



HAL
open science

Fluid migration in low-permeability faults driven by decoupling of fault slip and opening

Frédéric Cappa, Yves Guglielmi, Christophe Nussbaum, Louis de Barros, Jens Birkholzer

► **To cite this version:**

Frédéric Cappa, Yves Guglielmi, Christophe Nussbaum, Louis de Barros, Jens Birkholzer. Fluid migration in low-permeability faults driven by decoupling of fault slip and opening. *Nature Geoscience*, In press, 10.1038/s41561-022-00993-4 . hal-03750371

HAL Id: hal-03750371

<https://hal.science/hal-03750371v1>

Submitted on 18 Aug 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Fluid migration in low-permeability faults driven by decoupling of fault slip and opening

Frédéric Cappa^{1,2,*}, Yves Guglielmi³, Christophe Nussbaum⁴, Louis De Barros¹, and Jens Birkholzer³

¹ Université Côte d'Azur, CNRS, Observatoire de la Côte d'Azur, IRD, Géoazur, Sophia Antipolis, France

² Institut Universitaire de France, Paris, France

³ Energy Geosciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California, USA

⁴ Federal Office of Topography, Swisstopo, St-Ursanne, Switzerland

*e-mail to: frederic.cappa@univ-cotedazur.fr

Understanding the response of faults to the injection of high-pressure fluids is important for several subsurface applications, for example geologic carbon sequestration or energy storage. Lab-based experiments suggest fluid injection can activate fault slip and that this slip can lead to increased fluid transmission along low-permeability faults. Here, we present in situ observations from a cross-borehole fluid injection experiment in a low-permeability shale-bearing fault, which show fault displacement occurring prior to fluid pressure build-up. Comparing these observations to numerical models with differing permeability evolution histories, we find that the observed variation in fluid pressure is best explained by a change in permeability only after the fault fails and slips beyond the pressurized area. Once fluid migration occurs along the fault as a result of slip-induced permeability increase, the fault experiences further opening due to a decrease in the effective normal stress. We suggest that decoupling of fault slip and opening, leading to a rapid increase in fluid pressurization following the initial fault slip, could be an efficient driver for fluid migration in low-permeability faults.

Fluids can reactivate tectonic faults and have the potential to cause earthquakes, as observed in both natural seismic swarms^{1,2} and in response to fluid injection activities related to energy production and storage^{3,4}. Increase in fluid pressure can also trigger aseismic slip on faults^{5,6}. At the same time, hydraulic fault properties are an important factor as the evolution of permeability and porosity is coupled with slip, and a consequence of this interaction is the variation of fluid pressure^{7,8}.

Recent works have shown that even low permeability faults can serve as a conduit for transmission and increase of fluid pressure because the fault permeability can transiently increase during slip^{9,10}. However, in the absence of *in situ* continuous measurements of fluid pressure and deformation in faults, important questions remain, such as how fluid pressure migrates along faults, and how the fault responds.

Here, using an *in situ* cross-borehole experiment with controlled fluid injection into a low permeability shale fault zone ($k_0 \sim 10^{-17} \text{ m}^2$,¹¹), we directly measured the evolution of fluid pressure and fault displacements (Fig. 1) at two vertical boreholes, spaced about 3 m horizontally. This meter-scale experiment was developed at a depth of 340 m in the Mont Terri Underground Research Laboratory, Switzerland¹² (Supplementary Fig. S1). Reproducing the observations with hydromechanical models, we track the fluid migration in association with fault deformation. Results give insights into how the decoupling between slip and opening, as

well as the shear stress perturbation occurring outside the pressurized zone, control the fluid migration over the fault.

Observations from controlled-injection fault activation

The experiment was conducted in a 1.5–3 m thick seismically-inactive thrust fault zone with a mean orientation of N^o045 in dip direction, a dip of 45°, and a slip offset of a few meters¹¹ (Fig. 1a, and Supplementary Figs. S1 and S2). During the experiment, pressurized water was injected for 645 s with step-increasing rates into a 2.4-m-long packer-isolated borehole interval spanning the main slip plane of the fault zone. The fluid pressure, the fault-normal (opening) and the fault-parallel (slip) displacements were recorded at both the injection and monitoring points with a specially designed borehole (SIMFIP) probe¹³ (Methods) (Fig. 1a and Supplementary Fig. S2), while the flowrate was only monitored at the injection point. The experiment was conducted in a pressure-controlled mode to maintain a quasi-constant pressure value during each step. Thus, the flowrate corresponds to the rate of fluid flow into the fault required to achieve and maintain the target pressure. Prior to the experiment, the state of stress was estimated at $\sigma_1 = 6\text{-to-}7$ MPa (subvertical), $\sigma_2 = 4\text{-to-}5$ MPa and $\sigma_3 = 0.6\text{-to-}2.9$ MPa (subhorizontal), using a combination of geological data, borehole hydromechanical measurements, and modeling¹⁴⁻¹⁶. At injection, the initial effective normal stress and shear stress acting on the fault were estimated at $\sim 5.0 \pm 0.3$ MPa, and $\sim 0.75 \pm 0.3$ MPa, respectively¹⁵. The initial fluid pressure in the packed-off interval before injection was measured at 0.5 MPa. The temperature is constant (15.6°C) in the boreholes during the experiment.

At the injection point, the fluid pressure was increased step-by-step from the initial value of 0.5 MPa to a maximum value of 5.4 MPa (Fig. 1b). This maximum value represents an extreme fluid pressurization relative to the local stress conditions. As the pressure increased in the injection borehole, no change was detected until a complex evolution of fault deformation and fluid pressure response started at the injection point and then at the monitoring point (Figs. 1b and 1c), about 555 s into the experiment. The fault is reactivated, implying a sudden enhancement of the fault's permeability and fluid flow. No seismic event was observed, the fault displacements thus appear aseismic. We examine here in detail the temporal sequence of processes at the two measuring points (Supplementary Fig. S3). At the injection, first, the fault slip initiates at 555 s, followed by rapid fault opening at 568 s, and flowrate increase (0 to 33.8 l/min) at 572 s (Fig. 1d). Then, the fluid pressure decreases from the peak to a steady-state value of 4.2 MPa. Fault slip accelerates with fluid flow, and then decelerates when flowrate and pressure become constant and fault opening stabilizes. The slip increased to about 18.7 μm , and the opening up to 19.7 μm . A secondary phase of fault closing followed by opening is observed from 628 to 632 s. At the monitoring point, first, the fault slip initiates at 574 s after the beginning of injection, followed by fault opening at 587 s (Fig. 1e). No fluid pressure change was detected until 31 μm of fault slip, 5 μm of fault opening, about 597 s into the experiment. Thus, at the monitoring point, the fluid pressure starts to increase 23 s after the fault starts to slip. The fluid pressure reaches a maximum value of 4.17 MPa at 623 s. The fluid pressurization occurs at a rate of 0.16 MPa/s. This phase of pressurization is associated with fault closing (10.7 μm from 597 to 618 s) and slip at a slower rate toward the peak value (58.5 μm at 622 s). After the peak of pressurization at the monitoring point, the fluid pressure slightly decreases and stabilizes at a value of 3.85 MPa. This phase is associated with a fault opening of 24 μm from 618 to 645 s. Meanwhile, there is a decrease of fault slip of 20 μm , from 58.5 μm at 622 s to 38.5 μm at 645 s.

From the evolution of flowrate, fluid pressure and slip between the two measuring points, we estimate a pressure migration speed at 0.174 m/s, and a rupture propagation at a

speed of 0.228 m/s. These observations demonstrate that the fault initially failed in shear with slip preceding the fluid migration, which is slower (~24%) than the rupture velocity. Then, a large fault opening, that is poorly coupled to slip, occurred and resulted in sufficient permeability enhancement ($\Delta k \sim 2.78 \times 10^5 \text{ m}^2$ from its initial pre-slip value of $\sim 10^{-17} \text{ m}^2$) over a large enough patch of the fault to generate connectivity between the two boreholes. The increase in fluid pressure came after this sequence of fault slip and opening.

Modeling fault deformation and fluid flow

To investigate the process responsible for the dynamic evolution of the hydraulic connection between the two boreholes and the sudden increase in fluid pressure measured at the monitoring point, we developed a three-dimensional hydromechanical model of this *in situ* experiment (Methods). The model simulates the fluid flow, slip and opening along a planar fault with a dip of 45° in an elastic and impervious medium (Fig. 1a). The initial hydromechanical properties, measured in the laboratory and *in situ*^{15,17}, are uniform over the fault (Supplementary Table S1). Before injection, the *in situ* stresses and fluid pressure are initialized over the fault. We used the gradual step-by-step pressurization measured at injection as loading path (Fig. 1b). During injection, fluid pressure (p) and effective normal stress ($\sigma_n - p$) evolve over the fault, and modify the fault strength $\tau = c + \mu \cdot (\sigma_n - p)$. Once a fault rupture initiates, the friction coefficient (μ) is governed by a linear slip-weakening law¹⁸, while the fault cohesion (c) instantaneously falls to zero (Methods). Fluid flow is governed by the modified cubic law¹⁹, with effective stress- and shear dilation-induced permeability change on the fault (Methods). We compare three permeability evolution models (Fig. 2a), including (1) a model with constant permeability, (2) a model with a variable permeability activated from the start of injection, and (3) a model with a variable permeability activated only in the ruptured part of the fault (Methods).

The measured fluid pressure evolution is reproduced by the numerical solution when the fault first fails and slips while activating permeability change (Figs. 2a and 2b), whereas models with a constant or variable permeability from the start of injection do not capture the data. The injection of fluid increases the pressure (Supplementary Fig. S4), which weakens the fault and initiates failure. Once the fault fails and starts slipping, the fluid enters the ruptured parts and induces a decrease of effective normal stress (Supplementary Fig. S5), causing an intense fault opening and slip acceleration, consistently with field data (Fig. 2b). The model fits well the last phases of rapid increase of fluid pressure and stabilization at a maximum value (~4 MPa). Model results (Fig. 3, and Supplementary Fig. S4) also show that the fluid pressure front follows the migration of peak shear stress where rupture occurs. Shear stress increases within a highly localized zone at the rim of the region of fluid pressurization. In this high stressed zone, the stored energy is released when the shear stress exceeds strength and the fault fails, resulting in slip propagation and creation of hydraulic pathways. The shear stress perturbation arising from fault slip develops beyond the pressure front (Fig. 3a), and gradually drops from the peak to background value (Figs. 3b-f). At the end of injection, the fault area where the stress perturbation occurs is about 6 times the size of the pressurized area (Fig. 3f). This result is consistent with previous modeling studies, suggesting that increased shear stress and friction weakening drive slip beyond the pressure front^{20,21} (Supplementary Figs. S6 and S7). By varying the model parameters (Supplementary Fig. S8), we also show that the initiation time of fluid pressurization at the monitoring point is strongly influenced by the amount of frictional weakening (Supplementary Fig. S8B). To match the fluid pressure observed at the monitoring point, the fault weakens significantly with frictional strength drop of 83.3 %.

Comparison of the data with the model solutions shows that the data fit is good for the fluid pressure, except the displacements (Figs. 2a and 2b). Although modelled displacements capture the main features of the observed signals, some differences in shape and amplitude arise because of simplified model assumptions used to represent the natural fault zone such as a single planar fault geometry and uniform hydromechanical parameters, and because we did not account for the off-fault deformation on surrounding fractures. In addition, the exact process responsible for the observed rapid changes in acceleration or deceleration of fault displacements remains elusive. They could reflect interactions between the fault weakening induced by fluid pressurization, frictional stability of shales at low effective stress, and variable material properties^{22,23}. The time lag observed between fault opening and the change in fluid pressure is reproduced slightly differently by the model that does not consider the storage effect associated with the monitoring interval. Indeed, in the field, the pressure front propagating along the fault enters the larger monitoring interval of the borehole, which induces a delayed pressurization at the pressure sensor. Moreover, the fault opening observed before fluid pressurization could also be explained by another part of the fault, that was not instrumented, opening first, and then elastic stress transfer caused the opening at the measurement location. Despite the model simplifications, our numerical results show two phenomena that can be compared to observations: (1) a decoupling between fault slip and opening, and (2) a rapid fluid pressurization rate initiating at failure. Importantly, shear stress increase at the rupture front and frictional weakening with increasing slip offer an efficient mechanism for rupture propagation, permeability enhancement and the rapid transmission of high-fluid pressures within low permeability faults.

Implications for fluid pressure migration along faults

This study demonstrates that fluid pressure migration along low permeability faults is driven by rupture growth through stress perturbation ahead of the pressurized zone. This behavior is different from the fluid diffusion in permeable and porous media²⁴. The most pronounced change in behavior occurs when the fault rupture increases permeability and fluid flows in the preferential direction of fault slip. Our results are consistent with previous laboratory-sized experiments on sawcut rock surfaces, which showed that rupture is a necessary condition to allow fluid flow in low permeability faults²⁵.

Our observations also provide clear *in situ* constraints on the physics underlying fault permeability enhancement in shales. Once failure occurs, a large increase in permeability and significant fluid migration can occur in the fault, now mainly driven by fault opening as a result of a strong decrease in effective normal stress. At this point, the fault is at rupture but the contribution of dilation induced by slip to permeability enhancement is minor. This fault response demonstrates that a mixed-mode rupture mechanism favored by a combination of slip propagation and opening explains such rapid fluid migration at high pressure and the apparent decoupling between fault slip and opening in low permeability shale formations⁹.

Overall, in terms of fault activation and fluid flow, our results have provided *in situ* constraints with important implications for subsurface reservoir geomechanics, particularly the integrity of sealing caprock overlying CO₂ storage formations. The fluid-fault mechanics outlined in this study have also implications for geothermal power production where observations at 3 km depth indicate a time delay between fault shearing and opening during permeability enhancement operations²⁶, a process that we directly measured in our experiment. Beyond improving our fundamental knowledge about the relationship between fault slip, opening and fluid migration in a shale fault, the mechanisms observed in this experiment could also be beneficial to understand how induced seismicity, and in a broader context, natural

earthquakes are triggered by fluid perturbations operating in the Earth's crust, since there appears to be a clear link between permeability increase from slip and reduction in effective normal stress. This process is efficient for the transmission of high-fluid pressures at fast rates over sufficiently large sections of a fault that can potentially transition from aseismic creep to seismic slip. Fluid pressurization in low permeable faults can also increase shear stress at the periphery of the aseismic dilatant slip zone and promotes earthquake nucleation in the neighboring asperities or segments.

Methods

Methods and any associated references are available in the online version of the paper.

Data availability

All of the fluid pressure, flowrate and fault displacement data from the experiment are available at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6601739> and were used in producing the Figures 1b and 1c of this manuscript.

References

1. Shelly, D.R. et al. Fluid-faulting evolution in high definition: Connecting fault structure and frequency-magnitude variations during the 2014 Long Valley Caldera, California, earthquake swarm. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **121**, 1776–1795, 10.1002/2015JB012719 (2016).
2. Ross, Z.E. et al. 3D fault architecture controls the dynamism of earthquake swarms. *Science*, **368**(6497), 1357-1361, doi:10.1126/science.abb0779 (2020).
3. Ellsworth, W.L. Injection-induced earthquakes. *Science*, **341**, 6142, 10.1126/science.1225942 (2013).
4. Keranen, K.M. & Weingarten, M. Induced seismicity. *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.*, **46**, 149-174, 10.1146/annurev-earth-082517-010054 (2018).
5. Guglielmi, Y. et al. Seismicity triggered by fluid injection-induced aseismic slip. *Science*, **348**, 1224, 10.1126/science.aab0476 (2015).
6. Wei, S. et al. The 2012 Brawley swarm triggered by injection-induced aseismic slip. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, **422**, 115-125, 10.1016/j.epsl.2015.03.054 (2015).
7. Sibson, R.H. Conditions for fault-valve behaviour. *Geol. Soc. Lond. Spl. Publ.*, **54**, 15–28 (1990).
8. Zhu, W. et al. Fault valving and pore pressure evolution in simulations of earthquake sequences and aseismic slip. *Nature Communications*, **11**:4833, 10.1038/s41467-020-18598-z (2020).
9. Guglielmi, Y. et al. In situ observations on the coupling between hydraulic diffusivity and displacements during fault reactivation in shales. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **120**, 10.1002/2015JB012158 (2015).
10. Wu, W. et al. Permeability evolution of slowly slipping faults in shale reservoirs. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **44**, 11,368-11,375, 10.1002/2017GL075506 (2017).
11. Wenning, Q.C. et al. Shale fault zone structure and stress dependent anisotropic permeability and seismic velocity properties (Opalinus Clay, Switzerland). *J. Struct. Geol.*, **144**, 104273, 10.1026/j/jsg.2020.104273 (2020).
12. Thury, M. & Bossart, P. The Mont Terri rock laboratory, a new international research project in a Mesozoic shale formation, in Switzerland. *Engineering Geology*, **52**(3–4), 347-359 (1999).
13. Guglielmi, Y. et al. 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**, 10.1007/s00603-013-0517-1 (2014).
14. Martin, C.D. & Lanyon, G.W. Measurement of in situ stress in weak rocks at Mont Terri Rock Laboratory, Switzerland. *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min. Sci.*, **40**(7–8), 1077–1088 (2003).
15. Guglielmi, Y. et al. Complexity of fault rupture and fluid leakage in shale: insights from a controlled fault activation experiment. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **125**, 10.1029/2019JB017781 (2020).
16. Guglielmi, Y. et al. Estimating perturbed stress from 3D borehole displacements induced by fluid injection in fractured or faulted shales. *Geophys. J. Int.*, **221**, 10.1093/gji/ggaa103 (2020).
17. Aoki, K. et al. Micro-textures of deformed gouges by friction experiments of Mont Terri Main Fault, Switzerland, 2017 AGU Fall Meeting, MR33B-2057 (2017).
18. Ida, Y. Cohesive force across the tip of a longitudinal-shear crack and Griffith's specific surface energy *J. Geophys. Res.*, **77**(20), 3796-3805 (1972).
19. Witherspoon, P.A. et al. Validity of cubic law for fluid flow in a deformable rock fracture. *Water Resour. Res.*, **16**, 1016-1024 (1980).
20. Cappa, F. et al. On the relationship between fault permeability increases, induced stress perturbation, and the growth of aseismic slip during fluid injection. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **45**, 10.1029/2018GL080233 (2018).

21. Bhattacharya, P. & Viesca, R.C. Fluid-induced aseismic fault slip outpaces pore-fluid migration. *Science*, **364**, 10.1126/science.aaw7354 (2019).
22. Scuderi, M.M. et al. Frictional stability and earthquake triggering during fluid pressure stimulation of an experimental fault. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* **477**, 10.1016/j.epsl.2017.08.009 (2017).
23. Scuderi, M.M. & Collettini, C. Fluid injection and the mechanics of frictional stability of shale-bearing faults. *J. Geophys. Res.* **123**, 10.1029/2018JB016084 (2018).
24. Wang, H.F. *Theory of Linear Poroelasticity*, 287 pp., Princeton Univ. Press. (2000).
25. Rutter, E.H. & Hackston, A. On the effective stress law for rock-on-rock frictional sliding, and fault slip triggered by means of fluid injection. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, **375**, 10.1098/rsta.2016.0001 (2017).
26. Evans, K.F., et al. 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, 10.1111/j.1365-246X.2004.02474.x (2005).

Acknowledgments

This work has been supported by the Federal Office of Topography, Swisstopo, and by the U.S. Department of Energy (Spent Fuel and Waste Science and Technology Research Group). F.C. acknowledges support from the Institut Universitaire de France. We thank E. Dunham and R.M. Pollyea for constructive comments.

Authors contributions

F.C. and Y.G. designed the study. Y.G and C.N. performed the experiment. F.C. performed the numerical simulations. All authors contributed to the analysis of the data and simulations, and preparation of the manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Additional information

Supplementary information is available in the online version of this paper.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Experiment setting and in situ data. **a**, Geometry of the experimental zone at a depth of 340 m below the Earth's surface in the Mont Terri Underground Research Laboratory in Switzerland, and numerical model schematic. Fluid is injected through the open section of the injection borehole into the fault. A borehole probe (SIMFIP) was used to simultaneously measure the fault displacement (fault-parallel (“slip”) in red, and fault-normal (“opening”) in gold) and fluid pressure (blue) at the **b**, injection and **c**, monitoring points. Flowrate (green) is measured at injection. **d** and **e**, Close-up view of the time window 550 to 645 s.

Figure 2. Observed and modeled fluid pressure and fault displacements. From the monitoring point, in response to fluid injection. **a**, Best-fit numerical solution for fluid pressure calculated with a variable permeability model activated at failure (black). For comparison, the fluid pressure calculated with a variable permeability model from the start of injection (purple) and a constant permeability (grey) is presented. **b**, Model-predicted fault displacements for the variable permeability model activated at failure.

Figure 3. Spatio-temporal evolution of fault behavior. **a**, Time evolution of the fronts of fluid pressure, fault displacements, and shear stress. **b-f**, Spatial distributions of the change in shear stress relative to the initial value at the indicated times (560, 580, 600, 620 and 640 s) for the best-fit numerical solution. On each snapshot, the cyan contour represents the locations of the fluid pressure front (1% increase from initial value) and the dashed green contour marks the limit of the zone of perturbed shear stress.

Methods

Monitoring fault movements with a SIMFIP borehole probe during the fluid injection field experiment

Similar to Guglielmi et al. (2020)¹⁵, in the Mont Terri experiment (Supplementary Fig. S1), two SIMFIP borehole probes allow the simultaneous monitoring of fluid pressure in the fault and three-dimensional displacements of the fault¹³. A 2.4 m-long sealed interval is isolated in an open hole using two inflatable rubber packers (Supplementary Figs. S2a and S2b). A 0.49 m long and 0.1 m diameter pre-calibrated aluminum cage located between the two packers is clamped on the borehole wall on both sides of the existing fault plane. When clamped, the cage is disconnected from the straddle packer system. When the fault is moving as a result of the fluid injection into the interval, the cage monitors the three-dimensional displacement tensor and the three rotations of the upper anchor of the cage relatively to the lower anchor. The maximum displacement range of the deformation cage is 0.7 and 3.5 mm in the axial and radial directions of the borehole, respectively, and the accuracy is $\pm 5 \times 10^{-6}$ m. A compass set on the probe provides the orientation of measurements with 0.1° accuracy. In this paper, the displacements are rotated into tangential (i.e., parallel) and normal (i.e., perpendicular) displacements of the fault. The measured fault opening (i.e., fault-normal displacement) corresponds to increased hydraulic aperture on a pre-existing fault segment composed of asperities and void spaces. Based on the 3D analysis of the variations in the fault displacement vectors with time at the injection point in Guglielmi et al. (2020)¹⁵, our measurements show that, until 572 s into the experiment, the displacements are slightly more inclined than the orientation of the fault plane, highlighting a dominant tangential displacement with a slight normal displacement component. After 572 s of injection, displacement vectors are significantly more inclined than the fault plane. This is illustrated by the normal displacement curve that shows a much sharper increase than the tangential displacement curve (Fig. 1d). This much larger dip of displacement vectors after 572 s corresponds to a significant fault vertical opening associated with a strong fluid pressure drop (1.2 MPa) around the injection.

The displacement data are continuously logged together with pump parameters (pressure and flowrate), as well as temperature and pressure in the borehole above, between and below the packers. The pressure sensors allow for measurements over a pressure range from 0 to 10 MPa, with a 0.001 MPa accuracy. The accuracy of the temperature sensors is 0.1°C .

During the hydraulic injection test, the injection pressure is controlled by an engine pump while flowrate, pressure, temperature and displacement variations from the two SIMFIP probes, respectively installed in the injection borehole and in the monitoring borehole, are monitored with the same acquisition station. The sampling frequency is 500 Hz.

Numerical modelling: assumptions and parameters

To investigate the origin of the rapid increase in fluid pressure measured at the monitoring point and the hydraulic connection between the two boreholes, we have used a three-dimensional distinct element code²⁷. This numerical code was successfully used to model fluid injections in faults and fractured rocks^{9,20,28}. The model simulates the fluid flow and the evolution of the mechanical displacements along a single fault plane to the step-by-step pressurization boundary condition imposed at the injection point (Fig. 1b and Supplementary Fig. S4a). A sensitivity analysis was also conducted to address the influence of the faults' hydromechanical properties (mainly frictional and hydraulic parameters; Supplementary Fig. S8) on its rupture and hydraulic behavior. In this modeling, we focus on reproducing the hydromechanical response of the fault at the monitoring point.

Details about the numerical code are provided in Cappa et al. (2018)²⁰ and Wynants-Morel et al. (2020)²⁸. The model employs the modified cubic law¹⁹ (eq. 1) for fluid flow along a smooth deformable fault (i.e., no roughness), and fault slip is initiated based on the Mohr-Coulomb failure criterion ($\tau = c + \mu \cdot \sigma_n'$, where τ is the shear stress at which slip initiates; c is the cohesion, σ_n' is the effective normal stress, i.e., total normal stress, σ_n , minus fluid pressure, p ; and μ is the friction coefficient)²⁹. When the fault slips, a linear slip-weakening friction law (eq. 5) is used¹⁸. A frictional stress-dependent permeability is applied to calculate the fluid pressure diffusion in the slipping patches of the fault. In this model, fluid flow is thus activated at failure and occurs only in the ruptured part of the fault (i.e., no fluid flow in the unruptured parts).

Thus, after the onset of slip, the fluid flow over the slipping part of fault is computed as follows:

$$q = -\frac{b_h^3 \cdot w}{12\mu_f} \nabla p \quad (1)$$

where q is the volumetric flow rate (m³/s), w denotes the fault width (m), μ_f is the fluid dynamic viscosity (Pa.s), ∇p is the fluid pressure gradient (Pa/m). The fault hydraulic aperture (b_h in m) varies with the effective normal stress and shear-induced dilation:

$$b_h = b_{ho} - \frac{\Delta\sigma_n'}{k_n} + \Delta u_s \cdot \tan \psi \quad (2)$$

where b_{ho} (m) is the initial hydraulic aperture at failure initiation, $\Delta\sigma_n'$ is the increment in effective normal stress ($\sigma_n - p$) (Pa), k_n is the fault normal stiffness (Pa/m), Δu_s (m) is the slip increment, and ψ is the dilation angle (°). Dilation occurs only as the fault slips. Assuming smooth fault surfaces, the hydraulic aperture is linked to the permeability, k , (m²) as follows¹⁹:

$$k = \frac{b_h^2}{12} \quad (3)$$

The fluid pressure in the deformable fault follows a diffusion equation:

$$\frac{\delta p}{\delta t} = \frac{b_h^2 K_f}{12\mu_f} \nabla^2 p - \frac{K_f}{b_h} \frac{\delta b_h}{\delta t} \quad (4)$$

where K_f is the fluid bulk modulus (Pa) and t is the time. Thus, the change in pressure is a result of fluid flow (the first term in equation 4) and mechanical deformation (the second term in equation 4).

The distinct element method^{30,31} is used to calculate displacements along the fault and rotations of rock blocks that surrounds it. On the fault, linear stress-displacement relations govern the elastic motions, in both the parallel and perpendicular directions.

The model is discretized with tetrahedral zones. The finite volume method is used to calculate stresses and strains in the rock blocks. The code uses an explicit time-marching procedure²⁷.

Within each time step, the two-way coupling calculation is sequentially iterative, and proceeds by performing a fluid calculation step and then some mechanical calculation steps to achieve a hydromechanical equilibrium. Thus, the permeability of the fault is affected by the mechanical deformation, and the fluid pressure affects the mechanical computation at each time step.

We built a model (60 m × 60 m × 60 m) which considers fluid injection into a single fault plane with a dip angle of 45° in a homogeneous elastic and impervious medium (Fig. 1a). The fault zone geometry is inferred from previous geological studies³². To calibrate the model, we used the injection pressure measured from the experiment as the input data (Fig. 1b), and compared the monitoring pressure obtained from the numerical solution and experimental data (Figs. 1c, 2a, and Supplementary Figs. S4, S5 and S6).

The fault hydromechanical properties and the rock elastic properties were taken from previous studies¹⁶ (Supplementary Table S1). Before injection, the initial properties are uniform over the fault. For the slip-weakening friction law¹⁸, we use the following frictional parameters, $\mu_s = 0.6$, $\mu_d = 0.1$, and $d_c = 150$ microns to model the evolution of the friction coefficient (μ) as a function of the amount of slip (D):

$$\mu = \begin{cases} \mu_s - (\mu_s - \mu_d) \frac{D}{\delta_c} & D < \delta_c \\ \mu_d & D > \delta_c \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

These values fall within the range of frictional parameters measured in laboratory tests at low stress conditions and slow slip rates on the fault samples collected in deep boreholes used for the present injection experiment^{17,33}. It is important to note that a very low dynamic friction coefficient (μ_d) is required in the model to reproduce the rapid pressure build-up and the mixed-mode deformation mechanism with fault slip and opening observed at the monitoring point

The first modelling stage consists of a comparison of different fluid flow modes to evaluate capabilities of each mode to reproduce the fluid pressure evolution observed at the monitoring point (Fig. 2a, and Supplementary Fig. S4). In this application, we tested three models:

- (1) A constant permeability model (i.e., constant hydraulic aperture, $b_h = b_{ho}$);
- (2) A variable permeability model (i.e., hydraulic aperture changes according to Equation 1) activated from the start of injection;
- (3) A variable permeability model activated at failure (i.e., Equation 1 and frictional stress-dependent permeability model activated at failure as described above, when $\Delta u_s > 0$).

References

27. Itasca Consulting Group, Inc. 3DEC 3-dimensional distinct element code. Minneapolis: ICG (2016).
28. N. Wynants-Morel, F. Cappa, L. De Barros, J.P. Ampuero, Stress perturbation from aseismic slip drives the seismic front during fluid injection in a permeable fault, *J. Geophys. Res.*, **125**, e2019JB019179, doi:10.1029/2019JB019179 (2020).
29. J.C. Jaeger, N.G.W. Cook, Fundamentals of Rock Mechanics, *Chapman and Hall*, London, U.K. (1979).
30. Cundall PA, Strack ODL, A discrete numerical model for granular assemblies, *Geotechnique*, **29**(1):47-65. doi: 10.1680/geot.1979.29.1.47 (1979)
31. Cundall, P. A. Formulation of a three-dimensional distinct element model—Part I. A scheme to detect and represent contacts in a system composed of many polyhedral blocks.

- Int. J. Rock Mech. Min. Sci. Geomech. Abs.*, **25**(3), 107–116. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-9062\(88\)92293-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-9062(88)92293-0) (1988)
32. C. Nussbaum, P. Bossart, F. Amann, C. Aubourg. Analysis of tectonic structures and excavation induced fractures in the Opalinus Clay, Mont Terri underground rock laboratory (Switzerland). *Swiss J. Geosci.*, **104**, 187-210 (2011).
 33. Shimamoto, T. Frictional Properties of Mont Terri Claystones from Fault Slip Test Sites at Low to Intermediate Slip Rates, Report to JAEA (2017)





