, B., Wiemer, S., and Bachmann, C.: Building robust model to forecast the induced seismicity related to geothermal reservoir enhancements, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, 103, 383–393, 2013.
- Meng, C.: Hydraulic fracture propagation in pre-fractured rocks, in: *Proceedings of the SPE Hydraulic Fracturing Technology Conference*, 24–26 January 2011, The Woodlands, USA, Society of Petroleum Engineers, 2011.
- Mignan, A., Landtwing, D., Kästli, P., Mena, B., and Wiemer, S.: Induced seismicity risk analysis of the 2006 Basel, Switzerland, Enhanced Geothermal System project: Influence of uncertainties on risk mitigation, *Geothermics*, 53, 133–146, 2015.
- Murdoch, L. C., Schweisinger, T., Svenson, E., and Germanovich, L.: Measuring and analyzing transient changes in fracture aperture during well tests: preliminary results, in: *Proceedings of the Dynamics of fluids in fractured rock (Witherspoon Conference)*, 10–12 February 2004, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, California, USA, 129–132, 2004.
- Murphy H., Huang, C., Dash, Z., Zyvoloski, G., and White, A.: Semi-analytical solutions for fluid flow in rock joints with pressure-dependent openings, *Water Resour. Res.*, 40, W12506, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2004WR003005>, 2004.
- Nicholson, C. and Wesson, R.L.: *Earthquake Hazard Associated with Deep Well Injection – A Report to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency*, U.S. Geological Survey Bulletin, Denver, USA, 74 pp., 1951.
- Nicol, D. A. C. and Robinson, B. A.: Modelling the heat extraction from the Rosemanowes HDR reservoir, *Geothermics*, 19, 247–257, 1990.
- Niitsuma, H., Fehler, M., Jones, R., Wilson, S., Albright, J., Green, A., Baria, R., Hayashi, K., Kaieda, H., Tezuka, K., Jupe, A., Wallroth, T., Cornet, F., Asanuma, H., Moriya, H., Nagano, K., Phillips, W.S., Rutledge, J., House, L., Beauce, A., Alde, D., and Aster, R.: Current status of seismic and borehole measurements for HDR/HWR development, *Geothermics*, 28, 475–490, 1999.
- Olsson, R. and Barton, N.: An improved model for hydromechanical coupling during shearing of rock joints, *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min.*, 38, 317–329, 2001.
- Parker, R. H.: *Hot Dry Rock Geothermal Energy: Phase 2B Final Report of the Camborne School of Mines Project*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, UK, 1391 pp., 1989.
- Parker, R. H.: The Rosemanowes HDR project 1983–1991, *Geothermics*, 28, 603–615, 1999.
- Pearson, C.: The relationship between microseismicity and high pore pressures during hydraulic stimulation experiments in low porosity granitic rock, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 86, 7855–7864, 1981.
- Pettitt, W., Pierce, M., Damjanac, B., Hazzard, J., Lorig, L., Fairhurst, C., Gil, I., Sanchez, M., Nagel, N., Reyes-Montes, J., and Young, R. P.: Fracture network engineering for hydraulic fracturing, *The Leading Edge*, 30, 844–853, <https://doi.org/10.1190/1.3626490>, 2011.
- Petty, S., Nordin, Y., Glassely, W., and Cladouhos, T.: Improving geothermal project economics with multi-zone stimulation: results from the Newberry volcano EGS demonstration, in: *Proceedings of the Thirty-Eighth Workshop on Geothermal Reservoir Engineering*, 11–13 February 2013, Stanford, USA, 2013.
- Phillips, S., House, L. S., and Fehler, M. C.: Detailed joint structure in a geothermal reservoir from studies of induced microseismic clusters, *J. Geophys. Res.-Sol. Ea.*, 102, 11745–11763, 1997.
- Pine, R. J., Baria, R., Pearson, R. A., Kwakwa, K., and McCartney, R.: A Technical Summary of Phase 2B of the Camborne School of Mines HDR Project, 1983–1986, *Geothermics*, 16, 341–353, 1987.
- Power, W. L. and Tullis, T. E.: Euclidean and fractal models for the description of surface roughness, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 96, 415–424, 1991.
- Preisig, G., Eberhardt, E., Gischig, V., Roche, V., Van der Baan, M., Valley, B., Kaiser, P., and Du, D.: Development of connected rock mass permeability by hydraulic fractures growth accompanying fluid injection, *Geofluids*, 15, 321–337, 2015.
- Pruess, K.: Enhanced geothermal systems (EGS) using CO₂ as working fluid – a novel approach for generating renewable energy with simultaneous sequestration of carbon, *Geothermics*, 35, 351–367, 2006.
- Pruess, K.: Role of fluid pressure in the production behavior of enhanced geothermal systems with CO₂ as working fluid, *GRC Trans.*, 31, 307–311, 2007.
- Rahman, M. K., Hossain, M. M., and Rahman, S. S.: A shear-dilation-based model for evaluation of hydraulically stimulated naturally fractured reservoirs, *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Met.*, 26, 469–497, 2002.
- Raleigh, C., Healy, J., and Bredehoeft, J.: An experiment in earthquake control at Rangely, Colorado, *Science*, 191, 1230–1237, 1976.
- Randolph, J. B. and Saar, M. O.: Combining geothermal energy capture with geologic carbon dioxide sequestration, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 38, L10401, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011GL047265>, 2011a.
- Randolph, J. B. and Saar, M. O.: Coupling carbon dioxide sequestration with geothermal energy capture in naturally permeable, porous geologic formations: Implications for CO₂ sequestration, *Energy Proced.*, 4, 2206–2213, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2011.02.108>, 2011b.

- Robinson, B. A. and Brown, D. W.: Modeling the hydraulic characteristics of the Fenton Hill, New Mexico Hot Dry Rock Reservoir, International Symposium on Geothermal Energy, 20–24 August, Kaillua, Kona, Hawaii, USA, 1990.
- Rutledge, J. T., Phillips, W. S., and Mayerhofer, M. J.: Faulting Induced by Forced Fluid Injection and Fluid Flow Forced by Faulting: An Interpretation of Hydraulic-Fracture Microseismicity, Carthage Cotton Valley Gas Field, Texas, *B. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, 94, 1817–1830, 2004.
- Rutqvist, J.: Determination of hydraulic normal stiffness of fractures in hard rock from well testing, *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min.*, 32, 513–523, 1995.
- Rutqvist, J.: Status of the tough-ac simulator and recent applications related to coupled fluid flow and crustal deformations, *Comput. Geosci.*, 37, 739–750, 2011.
- Rutqvist, J. and Oldenburg, C. M.: Analysis of injection-induced micro-earthquakes in a geothermal stream reservoir, Geysers Geothermal Field, California, in: Proceedings of the 42th US Rock Mech. Symposium, 29 June–2 July 2008, San Francisco, USA, 151 pp., 2008.
- Rutqvist, J. and Stephansson, O.: A cyclic hydraulic jacking test to determine the in-situ stress normal to a fracture, *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min.*, 33, 695–711, 1996.
- Rutqvist, J. and Stephansson, O.: The role of hydromechanical coupling in fractured rock engineering, *Hydrogeol. J.*, 11, 7–40, 2003.
- Saar, M. O.: Review: Geothermal heat as a tracer of large-scale groundwater flow and as a means to determine permeability fields, *Hydrogeol. J.*, 19, 31–52, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10040-010-0657-2>, 2011.
- Saar, M. O.: Novel Geothermal Technologies, in: Potentials, costs and environmental assessment of electricity generation technologies, edited by: Bauer, C. and Hirschberg, S., Swiss Federal Office of Energy, Swiss Competences Center for Energy Research “Supply of Electricity” and “Biomass for Swiss Energy Future”, Bern, Switzerland, 715–725, 2017.
- Saar, M. O. and Manga, M.: Seismicity induced by seasonal groundwater recharge at Mt. Hood, Oregon, *Earth Planet. Sc. Lett.*, 214, 605–618, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-821X\(03\)00418-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-821X(03)00418-7), 2003.
- Saar, M. O. and Manga, M.: Depth dependence of permeability in the Oregon Cascades inferred from hydrogeologic, thermal, seismic, and magmatic modeling constraints, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, B04204, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2003JB002855>, 2004.
- Samuelson, J., Elsworth, D., and Marone, C.: Shear-induced dilatancy of fluid-saturated faults: Experiment and theory, *J. Geophys. Res.-Sol. Ea.*, 114, 1–15, 2009.
- Schmittbuhl, J., Schmitt, F., and Scholz, C.H.: Scaling invariance of crack surfaces, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 100, 5953–5973, 1995.
- Schoenball, M., Baujard, C., Kohl, T., and Dorbath, L.: The role of triggering by static stress transfer during geothermal reservoir stimulation, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, B09307, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012JB009304>, 2012.
- Scholz, C. H.: On the stress dependence of the earthquake b value, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 42, 1399–1402, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GL02863>, 2015.
- Schorlemmer, D., Wiemer, S., and Wyss, M.: Variations in earthquake size distribution across different stress regimes, *Nature*, 437, 539–542, 2005.
- Schrauf, T. W. and Evans, D. D.: Laboratory Studies of Gas Flow Through a Single Natural Fracture, *Water Resour. Res.*, 22, 1038–1050, 1986.
- Schweisinger, T., Murdoch, L. C., and Huey Jr., C. O.: Design of a removable borehole extensometer, *Geotech. Test. J.*, 30, 202–211, 2007.
- Schweisinger T., Swenson, E. J., and Murdoch, L. C.: Introduction to hydromechanical well tests in fractured rock aquifers, *Groundwater*, 47, 69–79, 2009.
- Scotti, O. and Cornet, F. H.: In situ evidence for fluid induced aseismic slip events along fault zones, *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min.*, 1, 347–358, 1994.
- Shamir, G. and Zoback, M. D.: Stress orientation profile to 3.5 km depth near the San Andreas fault at Cajon Pass, California, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 97, 5059–5080, 1992.
- Sileny, J., Hill, D. P., and Cornet, F. H.: Non-double-couple mechanisms of microearthquakes induced by hydraulic fracturing, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 114, B08307, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JB005987>, 2009.
- Song, I., Suh, M., Won, K., and Haimson, B.: A laboratory study of hydraulic fracturing breakdown pressure in tablerock sandstone, *Geosci. J.*, 5, 263–271, <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02910309>, 2001.
- Spada, M., Tormann, T., Goebel, T., and Wiemer, S.: Generic dependence of the frequency-size distribution of earthquakes on depth and its relation to the strength profile of the crust, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40, 709–714, 2013.
- Stein, R. S.: The role of stress transfer in earthquake occurrence, *Nature*, 402, 605–609, 1999.
- Tenma, N., Yamaguchi, T., and Zvyoloski, G.: The Hijiori Hot Dry Rock test site, Japan evaluation and optimization of heat extraction from a two-layered reservoir, *Geothermics*, 37, 19–52, 2008.
- Terakawa, T., Miller, S. A., and Deichmann, N.: High fluid pressure and triggered earthquakes in the enhanced geothermal system in Basel, Switzerland, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, B07305, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JB008980>, 2012.
- Tester, J. W., Anderson, B. J., Batchelor, A., Blackwell, D., DiPippo, R., Drake, E., Garnish, J., Livesay, B., Moore, M., Nichols, K., Petty, S., Toksöz, M. N., and Veatch, R. W.: The future of geothermal energy – Impact of Enhanced Geothermal Systems (EGS) on the United States in the 21st Century, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA, 372 pp., 2006.
- Tezuka, K. and Niitsuma, H.: Stress estimated using microseismic clusters and its relationship to the fracture system of the Hijiori Hot Dry Rock reservoir, *Eng. Geol.*, 56, 47–62, 2000.
- Tormann, T., Wiemer, S., and Mignan, A.: Systematic survey of high-resolution b value imaging along Californian faults: Inference on asperities, *J. Geophys. Res.-Sol. Ea.*, 119, 2029–2054, 2014.
- Tormann, T., Enescu, B., Woessner, J., and Wiemer, S.: Randomness of megathrust earthquakes implied by rapid stress recovery after the Japan earthquake, *Nat. Geosci.*, 8, 152–158, 2015.
- Valley, B. and Evans, K. F.: Stress orientation to 5 km depth in the basement below Basel (Switzerland) from borehole failure analysis, *Swiss J. Earth Sci.*, 102, 467–480, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00015-009-1335-z>, 2009.
- Valley, B. and Evans, K. F.: Stress Heterogeneity in the Granite of the Soultz EGS Reservoir Inferred from Analysis of Wellbore Failure, in: Proceedings of the World Geothermal Congress, 25–

- 29 April 2010, Bali, Indonesia, International Geothermal Association, 2010.
- van As, A. and Jeffrey, R. G.: Caving Induced by Hydraulic Fracturing at Northparkes Mines, in: Proceedings of the 4th North American Rock Mech. Symposium, 31 July–3 August 2000, Seattle, USA, American Rock Mech. Association, 2000.
- van As, A. and Jeffrey, R. G.: Hydraulic fracture growth in naturally fractured rock: mine through mapping and analyses, in: Proceedings of the 5th North American Rock Mech. Symposium and the 17th Tunneling Association of Canada Conference (NARMS-TAC conference), 7–10 July 2002, Toronto, Canada, 2002.
- van As, A., Jeffrey R. G., Chacón, E., and Barrera, V.: Preconditioning by hydraulic fracturing for bloc caving in a moderately stressed naturally fractured orebody, in: Proceedings of the Massmin 2004 conference, 22–25 August 2004, Santiago, Chile, 2004.
- van der Baan, M., Eaton, D., and Dusseault, M.: Microseismic Monitoring Developments in Hydraulic Fracture Stimulation, in: Effective and Sustainable Hydraulic Fracturing, edited by: Bungler, A. P., McLennan, J., and Jeffrey, R. G., InTech, 439–466, <https://doi.org/10.5772/45724>, 2013.
- Vermilyen, J. and Zoback, M. D.: Hydraulic Fracturing, Microseismic Magnitudes, and Stress Evolution in the Barnett Shale, Texas, USA, in: Proceedings of the SPE Hydraulic Fracturing Technology Conference, 24–26 January 2011, The Woodlands, USA, Society of Petroleum Engineers, 2011.
- Vogler, D., Amann, F., Bayer, P., and Elsworth, D.: Permeability Evolution in Natural Fractures Subject to Cyclic Loading and Gouge Formation, *Rock Mech. Rock Eng.*, 49, 3463–3479, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00603-016-1022-0>, 2016.
- Warpinski, N. R.: Measurement of Width and Pressure in a Propagating Hydraulic Fracture, *Soc. Petrol. Eng. J.*, 25, 46–54, <https://doi.org/10.2118/11648-PA>, 1985.
- Warpinski, N. R.: Microseismic Monitoring – Inside and Out, *J. Petrol. Technol.*, 61, 80–85, <https://doi.org/10.2118/118537-JPT>, 2009.
- Warpinski, N. R.: Understanding Hydraulic Fracture Growth, Effectiveness, and Safety Through Microseismic Monitoring, in: Effective and Sustainable Hydraulic Fracturing, edited by: Bungler, A. P., McLennan, J., and Jeffrey, R. G., InTech, 123–135, 2013.
- Warpinski, N. R. and Du, J.: Source-Mechanism Studies on Microseismicity Induced by Hydraulic Fracturing, in: Proceedings of the SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, 19–22 September 2010, Florence, Italy, Society of Petroleum Engineers, 2010.
- Warpinski, N. R. and Teufel, L. W.: Influence of geologic discontinuities on hydraulic fracture propagation, *J. Petrol. Technol.*, 39, 209–220, 1987.
- Warpinski, N. R., Clark, J. A., Schmidt, R. A., and Huddle, C. W.: Laboratory Investigation on the Effect of In-Situ Stresses on Hydraulic Fracture Containment, *Soc. Petrol. Eng. J.*, 22, 333–340, <https://doi.org/10.2118/9834-PA>, 1982.
- Warren, W. E. and Smith, C. W.: In Situ Stress Estimates From Hydraulic Fracturing and Direct Observation of Crack Orientation, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 9, 829–868, 1985.
- Wolhart, S. L., Harting, T. A., Dahlem, J. E., Young, T., Mayerhofer, M. J., and Lolon, E. P.: Hydraulic fracture diagnostics used to optimize development in the Jonah field, in: Proceedings of the SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, 24–27 September 2006, San Antonio, USA, Society of Petroleum Engineers, 2006.
- Yeo, I. W., De Freitas, M. H., and Zimmerman, R. W.: Effect of shear displacement on the aperture and permeability of a rock fracture, *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min.*, 35, 1051–1070, 1998.
- Yoon, J.-S., Zang, A., and Stephansson, O.: Numerical investigation on optimized stimulation of intact and naturally fractured deep geothermal reservoirs using hydro-mechanical coupled discrete particles joints model, *Geothermics*, 52, 165–184, 2014.
- Zang, A., Yoon, J. S., Stephansson, O., and Heidbach, O.: Fatigue hydraulic fracturing by cyclic reservoir treatment enhances permeability and reduces induced seismicity, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 195, 1282–1287, <https://doi.org/10.1093/gji/ggt301>, 2013.
- Ziegler, M., Valley, B., and Evans, K.: Characterisation of Natural Fractures and Fracture Zones of the Basel EGS Reservoir Inferred from Geophysical Logging of the Basel-1 Well, in: Proceedings of the World Geothermal Congress, 19–25 April 2015, Melbourne, Australia, International Geothermal Association, 2015.
- Zoback, M. D. and Harjes, H.-P.: Injection-induced earthquakes and crustal stress at 9 km depth at the KTB deep drilling site, Germany, *J. Geophys. Res.-Sol. Ea.*, 102, 18477–18491, 1997.
- Zoback, M. D., Rummel, F., Jung, R., and Raleigh, C. B.: Laboratory Hydraulic Fracturing Experiments in Intact and Prefractured Rock, *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min.*, 14, 49–58, 1977.
- Zoback, M. D., Kohli, A., Das, I., and McClure, M. W.: The importance of slow slip on faults during hydraulic fracturing stimulation of shale gas reservoirs, in: Proceedings of the SPE Americas Unconventional Resources Conference, 5–7 June 2012, Pittsburgh, USA, Society of Petroleum Engineers, 2012.