

2-1-2021

A Unified Model of Crustal Stress Heterogeneity From Borehole Breakouts and Earthquake Focal Mechanisms

Karen Luttrell
Louisiana State University

Jeanne Hardebeck
United States Geological Survey

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/geo_pubs

Recommended Citation

Luttrell, K., & Hardebeck, J. (2021). A Unified Model of Crustal Stress Heterogeneity From Borehole Breakouts and Earthquake Focal Mechanisms. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 126 (2) <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JB020817>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Geology and Geophysics at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact ir@lsu.edu.

A unified model of crustal stress heterogeneity from borehole breakouts and earthquake focal mechanisms

Karen Luttrell – Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

Jeanne Hardebeck – U.S. Geological Survey, Moffett Field, California 94035

KEY POINTS

- We compare SHmax estimates derived from boreholes and from inversion of earthquake focal mechanisms to infer crustal stress heterogeneity
- Stress orientation varies with depth within sediment basins, but approaches more homogeneous basement orientations at bedrock interface
- Lateral stress orientation heterogeneity is mostly associated with basin margins and proximity to active faults at length scales of 1–20 km

ABSTRACT

Observations of crustal stress orientation from the regional inversion of earthquake focal mechanisms often conflict with those from borehole breakouts, possibly indicating local stress heterogeneity, either laterally or with depth. To investigate this heterogeneity, we compiled SHmax estimates from previous studies for 57 near-vertical boreholes with measured breakout azimuths across the Los Angeles region. We identified subsets of earthquake focal mechanisms from established earthquake catalogs centered around each borehole with various criteria for maximum depth and maximum lateral distance from the borehole. Each subset was independently inverted for 3-D stress orientation and

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JB020817). Please cite this article as doi: [10.1029/2020JB020817](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JB020817).

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

corresponding SHmax probability distributions, then compared with the corresponding borehole breakout-derived estimate. We find good agreement when both methods sample the basement stress (breakouts are close to the sediment-basement interface), or when both methods sample the mid-basin stress (sufficient earthquakes are present within a sedimentary basin). Along sedimentary basin margins, in contrast, we find acceptable agreement only when focal mechanisms are limited to shallow and close earthquakes, implying short-length-scale heterogeneity of < 20 km. While the region as a whole shows evidence of both lateral and vertical stress orientation heterogeneity, we find a more homogeneous stress state within basement rock, over length scales of 1 – 35 km. These results reconcile the apparently conflicting observations of short-length-scale heterogeneity observed in boreholes, which sample primarily the basins, with the relative homogeneity of stress inferred from focal mechanisms, which sample primarily the basement, and imply distinct regimes for the appropriate use of each type of stress indicator.

PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY

Earthquakes and other tectonic phenomena respond largely to the state of stress within the Earth's crust, but this stress state is extraordinarily difficult to measure. Two methods are commonly used to estimate at least the orientation of the stress field within the crust: the azimuth of breakout fractures observed within drilled boreholes, which tend to be < 3 km deep within sedimentary basins, and the inversion of sets of earthquake focal mechanisms observed seismically, which tend to be > 5 km deep within bedrock. Studies using these two techniques have repeatedly arrived at different conclusions about how variable the

crustal stress field is, and particularly have disagreed about the distances over which those variations occur. The discrepancy may be due to differences in the volume of crust sampled by each estimate, and we test this by systematically comparing observations from both types of estimates using a range of different crustal volumes. We find that if the two estimates are made near enough to one another, especially in depth, they generally agree, but “how near is near enough” changes depending on the local geology. These investigations help bridge the gap between our understanding of how stress changes over different length scales.

INDEX TERMS

- 8164 – stresses: crust and lithosphere
- 8106 – continental margins – transform
- 7215 – earthquake source observations
- 915 – downhole methods

KEYWORDS

- Borehole breakout
- Focal mechanism
- SHmax
- Crustal stress
- Stress heterogeneity

1. INTRODUCTION

The crustal stress field plays an important role in understanding earthquake processes and predicting ground motions from earthquakes [Harris *et al.*, 2018], but direct observation of stress state is difficult [Zoback *et al.*, 2010]. Observations of stress field orientation may be provided either by the inversion of earthquake focal mechanisms (FMs) [Michael, 1984; 1987; Hardebeck and Hauksson, 2001; Hardebeck and Michael, 2006; Yang and Hauksson, 2013] or by the azimuth of borehole breakouts (BH) [Stock and Healy, 1988; Mount and Suppe, 1992; Shamir and Zoback, 1992; Zoback and Healy, 1992; Kerkela and Stock, 1996; Wilde and Stock, 1997; Zajac and Stock, 1997]. However studies of these stress indicators have reached different conclusions about the extent and characteristic length scales of heterogeneity in areas of active faulting, with studies of predominantly FMs finding smooth variations at regional length scales of 10s to 100s of km [Yang and Hauksson, 2013; Heidbach *et al.*, 2018] and studies of BHs finding considerable heterogeneity at local length scales as low as 1 km [Wilde and Stock, 1997; Schoenball and Davatzes, 2017]. This leaves researchers unclear about how to best represent the stress field at intermediate length scales of $\sim 1 - 15$ km [Harris *et al.*, 2018].

The main difference between these two measurement types is the crustal volume represented by each. Near-vertical boreholes provide a direct observation of maximum horizontal compressional stress (SHmax) azimuth at a discrete location over the depth range of existing breakouts, which are typically within sedimentary basins. FM stress inversion requires a population of FMs derived from earthquake records, and the resulting 3-D stress orientation represents the entire crustal volume sampled by those earthquakes, which are predominantly within bedrock. The goal of this work is to test whether

Author Manuscript

differences in either depth or volume sampled can account for the discrepancies in stress orientation indicated by the two techniques, and if so over what length scale that transition occurs. We use the Los Angeles area (Figure 1) as a natural laboratory because of the readily available BH and FM data, the complexity of the stress field in that region, and because of the practical importance of understanding the stress field in areas with high seismic hazard.

We identify 57 BHs with published SHmax estimates (Table 1) and perform new FM inversions for earthquake populations [Yang *et al.*, 2012] covering a range of depth and distance criteria. We then interpret the variations in SHmax agreement over different crustal volumes sampled by FMs for indications of the spatial variability in stress state heterogeneity. If the stress field is relatively homogeneous within the volume sampled by the BH and FMs, we would expect good agreement in SHmax orientation. If the stress field is more heterogeneous, we would expect the agreement in SHmax orientation to improve the more closely the FMs are located to the borehole breakouts. In particular, if stress or stress heterogeneity varies with depth, or differs between basin and bedrock, we would expect the agreement to improve the closer in the depth the FMs are to the breakout depth.

Borehole observations are not uniformly distributed across the Los Angeles region. They tend to be derived from wells drilled for oil and gas exploration, and as such are biased towards areas with thicker sediment cover, including the Los Angeles, San Fernando, and Ventura basins. Figure 1b shows depth histograms of seismicity [Yang *et al.*, 2012], sediment-basement interface [Shaw *et al.*, 2015], and available borehole breakouts (Table 1). While BHs are mostly shallow and FMs mostly deeper, there is some

overlap in the 3-5 km range, which coincides with basin depths across much of the region. We therefore interpret stress orientation heterogeneity not only across the entire region but also according to the geologic context of each BH relative to sediment basin structures. The results will be used to describe characteristic behaviors of stress orientation rotation across the region, with implications for stress heterogeneity in similar systems around the world.

2. METHODS

2.1 Borehole observations compiled from previous studies

The most direct observations of the 3-D *in situ* stress field within the seismogenic crust come from drilling for scientific or industrial purposes, where a combination of borehole breakouts and hydraulic fracturing can be used to estimate the orientation of the stress field, and in some cases be used to estimate the full *in situ* stress tensor [e.g., *Stock and Healy*, 1988; *Mount and Suppe*, 1992; *Shamir and Zoback*, 1992; *Zoback and Healy*, 1992; *Kerkela and Stock*, 1996; *Brudy et al.*, 1997; *Wilde and Stock*, 1997; *Zajac and Stock*, 1997; *Hickman and Zoback*, 2004; *Zoback et al.*, 2010]. If a borehole is near-vertical and one of the principal stress directions is near-vertical, then the azimuth of SHmax can be inferred to be 90° from the azimuth of the borehole breakouts [e.g., *Plumb and Hickman*, 1985]. When a well is deviated, or none of the principal stress axes are near-vertical, then the relationship between SHmax azimuth and borehole breakout azimuth is less straightforward, but if enough breakouts are available in deviated boreholes of varying orientations within an area, the three-dimensional stress orientation can in some cases be

estimated [e.g., *Mastin*, 1988]. In these ways, boreholes provide an opportunity to estimate stress state at a specific location within 3-D space with very little spatial averaging.

Wilde and Stock [1997] analyzed 4-arm oriented caliper data from 71 wells across southern California from Los Angeles to Santa Barbara, divided into six sub-regions, with the goal of both estimating the SHmax direction and constraining the stress regime across the sub-regions. We treat each borehole individually and exclude from consideration wells that are highly deviated (such that determination of SHmax direction is not straightforward), wells whose breakouts the authors determined were not reliable indicators of SHmax direction (e.g., key seats), and wells located outside the range of the SCEDC catalog, leaving 35 wells for consideration. *Mount and Suppe* [1992] compiled 118 breakout azimuths from near-vertical ($< 10^\circ$ deviation) wells across California, of which 18 are within both the range of the Southern California Earthquake Data Center (SCEDC) catalog and the current study area. *Kerkela and Stock* [1996] analyzed data from 10 wells in the San Fernando Valley area, of which 4 were near-vertical ($< 5^\circ$ deviation).

For the 57 individual wells we consider, the SHmax direction is inferred to be 90° from the observed breakout azimuth (Table 1). For each study, the uncertainty in breakout azimuth is calculated as the standard deviation of breakout azimuths observed within each borehole. However, this leads to artificially small uncertainties when data is sparse (e.g., a standard deviation of 0° when only one breakout is present within a well). We therefore adopt a functional uncertainty for each borehole that is the larger of either the stated standard deviation or the mean of all the stated standard deviations (10°). We also note that for many wells, the locations are specified only by Public Land Survey System (PLSS)

township, range, and section, suggesting well locations should be considered to have an uncertainty of 1 km.

2.2 Inversion of earthquake focal mechanism subsets

For this analysis, we used the updated catalog of 216,000 earthquake focal mechanisms from 1981 – 2018 from the SCEDC [Yang *et al.*, 2012], of which 21,000 are within our study area. The earthquakes in this catalog have absolute location errors of < 1 km [Hauksson *et al.*, 2012], so we consider their locations to be known more precisely than those of the BH. For each of the 57 boreholes listed in Table 1, we identified subsets of focal mechanisms that fit a certain maximum depth (z_{max}) and maximum lateral distance (d_{max}) criteria (Figure 2). We invert each subset of focal mechanisms for 3-D stress orientation using the method of Michael [1984], which minimizes the difference between the rake direction of each mechanism and the resolved shear stress on the fault plane. The nodal plane ambiguity is addressed by choosing the nodal plane with the greatest instability in the stress field, and the stress model and nodal plane are iterated until they stabilize [Vavryčuk, 2014]. Uncertainty is determined using bootstrap resampling, with 1000 iterations [Michael, 1987]. For each subset, we identify the SHmax orientation of the best stress tensor, and represent the uncertainty probability density function (PDF) of SHmax values with 5-degree resolution. While we invert for 3-D principal stress axes, we report only the predicted SHmax azimuths to compare directly with borehole observations.

Because our analysis is limited by the number of earthquakes available, we choose to use all focal mechanisms, regardless of quality. In testing, we found the increase in uncertainty associated with using “C” or “D” quality mechanisms was negligible relative

to the increase in uncertainty associated with reducing the number of mechanisms used in each inversion. Theoretically, a stress tensor can be determined for a population of six or more individual focal mechanisms, but in practicality, well-constrained solutions require a population of at least ten earthquakes. We identified 3 z_{max} (all depths, shallower than 5 km, shallower than 3 km) and 14 d_{max} (1 – 35 km) values, for a total of 2394 individual stress inversions. In practice, not all boreholes have a sufficient number of earthquakes within a given depth or distance criteria to compute a valid stress estimate, so the actual number of inversions computed is 2059.

2.3 Comparing borehole and focal mechanism data

We compare pairs of BH and FM SHmax estimates by calculating the absolute circular difference (ACD) $\in [0^\circ, 90^\circ]$, which emphasizes the degree of misfit independent of whether the FM SHmax estimate is clockwise or counterclockwise from the BH SHmax estimate. Confidence is expressed as the PDF of each ACD, calculated assuming the BH SHmax PDFs are uniform on the interval of the SHmax estimate \pm the effective SHmax uncertainty (Table 1). To characterize the SHmax misfit for a set of BH FM pairs, we calculate the root mean square (RMS) of the corresponding set of individual ACD values. For each population, an ACD RMS PDF is calculated from bootstrap resampling of the individual ACD PDFs using 10^6 samples. Because the range of possible SHmax values is bounded, there is a certain level of misfit that would be expected even if the SHmax azimuths were distributed randomly. For the RMS metric, this can be calculated analytically based on the expected value of the square of a random variable uniformly distributed on $\in [0^\circ, 90^\circ]$ as $90^\circ/\sqrt{3} = 51.96^\circ$. Any RMS at or above this level fits no

Author Manuscript
better than random (dashed black line in Figure 2 and Figure 3), so this can be used as one measure of significance.

2.4 Borehole subgroups by geologic context

In order to test specific hypotheses about stress heterogeneity and the causes of discrepancy between BH and FM observations, it is instructive to consider both the overall ACD RMS results from the entire region and the ACD RMS from groups of boreholes sorted by their immediate geologic context rather than their geographic subregion. To this end, we divided the 57 boreholes into 5 categories (Figure 1 and Table 1), based on the spatial relationship between the boreholes, nearby earthquakes, and sediment-basement interface [Shaw *et al.*, 2015]. First, we identify 19 boreholes that occur near the edge of a sedimentary basin, generally close to an active fault bounding the basin and in sediments < 4 km deep. Of these, 11 are on the north edge of the San Fernando Valley basin (green circles), in the vicinity of strands of the San Cayetano and Oak Ridge fault zones, while 8 of them are along the north and northeast edges of the Los Angeles basin (dark blue circles), in the vicinity of the Whittier fault and Santa Monica thrust. Of those boreholes within a sedimentary basin, 7 of them within the Los Angeles basin have breakouts that are within 3 km of the sediment-basement interface (purple circles). Of the remaining boreholes, 13 occur in regions where at least 25% of the earthquakes within 10 lateral km occur above the sediment basement interface (yellow circles), and 18 occur in places without substantial earthquake activity within the sediments (light blue circles).

2.5 Expected results for multiple working hypotheses

In general, we move forward with 4 working hypotheses about possible stress orientation distribution, each of which would have a distinct pattern of borehole versus earthquake focal mechanism misfit as a function of d_{max} and z_{max} (Figure 2). If the stress state were homogeneous over depth and across areas up to the maximum d_{max} value considered (35 km), we would expect good agreement between the two SHmax estimates regardless of which subset of earthquakes were included in the focal mechanism inversion (Figure 2a). If there is vertical heterogeneity in stress orientation (Figure 2b), we expect FM SHmax values considering only the shallowest earthquakes (blue line) to fit better than those also considering deeper earthquakes (orange line) or those considering earthquakes of any depth (yellow line), independent of choice of d_{max} . If stress orientation heterogeneity is purely lateral (Figure 2c), we expect focal mechanism inversions involving only closer earthquakes (smaller d_{max} values) to fit better than those covering a larger area, but with no difference between earthquake subsets with different z_{max} values. If stress orientation is heterogeneous in both the vertical and lateral directions (Figure 2d), we expect misfit to generally improve for lower d_{max} , but we expect that improvement to be more pronounced for subsets involving only the shallowest earthquakes.

Our interpretation will necessarily be hampered by the uneven distribution of earthquakes throughout the crust. In particular, for each borehole considered, there may not be sufficient earthquakes at low d_{max} and z_{max} values to compute a valid stress state inversion. This would be equivalent to erasing the left ends of the orange and especially blue lines in Figure 2. Even so, we expect particular features of the misfit curves to offer further insight. In the case of lateral heterogeneity (Figure 2c or 2d), the d_{max} value at which misfit values start to decrease puts an upper limit on the length scale of lateral

heterogeneity in the area. If misfit improves to within uncertainty, the d_{max} value at which RMS intersects zero provides a lower limit on the length scale of lateral heterogeneity. If the misfit curve remains significantly different from zero, it indicates that heterogeneity exists at scales smaller than those able to be considered by the available distribution of earthquakes.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Results for individual BHs and FM inversions

Figures SA1-SA14 show the map view summary of best-fitting SHmax values derived from focal mechanism subsets satisfying various criteria, around each of the 57 boreholes across the study area. When considering all earthquakes within 35 km d_{max} from a borehole (Figure SA1), the resulting SHmax directions vary smoothly across the region from $\sim 0 - 10^\circ$ E of N. As the d_{max} values decrease, the resulting solutions increase in heterogeneity, but even at the smallest distances for which inversions can be calculated (Figure SA14), they do not appear to capture the full heterogeneity observed in the borehole SHmax values. Figures SB1-SB57 show the ACD PDFs between each individual borehole and the FM SHmax estimates for different earthquake subsets, numbered by the BH # listed in Table 1.

The borehole observations themselves exhibit varying degrees of heterogeneity (Figure 1) with some having relatively consistent SHmax azimuths (e.g., south Ventura Basin), others exhibiting bimodal distributions that are nearly orthogonal (north San Fernando Valley), and still others being almost uniformly distributed in azimuth (Los Angeles Basin). One should not expect the FM observations to fit the BH observations at a given

distance better than the BH observations fit themselves. We therefore calculate the expected ACD RMS from pairs of boreholes that are a comparable distance apart, illustrated by the black line in Figure 3a. Borehole pairs greater than 10 km apart have an RMS misfit of $\sim 45^\circ$, slightly better than random. For pairs less than 10 km apart, RMS misfit decreases gradually to $\sim 35^\circ$ for pairs < 2 km apart.

3.2 Composite results across the entire region

Figure 3a shows the ACD RMS PDFs for all 57 boreholes considered (Figure 1), as a function of d_{max} and z_{max} . When earthquakes of all depths are considered (yellow), the overall misfit remains at $\sim 45^\circ$ regardless of proximity to the individual borehole. This is better than would be expected if the SHmax estimates were distributed uniformly (dashed line), indicating some sensitivity to broad regional stress state, but also that proximity alone is insufficient to account for the observed discrepancies. When only shallow earthquakes ($z_{max} = 3$ km) are considered (blue), we see that when earthquakes beyond ~ 10 km are included, the misfit remains constant at $\sim 45^\circ$. However, for $d_{max} < 10$ km, there is a gradual improvement in misfit to $\sim 35^\circ$. (Note the widening of the PDF due to the smaller number of boreholes with sufficient earthquakes satisfying these depth and distance criteria to compute a valid stress inversion solution.) While these RMS values represent a coarse level of agreement, they are on-par with the level of agreement observed between borehole pairs at these distances (black line). In that regard, it would be surprising if the focal mechanism solutions were able to fit the borehole SHmax observations better than the boreholes could fit themselves. With an intermediate z_{max} of 5 km, there is some improvement at distances of < 10 km, but less so than observed when using only the

shallowest 3 km. Overall this indicates substantial regional heterogeneity in the stress field (e.g., Figure 2d), both vertically and laterally at length scales < 10 km.

3.3 Geologic context subset results

Figure 3b-f shows the ACD RMS PDFs for the five geologic context subgroups (Figure 1 and Table 1 and Section 2.4). We find that boreholes within the sedimentary basin with breakouts close to the sediment-basin interface (Figure 3d) are consistently well fit to the earthquake-derived SH_{max} , within 20° RMS for any depth and distance criteria, and in many cases fitting to within uncertainty for solutions derived from the shallowest and closest focal mechanisms. This suggests that both methods are sampling an essentially homogeneous basement stress state (e.g. Figure 2a). Boreholes within a basin in regions where earthquakes are present within the sediments (Figure 3e) fit moderately well, with $\sim 35^\circ$ RMS, while boreholes in regions without shallow earthquakes (Figure 3f) fit their focal mechanism counterparts no better than random. Neither of these cases demonstrate improvement when considering only shallower or closer sets of earthquakes. These results suggest a stress field that varies with depth (e.g. Figure 2b), particularly with a difference between the basin and the bedrock. The moderate fit between FM and BH that both sample the basin suggests that the stress within the basin is relatively homogeneous, although less so than the basement.

For boreholes along the edge of a basin (Figure 3b and 3c), both show a similar pattern in which sets of shallower and closer earthquakes fit significantly better than earthquakes of any depth or distance, which fit no better than random. In the case of the Los Angeles basin (Figure 3c), the shallowest earthquakes (depths < 3 km) within 20 km of the borehole,

and especially within 12 km of the borehole, fit much better with $\text{RMS} \sim 35^\circ$. For the San Fernando Valley (Figure 3b), we find that earthquakes within 10 km fit better, with steady improvement for shallow (depth < 5 km) and shallowest (depth < 3 km) subsets and RMS values as low as 25° . This suggests that the stress state near the basin edges varies both laterally and with depth (e.g. Figure 2d) in the transition between basin and bedrock stress states. The length scale of lateral heterogeneity ranges from $< 1 - 10$ km in the San Fernando Valley, and from $< 6 - 20$ km in the Los Angeles basin.

3.4 Case study: stress orientation heterogeneity near the Newport-Inglewood fault

Along the Newport-Inglewood fault within the west Los Angeles basin area, there are three boreholes within 300 m (coincident within borehole location uncertainty) of one another (BH #21-22 and 52) that have breakouts at 3 different depths (Figure 4). The basement in the area dips to the NE from 2 to 8 km depth, and almost all nearby earthquakes occur within the basement at depths > 8 km, with an estimated FM SH_{max} of $18.2 \pm 4.5^\circ \text{EofN}$. The 3 nearly co-located boreholes result in distinct SH_{max} estimates that range from $41 \pm 10^\circ \text{WofN}$ for the shallowest breakouts within 200 m of the surface to $18 \pm 10^\circ \text{EofN}$ for the deepest breakouts at 3 km depth within 700 m of the sediment-basement interface. Intermediate depth breakouts at 2 km depth have an intermediate SH_{max} orientation of $9 \pm 13^\circ \text{WofN}$.

The steady clockwise rotation of SH_{max} with depth along with the excellent fit between the deepest borehole breakouts and the earthquake focal mechanisms suggests significant stress heterogeneity with depth within the shallow crustal sediments, along with more homogeneous stress in and near the basement. This is in agreement with the observation

from Section 3.3 that boreholes within the sedimentary basin with breakouts close to the sediment-basin interface are consistently well fit to the FM SHmax estimates. The next closest borehole (BH #23), 3.5 km to the northeast, contains breakouts from 1.5 – 3 km depth and has an estimated SHmax of $16 \pm 19^\circ$ EofN, agreeing both with the FM SHmax estimates in the area and with the deepest breakouts from within the Newport-Inglewood fault zone, even though the basement depth in this area has dropped to 6 km. This suggests that the degree of stress orientation heterogeneity within the sediments decreases with sufficient distance from active locked faults, and that overall lateral heterogeneity is weaker than vertical heterogeneity.

4. DISCUSSION

Figure 5 schematically illustrates a summary of the results described above. While region wide results indicate SHmax azimuth varies both with depth and laterally at length scales < 10 km (Figure 3a), the geologic context subgroup results show that lateral heterogeneity is principally confined to the edges of sedimentary basins (Figure 3b and 3c). Depth heterogeneity is important both within (Figure 3e and 3f) and at the edges of (Figure 3b and 3c) basins, and stress state deep within the basins agrees well with the more homogeneous basement stress orientation (Figure 3d and Figure 4). In areas of significant 3-D stress heterogeneity, depth variations are more prominent than lateral variations, evidenced by the lack of improved fit when earthquakes of any depth are considered (Figure 3b and 3c). That we see more heterogeneity in the basins versus the basement, explains why BH orientations tend to be more heterogeneous (because they generally sample basins), while FM orientations are more homogeneous (because they generally

sample basement). Within sediment basins, some depth heterogeneity may be captured by FMs when present (Figure 3e), but the persistent significant difference between FM and BH within the basins indicates the full heterogeneity must include scales smaller than those that were able to be explored with this earthquake distribution.

In this study, we did not use any time constraints, and instead simultaneously used the entire set of boreholes and earthquake catalog spanning at least 4 decades. This makes our analysis insensitive to any time-dependent changes in the stress field that may have occurred during that time, particularly in the vicinity of the 1994 M_w 6.7 Northridge earthquake in the San Fernando Valley [Zhao *et al.*, 1997; Hardebeck and Hauksson, 2001], the aftershocks of which are abundant within the catalog. However, the similarity in behavior observed at the edges of the San Fernando Valley and Los Angeles basin makes us confident that our results are not being unduly biased by the abundance of Northridge aftershocks.

Previous studies of stress heterogeneity have focused on length scales both longer and shorter than those considered here, and in some cases obtained conflicting results. The World Stress Map project [Heidbach *et al.*, 2018] used individual FMs and BH observations to analyze stress patterns globally and describe a smoothly-varying field with large SHmax rotations across 40 – 60 km, while Persaud *et al.* [2020] performed new analysis of BH records and record substantial SHmax variation over lateral length scales < 1 km. Wilde and Stock [1997], performed a regional analysis of BHs in the Los Angeles to identify SHmax azimuths representing 6 subregions, with values varying by 60°. Yang and Hauksson [2013], on the other hand, used the methods of Hardebeck and Michael [2006] to invert the same FM catalog considered here for the 3-D deviatoric stress tensor

orientation across southern California. At the 10 – 100 km scale they found similar SHmax variation as *Wilde and Stock* [1997], but with values in individual subregions differing by as much as 50° from those derived from BHs.

There have been similar levels of disagreement about the extent of SHmax variability with depth. *Pierdominici and Heidbach* [2012] compared shallow BHs and FMs versus deep FMs in smoothed stress fields across Italy. They found little SHmax variation between the shallowest 5 km and deeper crust, and conclude that lateral heterogeneity is more significant. In contrast, *Schoenball and Davatzes* [2017] studied BHs in eastern California and found significant SHmax variability with depth by correlating SHmax standard deviation with breakout length. In the vicinity of the Newport-Inglewood fault (Figure 4), *Wilde and Stock* [1997], who reported BH#22 and 52, noted their findings as an indication of significant depth variations in stress state, similar to those reported in the Cajon Pass borehole experiment [*Shamir and Zoback*, 1992]. However *Mount and Suppe* [1992], who reported BH #21 and 23, noted the broad agreement between these boreholes and estimates of FM SHmax available at the time [*Hauksson*, 1987], suggesting broad homogeneity in stress state.

The broad confusion in the literature about stress state heterogeneity in areas of active faulting demonstrates the utility of specifically examining stress heterogeneity at the intermediate length scales considered here. Taken together, the previous observations from the Los Angeles area [*Mount and Suppe*, 1992; *Wilde and Stock*, 1997; *Yang and Hauksson*, 2013] are in concert with the results presented in this study, of significant heterogeneity with depth, particularly in the vicinity of active faults and sediment basin margins, but of relative homogeneity within the sediment basins, and particularly within basement rock.

We expect that these findings will be relevant to the interpretation of other regions, particularly those including active faults or sedimentary basin structures. However we note that while small-scale stress orientation heterogeneities are principally observed in active tectonic areas, studies distant from plate boundaries have demonstrated consistency between BH and FM stress observations [e.g., *Gough and Bell, 1982; Lund Snee and Zoback, 2020*].

Our analysis considers only heterogeneity in the S_{Hmax} direction, as S_{Hmax} is constrained by the borehole data. There may also be heterogeneity in the vertical stress, specifically variations in stress regime depending on which principal stress axis is most vertical. This potential heterogeneity can be addressed by focal mechanism studies, and in our study region the stress regime has been shown to vary laterally and with depth. The stress inferred from focal mechanisms in our study area exhibits both strike-slip and reverse regimes [*Hardebeck and Hauksson, 2001; Yang and Hauksson, 2013*], which *Yang and Hauksson [2013]* characterize as E-W trending bands of thrust faulting within the overall strike-slip regime of southern California. Two of these bands of thrust faulting encompass the deepest parts of the LA and Ventura Basins, with strike-slip regime in the western Transverse Ranges in between. The stress regime also varies with depth, transitioning to predominately reverse faulting at 10-15 km depth [*Hardebeck and Hauksson, 2001*]. *Yang and Hauksson [2011]* found a similar change to a reverse regime at depth along the eastern margin of the LA Basin, accompanied by a change in the S_{Hmax} direction. The aftershocks of the 1994 Northridge earthquake also vary from reverse faulting along the mainshock plane at depth to strike-slip faulting above in the hanging wall [*Shearer et al., 2003*]. Variations in the plunge of the most-vertical stress axis with depth have been found

in northern California [*Bokelmann and Beroza, 2000*] and in the San Jacinto Fault zone [*Abolfathian et al., 2019*], although a similar variation has not been reported in our study area.

One application of understanding crustal stress heterogeneity is the effective design of initial stress conditions for dynamic rupture simulations [*Harris et al., 2018*]. Many of the geodynamic models that integrate multiple physical processes into estimates of lithosphere stress state rely heavily on observations of stress orientation from either FMs or BHs [*Ghosh and Holt, 2012; Naliboff et al., 2012; Bird, 2017; Luttrell and Smith-Konter, 2017*]. The results presented above suggest that users of stress orientation observations should carefully consider the length scales of their problem of interest when deciding which indicators to adopt. If relying exclusively on FMs, considerable heterogeneity associated with sediment basins and near-fault processes may be overlooked. On the other hand, including BHs in a broader study may introduce unhelpful noise more relevant to individual fault segments than to a full plate boundary system.

In this work we have described stress orientation heterogeneity, but the magnitude and variation of stress magnitudes cannot be inferred from this analysis. Magnitude variations may exist in places of uniform orientation, or a stress field that rotates with depth may remain otherwise constant. One could potentially use the observed stress orientation heterogeneity described here as a constraint to infer stress magnitudes [e.g., *Luttrell and Smith-Konter, 2017*], but that is beyond the scope of the current investigation. Similarly, in this study we have focused on interpreting behavior that is broadly applicable across the region, but more might be learned about specific locations from comparison of the local FM inversions with individual BHs. A detailed description of each context is beyond the

scope of this work, but the reader is directed to Supplementary Figures SB1-SB57 for the behavior of individual boreholes in their particular region of interest.

5. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, we have compared SHmax azimuths derived from published compilations of borehole breakouts with those derived from the inversion of local subsets of earthquake focal mechanisms in order to determine over what length scales and under what circumstances SHmax varies. We find strong evidence for depth variations in SHmax, particularly within sedimentary basins, but also evidence for a more homogeneous stress state within basement rock. Lateral variations in SHmax appear to be limited to the edges of sedimentary basins at length scales of $< 1 - 10$ km in the San Fernando Valley and $< 6 - 20$ km in the Los Angeles basin. The intermediate length scales considered here ($1 - 35$ km) push the lower-limit boundary of what can be resolved by focal mechanisms and effectively bridge the gap between previous BH and FM studies that found conflicting results with regard to stress heterogeneity.

6. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank members of the Southern California Earthquake Center (SCEC) Community Stress Model working group for the many conversations that motivated this work. We are grateful to Joann Stock, Andrea Llenos, Noha Farghal, and an anonymous reviewer for their helpful reviews of the manuscript. This research was supported by the Southern California Earthquake Center (contribution No. 10303). SCEC is funded by NSF Cooperative Agreement EAR-1600087 and U.S. Geological Survey Cooperative

Agreement G17AC00047. Focal mechanism data from 1981 – 2018 available from the Southern California Earthquake Data Center, <https://scedc.caltech.edu/research-tools/alt-2011-yang-hauksson-shearer.html>, last visited on Jan 8, 2020. Any use of trade, firm, or product names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

7. FIGURES




Figure 1: a) map of boreholes considered in this study (Table 1), colored by geologic context, with estimates of SH_{max} azimuth from breakouts indicated by thick black lines. Contours of depth to sediment basement interface [Shaw *et al.*, 2015] for 3 – 15 km depth are shown as thick colored lines. Dots indicate earthquakes with available focal mechanism solutions [Yang *et al.*, 2012], colored by depth. b) Depth distributions of earthquakes, sediment-basement interface, and breakout ranges in the boreholes considered.




Figure 2: Schematic of possible stress orientation arrangements in the shallow crust, along with the expected behavior of misfit as a function of d_{max} and z_{max} . Stars represent earthquakes in the vicinity of the borehole. Only those within the cylinder range defined by d_{max} and z_{max} (dashed box) are considered for a given focal mechanism inversion.

Expected shapes are shown for shallowest (blue), shallow (orange), and all depths (yellow) of earthquakes. Because ACD has a finite range, there is a certain level of misfit that would be expected even from uniformly distributed random azimuths (dashed line).




Figure 3: PDF distributions of ACD RMS for a) all boreholes across entire region and b-f) borehole subsets based on geologic context as indicated in Figure 1 and Table 1. Earthquake subsets using shallowest earthquakes with depth < 3 km (blue), shallow earthquakes with depth < 5 km (red), and all available earthquakes (yellow) shown. Dashed line represents expected random fit, and solid colored lines represent RMS using best estimate of borehole and focal mechanism SH_{max} . Solid black line in a) represents ACD RMS between pairs of boreholes within the specified maximum distance. N indicates the number of boreholes included in each subgroup.




Figure 4: a) Map view of BH #21, 22, 52, and 23 locations (blue, purple, yellow, and green circles, respectively), with earthquake locations (dots) and sediment-basement interface contours (lines) colored by depth. Gray shading indicates approximate surface trace of the Newport-Inglewood fault zone, and solid black line indicates profile. Map extent shown in Figure 1. b) Cross section profile along A-A' showing the depth range of breakouts for each of the four boreholes (solid vertical lines) to scale. Surface topography and sediment-basement interface are indicated by black lines, and earthquakes shown in (a) are colored by depth. c) SH_{max} estimates, with confidence intervals, for the four boreholes (colored lines and shading), along with SH_{max} estimate and 5-95% confidence interval range for earthquake focal mechanisms within 6 km of BH #21, of any depth (black line and shading). Line lengths are staggered to better visualize overlap.




Figure 5: Schematic summary of results for stress orientation arrangements in the shallow crust. Solid black line represents sediment-basement interface.

8. TABLES

Table 1: SHmax estimates from borehole breakouts used in this study

<i>BH #</i>	<i>geologic context</i>	<i>latitude</i> ^a	<i>longitude</i> ^a	<i>breakout depth</i>	<i>SHmax azimuth</i> ^b	<i>reference</i>
				<i>range (m)</i>	<i>(° from North)</i>	
1	SFV edge	34.4558	-118.9133	124 - 159	166 ± 14	Wilde and Stock [1997]
2	SFV edge	34.4333	-118.8317	637 - 804	48 ± 4	Wilde and Stock [1997]
3	SFV edge	34.4242	-118.8215	893 - 906	84 ± 3	Wilde and Stock [1997]
4	SFV edge	34.4231	-118.7663	246 - 1027	85 ± 11	Wilde and Stock [1997]
5	SFV edge	34.4333	-118.7448	635 - 866	28 ± 9	Wilde and Stock [1997]
6	SFV edge	34.4000	-118.7000	940 - 940	63 ± 0	Wilde and Stock [1997]
7	SFV edge	34.4300	-118.6428	1356 - 3624	128 ± 28	Mount and Suppe [1992]
8	SFV edge	34.4133	-118.5797	2897 - 3964	69 ± 22	Mount and Suppe [1992]
9	SFV edge	34.4219	-118.5281	1995 - 2331	38 ± 11	Mount and Suppe [1992]
10	SFV edge	34.3226	-118.5090	316 - 850	46 ± 0.3	Kerkela and Stock [1996]
11	SFV edge	34.3731	-118.5026	76 - 326	61 ± 0.3	Kerkela and Stock [1996]
12	LAB edge	34.0603	-118.4119	2432 - 2576	49 ± 7	Mount and Suppe [1992]
13	LAB edge	34.0554	-118.3902	2440 - 2657	140 ± 7	Wilde and Stock [1997]
14	LAB edge	34.0750	-118.3780	331 - 435	131 ± 0	Wilde and Stock [1997]
15	LAB edge	34.0308	-118.0600	1566 - 1890	124 ± 5	Wilde and Stock [1997]
16	LAB edge	34.0138	-118.0533	365 - 2661	71 ± 19	Wilde and Stock [1997]
17	LAB edge	33.9946	-118.0420	358 - 797	78 ± 18	Wilde and Stock [1997]
18	LAB edge	33.9296	-117.8400	422 - 1506	174 ± 20	Wilde and Stock [1997]
19	LAB edge	33.9238	-117.8221	283 - 1139	128 ± 12	Wilde and Stock [1997]
20	breakouts near basement	34.0394	-118.4031	3109 - 3450	16 ± 9	Mount and Suppe [1992]
21	breakouts near basement	33.9567	-118.3381	2708 - 2969	18 ± 4	Mount and Suppe [1992]
22	breakouts near basement	33.9550	-118.3360	1559 - 2123	171 ± 13	Wilde and Stock [1997]
23	breakouts near basement	33.9706	-118.3033	1568 - 3246	16 ± 19	Mount and Suppe [1992]
24	breakouts near basement	34.0583	-118.2948	1334 - 1751	16 ± 8	Wilde and Stock [1997]
25	breakouts near basement	33.8142	-118.1808	1105 - 1606	19 ± 25	Mount and Suppe [1992]
26	breakouts near basement	33.7847	-118.1433	2469 - 3532	28 ± 28	Mount and Suppe [1992]
27	mid basin shallow EQs	34.3297	-119.3608	3530 - 4185	178 ± 19	Mount and Suppe [1992]
28	mid basin shallow EQs	34.2436	-119.2031	3018 - 4039	22 ± 24	Mount and Suppe [1992]

29	mid basin shallow EQs	34.4278	-119.1508	1205 - 1443	61 ± 5	Mount and Suppe [1992]
30	mid basin shallow EQs	34.4337	-119.1483	2570 - 2663	22 ± 3	Wilde and Stock [1997]
31	mid basin shallow EQs	34.4281	-119.1375	918 - 1049	62 ± 8	Mount and Suppe [1992]
32	mid basin shallow EQs	34.4329	-119.1285	175 - 226	175 ± 18	Wilde and Stock [1997]
33	mid basin shallow EQs	34.4343	-119.1084	480 - 546	9 ± 9	Wilde and Stock [1997]
34	mid basin shallow EQs	34.4366	-119.1023	740 - 751	24 ± 2	Wilde and Stock [1997]
35	mid basin shallow EQs	34.4304	-119.0988	869 - 1829	162 ± 9	Wilde and Stock [1997]
36	mid basin shallow EQs	34.4438	-119.0937	2494 - 2545	22 ± 4	Wilde and Stock [1997]
37	mid basin shallow EQs	34.4342	-119.0850	557 - 1024	20 ± 3	Wilde and Stock [1997]
38	mid basin shallow EQs	34.3272	-118.5833	505 - 1892	152 ± 8	Wilde and Stock [1997]
39	mid basin shallow EQs	34.3220	-118.5637	1401 - 2994	21 ± 0.3	Kerkela and Stock [1996]
40	mid basin no shallow EQs	34.4750	-119.9300	284 - 558	178 ± 12	Wilde and Stock [1997]
41	mid basin no shallow EQs	34.2092	-119.2230	2439 - 3605	47 ± 21	Wilde and Stock [1997]
42	mid basin no shallow EQs	34.4453	-119.1514	2595 - 2745	29 ± 17	Mount and Suppe [1992]
43	mid basin no shallow EQs	34.2175	-119.1311	2035 - 2882	13 ± 9	Mount and Suppe [1992]
44	mid basin no shallow EQs	34.2368	-119.1292	2467 - 2510	48 ± 42	Wilde and Stock [1997]
45	mid basin no shallow EQs	34.2325	-119.1125	2292 - 2683	24 ± 2	Mount and Suppe [1992]
46	mid basin no shallow EQs	34.3378	-118.9681	412 - 1815	67 ± 15	Mount and Suppe [1992]
47	mid basin no shallow EQs	34.3042	-118.8833	1605 - 2209	52 ± 11	Wilde and Stock [1997]
48	mid basin no shallow EQs	34.3035	-118.7225	155 - 687	36 ± 11	Wilde and Stock [1997]
49	mid basin no shallow EQs	34.3500	-118.7063	200 - 282	65 ± 19	Wilde and Stock [1997]
50	mid basin no shallow EQs	34.2718	-118.4737	73 - 2256	116 ± 0.3	Kerkela and Stock [1996]
51	mid basin no shallow EQs	34.0080	-118.3683	568 - 604	98 ± 5	Wilde and Stock [1997]
52	mid basin no shallow EQs	33.9560	-118.3350	147 - 215	139 ± 8	Wilde and Stock [1997]
53	mid basin no shallow EQs	33.9400	-118.0667	387 - 504	87 ± 19	Wilde and Stock [1997]
54	mid basin no shallow EQs	33.9457	-118.0650	397 - 1250	73 ± 11	Wilde and Stock [1997]
55	mid basin no shallow EQs	33.9029	-117.9733	1136 - 1136	174 ± 0	Wilde and Stock [1997]
56	mid basin no shallow EQs	33.9075	-117.9698	1046 - 1236	169 ± 4	Wilde and Stock [1997]
57	mid basin no shallow EQs	33.9281	-117.9531	1020 - 1242	178 ± 6	Mount and Suppe [1992]

^a Reported locations have uncertainty of ≤ 1 km.

^b Reported standard deviation of observed breakouts listed, effective uncertainty is the larger of reported standard deviation or 10° .

9. REFERENCES

- Abolfathian, N., P. Martínez-Garzón, and Y. Ben-Zion (2019), Spatiotemporal variations of stress and strain parameters in the San Jacinto fault zone, *Pure Appl. Geophys.*, *176*(3), 1145-1168, doi:10.1007/s00024-018-2055-y.
- Bird, P. (2017), Stress field models from Maxwell stress functions: southern California, *Geophys. J. Int.*, *210*, 951-963, doi:10.1093/gji/ggx207.
- Bokelmann, G. H., and G. C. Beroza (2000), Depth - dependent earthquake focal mechanism orientation: Evidence for a weak zone in the lower crust, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *105*(B9), 21683-21695, doi:10.1029/2000JB900205.
- Brudy, M., M. D. Zoback, K. Fuchs, F. Rummel, and J. Baumgärtner (1997), Estimation of the complete stress tensor to 8 km depth in the KTB scientific drill holes: Implications for crustal strength, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *102*(B8), 18453, doi:10.1029/96jb02942.
- Ghosh, A., and W. E. Holt (2012), Plate motions and stresses from global dynamic models, *Science*, *335*(6070), 838-843, doi:10.1126/science.1214209.
- Gough, D. I., and J. S. Bell (1982), Stress orientations from borehole wall fractures with examples from Colorado, east Texas, and northern Canada, *Can. J. Earth Sci.*, *19*(7), doi:10.1139/e82-118.
- Hardebeck, J. L., and E. Hauksson (2001), Crustal stress field in southern California and its implications for fault mechanics, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *106*(B10), 21859-21882, doi:10.1029/2001jb000292.
- Hardebeck, J. L., and A. J. Michael (2006), Damped regional-scale stress inversions: Methodology and examples for southern California and the Coalinga aftershock sequence, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *111*(B11), B11310, doi:10.1029/2005jb004144.
- Harris, R. A., et al. (2018), A Suite of Exercises for Verifying Dynamic Earthquake Rupture Codes, *Seismol. Res. Lett.*, *89*(3), doi:10.1785/0220170222.
- Hauksson, E. (1987), Seismotectonics of the Newport-Inglewood fault zone in the Los Angeles basin, southern California, *Bull. Seismol. Soc Am.*, *77*(2), 539-561.
- Hauksson, E., W. Yang, and P. M. Shearer (2012), Waveform Relocated Earthquake Catalog for Southern California (1981 to 2011), *Bull. Seismol. Soc Am.*, *102*(5), 2239-2244, doi:10.1785/0120120010.
- Heidbach, O., et al. (2018), The World Stress Map database release 2016: Crustal stress pattern across T scales, *Tectonophysics*, *744*, 484-498, doi:10.1016/j.tecto.2018.07.007.

- Hickman, S., and M. D. Zoback (2004), Stress orientations and magnitudes in the SAFOD pilot hole, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *31*(15), L15S12, doi:10.1029/2004gl020043.
- Kerkela, S., and J. Stock (1996), Compression directions north of the San Fernando Valley determined from borehole breakouts, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *23*(23), 3365-3368, doi:10.1029/96GL03054.
- Lund Snee, J., and M. D. Zoback (2020), Multiscale variations of the crustal stress field throughout North America, *Nat Commun*, *11*(1951), doi:10.1038/s41467-020-15841-5.
- Luttrell, K., and B. Smith-Konter (2017), Limits on crustal differential stress in southern California from topography and earthquake focal mechanisms, *Geophys. J. Int.*, *211*, 472-482, doi:10.1093/gji/ggx301.
- Mastin, L. (1988), Effect of Borehole Deviation on Breakout Orientations, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *93*(B8), 9187-9195, doi:10.1029/JB093iB08p09187.
- Michael, A. J. (1984), Determination of stress from slip data: Faults and folds, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *89*(B13), 11517, doi:10.1029/JB089iB13p11517.
- Michael, A. J. (1987), Use of Focal Mechanisms to Determine Stress: A Control Study, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *92*(B1), 357-368, doi:10.1029/JB092iB01p00357.
- Mount, V., and J. Suppe (1992), Present-Day Orientations Adjacent to Active Strike-Slip Faults: California and Sumatra, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *97*(B8), 11995-12013, doi:10.1029/92JB00130.
- Naliboff, J. B., C. Lithgow-Bertelloni, L. J. Ruff, and N. de Koker (2012), The effects of lithospheric thickness and density structure on Earth's stress field, *Geophys. J. Int.*, *188*, 1-17, doi:10.1111/j.1365-246X.2011.05248.x.
- Persaud, P., E. H. Pritchard, and J. Stock (2020), Scales of Stress Heterogeneity Near Active Faults in the Santa Barbara Channel, Southern California, *Geochem. Geophys. Geosys.*, *21*, doi:10.1029/2019GC008744.
- Pierdominici, S., and O. Heidbach (2012), Stress field of Italy — Mean stress orientation at different depths and wave-length of the stress pattern, *Tectonophysics*, *532-535*, 301-311, doi:10.1016/j.tecto.2012.02.018.
- Plumb, R., and S. Hickman (1985), Stress - induced borehole elongation: A comparison between the four - arm dipmeter and the borehole televiewer in the Auburn Geothermal Well, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *90*(B7), 5513-5521, doi:10.1029/JB090iB07p05513.
- Schoenball, M., and N. C. Davatzes (2017), Quantifying the heterogeneity of the tectonic stress field using borehole data, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *122*, 6737-6756, doi:10.1002/2017JB014370.

- Shamir, G., and M. Zoback (1992), Stress Orientation Profile to 3.5 km Depth Near the San Andreas Fault at Cajon Pass, California, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 97(B4), 5059-5080, doi:10.1029/91JB02959.
- Shaw, J., et al. (2015), Unified Structural Representation of the southern California crust and upper mantle, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 415, 1-15, doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2015.01.016.
- Shearer, P. M., J. Hardebeck, L. Astiz, and K. B. Richards-Dinger (2003), Analysis of similar event clusters in aftershocks of the 1994 Northridge, California, earthquake, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108(B1), 2035, doi:10.1029/2001JB000685.
- Stock, J., and J. H. Healy (1988), Continuation of a Deep Borehole Stress Measurement Profile Near the San Andreas Fault: 2. Hydraulic Fracturing Stress Measurements at Black Butte, Mojave Desert, California, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 93(B12), 15196-15206, doi:10.1029/JB093iB12p15196.
- Vavryčuk, V. (2014), Iterative joint inversion for stress and fault orientations from focal mechanisms, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 199, 69-77, doi:10.1093/gji/ggu224.
- Wilde, M., and J. Stock (1997), Compression directions in southern California (from Santa Barbara to Los Angeles Basin) obtained from borehole breakouts, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 102(B3), 4969, doi:10.1029/96jb03734.
- Yang, W., and E. Hauksson (2011), The tectonic crustal stress field and style of faulting along the Pacific North America Plate boundary in Southern California, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 194(1), 100-117, doi:10.1785/0120100216.
- Yang, W., and E. Hauksson (2013), The tectonic crustal stress field and style of faulting along the Pacific North America Plate boundary in Southern California, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 194(1), 100-117, doi:10.1093/gji/ggt113.
- Yang, W., E. Hauksson, and P. M. Shearer (2012), Computing a Large Refined Catalog of Focal Mechanisms for Southern California (1981-2010): Temporal Stability of the Style of Faulting, *Bull. Seismol. Soc Am.*, 102(3), 1179-1194, doi:10.1785/0120110311.
- Zajac, B., and J. Stock (1997), Using borehole breakouts to constrain the complete stress tensor: Results from the Sijan Deep Drilling Project and offshore Santa Maria Basin, California, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 102(B5), 10083, doi:10.1029/96jb03914.
- Zhao, D., H. Kanamori, and D. Wiens (1997), State of stress before and after the 1994 Northridge earthquake, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 24(5), 519-522, doi:10.1029/97GL00258.
- Zoback, M. D., and J. H. Healy (1992), In situ stress measurements to 3.5 km depth in the Cajon Pass Scientific Research Borehole: Implications for the mechanics of crustal faulting, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 97(B4), 5039, doi:10.1029/91jb02175.
- Zoback, M. D., S. Hickman, and W. Ellsworth (2010), Scientific Drilling Into the San Andreas Fault Zone, *Eos Trans. AGU*, 91(22), 197-199, doi:10.1029/2010EO220001.