RESIDUAL PRESTACK MIGRATION AND INTERVAL–VELOCITY ESTIMATION

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
John Theodore Etgen
October 1990

© Copyright 1990
by
John Theodore Etgen

printed as Stanford Exploration Project No. 68
by permission of the author

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

Residual prestack migration and interval–velocity estimation

John T. Etgen, Ph.D.
Stanford University, 1991

ABSTRACT

Migration uses a model of wave-propagation velocities in the Earth (also called interval velocities) to convert seismic reflection data to an image of subsurface reflecting horizons. When geological structure is complex and interval velocities vary laterally, prestack depth migration with an accurate interval-velocity model is needed to form an accurate image of the subsurface. The interval velocities of the subsurface are usually not known in advance; separate processing steps are required to find the interval-velocity model to use for prestack depth migration. As long as lateral velocity variation is mild, conventional velocity-analysis techniques based on simplified models of wave propagation work well; but when lateral velocity variation is significant, when prestack depth migration is needed, conventional methods do not give adequate interval-velocity estimates.

Fortunately, the output of prestack depth migration can be used for velocity analysis. When the correct velocity model is used to depth-migrate a data set before stack, the images of a reflector on the output migrated constant-offset sections are located at identical positions. If the velocity model is inaccurate, the images of a reflector will have residual moveout over offset. Residual prestack migration measures residual moveout and hence velocity errors by applying kinematic corrections to the migrated constant-offset sections and measuring the coherence of their stack. Applying only the residual-NMO and residual-DMO parts of residual prestack migration performs residual-velocity analysis for fixed reflection events from the migrated constant-offset sections. Thus, velocity analysis is not confused by reflector movement caused by the zero-offset residual-migration component of residual prestack migration.

Residual velocity, the measure of residual moveout, like prestack time-migration velocity or stacking velocity is not an interval velocity itself, but is a function of the interval-velocity model. The residual velocity that best stacks the image of a reflector is related

to an interval-velocity model by a filtered traveltime-tomography operator. The operator is similar to conventional traveltime tomography, but in addition the operator has terms that convert changes in traveltime into changes in residual velocity and terms that account for the movement of reflector images as the velocity model changes.

The velocity-analysis method of this thesis begins by depth-migrating the constant-offset sections of the data and applying residual NMO+DMO to perform residual-velocity analysis. To convert the residual-velocity information to an updated interval-velocity model, I invert the filtered traveltime-tomography operator. To verify the new interval-velocity model's correctness, I remigrate the constant-offset sections with it. Any remaining residual moveout will appear in a new residual-velocity analysis; the entire process iterates until an accurate image is obtained.

Results from field data and synthetic data indicate that the velocity-analysis method successfully estimates interval-velocity models that lead to depth-migrated images with no residual moveout. However, if the reflectors are sparse, or data quality is poor, this interval-velocity model is non-unique. Then, additional information about the interval-velocity model or the positions of reflectors must be supplied to obtain the correct interval-velocity model and structural image of the data.

Approved for publication:

By _____

For Major Department

By _____

Dean of Graduate Studies

Acknowledgments

I thank Jon Claerbout for creating and directing the Stanford Exploration Project, a truly exceptional research environment. I thoroughly enjoyed the open exchange of ideas and academic freedom that Jon fosters here. I also benefited daily from his fresh insights into all aspects of seismic data processing. During his visits with SEP, discussions with Fabio Rocca planted the seed of an idea that became residual constant-offset migration. Francis Muir, always up to the challenge, provided many ideas, practical and speculative. I thank all the sponsors of the Stanford Exploration Project both for their financial support and for their advice, criticism, and ideas. In particular, I thank Amoco Production Company and Jeff Johnson for providing the North Sea data set used in this thesis, and for patiently waiting for me to finish.

The foundation of this thesis is heavily influenced by the work of Kamal Al-Yahya, Paul Fowler, and John Toldi. I am deeply grateful to them for describing their ideas so well, both verbally and in written form. My office mates Biondo Biondi and Jos van Trier were always a good source of advice, ideas, dissent, and general discussion on velocity analysis and everything else. Joe Dellinger provided unending help with graphics, programming, and other computer questions. Dave Nichols and Martin Karrenbach conspired with Francis and Joe to encourage my part time involvement with wave-equation modeling; they made it enjoyable and worthwhile. Peter Mora got me interested in elastic modeling and continues to challenge me to do it better. Stew Levin was always able to spare a moment to show me how to make my programs run faster. Clement Kostov, Chuck Sword, Marta Woodward, Steve Cole, Rick Ottolini, and Lin Zhang were always eager to listen to crazy ideas.

Finally, I thank my parents, my brothers, and especially my wife Jenni for their patience, love, and understanding during my graduate student career and while I was "almost done" for about a year.

Table of Contents

Abstract iii

Acknowledgments v

1 Introduction 1

1.1 Imaging seismic reflection data 1

1.1.1 Migration 1

1.1.2 Velocity analysis 8

1.2 Handling lateral velocity variation 10

1.2.1 Imaging 10

1.2.2 Velocity analysis 11

1.3 Tenets of velocity analysis 12

1.3.1 Common-reflection-point gathering 12

1.3.2 Velocity space 13

1.3.3 Fixed events versus fixed positions 14

1.3.4 Model-driven velocity analysis 15

1.4 Velocity analysis for prestack depth migration 15

1.4.1 Residual prestack migration 17

1.4.2 Relating residual velocity to interval velocity 18

1.4.3 Velocity analysis as an optimization problem 18

1.5 Assumptions and terminology 19

2 Residual prestack migration and velocity analysis 21

2.1 Introduction and overview 21

2.1.1 Historical background 21

2.1.2 Residual prestack migration for velocity analysis 22
2.2 Residual constant-offset migration 24
2.2.1 Definition 24
2.2.2 Asymptotic residual constant-offset migration 25
2.2.3 Geometrical derivation of residual constant-offset migration 26
2.3 Residual NMO+DMO 31
2.3.1 Definition 31
2.3.2 Asymptotic residual NMO+DMO 34
2.3.3 Geometrical derivation of residual NMO+DMO 35
2.3.4 Velocity analysis 37
2.4 Examples 38

3 Relating changes in interval slowness to residual slowness 55
3.1 Introduction and overview 55
3.2 Reflector tomography for fixed depth points 56
3.2.1 Relating changes in interval slowness to changes in migrated position 57
3.2.2 Relating changes in migrated position to changes in residual slowness for a fixed depth point 59
3.2.3 Building the filtered traveltime-tomography operator **G** 64
3.3 Reflector tomography for a fixed event 72
3.3.1 Nonlinear forward modeling with **G** 73
3.3.2 Linear forward modeling with **G** 75
3.4 Forward modeling example 78

4 Interval-velocity estimation for 2-D prestack depth migration 83
4.1 Velocity analysis: an optimization problem 83
4.1.1 Objective function 84
4.1.2 Model parameterization 87
4.2 Updating the interval-slowness model 88
4.2.1 Gradient of the objective function 88
4.2.2 Iterative velocity-analysis algorithm 90
4.3 Synthetic example 91

5 Interval-velocity estimation: field-data example **101**
5.1 Data description and preprocessing 101
5.2 Iterative depth migration and velocity estimation 102
5.3 Discussion and conclusions 118

A Constant-offset prestack migration **123**

B Asymptotic approximation to residual prestack migration **127**
B.1 Residual constant-offset migration 127
B.1.1 Higher-order stationary points 130
B.2 Residual NMO+DMO 131

Bibliography **135**

List of Figures

1.1 CMP-stacked section of North Sea data set 4
1.2 Prestack time-migrated image of North Sea data set 5
1.3 Prestack depth-migrated image of North Sea data set 6
1.4 CMP gathers showing residual moveout after constant-offset migration . . . 7

2.1 Migration impulse-response ellipse going through a reflector point 27
2.2 Migration impulse-response ellipses for 2 velocities 30
2.3 Changing variables to take-off angles of specular rays 31
2.4 Integration paths for residual constant-offset migration: $\gamma = 1.2$ 32
2.5 Integration paths for residual constant-offset migration: $\gamma = .8$ 33
2.6 Reflector movement for three constant-offset sections 35
2.7 Decomposing RCOM into RNMO+RDMO+RZOM 37
2.8 Integration paths for residual NMO+DMO 41
2.9 Point-diffractor data and correctly migrated image 42
2.10 Residual constant-offset migration applied to incorrectly migrated point-diffractor data 43
2.11 Residual NMO+DMO and residual zero-offset migration applied to incorrectly migrated point-diffractor data 44
2.12 Gulf of Mexico constant-offset section 45
2.13 Stack of 12 migrated nearby constant-offset sections 46
2.14 Residual-NMO+DMO stack: $\gamma = .745$ 47
2.15 Residual-NMO+DMO stack: $\gamma = .835$ 48
2.16 Residual-NMO+DMO stack: $\gamma = .94$ 49
2.17 Residual zero-offset migration applied to the RNMODMO-corrected stack: $\gamma = .745$ 50

2.18 Residual zero-offset migration applied to the RNMODMO-corrected stack: $\gamma = .835$ 51
2.19 Residual zero-offset migration applied to the RNMODMO-corrected stack: $\gamma = .94$ 52
2.20 Residual-slowness analyses for 3 midpoints 53

3.1 Specular rays for a dipping reflector 58
3.2 Residual NMO with residual depth conversion 61
3.3 Residual-NMO stacking curves 62
3.4 Impulse response of $\mathbf{L}_\gamma$ 64
3.5 Impulse response of $\mathbf{L}_\tau$ 65
3.6 Best fitting stacking trajectory for perturbed outer offset 66
3.7 Best fitting stacking trajectory for perturbed inner offset 67
3.8 Row of $\mathbf{G}$ for a point on a flat reflector 68
3.9 Row of $\mathbf{G}$ for a point on a dipping reflector 69
3.10 Column of $\mathbf{G}$ for flat reflectors 70
3.11 Column of $\mathbf{G}$ for dipping reflectors 71
3.12 Lateral-wavenumber spectrum of $\mathbf{G}_\gamma$ 72
3.13 Lateral-wavenumber spectrum of $\mathbf{G}_\tau$ 73
3.14 Depth locations of an event after different residual time migrations 74
3.15 Different events that map to (x, z) for different residual time migrations . . 75
3.16 Finding γ for a fixed event (nonlinear version) 76
3.17 Finding γ for a fixed event (linearized version) 77
3.18 Slowness model used to generate synthetic data 79
3.19 Migrated and stacked section using constant velocity 80
3.20 Horizon residual-slowness analyses and predicted γ's 81

4.1 Evaluating the data component of the objective function 85
4.2 Initial prestack-migrated and stacked image of synthetic data 92
4.3 Horizon residual-slowness analyses after initial migration 93
4.4 Interval-slowness model after 1 iteration 94
4.5 Migrated and stacked synthetic data after 1 iteration 95
4.6 Horizon residual-slowness analyses after first iteration 96
4.7 Final interval-slowness model for synthetic data 97

4.8 Final migrated and stacked image of the synthetic data 98
4.9 Horizon residual-slowness analyses after final iteration 99

5.1 Shot profile from North Sea data set 102
5.2 Near-offset section from North Sea data set 103
5.3 Near-offset section after gapped deconvolution 104
5.4 Initial interval-slowness model 105
5.5 Initial migrated and stacked image of the North Sea data 106
5.6 CMP gathers after initial migration 107
5.7 Events chosen for horizon residual-slowness analysis 108
5.8 Horizon residual-slowness analyses after initial migration 110
5.9 Interval-slowness model after 1 iteration 111
5.10 Migrated and stacked image of the North Sea data set after 1 iteration . . . 112
5.11 Events selected for horizon residual-slowness analysis 113
5.12 Horizon residual-slowness analyses after 1 iteration 114
5.13 Final interval-slowness model and cumulative change to the model for North Sea data set 116
5.14 Final migrated and stacked image of North Sea data set 117
5.15 Events selected for horizon residual-slowness analysis after final migration . 118
5.16 Horizon residual-slowness analyses after final migration 119
5.17 Center of final migrated image plotted with no vertical exaggeration 120

B.1 Trajectories in $\mathbf{x}$ sharing the same stationary point $\boldsymbol{\xi}_s$ 128