FINAL TECHNICAL REPORT

Table of Contents

Final Report: Measuring and Modeling Deformation at a Geothermal Site in Utah Selected for the DOE FORGE Program

Kurt Feigl and Sam Batzli

1 Abstract

This report describes research activities between August 16th, 2018 and July 30th, 2024 under Subaward Agreement between the University of Utah and the University of Wisconsin System. The goals of the research activities are to conduct: InSAR analysis (Subtask 3.7.3) and Ground Surface Deformation Modeling (Subtask 3.4.4). Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar (InSAR) data have been obtained from two satellite missions, combined pair-wise into interferograms to assess ground deformation. The results are registered ("geo-coded") into a cartographic map projection and published on the Geothermal Data Repository. Time series of displacement inferred from InSAR data are compared with those measured by GPS surveying. The InSAR data analyzed here do not show any measurable deformation in the area immediately surrounding the FORGE wells. Nor do the time series of vertical displacement measured by GPS show any signals that would reject the null hypothesis of no internal deformation with 95 percent confidence. No vertical surface displacement that could be measurable by InSAR or GPS is expected from the stimulation experiments conducted at the Utah FORGE site in 2023 or 2024. The expected vertical displacement at the Earth's surface is less than 1 millimeter, based on modeling using an analytic solution (Mogi). Hydromechanical modeling in a poroelastic medium conducted using the finite-element method also indicates vertical surface displacements smaller than 1 millimeter in magnitude. In other words, the magnitude of the deformation produced by injection experiments is too small to be measured by InSAR or GPS. A seismic event with magnitude $M \sim 4$, however, would likely produce measurable deformation, depending on depth and focal mechanism.

2 Introduction

The scientific rationale and results of the FORGE project are described elsewhere, [e.g., *Simmons et al.*, 2019]. Here we focus on measuring and modeling deformation at the Utah FORGE site (*Figure 1*). The goals of the research activities are to conduct: InSAR analysis (Subtask 3.7.3) and Ground Surface Deformation Modeling (Subtask 3.4.4).

3 InSAR analysis (Subtask 3.7.3)

3.1 Objective from statement of work

Under this subtask, the Recipient is to obtain and interpret Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar (InSAR) interferograms to assess ground deformation and to complement continuous GPS monitoring. Additional scenes will be acquired from several satellite missions as available. The new scenes will be compared with previous scenes in interferometrically compatible combinations. The InSAR results will be evaluated to estimate ground deformation. Hydromechanical modeling in a poroelastic medium will be conducted. The InSAR data will be analyzed and interpreted, and the results registered ("geo-coded") and integrated into the earth model.

3.2 Methodology

To measure deformation at the Utah FORGE site, we use InSAR — Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar. We have collected and analyzed SAR data covering the Utah FORGE site (Figure 1), especially FORGE wells 58-32, 68-32, and 78-32 (Table 1). The data sets spanning late 2019 through March 2024 were acquired by two independent satellite missions: TSX and S1.

The TSX data set consists of SAR images acquired by TerraSAR-X and TanDEM-X satellite missions operated by the German Space Agency (DLR). The images acquired on individual dates are listed in *Table 4*. Synthetic Aperture Radar data from the TerraSAR-X and the TanDEM-X satellite missions operated by the German Space Agency (DLR) were used under the terms and conditions of Research Project RES1236. DLR charges a fee of 200 EUR for one scene as the cost of fulfilling user requests (COFUR) under the "general science" category.

Interferometric pairs (interferograms) were created using GMT-SAR processing software [Sandwell et al., 2011]. Software is available publicly on GitHub for the General Inversion of Phase Technique (GIPhT) [*Feigl et al.*, 2019], the PoroTomo project [*Reinisch and Feigl*, 2018], and the UW Madison HTCondor InSAR Workflow [*Reinisch et al.*, 2018a]. We have analyzed TSX data from 2019 through 2024. The interferometric pairs from TSX data are publicly available as data sets on the Geothermal Data Repository:

Utah FORGE InSAR Data from 2020

Utah FORGE InSAR Data from 2021

Utah FORGE InSAR Data from 2022

Utah FORGE: InSAR Data Best Pairs

Utah FORGE: Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar Data from 2023 and 2024

The S1 data set includes SAR data from the SENTINEL-1 satellite mission operated by the European Space Agency (ESA). The SENTINEL-1 mission currently includes two spacecraft in orbit: SENTINEL-1A and SENTINEL-1B. These data sets cover the Utah FORGE site from late 2016 through early 2024. The SAR sensor aboard the Sentinel-1B spacecraft did not acquire any InSAR data covering the Utah FORGE site after December 2021. "Sentinel-1B experienced an anomaly which rendered it unable to deliver radar data in December 2021" [*ESA*, 2022] https://www.eoportal.org/satellite-missions/copernicus-sentinel-1]. On the other hand, Sentinel-1A acquired SAR data covering the Utah FORGE site in 2023 and 2024. To analyze the Sentinel data, we use ASF HyP3, the Alaska Satellite Facility's Hybrid Pluggable Processing Pipeline [ASF, 2024], which became available as a service in April 2024. The S1 pairs analyzed between 2020 and 2024 are listed in *Table 5* and *Table 6* for Sentinel-1A and Sentinel-1B, respectively.

3.3 Time series analysis

We have calculated many different interferometric pairs. We analyze the interferometric pairs as time series of displacement using the Miami INsar Time-series software in PYthon (MintPy) workflow (Yunjun et al., 2019). The MintPy workflow partially mitigates atmospheric effects and topographic artefacts.

For each data set, we show a graph of the relative positions of TSX/TDX spacecraft at the times that individual SAR images were acquired (circles) as well as the separation ("perpendicular baseline", left-hand scale) between two different positions (at different times) in the orbital trajectory. Each interferometric pair is shown as line segment, colored by average spatial coherence (right hand scale) in a so-called "network diagram" (*Figure 2, Figure 5, Figure 9,* and *Figure 14*).

The quantity of interest is the (scalar) displacement along the radar line of sight (LOS). By convention, positive values of LOS displacement correspond to motion toward the satellite. For example, *Figure 3* shows a sequence of maps of the LOS displacement at dates between 2019 and 2023.

To visualize the deformation field, we consider the mean rate of LOS displacement over the full, multi-year time interval spanned by the data. Each map in *Figure 4*, *Figure 10*, *Figure 12*, *Figure 15*, and *Figure 8* shows the mean rate of LOS displacement averaged over the time interval shown in the network diagram. In each figure, the rate is referred a reference pixel.

3.4 GPS

Here we consider the vertical component of displacement measured by GPS and provided by Ben Erickson:

Sent: Monday, May 13, 2024 8:47 AM; Subject: Re: GPS Monument Data

I've attached the most recent GPS processing; keep in mind, the comparative initial date has changed from the referenced spreadsheet. I also maintain the Foundry site with this spreadsheet, the comparative time series, and raw GPS data.

Ben Erickson (he/him); Senior Geologist | M.S., P.G

To mitigate the effects of changing reference frames, we analyze the GPS time series of vertical displacement with respect to several different references. This approach would highlight any internal deformation within the GPS network.

Figure 17 shows the relative vertical displacement of each station with respect to the continuously operating station GDM-01. Although there is a suggestion of a seasonal effect (upward displacements during the winter and downward displacements during the summer), there is no significant vertical displacement between the surveys bracketing the date of the flow test in 2023.

Figure 18 shows the vertical displacement of each station referred to the overall mean of all stations. No individual station appears to deviate consistently from the 95-percent confidence interval.

Figure 19 shows the vertical displacement of each station referred to the mean of all stations for each survey. This figure does not show any vertical displacements that would reject the null hypothesis of no deformation with 95% confidence.

3.5 Discussion

The InSAR data do not show any deformation that is obviously associated with FORGE wells 58- 32, 68-32, or 78-32, shown as triangles in the figures. The large-scale patterns are probably the result of atmospheric effects that are partially correlated with topography. The wide-scale patterns are probably the result of unmodeled orbital effects in the satellite trajectories. Nor do the time series of vertical displacement measured by GPS show any signals that would reject the null hypothesis of no internal deformation with 95 percent confidence.

4 Ground Surface Deformation Modeling (Subtask 3.4.4).

4.1 Objective from amended statement of work

The Recipient will model ground surface deformation for comparison with InSAR data. The deliverable will be in the form of a report that makes comparison of modeled results with other monitoring techniques used at Utah FORGE such as GPS surveys and strain measurements. It will make reference to analogous injection-production fields elsewhere in the world.

4.2 Analytic modeling configuration

To calculate the order of magnitude of the displacement at the Earth's surface, we performed forward modeling using a simple model [*Mogi*, 1958]. This model assumes an inflating sphere buried in a half space with uniform elastic properties. The Mogi model expresses vertical displacement *uz* of a point on the ground in terms of the volume change *ΔV* and depth *d* of a subsurface source, as shown in the following equation from [*Segall*, 2010].

$$
u_z = \frac{(1-v)\Delta V}{\pi} \frac{d}{(\rho^2 + d^2)^{3/2}},
$$

where ΔV is the injected volume, u_z is vertical displacement, v is Poisson's ratio (here assumed to be $\frac{1}{4}$, d is depth, and ρ is radial horizontal distance from center of source to observation point [*Segall*, 2010]. Vertical displacement *uz* is a linear function of the volume *ΔV* injected at depth. In contrast, displacement *uz* is a non-linear function of depth *d*.

For simplicity, we use an (X,Y) coordinate system with an origin centered on the toe of Well 16A(78)-32. To estimate the depth of the volume change, we followed the document entitled *End of Job Report Hydraulic Fracturing of Well 16A(78)-32 (April 2022)* prepared by Kevin England and John McLennan which reports the following information.

[&]quot;The bit was run to near the end of the open-hole section of the wellbore (10,951 ft MD) while the casing scraper reached a depth of 10,761.62 ft MD within the cased-hole and ensured the absence of debris. The drift sub was run one joint above the casing scraper and reached a depth of 10,726.07 ft MD which assured that there is adequate clearance to run the bridge plug to the maximum planned depth of 10,670 ft MD.

There were some tight spots in the open-hole $(\sim 10,857 - 10,872$ ft MD) which were worked through with the bit by rotation and washing down." [*McLennan*, 2022].

To estimate the total volume for the 2023 and 2024 tests at the Utah FORGE site, we considered the details described in the following two sub-sections.

4.2.1 Modeling details - 2023

For the 2023 circulation tests, we follow Munday et al. (2024):

Two sets of circulation tests were performed in July 2023 to test connectivity between wells 16A and 16B. A comprehensive analysis of the circulation tests is given by Xing et. al. (2024). In this work we use pressure and mass data from the second set of circulation tests performed on July 18 and 19 to fit our THM model. Wellhead pressure, injection rate, and producing rate for the July 18 and 19 tests are given in Figure 3. The injection rates range from 2.5 to 7.5 bpm with a maximum pressure of 4500 psi during the July 18 circulation test. Injection well 16A contains three frac stages spaced approximately 300 feet apart where the bottom stage 1 is 200 ft of open hole at a depth of 10938 ft and stages 2 and 3 are cased and perforated. The flow rate for the July 18 and 19 The flow is partitioned between the three stages and the open hole stage 1 zone receives approximately 50% of the flow for the July 19 tests (Xing et al, 2023).

We calculated the total volume of injected fluid by visually estimating the mean flow rate at approximately 5 barrels per minute and then integrating with respect to time over the 4-hour duration for each of the two tests, as shown in *Figure 21*. Assuming that a barrel is 0.159 m^3 , we find a total change in volume of $\Delta V = 382$ m³ for the circulation tests in 2023.

4.2.2 Modeling details - 2024

For the 2024 test, we refer to the following message from Kevin England, dated May 9, 2024:

Subject: Fluid volumes pumped into well 16A(78)-32 during the frac stimulation treatments Please see below the actual volumes of fluid that were pumped for each of the frac stages in well 16A. We just received all of the data files from Calfrac and I will confirm all of this in the next few days. I'm pretty sure there is additional volume pumped in stage 6R after we perforated an additional 3 ft of zone (probably close to 3,000 bbl). The total fluid injected is 110,776 bbl (4,652,592 gal).

Assuming that a barrel is 0.159 m³, we find a total change in volume of $\Delta V = 18,000$ m³ for the stimulation treatments in 2024.

4.3 Analytic modeling results

We consider six different cases, as listed in Table 2.

The first two cases approximate the stimulations in July 2023 and April 2024, respectively. As shown by solid curves in *Figure 20*, the simulated ground motion forms small bulge of uplift. The maximum values of vertical displacement are 8 micrometer and 4 micrometer, respectively. These values are considerably smaller than the detection limit of 10 millimeters for InSAR.

We also consider three hypothetical cases with large modeled injection volumes (dotted curves). In Case 3, the vertical displacement u_z of 8 mm approaches the detection limit of 10 mm. Cases 4 and 5 consider injection volumes of the same order of magnitude (in absolute value) of the annual rate of net production at a commercial operation. For context, pumping at 500 GPM for 1 year is approximately equivalent to $\Delta V \sim 10^6$ m³. The values of u_z in Cases 4 and 5 are 80 mm and 800 mm, respectively. In other words, if injection at the same rate as during the 2023 FORGE tests were to continue for a year, then the surface displacement would be measurable by InSAR.

The deformation in Case 4 is similar to that observed at East Mesa in California [*Eneva et al.*, 2012; *Han et al.*, 2011; *Massonnet et al.*, 1997; 1998; *Taylor et al.*, 2013].

To illustrate the non-linear trade-off between depth *d* and volume change *ΔV,* we consider another hypothetical case (numbered 6) with a shallow depth $d = 500$ m and $\Delta V = 18,000$ m³ (just as in Case 2). Case 6 would produce 20 mm of vertical displacement at the surface (dark blue dotted curve).

4.4 Simulating vertical displacements using the Finite Element Method

To confirm the order of magnitude of the surface deformation expected from the stimulation experiments in July 2023 and April 2024, we apply the finite element method (FEM) to perform numerical simulations. The FEM model applies the poroelastic theory of Biot as implemented using COMSOL Multiphysics [*COMSOL*, 2024b]. This approach has been validated against the analytic solution of Terzhagi [*COMSOL*, 2024a].

In particular, we use a model developed by Larry Murdoch as Milestone 5.1 of FORGE Project 3-2514. The following description is adapted from e-mail communications with Murdoch. As shown in Figure 22, the mesh for the FEM model is symmetric about the left side. The simulated region is below the dark grey patch on the left side. This simulation treats the fracture as a permeable layer that is inflated by injecting fluid. The modulus of the layer currently is small, which would represent an open fracture, like a Mode I fracture.

This model does not include the non-linear effects related to propagation, so it cannot match the pressure history (pressure increases early and then decreases). However, it should be able to match the maximum pressure and injected volume, and the length and orientation of the fracture can be adjusted based on the microseismic interpretations. That should allow the model to predict the magnitudes and patterns of the far field deformation fairly well.

Figure 23 shows the vertical component of displacement along a profile from the center of the field to the eastern side. Each curve shows the displacement accumulated at a time step ranging from the start of injection to a time some 2.5 hours later. The maximum displacement is less than 11 micrometers, the same order of magnitude as calculated using the analytic model. *Figure 24* shows the vertical displacement field in map view.

5 Conclusions

In summary, the InSAR data analyzed do not show any measurable deformation in the area immediately surrounding the FORGE wells. Nor do the time series of vertical displacement measured by GPS show any signals that would reject the null hypothesis of no internal deformation with 95 percent confidence.

No deformation larger than 1 millimeter is expected from the stimulation experiments. This result is not surprising since the stimulation experiments injected relatively small volumes at depths on the order of \sim 2000 m. The expected deformation is less than 1 mm, i.e., based on the modeling using both an analytic solution (Mogi) and the finite element method. In other words, the magnitude of the deformation produced by injection experiments is too small to be measured by InSAR. A seismic event with magnitude $M \sim 4$, however, would likely produce measurable deformation, depending on depth and focal mechanism.

6 Acknowledgments

Interferograms were created using GMT-SAR processing software [*Sandwell et al.*, 2011]. Several figures were created using the Generic Mapping Tools [*Wessel et al.*, 2013].

Software is available publicly on GitHub for the General Inversion of Phase Technique (GIPhT) [*Kurt L. Feigl et al.*, 2019] and the FringeFlow workflow for generating interferometric fringe patterns from synthetic aperture radar data, both developed at UW Madison [*K. L. Feigl et al.*, 2022].

Synthetic Aperture Radar data from the TerraSAR-X and the TanDEM-X satellite missions operated by the German Space Agency (DLR) were used under the terms and conditions of Research Project RES1236.

We gratefully acknowledge support from the Weeks family to the Department of Geoscience at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

7 References Cited

ASF (2024), ASF HyP3: Alaska Satellite Facility's Hybrid Pluggable Processing Pipeline, edited. COMSOL (2024a), Biot PoroelasticityRep.

COMSOL (2024b), COMSOL Multiphysics®: The Platform for Physics-Based Modeling and Simulation, edited.

- Eneva, M., D. Adams, G. Falorni, and J. Morgan (2012), Surface Deformation in Imperial Valley, CA, From Satellite Radar Interferometry, paper presented at Geothermal Research Council Transactions.
- ESA (2022), ESA Mission ends for Copernicus Sentinel-1B satellite, edited.
- Feigl, K. L., S. Batzli, N. Bearson, and E. C. Reinisch (2022), FringeFlow: Workflow for generating interferometric fringe patterns from synthetic aperture radar data, edited.
- Feigl, K. L., C. Thurber, L. Powell, P. Sobol, A. Masters, E. C. Reinisch, and S. T. Ali (2019), General Inversion of Phase Technique (GIPhT) software repository, edited.
- Han, J.-Y., R. R. Forster, D. E. Moser, A. L. J. Ford, J. Ramirez-Hernandez, and K. F. Tiampo (2011), The spatial and temporal subsidence variability of the East Mesa Geothermal Field, California, USA, and its potential impact on the All American Canal System, International Journal of Remote Sensing, 32(12), 3427-3449, doi:10.1080/01431161003749444.
- Massonnet, D., T. Holzer, and H. Vadon (1997), Land subsidence caused by the East Mesa geothermal field, California, observed using SAR interferometry, Geophys. Res. Lett., 24, 901-904.
- Massonnet, D., T. Holzer, and H. Vadon (1998), Correction to "Land subsidence caused by the East Mesa geothermal field, California, observed using SAR interferometry", Geophys. Res. Lett., 25(16), 3213-3213.
- McLennan, J. (2022), Utah FORGE Well 16A(78)-32 Stimulation Data (April, 2022), edited, Energy and Geoscience Institute at the University of Utah, doi:10.15121/1871203.
- Mogi, K. (1958), Relations between the eruption of various volcanoes and the deformations of the ground surfaces around them, Bull. Earthquake Research Institute, 36, 99-134.
- Munday, L. B., and R. K. Podgorney (2024), Numerically Testing Conceptual Models of the Utah FORGE Reservoir Using July 2023 Circulation Test Data, United States, 2024-02-27.
- Sandwell, D., R. Mellors, X. Tong, M. Wei, and P. Wessel (2011), Open radar interferometry software for mapping surface deformation, Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union, 92(28), 234-234, doi:10.1029/2011eo280002.
- Segall, P. (2010), Earthquake and volcano deformation, 432 pp., Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.
- Simmons, S. F., et al. (2019), Update on the Geoscientific Understanding of the Utah FORGE Site, paper presented at PROCEEDINGS, 44th Workshop on Geothermal Reservoir Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, California, February 11-13, 2019.
- Taylor, H., M. E. Pritchard, and R. B. Lohman (2013), Recent Changes in Ground Deformation at the East Mesa Geothermal Field, California as Measured by InSAR, AGU Fall Meeting Abstracts, 33, 06.
- Wessel, P., W. H. F. Smith, R. Scharroo, J. Luis, and F. Wobbe (2013), Generic Mapping Tools (GMT), edited.
- Xing, P., K. England, J. Moore, R. Podgorney, and J. McLennan (2024), Analysis of Circulation Tests and Well Connections at Utah FORGE, paper presented at PROCEEDINGS, 49th Workshop on Geothermal Reservoir Engineering Stanford University, SGP-TR-227, Stanford, California, February 12-14, 2024.

8 Figures

Figure 1. West-southwest facing view of the Utah FORGE site in late 2020, showing drill pads, wells, power line supply, and site access. Well 58-32 is the deep pilot well that can be used to deploy downhole instruments during 2021 stimulations; the bottom 200 feet of the hole are open and the rest is lined with 7-inch casing. Well 68-32 is dedicated to seismic monitoring with a permanently installed geophone and accelerometer at depths of 921-925 ft. Well 78-32 is instrumented with a Silixa DAS cable including a Constellation fiber cemented in the annulus of the 5 ½" casing to 3268 ft; downhole instruments can be deployed in the casing. Well 56-32 has been drilled to 9,145 feet depth, and it is lined with 5½" casing to the toe; this well is also available for deployment of downhole instruments. Figure and caption [https://utahforge.com/site-operations/].

Table 1. Final coordinates of wells, downloaded from Hardwick, Christian. 2020. "Utah FORGE: Updated Phase 2C Well Location Coordinates". United States. https://gdr.openei.org/submissions/1268*. File name is "Updated Utah FORGE Phase 2C Well Location"*

Figure 2. Plot of relative positions of TSX/TDX spacecraft at the times that individual SAR images were acquired in (descending) Track 30 (circles) as well as the orbital separation ("perpendicular baseline", left-hand scale) between two positions forming an interferometric pair (line segments, colored by average spatial coherence (right hand scale). smb://research.drive.wisc.edu/feigl/insar /FORGE/TSX/T30 /feigl_20231222/MINTPY/pic/network.pdf

Figure 3. Map of LOS displacement at the dates shown in the previous figure, after accounting for the atmospheric effects and topographic artefacts. Black square indicates the reference location where rate of LOS displacement is zero. In each panel, the *black square indicates the reference location where rate of LOS displacement is zero. The spatial extent of each panel matches that shown in the following figure. [smb://research.drive.wisc.edu/feigl/insar/FORGE/TSX /T30/feigl_20231222/MINTPY/pic/timeseries_tropHgt_demErr_wrap10.png]*

Figure 4. Map of mean rate of LOS displacement averaged over the time interval [2019/02/11 through 2023/10/13]. Coordinates are longitude and longitude in degrees, respectively. Triangles indicate locations of wells 58-32, 68-32, and 78-32. smb://research.drive.wisc.edu/feigl/insar/FORGE/TSX/T30/feigl_20231222/MINTPY/pic/avgPhaseVelocity.png

Figure 5. Plot of relative positions of TerraSAR-X and TANDEM-X spacecraft at the times that individual SAR images were acquired (circles) as well as the orbital separation (left-hand scale) between two positions forming an interferometric pair (line segments, colored by average spatial coherence (right hand scale). smb://research.drive.wisc.edu/feigl/insar/ FORGE/TSX/T30/forge_2024/MINTPY6/pic/network.pdf

Figure 6. Map of LOS displacement at the dates shown in the previous figure, after accounting for atmospheric effects and topographic artefacts. Black square indicates the reference location where rate of LOS displacement is zero. In each panel, the black square indicates the reference location where rate of LOS displacement is zero. The spatial extent of each panel matches that shown in the following figure. [smb://research.drive.wisc.edu/feigl/insar/FORGE/TSX/T30/ forge_2024/MINTPY6/pic/timeseries_tropHgt_demErr_wrap10.png]

Figure 7. Map of mean rate of LOS displacement averaged over the time interval from 2023/05/01 through 2024/06/22 X and Y coordinates are longitude and longitude in degrees, respectively. Negative values of LOS displacement rate indicate motion away from the satellite. Triangles indicate locations of wells 58-32, 68-32, and 78-32. smb://research.drive.wisc.edu/feigl /insar/FORGE/TSX/T30/ forge_2024/MINTPY6/velocitymapv2_1_velocity.png

Figure 8. Time series of LOS displacement maps.. Black square indicates the reference location where rate of LOS displacement is zero. The spatial extent of each panel matches that shown in the previous figure.

Figure 9. Plot of relative positions of Sentinel 1-A and Sentinel 1-B spacecraft at the times that individual SAR images were acquired (circles) as well as the orbital separation (left-hand scale) between two positions forming an interferometric pair (line segments, colored by average spatial coherence (right hand scale). smb://research.drive.wisc.edu/feigl/insar/ FORGE/SDK/FORGE_DESCENDING2/pic/network.pdf

Figure 10. Map of mean rate of LOS displacement averaged over the time interval shown in previous figure, displayed with respect to its median value. X and Y coordinates are UTM easting and northing in km, respectively. Triangles near (E,N) = (335,4263) km indicate locations of wells 58-32, 68-32, and 78-32. Pixels with LOS displacement rates that less than twice their estimated standard deviation in absolute value are not shown. Blue trapezoid indicates bounding box of study area.

Figure 11. Map of estimated standard deviation of the mean rate of LOS displacement averaged over the time interval shown in previous figure. Plotting conventions as in previous figure.

Figure 12. Enlarged map of mean rate of LOS displacement averaged over the time interval shown in previous figure, displayed with respect to its median value. X and Y coordinates are UTM easting and northing in km, respectively. Triangles near (E,N) = (335,4263) km indicate locations of wells 58-32, 68-32, and 78-32. Pixels are approximately 80 m by 80 m. Pixels with LOS displacement rates that less than twice their estimated standard deviation in absolute value are not shown.

Figure 13. Enlarged map of estimated standard deviation of the mean rate of LOS displacement averaged over the time interval shown in previous figure. Plotting convention as in previous figure.

Figure 14. Plot of relative positions of Sentinel-1A spacecraft at the times that individual SAR images were acquired (circles) as well as the orbital separation ("perpendicular baseline", left-hand scale) between two positions forming an interferometric pair (line segments, colored by average spatial coherence (right hand scale). smb://research.drive.wisc.edu/feigl/ insar/FORGE/SDK/FORGE_ASCENDING/pic/network.pdf

Figure 15. Map of mean rate of LOS displacement averaged over the time interval shown in previous figure, displayed with respect to its median value. X and Y coordinates are UTM easting and northing in km, respectively. Triangles indicate locations of wells 58-32, 68-32, and 78-32. Pixels are approximately 80 m by 80 m. Pixels with LOS displacement rates that less than twice their estimated standard deviation in absolute value are not shown. Blue trapezoid indicates bounding box of study area.

Figure 16. Map of estimated standard deviation of the mean rate of LOS displacement averaged over the time interval shown in previous figure. Plotting convention as in previous figure.

Figure 17. Time series of relative vertical displacements referred to station GDM-01. Error bars delimit ± 2 standard deviations, i.e. 95 percent confidence. Vertical dashed lines indicate tests in July 2023 and April 2024.

Figure 18. Time series of vertical displacements referred to the initial position of each station at the time of the first survey. Thick black lines delimits interval of 95% confidence about the mean for each campaign. Vertical dashed lines indicate tests in July 2023 and April 2024.

Figure 19. Time series of vertical displacements referred to both the mean of the campaign and the mean for each station.Thick black lines delimits interval of 95% confidence about the mean for each campaign. Vertical dashed lines indicate tests in July 2023 and April 2024.

Table 2. Values of parameters in Mogi model

** assuming geometric potency (slip x area) equal to volume change ΔV and shear modulus of 30 GPa.*

Figure 20. Plot of vertical displacement in meters calculated from the Mogi model for injected volumes approximating the stimulations in July 2023 (light blue solid line) and April 2024 (green solid line) as well as three hypothetical cases (purple, yellow, red) with different values of volume change (labels on right hand side). The dark blue curve shows a hypothetical case with a shallow depth (labels at left).

Figure 21. Circulation test 2 data showing wellhead pressure, injection rate, and producing rate for (a) July 18 and (b) July 19, 2023 (after Figure 5 in [Xing et al., 2024]). Figure and caption [Munday and Podgorney, 2024].
2023 (after Figure 5 in [Xing et al., 2024]). Figure and caption [Munday and Podgorney, 2024].

4

parameter	symbol	values		
fluid density	rhof	000 [kg/m^3]		
length of screened interval in well	screen_len	10 [m]		
radius of well	well_radius	0.1 [m]		
pumping rate	pumping_rate	$3E-4[m^3/5]$		
gravitational acceleration	g	9.81 [m/s ^{^2}]		
fracture thickness	frx_thickness	0.1 [m]		
fracture depth	frx_depth	50 [m]		
fracture dip	frx_dip	90 [m]		
property	symbol	granite	alluvium	fracture
Young's modulus	E	1E8[Pa]	1E8[Pa]	1[Pa]
permeability	k	1e-12[m^2]		1e-12[m^2] 1.5E-12[m^2]
storage (effective)	Se	1.00E-07	1.00E-07	1.00E-09
porosity	porosity	0.2	0.2	0.5
Biot coefficient	b_alpha	0.95	0.95	0.9 ₁

Table 3 Input parameters for finite-element modeling using COMSOL from L. Murdoch.

Figure 22. Block diagram for configuration of the finite element model. The model domain is symmetric about the left side and the simulated region is below the dark grey patch on the left side. The eastward X axis points toward the upper right corner of the page. The vertical Z axis points upward such that the earth surface faces the top of the page. Material properties are listed in previous table for "granite" (blue) and "alluvium" (yellow). [Larry Murdoch, Milestone 5.1 of FORGE Project 3-2514]

Figure 23. Simulated vertical displacement in micrometers at various times along a profile from west to east at Y=2 km.

Figure 24. Map view of simulated vertical component of displacement in micrometers after approximately 2.5 hours of injection. Warm colors denote positive (upward) vertical displacement.

9 Supplementary Information

Table 4. List of SAR acquisitions from TerraSAR-X and TanDEM-X radar satellite missions showing date (YearMonthDate) and orbit number. The status flags are defined as follows: "D" represents a scene that has been delivered. "C" denotes a canceled scene acquisition, usually for technical reasons at the source. "P" denotes a scene that is planned for acquisition in the future. All of these acquisitions follow Track 30 in an ascending orbital pass that crosses the equatorial plane from south to north. Earlier acquisitions are listed in previous reports. [grep forge /s12/insar/TSX/TSX_OrderList.txt | cut -c 1-78 | sort -un]

Table 5. List of interferometric pairs calculated by ASF HYP3 from data acquired by Sentinel-1A satellite mission showing spacecraft, date and time of first and second acquisitions, respectively. (hyp3-mintpy) [feigl@emidio SDK]\$ find F -name "S1*unw_phase.tif" | tr '/' ',' | awk -F, '{print \$4}' | tr I ',' | awk -F, '{print \$1}' | sort -n | uniq*

SAT YYYYMMDD_hhmmss YYYYMMDD_hhmmss polarization S1AA_20200102T133453_20200114T133453_VVP012_ S1AA_20200114T133453_20200126T133452_VVP012_ S1AA_20200126T133452_20200207T133452_VVP012_ S1AA_20200207T133452_20200219T133452_VVP012_ S1AA_20200219T133452_20200302T133452_VVP012_ S1AA_20200302T133452_20200314T133452_VVP012_ S1AA_20200314T133452_20200326T133452_VVP012_ S1AA_20200326T133452_20200407T133452_VVP012_ S1AA_20200407T133452_20200419T133453_VVP012_ S1AA_20200419T133453_20200501T133453_VVP012_ S1AA_20200501T133453_20200513T133454_VVP012_ S1AA_20200513T133454_20200525T133455_VVP012_ S1AA_20200525T133455_20200606T133455_VVP012_ S1AA_20200630T133456_20200712T133457_VVP012_ S1AA_20200712T133457_20200724T133458_VVP012_ S1AA_20200724T133458_20200805T133459_VVP012_ S1AA_20200805T133459_20200817T133459_VVP012_ S1AA_20200817T133459_20200829T133500_VVP012_ S1AA_20200829T133500_20200910T133501_VVP012_ S1AA_20200910T133501_20200922T133501_VVP012_ S1AA_20200922T133501_20201004T133501_VVP012_ S1AA_20201004T133501_20201016T133502_VVP012_ S1AA_20201016T133502_20201028T133501_VVP012_ S1AA_20201028T133501_20201109T133501_VVP012_ S1AA_20201109T133501_20201121T133501_VVP012_ S1AA_20201121T133501_20201203T133501_VVP012_ S1AA_20201203T133501_20201215T133500_VVP012_ S1AA_20201215T133500_20201227T133500_VVP012_ S1AA_20201227T133500_20210108T133459_VVP012_ S1AA_20210108T133459_20210120T133458_VVP012_ S1AA_20210120T133458_20210201T133458_VVP012_ S1AA_20210201T133458_20210213T133458_VVP012_ S1AA_20210213T133458_20210225T133457_VVP012_ S1AA_20210225T133457_20210309T133457_VVP012_ S1AA_20210309T133457_20210321T133458_VVP012_ S1AA_20210321T133458_20210402T133458_VVP012_ S1AA_20210402T133458_20210414T133458_VVP012_ S1AA_20210414T133458_20210426T133459_VVP012_ S1AA_20210426T133459_20210508T133459_VVP012_ S1AA_20210508T133459_20210520T133500_VVP012_ S1AA_20210520T133500_20210601T133501_VVP012_ S1AA_20210601T133501_20210613T133502_VVP012_ S1AA_20210613T133502_20210625T133502_VVP012_ S1AA_20210625T133502_20210707T133503_VVP012_ S1AA_20210707T133503_20210719T133504_VVP012_ S1AA_20210719T133504_20210731T133504_VVP012_ S1AA_20210731T133504_20210812T133505_VVP012_ S1AA_20210812T133505_20210824T133506_VVP012_ S1AA_20210824T133506_20210905T133506_VVP012_ S1AA_20210905T133506_20210917T133507_VVP012_ S1AA_20210917T133507_20210929T133507_VVP012_ S1AA_20210929T133507_20211011T133507_VVP012_ S1AA_20211011T133507_20211023T133507_VVP012_ S1AA_20211023T133507_20211104T133507_VVP012_ S1AA_20211128T133506_20211210T133506_VVP012_ S1AA_20211210T133506_20211222T133505_VVP012_ S1AA_20211222T133505_20220103T133505_VVP012_ S1AA_20220103T133505_20220115T133504_VVP012_ S1AA_20220115T133504_20220127T133504_VVP012_ S1AA_20220127T133504_20220208T133503_VVP012_ S1AA_20220208T133503_20220220T133506_VVP012_ S1AA_20220220T133506_20220304T133506_VVP012_ S1AA_20220304T133506_20220316T133506_VVP012_ S1AA_20220316T133506_20220328T133506_VVP012_ S1AA_20220328T133506_20220409T133504_VVP012_

Table 6. List of interferometric pairs calculated by ASF HYP3 from data acquired by Sentinel-1B satellite mission showing spacecraft, date and time of first and second acquisitions, respectively. (hyp3-mintpy) [feigl@emidio SDK]\$ find F -name "S1*unw_phase.tif" | tr '/' ',' | awk -F, '{print \$4}' | tr I ',' | awk -F, '{print \$1}' | sort -n | uniq*

SAT YYYYMMDD_hhmmss YYYYMMDD_hhmmss polarization S1BB_20200103T012610_20200115T012610_VVP012_ S1BB_20200115T012610_20200127T012610_VVP012_ S1BB_20200127T012610_20200208T012609_VVP012_ S1BB_20200208T012609_20200220T012609_VVP012_ S1BB_20200220T012609_20200303T012609_VVP012_ S1BB_20200303T012609_20200315T012609_VVP012_ S1BB_20200315T012609_20200327T012609_VVP012_ S1BB_20200327T012609_20200408T012609_VVP012_ S1BB_20200408T012609_20200420T012610_VVP012_ S1BB_20200420T012610_20200502T012611_VVP012_ S1BB_20200502T012611_20200514T012611_VVP012_ S1BB_20200514T012611_20200526T012612_VVP012_ S1BB_20200526T012612_20200607T012613_VVP012_ S1BB_20200607T012613_20200619T012613_VVP012_ S1BB_20200619T012613_20200701T012614_VVP012_ S1BB_20200701T012614_20200713T012615_VVP012_ S1BB_20200713T012615_20200725T012615_VVP012_ S1BB_20200725T012615_20200806T012616_VVP012_ S1BB_20200806T012616_20200818T012617_VVP012_ S1BB_20200818T012617_20200830T012618_VVP012_ S1BB_20200830T012618_20200911T012618_VVP012_ S1BB_20200911T012618_20200923T012618_VVP012_ S1BB_20200923T012618_20201005T012619_VVP012_ S1BB_20201005T012619_20201017T012619_VVP012_ S1BB_20201017T012619_20201029T012619_VVP012_ S1BB_20201029T012619_20201110T012619_VVP012_ S1BB_20201110T012619_20201122T012618_VVP012_ S1BB_20201122T012618_20201204T012618_VVP012_ S1BB_20201204T012618_20201216T012617_VVP012_ S1BB_20201216T012617_20201228T012617_VVP012_ S1BB_20201228T012617_20210109T012616_VVP012_ S1BB_20210109T012616_20210121T012616_VVP012_ S1BB_20210121T012616_20210202T012615_VVP012_ S1BB_20210202T012615_20210214T012615_VVP012_ S1BB_20210214T012615_20210226T012615_VVP012_ S1BB_20210226T012615_20210310T012615_VVP012_ S1BB_20210310T012615_20210322T012615_VVP012_ S1BB_20210322T012615_20210403T012615_VVP012_ S1BB_20210403T012615_20210415T012616_VVP012_ S1BB_20210415T012616_20210427T012616_VVP012_ S1BB_20210427T012616_20210509T012617_VVP012_ S1BB_20210509T012617_20210521T012617_VVP012_ S1BB_20210521T012617_20210602T012618_VVP012_ S1BB_20210602T012618_20210614T012619_VVP012_ S1BB_20210614T012619_20210626T012620_VVP012_ S1BB_20210626T012620_20210708T012620_VVP012_ S1BB_20210708T012620_20210720T012621_VVP012_ S1BB_20210720T012621_20210801T012622_VVP012_ S1BB_20210801T012622_20210813T012622_VVP012_ S1BB_20210813T012622_20210825T012623_VVP012_ S1BB_20210825T012623_20210906T012624_VVP012_ S1BB_20210906T012624_20210918T012624_VVP012_ S1BB_20210918T012624_20210930T012624_VVP012_ S1BB_20210930T012624_20211012T012624_VVP012_ S1BB_20211012T012624_20211024T012625_VVP012_ S1BB_20211024T012625_20211105T012624_VVP012_ S1BB_20211105T012624_20211117T012624_VVP012_ S1BB_20211117T012624_20211129T012624_VVP012_ S1BB_20211129T012624_20211211T012623_VVP012_ S1BB_20211211T012623_20211223T012622_VVP012_