

TOMOGRAPHIC DETERMINATION OF
INTERVAL VELOCITIES FROM REFLECTION
SEISMIC DATA: THE METHOD OF CONTROLLED
DIRECTIONAL RECEPTION

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF GEOPHYSICS
AND THE COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES
OF STANFORD UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By
Charles Hege Sword, Jr.
September, 1987

© Copyright 1987
by
Charles Hege Sword, Jr.

printed as Stanford Exploration Project Report No. 55
by permission of the author

Copying for all internal purposes of the sponsors
of the Stanford Exploration Project is permitted

Abstract

Tomography in the context of reflection seismology can be defined as the use of measured traveltimes to determine rock velocities. I propose a method of tomographic inversion that uses not only reflected-wave traveltimes, measured between source points and receiver points, but that uses ray parameters as well. The ray parameters (essentially, the angles of travel of the waves) are measured at the source and the receiver. A consequence of this approach is that reflecting interfaces (horizons) are only assumed to be locally continuous, and horizon positions are not determined during the process of inverting for interval velocity.

I am able to use a fully-automated computer program to pick the traveltimes and ray-parameter data. This automated picking technique has been developed in the USSR as an aspect of the method of Controlled Directional Reception (CDR). The picked data are used to construct migrated images of seismic reflectors. These data can be filtered on the basis of velocity and dip to remove multiples and spurious picks.

I invert the picked data by means of an iterative ray-tracing technique to find the interval-velocity model that minimizes a non-linear least-squares objective function. This objective function is based on the mismatch between the actual paths of rays in the ground, as determined from the picked data, and the computed paths of rays in the velocity model. A penalty term is included in the objective function, to discourage sharp variations in the velocity model.

This tomographic method has given good results when I have used it to invert synthetic data and data from a marine reflection seismic survey.

...Почерк у [генерал-майора КГБ] Константинова был четкий и быстрый. Он, однако, предпочитал — особенно в последние годы — не писать, а сразу же печатать на портативной машинке, ибо слово напечатанное резко отличается от слова написанного. Более того, когда Константинов подготовил свою диссертацию к изданию (тема была открытой — «Политические маневры гитлеровской Германии накануне мятежа Франко»), он, к вящему своему удивлению, заметил, что страница, напечатанная на машинке, невероятно отличается от набранной в типографии — словно бы два совершенно разных текста. Он тогда подумал, что мера ответственности человека за мысль — а высшее выявление мысли это строка, набранная в типографии,— в значительной степени зависит от того, на какой бумаге и каким шрифтом набрано: куда ни крути, форма — это уже содержание.
(Юлиан Семенов, *TASS уполномочен заявить...*)

...[KGB Major-General] Konstantinov's handwriting was quick and precise. He, however, preferred—especially in recent years—not to write by hand, but to type directly on a portable typewriter, since the typed word differs sharply from the handwritten one. Moreover, when Konstantinov had prepared his dissertation for publication (the theme was an open one: “Political maneuvers of Hitler's Germany on the eve of Franco's revolt”), he, to his own great surprise, had discovered that a typewritten page differs by an amazing amount from one that has been typeset—almost as if they were two completely different texts. He came to realize that the extent of a person's accountability for his ideas (and the highest manifestation of ideas is the typeset page) to a significant degree depends on what sort of paper and what sort of typeface is used. There's no avoiding it: form is already substance.
(Yulian Semyonov, *TASS is Authorized to Announce...*)

Preface

The method of Controlled Directional Reception (CDR) was first developed by Frank Rieber in the 1930's (Rieber, 1936). This method, in its most elementary form, consisted of carrying out slant stacks (linear stacks along lines of different slope) (Schultz and Claerbout, 1978) over a short range of offsets. Rieber called the resulting slant-stacked traces sonograms. Although Rieber was an American, his method did not receive a great deal of attention in the United States. It was, however, extensively developed over the course of the next five decades in the Soviet Union, under the name CDR. Dr. L.A. Riabinkin (1910–1985) was the Soviet scientist most responsible for this development (Hermont, 1979); he always gave Rieber due credit for the original idea behind CDR.

As seismic recording technology and processing techniques grew more sophisticated, so too did the CDR method. The most recent Soviet contributions to CDR take advantage both of computerization and of the dense coverage afforded by modern recording methods. Despite these refinements, Soviet geophysicists have not been able to take advantage of the full power of CDR, because they have difficulty gaining access to adequate computer facilities.

I became interested in the CDR method during a 9-month stay in 1983–84 at the Gubkin Oil and Gas Institute in Moscow, where Dr. Riabinkin's laboratory is located. Upon return to Stanford, I developed the method of CDR tomographic velocity inversion, which I shall describe here.

Owing to differences in computer technology, some of the methods I describe in this thesis are dissimilar to those that are used in the Soviet Union. I make no real attempt to describe present-day Soviet CDR techniques, except as they have been incorporated into my own approach.

Acknowledgments

This thesis would not have been possible without the guidance of Professor Jon Claerbout. He encouraged me to try out my ideas, no matter how wild, and he always emphasized the importance of eventually applying these ideas to field data. He provided me with the perfect combination of freedom to explore, and guidance. The financial support for my work came from the Stanford Exploration Project (SEP), which Jon heads. I only wish that I had enough room to thank individually the forty companies and organizations that sponsor the Stanford Exploration Project.

Much of this thesis is based on work done by researchers in the Soviet Union. I had the opportunity to observe this work at first hand for nine months, thanks to the sponsorship of the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX). I must also thank the Gubkin Institute of Oil and Gas in Moscow, which provided me with support while I was in Moscow. Boris Zavalishin of the Gubkin Institute was particularly helpful, and many of his comments found a place in this thesis. I also thank Charlotte Derksen, the Head Librarian of the Stanford Earth Sciences library. Thanks to her efforts, Stanford has an excellent collection of Soviet geophysical literature.



Kiyoshi Yomogida carefully read two drafts of this thesis, and pointed out many unclear and ambiguous usages. Paul Fowler spent a great deal of time reformatting a British Petroleum data set to make it easy to use. Without his generosity in sharing these reformatted data with me, my thesis might not have contained any field examples. Will Gray shared his wisdom and experience regarding the pitfalls of processing field data. Pat Bartz, the SEP Project Coordinator, is the reason why the other SEP graduate students and I could concentrate our energies on research, instead of on paperwork and administration. I would also like to thank Jeff Thorson, Ivan Pšenčík, Rick Ottolini, and Dan Rothman for helpful discussions and ideas.

Most of all, I would like to thank my parents. Their patience, love, and support over many long years are what truly made this thesis possible.

Contents

Abstract	iii
Preface	v
Acknowledgments	vi
1 Introduction	1
1.1 The objective function	2
1.2 Optimization	2
1.3 Advantages and disadvantages	3
1.4 Notation	4
1.5 Summary of the thesis	5
2 The CDR method	7
2.1 Overview	7
2.1.1 Reciprocal parameters	8
2.1.2 Velocity and displays	9
2.1.3 Velocity filtering	9
2.1.4 Previous work	9
2.2 CDR picking methods	10
2.2.1 Direct picking methods	10
2.2.2 Indirect picking methods	16
2.2.3 Correlated CDR	20
2.3 CDR migration, velocity analysis, and imaging	20
2.3.1 CDR constant-velocity depth migration	20
2.3.2 CDR velocity analysis	23

2.3.3	CDR display techniques	24
2.4	Picking field data	30
2.4.1	Comparison of picked data to the original section	31
2.4.2	Velocity and amplitude filtering	33
3	Tomographic velocity inversion	35
3.1	Overview	35
3.1.1	Traveltime tomography	35
3.1.2	Layer stripping	36
3.1.3	CDR tomography	37
3.1.4	Other approaches	37
3.2	The CDR tomographic objective function	38
3.2.1	An unstable objective function	38
3.2.2	An expensive objective function	40
3.2.3	A stable objective function	41
3.3	Minimizing the objective function	42
3.3.1	Damping	43
3.3.2	The Gauss-Newton method	43
3.3.3	Problems with damping	46
3.4	Synthetic examples	48
3.4.1	Synthetic data from a layered medium	48
3.4.2	Synthetic data from a laterally heterogeneous model	49
3.5	Imaging the reflectors	53
3.6	Resolution	54
4	Inversion of field data	57
5	Future directions	65
5.1	Defining the velocity with basis functions	65
5.2	Using horizon coherency in the objective function	66
5.3	Damping and dip-bar density	67
5.4	Converted waves	67
5.5	Application to 3-D surveys	68

6	Conclusions	71
6.1	Summary	72
6.2	Interpretation and conclusions	72
A	Fine points of CDR picking	73
A.1	Slant stacks  picking	73
A.1.1	Slant stack interpolation . . . 	73
A.1.2	Automatic picking	75
A.2	A marine data set	78
A.2.1	CDR and picking parameters	78
A.2.2	Filtering parameters	80
A.2.3	Computation time	81
B	The line search	83
C	Ray tracing in a gridded velocity field	85
C.1	Ray tracing in a laterally homogeneous medium	85
C.2	Ray tracing in a laterally heterogeneous medium	86
D	Determining the Fréchet matrix	89
D.1	The Fréchet matrix when $v = v(z)$	89
D.2	The Fréchet matrix when $v = v(x, z)$	92
	Bibliography	95

List of Figures

1.1	Notation	4
2.1	Determining ray parameters	8
2.2	Picking p_s and p_g versus picking p_y and p_h	13
2.3	Two-way slant stacks	16
2.4	CDR migrated depth section ($v = \text{const}$)	25
2.5	CDR migrated depth section ($v = v_{\text{CDR}}$)	26
2.6	CDR simulated stacked section ($v = v_{\text{CDR}}$)	27
2.7	CDR migrated time section ($v = v_{\text{CDR}}$)	29
2.8	Stereo pair (migrated time section)	30
2.9	Stereo pair with offset as the fourth parameter	31
2.10	Conventional plot of near-offset seismic data	32
2.11	CDR simulated stacked section (conventional plot)	32
2.12	Filtered migrated time section	33
3.1	The layer-stripping method	36
3.2	The result of small errors in p_s and p_g	39
3.3	The x_{err} objective function	41
3.4	The damping function (frequency domain)	47
3.5	Generation of 1-D synthetic data (layered model)	48
3.6	Iterative inversion of synthetic data	49
3.7	2-D synthetic model	50
3.8	Migrated time section: noise-free synthetic data	51
3.9	Inversion results: noise-free synthetic data	51
3.10	Migrated time section: noisy synthetic data	52
3.11	Inversion results: noisy synthetic data	53

3.12	Basis of CDR depth migration ($v = v(x, z)$)	54
3.13	Results of CDR migration of synthetic data	55
3.14	Conventional-format plot of migrated synthetic data	55
4.1	Results of inverting field data	58
4.2	The need for a time shift	58
4.3	Depth migration using the inversion results	59
4.4	Plot of residual x_{err}	60
4.5	Superimposed velocity contours and migrated dip bars	61
4.6	An error estimate from the water column	62
4.7	Depth-migrated data (conventional plot)	62
4.8	Time-migrated data ($v = v_{CDR}$)	63
4.9	Velocity analysis along a horizon	63
4.10	Three rms velocity analyses	64
5.1	Typical 3-D marine survey	68
A.1	Biases from linear interpolation	74
A.2	Slant-stack sections	75
A.3	Maximum traces	76
A.4	Summation bases	79
C.1	Ray-tracing notation	86
D.1	Velocity grid box: definition of terms	93