

# 2 Fluid-induced rupture experiment on Fontainebleau sandstone:

# <sup>3</sup> Premonitory activity, rupture propagation, and aftershocks

4 A. Schubnel,<sup>1,2</sup> B. D. Thompson,<sup>1</sup> J. Fortin,<sup>2</sup> Y. Guéguen,<sup>2</sup> and R. P. Young<sup>1</sup>

5 Received 27 June 2007; accepted 22 August 2007; published XX Month 2007.

[1] A 14% porosity Fontainebleau sandstone sample 7 (diameter = 40 mm, length = 88 mm) was loaded tri-8 axially, under 100 MPa confining pressure and 240 MPa 9 differential stress. In drained conditions and under constant 10 load, pore pressure (water) was raised until failure was 11triggered. During the experiment, elastic wave velocities 12 and permeability were monitored while more than 3000 13 Acoustic Emissions (AE) were located prior and after 1415 failure. AE locations show that macroscopic fracture 16 propagated from a large nucleation patch at speeds comprised between 0.1 and 4 m/s. Number of AE hits per 17second followed Omori's law, with exponents of 0.92 and 18 1.18 pre- and post-failure respectively. No quiescence was 19 observed post failure, except where rupture initially 20nucleated from. Fast depressurization of the pore space 21induced secondary aftershocks located within the fracture 22 plane, possibly indicating a heterogeneous fault geometry 23after rupture, of lower permeability, that compacted during 2425the release of pore pressure. Citation: Schubnel, A., B. D. Thompson, J. Fortin, Y. Guéguen, and R. P. Young (2007), Fluid-26induced rupture experiment on Fontainebleau sandstone: 27Premonitory activity, rupture propagation, and aftershocks, 28Geophys. Res. Lett., 34, LXXXXX, doi:10.1029/2007GL031076. 29

## 31 1. Introduction

[2] The generation and maintenance of pore pressure 32 are of particular importance in crustal dynamics as they 33 play a major role in the diagenetic cycle of sedimentary 3435 rocks, the production and ascension of volcanic lavas, 36 aseismic deformation as well as within the earthquake cycle. In nature, numerous mechanisms exist which can 37 give rise to the generation of pore overpressures: for 38 example, porosity reduction [Wong et al., 1997], thermal 39 pressurization [Andrews, 2002], degassing or dehydration 40 reactions [Dobson et al., 2002]. Recent work on fault 41gouge mechanics have highlighted the crucial importance 42of the coupled evolution between damage, rock physical 43 properties (e.g. wave velocities or permeability), temper-44ature, pore pressure and solid stress [Rice, 1992]. In such 45way, in drained conditions that are characteristic of Earth's 46crust, the development of pore pressure excess is pro-47foundly influenced by the spatial and temporal variations 48 of permeability [Miller, 2002]. For example, the coupling 49between strain rate and permeability can lead to cases 50where, on the small scale, rocks are not fully drained thus 5152leading to localized pore fluid pressure excess [Brace and

*Martin*, 1968]. Evidence of pore-pressure driven after- 53 shocks [*Shapiro et al.*, 2003; *Miller et al.*, 2004] and 54 long distance triggering in geothermal areas [*Kanamori* 55 *and Brodsky*, 2004] have also emphasized the role fluids 56 may play in the redistribution of normal stresses [*Koerner* 57 *et al.*, 2004] and earthquake triggering. But the compli- 58 cations associated with in-situ monitoring of crustal pore 59 pressures in natural fault zones is such that little is known 60 quantitatively on the acoustic (or seismic) signatures of 61 varying fluid pressures in the field, which are nevertheless 62 thought to play a crucial mechanical (and chemical) role. 63

[3] In the laboratory however, many Acoustic Emission 64 (AE) studies have documented the mechanics of failure 65 propagation in dry rocks [Lockner, 1993] or dry fault gouge 66 analogues [Mair et al., 2007]. In the presence of fluid, AE 67 studies have been performed: (1) in drained conditions at 68 constant pore pressure, on the water weakening effect due 69 to stress corrosion processes in sandstones [Baud and 70] Meredith, 1997, 2000], damage accumulation and mapping 71 [Zang et al., 1996], shear and compaction band formation 72 [Fortin et al., 2006; Benson et al., 2007], and the strain rate 73 and temperature dependence of Omori's law exponent 74 [Ojala et al., 2004]; (2) in undrained conditions, several 75 studies have concentrated on dehydrating rocks such as 76 serpentinite [Dobson et al., 2002] or gypsum [Milsch and 77 Scholz, 2005] while Schubnel et al. [2006] have recently 78 investigated aseismic failure of marble due to pore pressur- 79 ization. In this preliminary study, we have investigated 80 experimentally the mechanical role an increasing pore 81 pressure plays on AE triggering and fracture propagation 82 in drained conditions on a high permeability sandstone. 83

### 2. Experimental Set-Up and Procedure

[4] A Fontainebleau sandstone specimen (length = 85 88 mm, diameter = 40 mm; cored perpendicular to the 86bedding plane) was deformed inside a triaxial vessel 87 installed at the Laboratoire de Géologie of Ecole Normale 88 Supérieure in Paris, France [Fortin et al., 2005; Schubnel 89 et al., 2005]. This triaxial cell of low stiffness is equipped 90 to record axial, radial and volumetric strains, permeability 91 along the vertical axis and acoustic activity contempora- 92 neously. A network of 14 piezoceramic transducers (PZT) 93 was used in order to measure P wave velocities along 94 several directions and locate AE during the experiment. 95 Absolute velocities were calculated with an error bar of a 96 few percent but relative error was lowered to 0.5% using 97 cross-correlation and double picking techniques. AE were 98 captured using a unique and innovative instrument 99 [Thompson et al., 2005, 2006], which stores continuous 100 ultrasonic waveform data onto a 40 GB circular Random 101 Access Memory (RAM) buffer with 14-bit resolution. This 102

84

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Lassonde Institute, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. <sup>2</sup>Laboratoire de Géologie, Ecole Normale Supérieure, Paris, France.

Copyright 2007 by the American Geophysical Union. 0094-8276/07/2007GL031076\$05.00

134



**Figure 1.** (a) Mechanical envelope of Fontainebleau sandstone (onsets of dilatancy and peak stresses). The arrow shows the stress path followed during this experiment (A, water injection phase; E, rupture; and G, pore pressure release). (b) Physical properties as a function of effective mean stress. Averaged, vertical (upper dashed line), and horizontal P wave velocities are represented. Filled circles show the averaged (upstream and downstream) permeability measurements.

103system was designed in response to the limitation of existing AE acquisition systems so that here, the complete 104AE catalog could be recorded at a very high resolution 105(10 MHz sampling frequency). The RAM was frozen a few 106seconds after macroscopic rupture. The continuous acoustic 107data was then downloaded and harvested for discrete AE 108events. AE absolute source locations were obtained with an 109average accuracy of  $\pm 2$  mm, using a homogeneous trans-110 versely isotropic velocity profile (fast vertical P wave 111 velocity - initially 4250 m/s, and then calibrated again 112after each velocity survey, anisotropy factor 5%) and a 113Downhill Simplex algorithm [Nelder and Mead, 1965]. 114

[5] Inside the vessel, the sample was covered with a 115116Neoprene jacket. Axial strain and stress were measured using a strain gage glued directly onto the sample (strain 117 measurement accuracy was  $\sim 10^{-6}$ ), an internal load cell placed on top of the sample (relative stress measurement 118 119accuracy was  $\sim 0.1$  MPa) and a LVDT placed on top of the 120piston (total displacement accuracy  $\sim 10 \ \mu m$ ). Pore pressure 121was driven by two precision volumetric pumps and distilled 122water was introduced into the sample through hardened 123 steel end pieces and porous spacers located on the top and 124bottom of the rock sample. The sample was saturated for 12524 hours prior to the experiment and then deformed under 126fully drained conditions. At various points, the experiment 127 was stopped and permeability measurements were per-128

formed in both directions (upstream and downstream) along 129 the main axis of compression, using a continuous delta 130 pressure technique (1 MPa) and measuring the continuous 131 resulting flow (between  $30-300 \text{ cm}^3/\text{hr}$ ) provided by the 132 two servo-controlled pumps.

#### 3. Experimental Results

### **3.1. Stress Path, Physical Properties, and Acoustic** 135 Activity 136

[6] Figure 1a presents the mechanical envelope of this 137 14% porosity Fontainebleau sandstone. Onset of inelastic 138 dilatant deformation (dilatancy - circles) and peak strength 139 stresses (squares) were measured in drained conditions on 140 samples all coming from the same block. The space limited 141 by these two lines correspond to the so-called damage 142 domain, i.e. the domain were crack propagation takes. 143 Below the onset of dilatancy, deformation is purely elastic 144 (or visco-elastic). On Figure 1a, the arrow shows the stress 145 path followed as a function of differential stress  $[\sigma_1 - \sigma_3]$  146 and effective mean stress  $[(\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_3)/3 - P_p]$ , where  $\sigma_1$  is the 147 vertical compressive stress,  $\sigma_3$  the confining pressure and  $P_p$  148 the pore pressure. This particular stress path was chosen so 149 that the sample crossed the damage domain by pore pres- 150 surization solely. The sample was initially loaded within the 151 elastic domain (point noted A on Figures 1 and 2): confining 152  $P_c$  and pore pressure  $P_p$  were set to 100 MPa and 10 MPa 153



Figure 2. (a) Differential stress, pore pressure, axial strain, and acoustic activity (number of AE per second) versus elapsed time during the experiment. A (pore pressure increase), G (pore pressure release), B and F (start and end of the continuous record on Figure 3a) are indicated by arrows. (b) Number of fore- and aftershocks were a power law function of time, with Omori exponents of ~0.92 and ~1.18 prior and after failure respectively.

respectively while differential stress was raised to 240 MPa. The sample was then brought back at constant differential stress into the brittle field by increasing the pore pressure solely and thus reducing the effective mean stress. At a pore pressure of 62 MPa, brittle failure was triggered (E) and the stress suddenly dropped to (F). Once quiescence was

160 reached, pore pressure was completely released (G).

161[7] Figure 1b shows the contemporaneous evolution of 162physical properties (P wave velocities and permeability) as a function of effective mean stress. The empty symbol dis-163plays the mean (averaged) P wave velocity, while the 164165dashed lines represent the mean upper (vertical) and lower (horizontal) values of P wave velocity. Initially, P wave 166velocities were equal to  $\sim$ 4.25 km/s. The rock showed a 5% 167anisotropy, with vertical velocities being faster than hori-168zontal ones. Initial permeability along the compressive axis 169was equal to  $\sim 1.25 \times 10^{-14}$  m<sup>2</sup>. Permeability and velocity 170 evolutions were highly correlated throughout the experi-171 ment. Initially, elastic compaction was accompanied with an 172increase in P wave velocity and a slight decrease of 173permeability, probably due to visco-elastic crack closure. 174175During this elastic phase, very few AEs were detected 176(Figure 2). Beyond A and as the pore pressure increased 177 further, no hysteresis was observed for P wave velocities, which decreased with decreasing effective mean stress due 178 to poro-elastic deformation (and crack re-opening). Further 179180 on, P wave velocities started to decrease substantially, as a consequence of microcracking. This also corresponded to 181 an increase in P wave anisotropy, a decrease in permeability 182 and the onset of AE triggering (Figure 2), the rate of which 183 reached a peak at failure. After failure, the final bulk 184 permeability of the rock sample was lower than the initial 185one, which can be explained by the fact the fault plane may 186have exhibited a much reduced permeability due to grain 187 crushing and gouge production [Zhu and Wong, 1997; 188 189 Fortin et al., 2005], while the rest of sample probably had a 190slightly larger permeability due to the reduction of effective 191mean stress as a result of the stress drop.

192[8] Figure 2 displays the contemporaneous evolution of stress (differential stress and pore pressure), axial 193194 strain and acoustic activity (number of detected AEs per second). Brittle failure was attained at  $P_p = 62$  MPa, with 195an associated differential stress drop of 140 MPa. The 196amount of slip, measured using a LVDT placed on top of 197 the sample and resolved for a  $60^{\circ}$  dipping fracture plane, 198was  $\sim 0.3$  mm. This yields a seismic moment  $M_0$  (calculated 199200 as  $M_0 = \mu Au$ , with a shear modulus  $\mu = 20$  GPa, a fault area,  $A = 30 \text{ cm}^2$  and u as the measured slip) equal to 1.7  $\times$ 201 202  $10^4$  Nm, which corresponds to a moment magnitude  $M_w$ (calculated using  $M_w = 2/3 \log_{10} M_0 - 6.0$ ) of -3.2. Failure 203204 nucleation and rupture propagation were accompanied by a 205peak of acoustic activity reaching up to 1000 per second for 206 a few seconds. After rupture, the AE rate decreased until quasi-quiescence. However, the final pore depressurization 207208 (noted G on Figure 2) unexpectedly induced a second set of aftershocks, probably due to local  $P_p$  re-equilibrations 209210on the fault plane and the fault zone lower permeability. Figure 2b plots the number of foreshocks and aftershocks as 211 212a function of logarithmic time. Regression lines show that 213 both datasets follow a power law (Omori's law), with exponents of  $\sim 0.92$  and  $\sim 1.18$  pre- and post-failure 214 respectively. This is comparable to values Ojala et al. 215

[2004] observed on drained sandstones experimentally as 216 well as values generally observed in the field [*Helmstetter*, 217 2002]. 218

#### **3.2. AE Locations, Nucleation Patch, and Aftershock** 219 Source Mechanisms 220

[9] Figure 3a displays a 134 second continuous acoustic 221 waveform, sampled at 10 MHz, over the course of rupture, 222 and the contemporaneous evolution of differential stress and 223 axial strain superimposed. Similar continuous waveforms of 224 all 14 PZT sensors were harvested for discrete AE events 225 and chopped into time periods from *B* to *F*. In this 226 experiment, frictional slip and stress drop were short phases 227 (*EF* < 1 s) that clearly corresponds to a peak of acoustic 228 activity. Figure 3b displays a zoom of the time period *EF*. 229 Between the dashed lines, AEs were triggered too rapidly to 230 distinguish discrete events. In consequence, few AEs could 231 be located during this critical time period (~0.25 s). During 232 these 0.25 s, the sensors were also fully saturated in voltage 233 during ~5 ms, as indicated on Figure 3b. 234

[10] Over 3 000 AEs were located and Figure 3b displays 235 the AE locations from A to G. During the time period AB 236  $(\sim 1 h)$ , 832 events were located and demonstrate the early 237 stages of strain localization. Within that first hour, and as 238 the pore pressure was slowly raised, only few AE located in 239 the bulk volume of the specimen. It might be that some pre- 240 existing heterogeneities might have controlled the initiation 241 of strain localization in the upper left of the specimen, as 242 seen by Lei et al. [2004] in granite or Fortin et al. [2006] in 243 sandstone. In the time period  $BC \sim 50$  s, AEs clustered in a 244 cloud. The cluster of AEs got smaller as the density of 245 AEs in its center increased, demonstrating the initiation of 246 a nucleation patch. Within the AE cluster, the final 247 AE density (total number of AE hits in the volume) 248 reached  $\sim 850$  AE/cm<sup>3</sup> at rupture. Approximately 1/4 of 249 the total number of AEs located within 1 cm<sup>3</sup> of the 250 sample, highlighting the extensive damage occurring within 251 the nucleation zone prior to failure. During the time periods 252 CD = 30 s and DE = 10 s, the nucleation patch accelerated 253 from a few tenths of mm.s<sup>-1</sup> to a few mm.s<sup>-1</sup>, so that at 254 during time period DE, the strain rate was already 255 increasing rapidly and the stress started to drop. Within 256 the next second (time period EF), unstable failure 257 propagated through the entire sample. Unfortunately, only 258 a few AEs could be located within time period *EF*, as the 259 AE rate was too fast to distinguish distinct AE events. 260 However, most AEs occurring before the first dashed line 261 on Figure 3b locate inside the nucleation patch. AEs 262 occurring after the second dashed line in Figure 3b also 263 locate at the base of the fault plane. Therefore, the region 264 highlighted on Figure 3c (a large asperity of  $\sim 2$  cm radius) 265 failed within  $\sim 0.25$  s during which no AEs could be 266 located. This yields a lower bound for the rupture velocity 267 of the order of 0.1 m.s<sup>-1</sup>. Assuming that the period of full 268 saturation of the sensors (5 ms) corresponds to the actual 269 dynamic propagation of the failure in the asperity also 270 yields an upper bound for the rupture velocity of 4 m.s<sup>-1</sup>. 271 Unlike in dry AE experiments, quiescence was not reached 272 before an hour after rupture and a large number of 273 aftershocks were observed. More than 200 AEs were 274 located in the time period FG, revealing a relative lack of 275 activity where rupture initially nucleated (highlighted by the 276



Figure 3. (a) Stress, strain, and radiated acoustic energy. A 134 second segment of the continuous acoustic waveform recorded on one single channel over the course of rupture. The evolution of axial strain and shear stress are also displayed, which is chopped into time periods, starting from B to F. (b) Zoom-in on time period EF. No AE locations could be performed between the dashed lines. (c) AE locations during time periods AB, BC, CD, DE, EF, FG, and after G.

ellipse). This could be explained by the important 277premonitory activity within this region. Unfortunately, no 278conclusive microstructural analysis was performed to 279support this hypothesis. Finally and once quiescence was 280reached, the final release of pore pressure (G) also triggered 281a set of aftershocks, all located within the fault zone. It is 282 likely that these aftershocks were triggered by differential 283pore pressure effects due to differential permeability along 284and across the fault plane. 285

# 287 4. Discussions and Conclusions

[11] In this preliminary study, three phases were observed 288during the rupture of an intact Fontainebleau sandstone 289specimen by pore pressurization. The first one corresponded 290 to clustered premonitory acoustic activity and strain local-291 ization. During this phase, elastic wave velocities and 292 permeability were affected and decreased, due to micro-293 cracking. The second phase corresponded to the initiation of 294a nucleation patch on which slip accelerated up to speeds of 295296  $\sim$ mm/s. Unstable rupture propagated in less than 0.25 s at speeds between 0.1-4 m/s. During this period, AEs were 297 triggered so rapidly that distinct AE events could not be 298distinguished anymore. This raises the fundamental ques-299tion of the nature of the waveforms acoustically radiated 300 during rupture propagation: can the sum of 1000 AEs, 301 corresponding to crack propagation increments of a few 302 tens of microns, be considered as one large event, 303 corresponding to the fracture of an asperity of a few 304 centimeters in size. Our experimental observations, which 305 tend to answer positively to this question, are also in close 306agreement with previous laboratory experiments [Thompson 307 et al., 2006] and field scale injection experiment studies 308

[Shapiro et al., 2006]. It also seem to follow, qualitatively at 309 least, the trends of Ohnaka's [2003] theoretical model of 310 unstable rupture nucleation both in intact and non-cohesive 311 rock materials, in which the nucleation size scales with the 312 amount of final slip and the rupture velocity evolves from 313 stable (or quasi-static) during a nucleation phase to unstable 314 (or dynamic) during the propagation phase. In our 315 experiment, the critical rupture velocity seems to be the 316 order of a few mm.s<sup>-1</sup>, before fast acceleration of the 317 fracture speed. The third phase of our experiments 318 corresponded to aftershock triggering, which revealed a 319 relative lack of activity within the rupture nucleation zone. 320 This might be due to the extensive premonitory damage 321 accumulation within this region (up to 850 AE within 322  $1 \text{ cm}^3$ ) where the stress heterogeneities might have already 323 been extensively released prior to failure. Aftershock 324 distribution in time followed a power law decrease (Omori's 325 exponent of 1.18). Secondary aftershocks might have been 326 due to the (1) possible fault heterogeneous geometry after 327 rupture, and (2) the compaction of the fault plane which 328 resulted in a decrease of the bulk permeability. Several 329 experiments of the same kind are now being planned on 330 different rock type to help built a catalog of the acoustic 331 signature of rocks during failure nucleation, and aftershock 332 time patterns, which, hopefully, will help quantify some of 333 the many questions raised by field studies. 334

[12] Acknowledgments. The authors would like to thank P.M. 335 Benson, M.H.B. Nasseri and D.S. Collins. We would also like to thank 336 Sergei Shapiro and Dan Faulkner for their highly constructive comments 337 that greatly improved the quality of our manuscript. This project was 338 funded via a National Environment Research Council (NERC) equipment 339 grant, a Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada 340 (NSERC) Discovery Grant and the Fond France Canada pour la Recherche 341 (FFCR). 342

#### References 343

- 344 Andrews, D. J. (2002), A fault constitutive relation accounting for thermal pressurization of pore fluid, J. Geophys. Res., 107(12), 2363, 345
- doi:10.1029/2002JB001942. 346
- Baud, P., and P. B. Meredith (1997), Damage accumulation during triaxial 347 348creep of Darley Dale sandstone from pore volumometry and acoustic emission, Int. J. Rock Mech. Min. Sci., 34, Pap. 024. 349
- Baud, P., W. L. Zhu, and T.-F. Wong (2000), Failure mode and weakening 350
- effect of water on sandstone, J. Geophys. Res., 105, 16,371-16,389. 351
- 352Benson, P. M., B. D. Thompson, P. G. Meredith, S. Vinciguerra, and R. P. Young (2007), Imaging slow failure in triaxially deformed Etna basalt 353 354 using 3D acoustic-emission location and X-ray computed tomography,
- Geophys. Res. Lett., 34, L03303, doi:10.1029/2006GL028721. 355 356
- Brace, W. F., and R. J. Martin (1968), A test of the effective stress for 357 crystalline rocks of low porosity, Int. J. Rock Mech. Min. Sci. Geomech. Abstr., 5, 415-426. 358
- 359Dobson, D. P., P. G. Meredith, and S. A. Boon (2002), Simulation of 360 subduction zone seismicity by dehydration of serpentine, Science, 298, 361 1407 - 1410
- 362Fortin, J., A. Schubnel, and Y. Guéguen (2005), Elastic wave velocities and 363 permeability evolution during compaction of Bleurswiller sandstone, Int. 364J. Rock Mech. Min. Sci., 42, 873-889.
- Fortin, J., S. Stanchits, G. Dresen, and Y. Guéguen (2006), Acoustic emis-365 366 sion and velocities associated with the formation of compaction bands in 367 sandstone, J. Geophys. Res., 111, B10203, doi:10.1029/2005JB003854.
- Helmstetter, A. (2002), Ruptures et instabilités: Simicité et mouvements 368 369 gravitaires, Ph.D. thesis, 388 pp., Univ. Joseph Fourier, Grenoble, France.
- Kanamori, H., and E. E. Brodsky (2004), The physics of earthquakes, Rep. 370 371Prog. Phys., 67, 1429-1496.
- 372Koerner, A., E. Kissling, and S. A. Miller (2004), A model of deep crustal fluid flow following the  $M_w = 8.0$  Antofagasta, Chile, earthquake, 373
- J. Geophys. Res., 109, B06307, doi:10.1029/2003JB002816. 374
- 375 Lei, X.-L., L. Masuda, O. Nishizawa, L. Jouniaux, L. Liu, W. Ma, T. Satoh, and K. Kusunose (2004), Detailed analysis of acoustic emission activity 376 during catastrophic fracture of faults in rocks, J. Struct. Geol., 26, 247-377
- 378258. 379 Lockner, D. A. (1993), The role of acoustic emission in the study of rock
- fracture, Int. J. Rock Mech. Min. Sci., 30, 1039-1046. 380
- Mair, K., C. Marone, and R. P. Young (2007), Rate dependence of acoustic 381382emissions generated during shear of simulated fault gouge, Bull. Seismol. 383 Soc. Am., in press.
- Miller, S. A. (2002), Properties of large ruptures and the dynamical influ-ence of fluids on earthquakes and faulting, J. Geophys. Res., 107(B9), 384 385 2182, doi:10.1029/2000JB000032. 386
- 387 Miller, S. A., C. Collettini, L. Chiaraluce, M. Cocco, M. Barchi, and B. J. P. Kaus (2004), Aftershocks driven by a high-pressure CO2 source at depth, 388 Nature, 427, 724-727. 389
- Milsch, H. H., and C. H. Scholz (2005), Dehydration-induced weakening 390
- 391 and fault slip in gypsum: Implications for the faulting process at intermediate depth in subduction zones, J. Geophys. Res., 110, B04202, 392
- doi:10.1029/2004JB003324. 393

Nelder, J., and R. Mead (1965), A simplex method for function minimisa-394tion, Comput. J., 7, 308-312. 395

- Ojala, I. O., I. G. Main, and B. T. Ngwenya (2004), Strain rate and tem-396 perature dependence of Omori law scaling constants of AE data: Implica- 397 tions for earthquake foreshock-aftershock sequences, Geophys. Res. Lett., 398 31, L24617, doi:10.1029/2004GL020781. 300
- Ohnaka, M. (2003), A constitutive scaling law and a unified comprehension 400 for frictional slip failure, shear fracture of intact rock, and earthquake 401 rupture, J. Geophys. Res., 108(B2), 2080, doi:10.1029/2000JB000123. 402
- Rice, J. R. (1992), Fault stress states, pore pressure distributions and the 403 weakness of the San Andreas fault, in Fault Mechanics and Transport 404 Properties of Rocks, edited by B. Evans and T.-F. Wong, pp. 475-503, 405 Academic, London. 406
- Schubnel, A., J. Fortin, L. Burlini, and Y. Guéguen (2005), Damage and 407 recovery of calcite rocks deformed in the cataclastic regime, in High 408 Strain Zones: Structures and Physical Properties, edited by D. Bruhn 409 and L. Burlini, pp. 203–221, Geol. Soc., London. 410 Schubnel, A., E. Walker, B. D. Thompson, J. Fortin, Y. Guéguen, and R. P. 411 Young (2006), Transient creep, aseismic damage and slow failure in 412 Correst markle deformed access the heitle durible durible for the fill.
- Carrara marble deformed across the brittle-ductile transition, Geophys. 413 Res. Lett., 33, L17301, doi:10.1029/2006GL026619. 414
- Shapiro, S. A., R. Patzig, E. Rothert, and J. Rindschwentner (2003), Trig- 415 gering of seismicity by pore-pressure perturbations: Permeability-related 416 signatures of the phenomenon, Pure Appl. Geophys., 160, 1051-1066. 417
- Shapiro, S. A., C. Dinske, and E. Rothert (2006), Hydraulic-fracturing 418 controlled dynamics of microseismic clouds, Geophys. Res. Lett., 33, 419 L14312, doi:10.1029/2006GL026365. 420
- Thompson, B. D., R. P. Young, and D. A. Lockner (2005), Observations of 421 premonitory acoustic emission and slip nucleation during a stick slip 422 experiment in smooth faulted Westerly granite, Geophys. Res. Lett., 32, 423 L10304, doi:10.1029/2005GL022750. 424
- Thompson, B. D., R. P. Young, and D. A. Lockner (2006), Observations 425 of fracture in Westerly granite under AE feedback and constant strain 426 rate loading: Nucleation, quasi-static propagation, and the transition to 427unstable fracture propagation, Pure Appl. Geophys., 163, 995-1019. 428
- Wong, T.-F., C. David, and W. Zhu (1997), The transition from brittle 429 faulting to cataclastic flow in porous sandstones: Mechanical deforma- 430 tion, J. Geophys. Res., 102, 3009-3025. 431
- Zang, A., C. F. Wagner, and G. Dresen (1996), Acoustic emission, micro- 432 structure, and damage model of dry and wet sandstone stressed to failure, 433 J. Geophys. Res., 101, 17,507–17,521. 434
- Zhu, W., and T.-F. Wong (1997), The transition from brittle faulting to 435 cataclastic flow: Permeability evolution, J. Geophys. Res., 102, 3027-436 3041.

B. D. Thompson and R. P. Young, Lassonde Institute, University of 442Toronto, 170 College Street, Toronto, ON, Canada M5S 3E3. 443

J. Fortin, Y. Guéguen, and A. Schubnel, Laboratoire de Géologie, Ecole 439 Normale Supérieure, 24 Rue Lhomond, F-75005 Paris, France. (aschubnel@ 440 441 geologie.ens.fr)