## Micro- and nano-scale study of deformation induced mineral

# transformations in Mg-phyllosilicate-rich fault gouges from the

# Galera Fault Zone (Betic Cordillera, SE Spain)

4 Catalina Sánchez-Roa (1) \*, Blanca Bauluz (2), Fernando Nieto (3), Isabel Abad (1), Juan

5 JIMENÉZ-MILLÁN (1) DANIEL FAULKNER (4).

(1) Departamento de Geología and CEACTierra, Unidad Asociada IACT (CSIC-UGR), Universidad de

Jaén, Campus Las Lagunillas s/n, 23071 Jaén, Spain, (2), IUCA-Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de

Zaragoza, Pedro Cerbuna 12, Zaragoza, Spain, (3) Departamento de Mineralogía y Petrología and IACT

(CSIC-UGR), Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Granada, Avda. Fuentenueva s/n, 18002 Granada,

Spain, (4) Rock Deformation Laboratory, Department of Earth, Ocean and Ecological Sciences,

University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK.

### **Abstract**

Naturally and experimentally deformed gouges from sliding surfaces within the Galera Fault Zone were analyzed using scanning and transmission electron microscopy (SEM, TEM) to identify changes in the fault rocks as a consequence of ongoing deformation. The two gouges studied have a particular mineral association that includes planar (mainly smectite and illite) and fibrous clay minerals (sepiolite and palygorskite). Microstructural findings include a radical difference in grain alignment between the two gouges, a phenomenon that strongly influences gouge permeability. Smectite crystals are aligned on the same orientation and show a great number of layer terminations and delamination on the basal planes that contribute to a distributed mode of deformation in the gouge. In contrast, the sepiolite-rich gouge exhibits a grid-like microfabric that results in localized deformation limited to small areas where the needle-like crystals are bent and broken producing "feather-like" structures, without the presence of lattice distortions. Meanwhile, significant

chemical results include: 1. Al content identified in sepiolite fibers through Analytical Electron Microscopy (AEM), together with variability in the (110) d-spacing of sepiolite across single fibers, suggest the existence of a progressive transformation from sepiolite to palygorskite; 2. Mg content in smectite suggests that a portion of the smectites within the fault plane could have an authigenic origin and may be the result of a transformation reaction from palygorskite, however the similarity of the 2:1 layer compositions between the smectites in the two contexts do not allow to either confirm nor deny such possibility. 3. Chemical continuity of Mg-decrease and Al+Fe-increase in the octahedral cation content of the sepiolites, palygorskites and smectites within the gouges indicate a sequence of mineral transformations that is favored by a depleted Mg content and an increase of Al content in the fluid. In this setting, deformation promotes grain size reduction and fluid-rock interaction with the wall rocks resulting in a local supply of Al to the fault gouge that drives phase transformations. Structural differences between smectites and fibrous clay minerals affect important chemical and physical properties of the gouge including their mechanical properties. We propose that the permeability of the gouges in the Galera Fault is strongly affected by their mineralogy. Furthermore, the extent of the mineral authigenesis and mineral transformations could be a controlling factor that progressively change both the permeability and the strength of the fault.

42

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

43

44

### **Keywords:**

- 45 Fibrous clay minerals, mineral transformations, fault zones, mineralogy of fault rocks, sepiolite,
- 46 palygorskite, smectite, HR-TEM.

47

48

#### 1. Introduction

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

Active faulting is an important phenomenon triggering chemical and physical processes in the rocks involved (Hickman et al., 1995; Faulkner et al., 2010). Chemical processes involve element mobility and redistribution assisted by fluids flowing through the faults. These fluids can either come from deep sources as in the case of hot springs, basin brines, hydrothermal and metamorphic fluids, or meteoric waters infiltrating through the newly-formed cracks in the rock. Significant evidence of the chemical reactions that occur in this setting include changes in the mineralogy of the fault gouge and adjacent rock (e.g., Sibson et al., 1979; Cox et al., 2001; Schleicher et al., 2006; 2012). Physical processes on the other hand are related to how minerals accommodate deformation under high levels of strain, commonly experienced on fault planes. A previous study of the mineralogy of the Galera Fault (SE Spain) documented the presence of authigenic Mg-rich fibrous clay minerals within the fault planes as a consequence of the fluid-rock interactions favored by active faulting (Sánchez-Roa et al., 2016). The two types of fault gouge in the Galera Fault present different resistance to shear due to the authigenic minerals concentrated in each section of the fault: the gouge to the south-west, which is rich in fibrous clay minerals has a higher friction coefficient (µ=0.47 under wet deformation); meanwhile the gouge recovered close to the town of Galera is rich in smectite with a small amount of fibrous minerals and has a lower friction coefficient (µ=0.17 under wet deformation) (Sánchez-Roa et al., 2016). The contrasting mechanical behavior between the two gouges motivates the study of the textural evolution and mineral transformations that can contribute to a differential resistance to shear during active faulting. Permeability is an important parameter in fault zones and is impacted by fundamental parameters such as the host rock lithology, fault activity, magnitude of displacement, pre-existing structures, the depth, the tectonic stress field and the width of the deformed zone (Houwers et al., 2015). The rock texture and its influence in the permeability of the two gouge types of the Galera Fault Zone

can be explored through scanning and transmission electron microscopy (SEM and TEM). A micro- and nano-scale study of these fault rocks could provide a deeper insight into the deformation mechanisms in phyllosilicates. Planar phyllosilicates commonly deform through delamination, fracturing, kinking and dislocation glide (Ibanez and Kronenberg, 1993; Mares and Kronenberg, 1993; Sánchez-Navas and Galindo-Zaldívar, 1993; French et al., 2015). Delamination often occurs during frictional sliding in phyllosilicates with low interlayer electrostatic separation energy (Moore and Lockner, 2004), as is the case for talc and pyrophyllite (Giese, 1978; Sakuma and Suehara, 2015). However, little is known about the possible deformation mechanisms and fluid/mineral interactions occurring in fibrous materials such as the fibrous clay minerals or a mixed regime where both fibrous and planar phyllosilicates are present. TEM study of clay minerals is challenging due to their susceptibility to electron beam damage, which is mainly related to the diffusion of alkali elements induced by the high voltages of the electron beam (van der Pluijm et al., 1988; Peacor, 1992). These observations remain true for the fibrous clay mineral group (sepiolite and palygorskite), where the cause of instability under the electron beam has been previously attributed to the high percentage of H<sub>2</sub>O and mobile cations within the zeolite-like channels (Krekeler and Guggenheim, 2008). Most work on the microscopic properties of these minerals has been achieved by separating individual particles, however the investigation of their mineral transformations and their contribution to the fabric of rocks is still to be explored. Thus, the study of these minerals and their texture in the context of active deformation is poorly understood and requires TEM exploration. In this study, we investigate naturally and experimentally deformed fault gouge samples from two main shear zones within the Galera Fault Zone by SEM and TEM. The aim of the study is to identify the microstructural features and mineral transformations that contribute to differences in the resistance to shear between the two main shear zones of the Galera Fault Zone.

99

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

### 2. Geological setting and materials

The Galera Fault Zone is an active strike-slip fault (Fig. 1), located in the Betic Cordillera of southeast Spain within the Guadix-Baza Basin (García-Tortosa et al., 2011). The Galera Fault has an extension of approximately 23 km long and 1.5 km wide with orientation N50°E. The structure is associated with a NE–SW elongated asymmetric anticline and consists of several parallel splays dipping 40° to 60° NW (Sánchez-Roa et al., 2016). The sedimentary sequence of the wall rock presents an alternation of white marls and dark lutitic layers that contain dolomite, gypsum, quartz, calcite and phyllosilicates in their mineral assemblages. Two distinct minerals assemblages have been identified within the fault planes and are focus of this study. The first consists of smectite-and palygorskite-rich fault gouges at the central area of the fault (Galera Village); the second consists of a sepiolite-rich gouge mainly at the SW segment of the fault (Rambla de los Pilares). Fibrous clay-rich gouges are enriched in Mg due to hydrothermal alteration during periods of fluid-rock interaction, concentrated in fault planes and fractures (Sánchez-Roa et al., 2016).

### 3. Methods

### 3.1. Sample preparation

118 The preparation of samples for High-Resolution (HR-) TEM observation had three different

119 procedures:

### 3.1.1 Impregnation with London Resin White (LRW) and ion thinning

Samples selected for microstructural analysis were prepared using a method modified from Kim et al. (1995). The method involves a multi-step exchange of the sample material with ethanol (99.9%) and London Resin White under refrigeration. The aim of the impregnation is to preserve the texture and the permanent expansion of smectite interlayers for TEM observation.

The impregnation of samples involves a hydration phase, where air-dried rock pieces were placed on a grid suspended over water creating a water steam saturated atmosphere. The samples were left for rehydration over a period of 48 hours. During the embedding phase: The water in the clay is replaced by ultra-pure ethanol of 99.9% purity. The samples were immersed in 100% ethanol for two periods of two hours and one of four hours. The LRW is progressively added in different mixtures of ethanol and LRW with volume ratios of ½, ⅓ and ⅓ each for two hours and then immersed in pure LRW overnight in a refrigerator. The next day the LRW was changed twice after periods of four hours. Finally, in the polymerization phase, fresh LRW was added to the samples and placed in an oven at 60 °C for 24h to polymerize and harden the LRW. The vacuum desiccator step (Kim et al., 1995), was not fully carried out due to the fragile nature of the samples.

The cured samples were cut perpendicular to the shear plane, in the direction of shear and an ordinary thin section was then prepared using a diamond saw with oil as lubricant to shape the samples. Sticky wax was used as an adhesive to bond the sample and the thin section glass.

Several 3 mm copper rings with a 1 mm hole in diameter were glued with an epoxy resin to the areas selected for further study. After drying for 24 hours, the rings were removed by heating the thin section. The rings were cleaned and ion-thinned to a suitable thickness for TEM study in a Fischione-1010 ion mill (Universidad de Jaén). The initial conditions for the ion thinning were 12°, 5kV and 5mA until the first hole opened, from there they had an intermediate stage with 8°, 4kV and 5mA, followed by a final stage with 5°, 3kV and 5mA.

### 3.1.2 Impregnation with Epothin resin and FIB-SEM

Sample preparation through the second method included an impregnation of the samples in EpoThin resin and hardener in a ratio of 2:1 and hardened under vacuum. The blocks were polished using silicon carbide powder and both isopropanol and mineral oil as lubricant agent. The polished blocks were observed under a Dual Beam Ariga Zeiss FIB-SEM (Focused Ion Beam-Scanning Electron Microscope) mainly operated at 30kV (Universidad de Sevilla). The objective of using the technique is to identify the most interesting areas for observation while keeping the fabric and structural context of the extracted lamellae. The FIB-SEM technique combines imaging capabilities of the electron beam and milling capabilities of the ion beam allowing the selection of suitable sampling sites with signs of higher deformation and micro-scale sectioning of electron transparent foils for TEM analysis. The selected area is marked and trenched using a focused beam of Ga<sup>+</sup> ions (Overwijk, 1993), the initial intensity for trenching was set to 20 nA for one hour and then set to 4 nA until the end of the trenching process. The procedure leaves a narrow slice standing and pending by one of the uncut edges. The slice was then welded by depositing a Pt-binding agent and was fixed to a half-copper-washer for TEM observation.

### 3.1.3 Particle dispersion

Powders of the natural samples were prepared using holey carbon-coated Cu grids. The powder was dispersed in ultra-pure ethanol and immersed in the ultrasonic bath for 15 seconds. This preparation disperses individual grains of minerals onto the grid surface. The analyses performed

on individual crystals allow a larger area to be used in the scanning transmission electron microscopy (STEM) mode for the chemical quantitative analysis and provides better reproducibility of data due to the decrease in alkali loss. Although the powdered samples offer higher spatial resolution for chemical analysis using EDS, the ion-milled samples offer textural information of the analyzed grains (Abad et al., 2002).

In addition to the natural samples, homoionized specimens of the smectite-rich sample were also analyzed using this particle dispersion method to reveal the possible presence of interlayer Mg.

### 3.2. Analytical techniques

### Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM)

Textural observations were made on polished impregnated blocks in secondary electron mode (SE) and backscattered electron mode (BSE). The SEM study was carried out with a Merlin Carl Zeiss field emission (FE) SEM in the Centro de Instrumentación Científico-Técnica of the Universidad de Jaén.

### 177 High-Resolution Transmission Electron Microscopy (HR-TEM)

The TEM images were obtained using three instruments: a JEOL-2000-FX-II TEM at the University of Zaragoza operated at 200 kV; a FEI TITAN G2 TEM in the Centro de Instrumentación Científica (C.I.C.) of the Universidad de Granada, operated at 300 kV, with XFEG emission gun, spherical aberration corrector and HAADF detector, with a resolution of 0.8 Å in the TEM mode and 2 Å in the scanning TEM mode; and a FEI TITAN High-Base TEM in the Laboratorio de Microscopias Avanzadas at the Universidad de Zaragoza, operated at 300 kV, with Schottky-FEG emission gun, spherical aberration corrector (CETCOR, CEOS company), HAADF detector, and a 2k x 2k CCD Gatan camera, with a resolution of 0.9 Å in the TEM mode.

### Analytical Electron Microscopy (AEM)

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

Chemical analyses (TEM-AEM) were obtained with two instruments: a Philips CM20 (C.I.C., Universidad de Granada), operating at 200 kV in STEM mode, with an EDAX solid-state energy dispersive X-ray (EDX) detector and with a scan window of ~20 Å~ 100 nm for the analysis of individual clay particles; the second instrument is a FEI TITAN Low-base TEM in the Laboratorio de Microscopias Avanzadas at the Universidad de Zaragoza, operated at 300 kV, with a high brightness field emission gun (XFEG), a monochromator unit, a spherical aberration corrector (CETCOR, CEOS company), HAADF detector, and a 2k x 2k CCD Gatan camera, with a resolution of 0.9 Å. The analyses were obtained in the HRSTEM mode. The following minerals were used to obtain the k factors for the transformation of intensity radiuses towards concentration ratios in accordance with the approximation made by Cliff and Lorimer (1975): albite, olivine, biotite, spessartine, muscovite, chlorite and titanite. Structural formulas of smectites were calculated from AEM data after analyzing 103 crystals. The results were normalized to  $O_{10}(OH)_2$  and all Fe was considered as  $Fe^{3+}$ . The normalization procedure shows a sum of octahedral cations higher than 2.1 per formula unit (a.f.u.) for 43% of the analyzed crystals indicating a divergence from their dioctahedral character. In addition, the sum of interlayer cations is lower than 0.2 a.f.u. for 32.5% and lower than 0.3 for 53.9% of the analyzed crystals. These results suggest the possibility that some of the Mg<sup>2+</sup> that was originally considered octahedral is instead located in the interlayer. Analyses on smectite particles from the samples homoionized with K and Ca show a strong decrease in Mg content, an octahedral population very close to 2 a.f.u., and normal values of interlayer population. Based on these results, the total Mg<sup>2+</sup> of the natural samples was redistributed within interlayer and octahedral positions to ensure that the octahedral sheet keeps a dioctahedral character and that the interlayer charge remains within the normal range for smectites (0.2 to 0.6).

### 3.3. Permeability measurements

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

Permeability tests were carried out on a triaxial deformation apparatus with a servo-controlled axial loading system and fluid pressure pump (Mitchell and Faulkner, 2008) in the Rock Deformation Laboratory in the University of Liverpool. The apparatus is capable of applying confining pressures of up to 250 MPa and pore pressures up to 200 MPa. It measures ultra-low permeability down to  $10^{-22}$  m<sup>2</sup> and a sample volume change of 0.1 mm<sup>3</sup>. The servo-controlled pore fluid system controls pore fluid pressure and serves as a high precision volumometer. This system can be used to measure permeability through various methods including the pulse transient technique (Brace et al., 1968) applied in this study to obtain values of permeability for the fault gouges at different confining pressures. The gouge powders were prepared by mixing 0.4 g of the sample with 0.5 mL of distilled water. The paste was then placed between two sintered discs with a known permeability of 10<sup>-13</sup> m<sup>2</sup>. The discs holding a cylindrical gouge layer approximately 1 mm high were placed within a PVC jacket and coupled with the sample assembly. Once the sample was inside the pressure vessel, the confining and pore pressure were progressively increased from a pore pressure value of 5 MPa that was kept for all measurements and an initial confining pressure of 10 MPa. The confining pressure was progressively increased in 20 MPa intervals to obtain permeability measurements at 5, 20, 40, 60, 80, and 100 MPa effective pressure. The pressure was left to equilibrate after each pressure increase until no changes in either pore or confining pressure were observed. The samples were recovered after depressurization and carefully measured to determine the final sample thickness and calculate permeability values. The pulse transient technique imposes a 1 MPa pressure differential in the upstream reservoir and bases the calculations on how this pressure increase is transmitted through the gouge sample to determine permeability (Brace et al., 1968).

### 4. Results

### 4.1 SEM observations

### 4.1.1 Naturally deformed fault rocks

### a. Smectite- and palygorskite-rich fault gouge

BSE-SEM observations of the fault gouge from the Galera town area show that the rock is composed of a very fine grain phyllosilicate-rich matrix that constitutes the majority of the rock and surrounds micron-size clasts of dolomite, orthoclase and quartz. Deformation features in the sample include the presence of bands of very fine grain minerals alternated with bands of coarser minerals that suggest cataclastic processes including grain rotation and grain size reduction (Fig. 2). The observed structural features of the sample include the alignment of platy clay minerals in an orientation similar to the shear direction, between 135° and 180° to the shear vector (Rutter et al., 1986), hereafter called the P-foliation after Logan et al. (1979). A set of shears that transect the P-foliation were also identified in the gouge and correspond with the definition of R<sub>1</sub> (Riedel) shears according to Logan et al., (1979). The gouge also exhibits surfaces parallel to the shear zone and with the same sense of shear, here referred to as Y surfaces (Logan et al., 1979).

### b. Sepiolite-rich fault gouge

Low magnification BSE images of the sepiolite-rich fault gouge show a homogeneous gouge with very fine grain size sepiolite that constitutes the majority of the sample (Fig. 3a). Deformation features are observed in the larger grain size phases that show mica-delamination and broken and aligned grains (Fig. 3a), however due to the clay size of the matrix further examination is restricted. Secondary electron image using in-lens detector of the gouge matrix shows fibrous sepiolite crystals with mainly two preferred orientations perpendicular to each other forming the majority of the gouge matrix (Fig. 3b).

### 4.1.2 Experimentally deformed fault rocks

### a. Smectite and palygorskite fault gouge material (wet deformation)

The examined gouge layers were recovered from the sliders. Samples retain some features related to the experimental assembly such as the grooved surface of the sliders (Fig. 4a). High deformation is visible towards the limit with the grooves, these type of shears have been described as boundary shears. The experimentally deformed layers show microstructural features previously described for clay-rich fault gouges (Rutter et al., 1986), such as P-foliation (Fig. 4b and c) and R<sub>1</sub> shears, the deformation bands are markedly noticeable when affecting coarser grains of mica and dolomite.

### b. Sepiolite fault gouge material (wet deformation)

Deformation microstructures in the experimentally deformed sepiolite-rich gouge are highly pronounced in mineral phases with bigger grain size, however clay mineral alignment is hard to define (Fig. 5). The artificial grooves in the gouge were lost during the impregnation due to the highly localized strain in the boundary shears (Fig. 5). Larger gypsum crystals are deformed in domino –type asymmetric boudinage (Fig. 5b, 5c), while larger mica crystals align and delaminate in favor of areas of localized shear (Fig. 5d, 5e). Dolomite crystals also appear highly fragmented due to the transection of R<sub>1</sub> and P surfaces with trail development (Fig. 5f).

#### c. Smectite and palygorskite fault gouge material (dry deformation)

The experimentally deformed gouge closely resembles the deformation structures identified in the natural gouge such as the  $R_1$  shears, bands of clay minerals alternated with bands of bigger grain size (Fig. 6a to 6d). A view of the shear planes shows the polished slickenside surface and striae, resulting from the shear (Fig. 6e, 6f).

### d. Sepiolite fault gouge material (dry deformation)

SEM examination of the deformed gouge shows similar deformation microstructures to that observed in the gouge deformed naturally and under wet conditions (Fig. 7). A high proportion of

small incipient shears that align in a similar direction are evident. These same shears have no evident connection between them (Fig. 7c). Figures 7d to 7f show the presence of a grid-like microfabric of the deformed gouge caused by the two main preferred orientations of sepiolite fibers. The two orientations of the fibers persist even towards the R<sub>1</sub> shears and on the shear planes (Fig. 7e, 7f).

### 4.1.3 Summary of micro-scale observations

In the naturally deformed rocks, grain orientation for the two materials studied differs significantly. The smectite- and palygorskite-rich gouge shows grain alignment with a series of parallel structures following similar orientations, on the other hand in the sepiolite-rich gouge it is noticeable the presence of two or more orientations of the fibers. Meanwhile, the differences for grain orientation identified in the two naturally deformed gouges studied remain noticeable in the experimentally deformed rocks, grain alignment in the smectite- and palygorskite-rich gouge and grid microfabric in the sepiolite-rich gouge. Finally, the presence of water during deformation does not develop any significant differences in grain orientation for either gouge, showing a similar resulting microstructure under both wet and dry conditions.

#### 4.2 TEM observations

### 4.2.1 Naturally deformed fault rocks

### a. Smectite and palygorskite fault rock

The gouge has a matrix mainly composed of smectite, with minor amounts of palygorskite and illite. The general texture of the rock shows phyllosilicate alignment as well as elongated porosity parallel to the basal planes of the crystals (Fig. 8a). The abundant presence of smectite helps to coat the coarse grains to maintain the fluid texture observed at lower magnification (Fig. 8b). High-resolution images of the rock matrix in a smectite-rich area show parallel to sub-parallel lattice fringes of smectite, the (001) spacing of smectite is measured to be around 1.05 nm to 1.30 nm,

due to the variable collapsing of its interlayer space in areas of poor impregnation (Fig. 8c, 8d). Lattice fringes with spacing that vary from 2.00 to 2.30 nm were also observed within the smectiterich matrix, which might correspond to mixed layer I/S with a variable degree of collapse (Fig. 8d). The smectite crystals present broken and displaced lattice planes where the low crystallinity of the clay grains is indicated by the absence of packets of more than two or three layers that never achieve a thickness of more than 10 nm (Fig. 8c, 8d). This kind of texture, which has been frequently described in smectites from both authigenic (Krekeler et al., 2004) and sedimentary (e.g. Nieto et al, 2016) environments, is compatible with plastic processes, able to accommodate the strain without breaking of the crystals. Illite shows lattice fringes with 1.00 nm spacing and is the most crystalline phase on the basis of selected area electron diffraction (SAED) patterns, however illite crystals are embedded in smectite crystals with a similar orientation, which hinders the chemical analysis of a single phase (Fig. 8e). HR-images show crystals with diffuse regions consistent with the polysomes structures described by Krekeler et al. (2005) (Fig. 8f).

### b. Sepiolite fault rock

The general texture of the rock showed that the fibers have mainly three preferred orientations: orientations 1 and 2 have the c-axis (direction of the fiber) parallel to the imaged plane and are oriented almost perpendicular to each other; orientation 3 has the c-axis of the fibers oriented perpendicular to the imaged plane, showing a transversal section of the bundles that appear in the image as small polygons (Fig. 9). These three orientations constitute a three-dimensional grid-like microfabric of the rock. The rock matrix is composed of fiber-aggregates (bundles) with different sizes that vary from 1 µm to 100 nm (Fig. 9). The lack of fiber orientation in the rock matrix creates a large number of triangular to polygonal voids in the rock distributed throughout the matrix (Fig. 9). SAED patterns in the matrix are difficult to obtain, however, it is possible to observe reflections representing the 110 spacing of sepiolite at approximately 1.23 nm (Fig. 9b inset).

FIB-cut-lamellae extracted from the red rectangle shown in Figure 3a allowed the identification of the general sense of deformation of the samples (Fig. 10a). Lamellae TEM observations show a consistent orientation for a set of feather-like structures that coincides with the general direction of shear of the sample (Fig. 10b, d and e). The feather structures show significant reduction of the grain size by bending and eventually breaking the fibers, creating an area of small oriented fibers that form the feather structure and are only recognizable at the TEM-scale (Fig. 10).

HR-TEM images show that the (110) lattice fringes in sepiolite crystals are continuous and no layer terminations were observed (Fig. 11). High-resolution images of the sepiolite crystals show lattice plane spacings that vary from 1.10 nm to 1.24 nm (Fig. 11). Some crystals (Fig. 11a) exhibit d-spacing closer to the ideal 1.20 and 1.21 nm. Meanwhile, other sepiolite crystals show progressive decrease of the d-spacing (Fig. 11b and 11c).

High-resolution images on single fibers in the naturally deformed sepiolite-rich samples showed multiple crystals with intermediate d-spacings between palygorskite and sepiolite showing a range of d-spacings from 1.03 nm to 1.18 nm (Fig. 12a). Furthermore, the images show crystals with d-spacings of 1.04 to 1.06 nm which correspond to the (110) plane of palygorskite. Crystal defects

### 4.2.2 Experimentally deformed gouges

### a. Smectite and palygorskite fault gouge material (wet and dry deformation)

as dislocations were identified within these palygorskite crystals (Fig. 12b).

Under wet conditions, low magnification images of the experimentally deformed gouge show two distinctively different textures of the rock (Fig. 13a). The first texture shows an oriented fabric constituted of laminar aggregates (Fig. 13b) that isolate the lenses of the second texture (Fig. 13a). Smectite and illite crystals constitute the matrix of texture 1 in the artificially fabricated gouge, these phyllosilicates are aligned on their basal planes, contrary to the initial random orientation of the crushed and powdered natural rock when placed on the sliders. Smectite spacing in these samples has been identified at around 1.02 nm and it is possible to recognize a number of

deformation features including delamination of the phyllosilicates and shearing of phases with larger grain size, such as gypsum (Fig. 13b). The second texture exhibits a more homogeneous aspect without visible crystals or any particular fabric orientation (Fig. 13c). High-resolution observations show that the origin of the two textures relates to the type of phyllosilicate in the area. Texture 1 is composed of smectite and illite, while texture 2 is entirely composed of the fibrous palygorskite (Fig. 13c). Samples deformed under the absence of water (dry deformation) show the same kind of phase segregation observed in the samples deformed under wet conditions (Fig. 14). Smectite-rich areas form sigmoidal structures and present large elongated pores that follow the orientation of the fluid-like deformation structure (Fig. 14a). SAED patterns are difficult to obtain for individual grains; however, the general SAED patterns in the matrix of both textures show significant differences confirming the segregation of mineral phases by habit. SAED pattern from areas rich in planar phyllosilicates are turbostratic, where the long axis represents d-spacings of 1.00 nm corresponding with the lattice spacing of the (001) plane of illite and possibly the collapsed smectite crystals, and the short axis represents d-spacings of 0.52 nm corresponding with the (003) plane of smectite (Fig. 14b inset).

### b. Sepiolite fault gouge (wet and dry deformation)

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

The general texture in the gouge deformed under wet conditions shows a continuous feather structure or kinks (Fig. 15a and b). High-resolution images show (110) planes of sepiolite crystals with different d-spacing, varying from 1.14 to 1.20 nm (Fig. 15c), this particular image with angular edges is possibly viewing the crystals along the [100] direction. The parallelogram-shaped minerals could be the result of a cross-section of rod mesocrystals that resemble open channel defects described by Krekeler and Guggenheim (2008).

Very few images were obtained from the gouge deformed under dry conditions. The lattice fringe spacing of the sepiolite crystals measured in this preparation was 1.14 nm.

### 4.3 Analytical Electron Microscopy

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

AEM analyses of single crystals from the two fault gouges in the Galera Fault Zone were collected to define the chemical compositions of sepiolite, palygorskite and smectite crystals and are presented in Figure 16 in the form of the main octahedral oxides to detect transitional compositions between sepiolite and palygorskite as well as between palygorskite and smectites. The fibrous samples plot continuously in all the compositional ranges discriminated in Suárez and García-Romero (2013), without major compositional gaps (Fig. 16). AEM analysis of smectite and palygorskite have great similitudes, palygorskite has a slightly higher Mg content than smectite, however the most significant feature to differentiate between them is their morphology. In order to identify whether or not the origin of the smectites present within the fault plane are authigenic, 103 smectite crystals were analyzed including smectites collected from within the fault plane and smectites from the two principal lithologies in the sedimentary sequence of the wall rock. The chemical composition of the major octahedral cations in the smectite crystals are presented in Figure 17. For the full list of normalized chemical formulas see Supplementary information, Table 1. Most of the smectites analyzed show a beidellite character. Smectites from the lutitic strata show a higher content of Fe, while those from the marly strata show a higher Al content. Smectites from the fault plane have chemical features similar to both the marls and the lutites from the wall rock, however their Mg content within the octahedral layer appears slightly higher than those from the wall rocks. The identification of a small peak of palygorskite in XRD analysis (see the diffractograms of samples in Supplementary Fig. 1) motivated the exploration of the chemical composition of the sepiolite fibers in the sepiolite-rich gouge. A sequence of chemical analysis acquired within 46 individual fibers of sepiolite show small content of aluminum in 16 of the crystals. The highest Al content appears towards the edges of the crystals in 9 of the 16 crystals; while for the remaining 7

405	the Al content seems to be similarly distributed along the crystals. Differences in the Al content
406	are noticeable within an individual fiber (Fig. 18), where the area of analysis 3 (in red) shows
407	significantly higher Al content than areas 1 and 2.
408	4.4 Permeability
409	The values obtained from the permeability measurements on the smectite-rich fault gouge range
410	between 1 x10 <sup>-20</sup> to 1 x10 <sup>-21</sup> m <sup>2</sup> , which decrease almost linearly with a rise in confining pressure
411	from 5 to 100 MPa, while results for the sepiolite-rich fault gouge range between 1 $\times$ 10 <sup>-18</sup> to 1 $\times$ 10 <sup>-18</sup>
412	<sup>19</sup> m <sup>2</sup> (Fig. 19).
413	

### 5. Discussion

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

### 5.1 Sepiolite to palygorskite phase transformation in the fault gouge

Sepiolite is the major phyllosilicate in the central segment of the Galera Fault (Sánchez-Roa et al., 2016), as is supported by low- and high-resolution TEM images (Figs. 9, 10, 11 and 12). Nevertheless, significant Al content has been found in various analyzed fibers, defining a continuous trend between the compositional fields of sepiolite and palygorskite (Fig. 16). This Al is preferentially associated to the border of the fibers, with a tendency to be absent in their centers (Fig. 18), and is expected to be associated to nanometer sized (less than 6 nm) discrete areas of palygorskite (Fig. 12b, 18). The d-spacing variation of lattice fringes on HR-TEM images of sepiolite ranges from 1.1 nm to 1.24 nm (Fig. 11). The presence of different d-spacings could suggest small contributions of palygorskite polysomes to the sepiolite structure (Suárez and García-Romero, 2013) that alter the regular (110) spacing of sepiolite ideally defined at 1.22 nm. The acquired images are consistent with this interpretation, however it is important to note that thickness, focus or beam damage effects could also cause alteration of regular spacings. In nature, the progressive transformation from one phase to another, due to changes in chemical and/or physical conditions, may occur via polysomatic reactions or as growth of discrete crystals of the new phase. Polysomatic reactions are seen in the case of smectite to illite through illite/smectite mixed-layers (Hower et al., 1976), or in the case of the transformation from pyroxenes to amphiboles through pyriboles (Veblen and Buseck, 1981). In both of these cases, high-resolution images display the new polysome as individual unit cells within the former phase showing their respective characteristic spacings, which allow the clear identification of the areas in which the new polysome is present (Bozhilov et al., 2007; Vázquez et al., 2014). In other cases, the new phase nucleates as discrete crystals, sometimes assisted by topotactic or epitactic mechanisms (Sánchez-Navas, 1999), but without the existence of intermediate stages (e.g. chlorite to biotite transformation or the transformation among the aluminum silicate polymorphs). Figure 12 could

represent such a case or could be a more advanced stage in the progressive development of polysomes (Krekeler et al., 2005; Krekeler and Guggenheim, 2008). Contrary to the layer silicates, the sepiolite- palygorskite polysomes would be individual chains. Considering that a lattice fringe in a high-resolution image would include at least 15 unit cells in depth, when assuming an average width of 20 nm per lath, the variability in the measured spacings could be the result of different proportions of the two types of chains, representing a weighted average of the spacings of the two polysomes. Nevertheless, we have not found individual lattice fringes corresponding to the palygorskite spacing in a matrix of sepiolite, contrary to the case described for pyriboles by Bozhilov et al. (2007). Hence, our results cannot be considered conclusive in relation to the mechanism of transformation between sepiolite and palygorskite, however chemical analysis confirms that the Al content appears often towards the edges of the crystals (Fig. 18). This suggests that the phase transformation starts affecting the edges of sepiolite fibers by including Al in palygorskite polysomes or directly producing the growth of individual crystals of palygorskite. This phenomenon in the context of fault zones can be related to fluid-rock interactions of the gouge (Sánchez-Roa et al., 2016).

### 5.2 Genetic relation between palygorskite and Mg-smectite in the fault gouge

Quantitative chemical analysis in palygorskite and smectite particles show a compositional overlapping between fibrous and smectite crystals (Fig. 16). This chemical similarity of some palygorskite and smectite crystals suggests that either a transformation or some mineral epitaxial overgrowth between smectite and palygorskite crystals is taking place within the smectite- and palygorskite-rich sample (Fig. 16).

To explore this possibility, AEM analysis on 103 crystals of smectite from the two main levels of the sedimentary sequence of the wall rock and smectites from the fault plane are shown in Figure 17. The results of the normalized chemical formula in the three groups of smectite show a higher interlayer Mg content for the smectites of the fault plane, but are inconclusive regarding a change

of the 2:1 layer composition of smectites. The most common products of the transformation of fibrous clay minerals in experimental studies are Mg-rich smectites (Golden and Dixon, 1990). This suggests that a portion of the smectites within the fault plane could have an authigenic origin, which would be the result of a transformation reaction from palygorskite (Krekeler et al., 2005), however the similarity of the 2:1 layer compositions between the smectites in the two contexts does not allow to either confirm nor deny such possibility. Previous studies on the transformation of fibrous clay minerals to smectites have experimentally showed that the product of hydrothermally transformed sepiolite is often constituted by lath-like morphology smectite (Guven and Carney, 1979). This phenomenon was again observed in the transformation from palygorskite to smectite and explained by smectite forming within the palygorskite laths prior to their physical disruption producing a palygorskite pseudomorph composed of smectite (Golden and Dixon, 1990). Based on the two well-defined textures in the experimentally deformed rock (Fig. 13, 14) and the absence of the texture segregation in the naturally deformed rock (Fig. 8), we suggest that this textural difference could be an indication that the palygorskite crystals were indeed intergrown with smectite crystals in the natural rock. Segregation of mineral phases observed in the experimentally deformed rocks can, on the other hand, occur as a result of the disaggregation of the rock during sample preparation and re-aggrupation of crystals by habit during the experiment

### 5.3 Deformation features in planar and fibrous clay minerals

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

(Fig. 13).

Clay minerals are major constituents of many fault gouges (Haines and van der Pluijm, 2012; Rutter et al., 2012; Schleicher et al., 2013), reaching up to 99.5% in the Central Deforming Zone of the San Andreas Fault (Hadizadeh et al., 2012; Janssen et al., 2014), and constitute the majority of the fault gouge in the Galera Fault Zone (Sánchez-Roa et al., 2016). However, not all clay minerals have the same physical and chemical properties and possibly nor the same mode of deformation.

In this section, we aim to compare the deformation features from platy and fibrous clay minerals to identify possible differences in their behavior under shear in both natural faults and friction experiments. The Galera Fault Zone is an ideal natural example for this study due to the presence of both platy and fibrous clay minerals within its main sliding planes (Sánchez-Roa et al., 2016). Frictional deformation in phyllosilicates is facilitated by a series of micromechanisms including grain-grain sliding when the planar minerals are aligned on their basal planes, delamination, cataclasis, crystal plasticity, and pressure-solution creep. These processes are controlled by many factors including pressure and temperature (Beeler, 2007; French et al., 2015). SEM observations on samples in this study do not show significant differences between the microstructures of wet and dry frictional experiments as has been previously described for microstructures of phyllosilicates sheared at low temperatures (Moore and Lockner, 2004; Behnsen and Faulkner, 2013; Haines et al., 2013). In general, all SEM observations in the experimentally deformed samples show distributed deformation within the phyllosilicates of the matrix (Figs. 2 to 7). TEM observations on the smectite-rich gouge show how smectite crystals present broken and displaced lattice fringes in the rock matrix in order to accommodate deformation (Fig. 8). In this way smectite crystals ensure a uniform distribution of the shear in the rock. The quick alignment of the smectite and illite crystals of the matrix of the smectite- and palygorskite-rich samples in the experimentally deformed gouges demonstrate that when the shear deformation starts, the platy minerals rapidly adopt a preferred orientation producing a very similar fabric to the one observed in the naturally deformed rocks. Smectite crystals aggregate together with the same orientation on their basal planes, and facilitate grain on grain sliding as well as delamination processes that accommodate deformation through creeping (Fig. 8). On the other hand, the fibrous phyllosilicate gouge shows mainly three different orientations of the fibers. This grid-like microfabric (Fig. 9) and the absence of weak cleavage planes for intragranular sliding result in the formation of feather structures that mark areas where the

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

deformation processes have been localized producing the observed grain size reduction through a mechanical bending and breaking of the fibers. The orientation of the feather-like structures (Fig. 10), resemble the orientation of Riedel shears (Rutter et al., 1986). Indicating that deformation is localizing by bending and breaking the fibers at a very small scale that is not visible until the clay fraction of the gouge is examined in detail (Fig. 10, 15).

In the case of the experimentally deformed smectite- and palygorskite-rich gouge no feather structures were observed, a phenomenon that can be explained by the high amount of smectite in the sample that accommodates most of the deformation without the need to affect the stronger palygorskite-rich areas.

In HR-TEM observations, the delamination processes are visible in the smectite crystals, however in the fibrous materials the lattice fringes appear continuous. The higher strength of the fibrous structure hinders delamination processes accommodating the imposed deformation by breaking and bending of fibers resulting in a series of feather-like structures at the micro-scale (Fig. 10).

### 5.4 Geological implications

Based on our results, we propose that the mineral transformations in the Mg-rich fault gouges of the Galera Fault are a consequence of the fluid depletion in Mg with progressive exhumation and a proportional increase of Al content enhanced by the interaction with the Al-rich wall rocks. Sánchez-Roa et al. (2016) showed that mineralogical and geochemical differences between fault gouges and wall rocks are likely to be the result of periods of fluid-rock interaction within the Galera Fault. MgO and As gains in fault gouges pointed to a circulation of hot deep fluids as the source of the Mg-rich fluid, produced by the dissolution of the thick dolostone sequences that form the Mesozoic carbonatic basement. Sepiolite precipitated directly from a Mg-rich fluid while palygorskite and smectite formation could be products of the interaction of the fluid with the Al-rich host rock and the infiltration of oxidized basinal fluids with high pH<sup>+</sup>. The evolution sequence identified in this study starts with the precipitation of sepiolite from Mg-rich hydrothermal fluids

(Sánchez-Roa et al., 2016). Sepiolite crystals start to incorporate palygorskite domains to produce a first evolution stage where both sepiolite and palygorskite are present as independent crystals as is the case of the studied gouge from the Galera Fault. Following this, we propose a second evolution stage intermediate between the two gouges studied, in which sepiolite has been transformed to palygorskite. The smectite-palygorskite gouge from the Galera Fault constitutes a third stage of transformation, in which the smectites in the wall rock change their interlayer composition and a part of the palygorskite could have been transformed to smectite as a result of the large Al-availability forming Mg-rich smectite. In a more advanced stage, it is possible that further alteration of the fault gouge results in a platy Mg-rich smectite enrichment, which could alter fault strength and permeability, affecting earthquake nucleation and propagation processes. The permeability of fault zones is a relevant property that controls the subsurface fluid flow and plays an important role in coseismic fluid pressure changes, pore pressure build-ups and potential weakening of faults (Scuderi and Collettini, 2016; Faulkner et al., 2018). There is a difference of almost two orders of magnitude in the measured permeability for the two fault gouges in this study (Fig. 19). This permeability contrast can be related to the dominant phyllosilicate for each gouge. Both gouges decrease their permeability with increasing confining pressure, however the smectite-rich fault gouge sustains greater decline in permeability for a given change in confining pressure (Fig. 19). The faster decrease in permeability for the smectite-gouge can be related to a much higher level of sheet alignment and lateral connectivity of the platy smectite crystals at medium to high pressures facilitated by the high particle mobility of this mineral (Behnsen and Faulkner, 2011). On the other hand, the grid-like microfabric in the fully fibrous material can leave room for a higher number of interconnected pores due to the lack of fiber alignment that adds to the structural microporosity of the fibers, as a consequence of their internal channels. These results show how the permeability of the gouges in the Galera Fault is strongly affected by the mineralogy of the gouge, implying that mineral authigenic growth and mineral transformations could constitute a controlling factor on the permeability of the fault zone.

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

The strength of the two fault gouges in the Galera Fault show highly contrasting values, the sepiolite-rich gouge has a higher friction coefficient (μ=0.47 under wet deformation), while the smectite and palygorskite-rich gouge has a significantly lower friction coefficient (μ=0.17 under wet deformation) (Sánchez-Roa et al., 2016). The presence of smectite has proven to have important effects on the strength of faults by contributing to a lower frictional strength and has been reported to have a weakening effect on concentrations as low as 10 wt% (Oohashi et al., 2015). Furthermore, previous studies comparing the strength of monomineralic fibrous clay minerals and the smectite saponite have shown that their frictional strength is dictated by their crystal structure showing that fibrous Mg-rich phyllosilicates are stronger than the platy smectite (Sánchez-Roa et al., 2017). Therefore, we suggest that the strength of the Galera Fault could be significantly controlled by the palygorskite to smectite ratio within the fault planes.

Mineral transformations between fibrous and planar clay minerals (specifically smectite) could occur in a variety of geological settings involving Mg-rich environments. As a consequence, these mineral transformations will considerably change important chemical and physical properties, such as surface area and cation exchange capacity that significantly alter the microfabric, permeability and strength of the geological material.

### Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Dr. M.M. Abad-Ortega, A. Martinez-Morales, Dr. M. A. Laguna, Dr. A. Ibarra and Dr. R. Fernández-Pacheco for their support in electron microscopy data acquisition. The authors thank the reviewers E. García-Romero and M. Krekeler for their comments that led to significant improvements. This work has been financed by the research projects CGL2011-30153-C02-01, CGL2011-30153- C02-02, and CGL2013-46169-C2-1-P from MINECO, research project UJA2014/06/17 from the Universidad-Caja Rural de Jaén, Research

589 Groups RNM-179 and RNM-325 of the Junta de Andalucía, UK NERC grant NE/J024449/1 590 and the F.P.I. Grant No. BES-2012-052 562 from the Spanish Government (Ministerio de 591 Economía y Competitividad). 592 References 593 Abad, I., Nieto, F., and Velilla, N., 2002, Chemical and textural characterisation of diagenetic to 594 low-grade metamorphic phyllosilicates in turbidite sandstones of the South Portuguese Zone: 595 A comparison between metapelites and sandstones: Schweizerische Mineralogische und 596 Petrographische Mitteilungen, v. 82, p. 303-324. 597 Beeler, N.M., 2007, Laboratory-observed faulting in Intrinsically and Apparently Weak Materials: 598 The Seismogenic Zone of Subduction Thrust Faults, p. 370–449. 599 Behnsen, J., and Faulkner, D.R., 2013, Permeability and frictional strength of cation-exchanged 600 montmorillonite: Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, v. 118, no. 6, p. 2788–2798, 601 doi: 10.1002/jgrb.50226. 602 Behnsen, J., and Faulkner, D.R., 2011, Water and argon permeability of phyllosilicate powders 603 under medium to high pressure: Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, v. 116, no. 604 12, p. 1–13, doi: 10.1029/2011JB008600. 605 Bozhilov, K.N., Brownstein, D., and Jenkins, D.M., 2007, Biopyribole evolution during tremolite 606 synthesis from dolomite and quartz in CO2-H2O fluid: American Mineralogist, v. 92, no. 5-607 6, p. 898–908, doi: 10.2138/am.2007.2376. 608 Brace, W.F., Walsh, J.B., and Frangos, W.T., 1968, Permeability of Granite under High Pressure: 609 Journal of Geophysical Research, v. 73, no. 6.

610 Cliff, G. and Lorimer, G. W., 1975, The quantitative analysis of thin specimens: Journal of 611 Microscopy, 103: 203-207. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2818.1975.tb03895.x 612 Cox, S.F., Knackstedt, M.A., and Braun, J., 2001, Principles of structural control on permeability 613 and fluid flow in hydrothermal systems: Reviews in Economic Geology, v. 14, p. 1–24. 614 Faulkner, D.R., Jackson, C.A.L., Lunn, R.J., Schlische, R.W., Shipton, Z.K., Wibberley, C.A.J., and 615 Withjack, M.O., 2010, A review of recent developments concerning the structure, mechanics 616 and fluid flow properties of fault zones: Journal of Structural Geology, v. 32, no. 11, p. 1557– 617 1575, doi: 10.1016/j.jsg.2010.06.009. Faulkner, D.R., Sánchez-Roa, C., Boulton, C., and den Hartog, S.A.M., Pore Fluid Pressure 618 619 Development in Compacting Fault Gouge in Theory, Experiments, and Nature: Journal of 620 Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, 123. https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JB015130 621 French, M.E., Chester, F.M., and Chester, J.S., 2015, Micromechanisms of creep in clay-rich gouge 622 from the Central Deforming Zone of the San Andreas Fault: Journal of Geophysical 623 Research B: Solid Earth, v. 120, no. 2, p. 827–849, doi: 10.1002/2014JB011496. 624 García-Romero, E., and Suárez, M., 2010, On the chemical composition of sepiolite and 625 Clay Minerals, palygorskite: Clays and v. 58, no. 1-20, doi: 626 10.1346/CCMN.2010.0580101. 627 García-Romero, E., and Suárez, M., 2013, Sepiolite-palygorskite: Textural study and genetic 628 considerations: Applied Clay Science, doi: 10.1016/j.clay.2013.09.013. 629 García-Tortosa, F.J., Alfaro, P., Sanz de Galdeano, C., and Galindo-Zaldívar, J., 2011, Glacis 630 geometry as a geomorphic marker of recent tectonics: The Guadix-Baza basin (South Spain): 631 Geomorphology, v. 125, no. 4, p. 517–529, doi: 10.1016/j.geomorph.2010.10.021.

632 Giese, R.F., 1978, Electrostatic Interlayer Forces of Layer Structure Minerals.: Clays and Clay 633 Minerals, v. 26, no. 1, p. 51–57, doi: 10.1346/CCMN.1978.0260106. 634 Golden, D.C., and Dixon, J.B., 1990, Low-temperature alteration of palygorskite to smectite: v. 635 38, no. 4, p. 401–408. Guven, N., and Carney, L.L., 1979, Hydrothermal Transformation of Sepiolite to Stevensite and 636 637 The Effect of Added Chlorides and Hydroxides.: Clays and Clay Minerals, v. 27, no. 4, p. 638 253-260, doi: 10.1346/CCMN.1979.0270403. 639 Hadizadeh, J., Mittempergher, S., Gratier, J.P., Renard, F., Di Toro, G., Richard, J., and Babaie, H. 640 a., 2012, A microstructural study of fault rocks from the SAFOD: Implications for the 641 deformation mechanisms and strength of the creeping segment of the San Andreas Fault: 642 Journal of Structural Geology, v. 42, p. 246–260, doi: 10.1016/j.jsg.2012.04.011. 643 Haines, S.H., Kaproth, B., Marone, C., Saffer, D., and Van der Pluijm, B., 2013, Shear zones in 644 clay-rich fault gouge: A laboratory study of fabric development and evolution: Journal of 645 Structural Geology, v. 51, p. 206–225, doi: 10.1016/j.jsg.2013.01.002. 646 Haines, S.H., and van der Pluijm, B.A., 2012, Patterns of mineral transformations in clay gouge, 647 with examples from low-angle normal fault rocks in the western USA: Journal of Structural 648 Geology, v. 43, p. 2–32, doi: 10.1016/j.jsg.2012.05.004. 649 Hickman, S., Sibson, R., and Bruhn, R., 1995, Mechanical involvement of fluids in faulting: Journal 650 of Geophysical Research, v. 100, no. B7, p. 12831–12840, doi: 10.1029/94EO01059. 651 Houwers, M.E., Heijnen, L.J., Becker, A., and Rijkers, R., 2015, A Workflow for the Estimation 652 of Fault Zone Permeability for Geothermal Production A General Model Applied on the

653 Roer Valley Graben in the Netherlands: Proceedings World Geothermal Congress 2015, , no. 654 April, p. 9. 655 Hower, J., Eslinger, E. V., Hower, M.E., and Perry, E. a., 1976, Mechanism of burial 656 metamorphism of argillaceos sediment: Geological Society Of America Bulletin, v. 87, no. 657 60512, p. 725–737, doi: 10.1130/0016-7606(1976)87<725. 658 Ibanez, W.D., and Kronenberg, A.K., 1993, Experimental deformation of shale: Mechanical 659 properties and microstructural indicators of mechanisms: International Journal of Rock 660 Mechanics and Mining Sciences and, v. 30, no. 7, p. 723-734, doi: 10.1016/0148-661 9062(93)90014-5. 662 Janssen, C., Wirth, R., Wenk, H.R., Morales, L., Naumann, R., Kienast, M., Song, S.R., and Dresen, 663 G., 2014, Faulting processes in active faults - Evidences from TCDP and SAFOD drill core 664 samples: Journal of Structural Geology, v. 65, p. 100–116, doi: 10.1016/j.jsg.2014.04.004. 665 Kim, J.W., Peacor, D.R., Tessier, D., and Elsass, F., 1995, A technique for maintaining texture and 666 permanent expansion of smectite interlayers for TEM observations: Clays and Clay Minerals, v. 43, no. 1, p. 51–57, doi: 10.1346/CCMN.1995.0430106. 667 668 Krekeler, M.P.S., Guggenheim, S., Rakovan, J., 2004, A microtexture study of palygorskite-rich sediments 669 from the Hawthorne Formation, Southern Georgia, by transmission electron microscopy and atomic force 670 microscopy. Clays and Clay Minerals, v. 52, no. 3, p. 263–274. 671 Krekeler, M.P.S., Hammerly, E., Rakovan, J., Guggenheim, S., 2005, Microscopy studies of the 672 palygorskite to smectite transformation. Clays and Clay Minerals, 53, 94–101.

Krekeler, M.P.S., and Guggenheim, S., 2008, Defects in microstructure in palygorskite-sepiolite 673 674 minerals: A transmission electron microscopy (TEM) study: Applied Clay Science, v. 39, no. 675 1-2, p. 98–105, doi: 10.1016/j.clay.2007.05.001. 676 Logan, J.M., Friedman, M., Higgs, N., Dengo, C., and Shimamoto, T., 1979, Experimental studies 677 of simulated gouge and their application to studies of natural fault zones: Proc. Conf. VIII -Analysis of Actual Fault Zones in Bedrock, p. 305-343. 678 679 Mares, V.M., and Kronenberg, a. K., 1993, Experimental deformation of muscovite: Journal of 680 Structural Geology, v. 15, no. 9-10, p. 1061–1075, doi: 10.1016/0191-8141(93)90156-5. 681 Mitchell, T.M., and Faulkner, D.R., 2008, Experimental measurements of permeability evolution 682 during triaxial compression of initially intact crystalline rocks and implications for fluid flow 683 in fault zones: Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, v. 113, no. 11, p. 1-16, doi: 684 10.1029/2008JB005588. 685 Moore, D.E., and Lockner, D.A., 2004, Crystallographic controls on the frictional behavior of dry 686 and water-saturated sheet structure minerals: Journal of Geophysical Research, v. 109, no. 687 B03401, p. 1–16, doi: 10.1029/2003JB002582. 688 Nieto, F., Arroyo, X., Aróstegui, J., 2016, XRD-TEM-AEM comparative study of nalkylammonium smectites and interstratified minerals in shallow-diagenetic carbonate 689 690 sediments of the Basque-Cantabrian Basin: American Mineralogist, v. 101, p. 385–398, doi: 691 https://doi.org/10.2138/am-2016-5301. 692 Oohashi, K., Hirose, T., Takahashi, M., and Tanikawa, W., 2015, Dynamic weakening of smectite-693 bearing faults at intermediate velocities: Implications for subduction zone earthquakes: 694 Geophysical Research-Solid Earth, Iournal of v. 120, 11881, doi: p. 695 10.1002/2015JB011881.Received.

696 Overwijk, M.H.F., 1993, Novel scheme for the preparation of transmission electron microscopy 697 specimens with a focused ion beam: Journal of Vacuum Science & Technology B: 698 Microelectronics and Nanometer Structures, v. 11, no. 6, p. 2021–2024, doi: 699 10.1116/1.586537. 700 Peacor, D.R., 1992, Analytical electron microscopy, in Buseck, P.R. ed., Minerals and reactions at 701 the atomic scale: Transmission electron microscopy., Mineralogical Society of America, p. 702 113-140. 703 Rutter, E.H., Faulkner, D.R., and Burgess, R., 2012, Structure and geological history of the 704 Carboneras Fault Zone, SE Spain: Part of a stretching transform fault system: Journal of 705 Structural Geology, v. 45, p. 68–86, doi: 10.1016/j.jsg.2012.08.009. 706 Rutter, E.H., Maddock, R.H., Hall, S.H., and White, S.H., 1986, Comparative microstructures of 707 natural and experimentally produced clay-bearing fault gouges: Pure and Applied Geophysics, v. 124, no. 1-2, p. 3-30, doi: 10.1007/BF00875717. 708 709 Sakuma, H., and Suehara, S., 2015, Interlayer bonding energy of layered minerals: Implication for 710 the relationship with friction coefficient: Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, p. 711 2212–2219, doi: 10.1002/2015JB011900. 712 Sánchez-Navas, A., 1999, Sequential kinetics of a muscovite-out reaction: A natural example: 713 American Mineralogist, v. 84, no. 9, p. 1270–1286. 714 Sánchez-Navas, A., and Galindo-Zaldívar, J., 1993, Alteration and deformation microstructures of 715 biotite from plagioclase-rich dykes (Ronda Massif, S. Spain): European Journal of Mineralogy, 716 v. 5, no. 1987, p. 245–256.

717 Sánchez-Roa, C., Jiménez-Millán, J., Abad, I., Faulkner, D.R., Nieto, F., and García-Tortosa, F.J., 718 2016, Fibrous clay mineral authigenesis induced by fluid-rock interaction in the Galera fault 719 zone (Betic Cordillera, SE Spain) and its influence on fault gouge frictional properties: 720 Applied Clay Science, doi: 10.1016/j.clay.2016.06.023. 721 Sánchez-Roa, C., Faulkner, D.R., Boulton, C., Jimenez-Millan, J., Nieto, 2017, How phyllosilicate 722 mineral structure affects fault strength in Mg-rich fault systems: Geophysical Research 723 Letters, doi: 724 Schleicher, A.M., Hofmann, H., and van der Pluijm, B.A., 2013, Constraining clay hydration state 725 and its role in active fault systems: Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems, v. 14, no. 4, p. 726 1039–1052, doi: 10.1002/ggge.20077. 727 Schleicher, A.M., Van Der Pluijm, B. a., Solum, J.G., and Warr, L.N., 2006, Origin and significance 728 of clay-coated fractures in mudrock fragments of the SAFOD borehole (Parkfield, 729 California): Geophysical Research Letters, v. 33, no. 16, doi: 10.1029/2006GL026505. 730 Schleicher, A.M., van der Pluijm, B.A., and Warr, L.N., 2012, Chlorite-smectite clay minerals and 731 fault behavior: New evidence from the San Andreas Fault Observatory at Depth (SAFOD) 732 core: Lithosphere, v. 4, no. 3, p. 209–220, doi: 10.1130/L158.1. 733 Scuderi, M.M., and Collettini, C., 2016, The role of fluid pressure in induced vs. triggered 734 seismicity: insights from rock deformation experiments on carbonates.: Scientific reports, v. 735 6, no. April, p. 24852, doi: 10.1038/srep24852. 736 Sibson, R.H., White, S.H., and Atkinson, B.K., 1979, Fault rock distribution and structure within 737 the Alpine Fault Zone: a preliminary account, in The Origin of the Southern Alps, R. I. 738 Walcott and M. M. Cresswell (Editors), R. Soc. New Zealand Bull. 18, 55–65.

739 Suárez, M., and García-Romero, E., 2013, Sepiolite-palygorskite: a continuous polysomatic series. 740 Clays Clay Miner. 61, 5, 461–472. 741 Van der Pluijm, B., Lee, J., and Peacor, D.R., 1988, Analytical Electron Microscopy and the 742 Problem of Potassium Diffusion: Clays and Clay Minerals, v. 36, no. 6, p. 498–504. 743 Vázquez, M., Nieto, F., Morata, D., Droguett, B., Carrillo-Rosua, F.J., and Morales, S., 2014, 744 Evolution of clay mineral assemblages in the Tinguiririca geothermal field, Andean Cordillera 745 of central Chile: an XRD and HRTEM-AEM study: Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal 746 Research, v. 282, p. 43–59, doi: 10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2014.05.022. Veblen, D.R., and Buseck, P.R., 1981, Hydrous pyriboles and sheet silicates in pyroxenes and 747 748 uralites: intergrowth microstructures and reaction mechanisms.: American Mineralogist, v. 749 66, no. 11-12, p. 1107-1134. 750 Whitney, D.L., and Evans, B.W., 2010, Abbreviations for names of rock-forming minerals. 751 American Mineralogist, 95, 185–187.

### **Figure Captions**

752

773

753 Figure 1. Geological map of the Galera Fault, modified from García-Tortosa et al. (2011). I: 754 Sampling site by the Galera Village, Smectite- and palygorskite-rich fault gouge II: Sampling site 755 Rambla de los Pilares, Sepiolite-rich fault gouge. 756 Figure 2. BSE image showing the deformation features of the naturally deformed smectite and 757 palygorskite fault gouge, including P-foliation following the alignment of platy clay minerals, R<sub>1</sub> 758 (Riedel) shears transecting the P-foliation, and Y surfaces parallel to the shear zone. Mineral 759 abbreviations acording to Whitney and Evans (2010), Or: orthoclase, Dol: dolomite, Qz: quartz. 760 Figure 3. a. BSE image showing the deformation features of the naturally deformed sepiolite fault 761 gouge and deformation in larger grains of mica and dolomite. The red rectangle indicates the area 762 selected for FIB-SEM lamellae extraction for TEM analysis b. Secondary electron image (in-lens 763 detector) of the matrix of the rock showing the fibrous character of sepiolite. 764 Figure 4. a. BSE image of the experimentally deformed smectite and palygorskite fault gouge 765 material under wet deformation. b. Enlarged view of the R<sub>1</sub> shear and P-foliation. c. Enlarged 766 view of the P-foliation and alignment of dolomite and orthoclase grains. 767 Figure 5. a. BSE image of the experimentally deformed sepiolite fault gouge material under wet 768 deformation. Shear direction indicated with half arrows. b. Enlargement of a boudinage structure 769 on a gypsum crystal. c Enlargement of R<sub>1</sub> shear. Shear direction indicated with half arrows. d to f. 770 Enlargement of structural features in the sample. 771 Figure 6. a. BSE image of the experimentally deformed smectite and palygorskite fault gouge 772 material under dry deformation. b, c, and d. Enlargement of structural features in the sample.

The red rectangle indicates the area selected for FIB-SEM lamellae extraction for TEM analysis e.

and f. Secondary electrons image of the shear planes after deformation with horizontal striae and 774 775 polished slickenside surface. 776 Figure 7. a. BSE image of the experimentally deformed sepiolite fault gouge material under dry 777 deformation. b and c. Enlargement of structural features in the sample. The red parallelogram 778 indicates the site selected for FIB-SEM extraction for TEM analysis. d. Secondary electrons high-779 magnification image (in-lens detector) showing sepiolite crystals of the matrix **e.** and **f.** Secondary 780 electrons image of the shear planes after deformation under dry conditions. 781 Figure 8. a. TEM image showing the general texture of the naturally deformed smectite and 782 palygorskite fault rock. b. Smectite crystals coating coarse dolomite grain. c. High-resolution image 783 of smectite crystals showing broken and displaced lattice fringes. d. Smectite-rich matrix shows 784 smectite crystals with (001) spacing of 1.30 nm, and an area of unidentified phases with lattice 785 fringes spaced 2.00 to 2.30 nm. e. HR-image of the matrix of the rock showing the proximity of 786 the smectite and illite crystals. f. HR-image of crystals with discontinuous lattice fringes of variable 787 d-spacing ranging from 1.9 to 2.4 nm. Mineral abbreviations acording to Whitney and Evans 788 (2010), Ilt: illite, Dol: dolomite, Sme: smectite. 789 Figure 9. TEM images from a Cu-washer of the sepiolite fault rock. a. General fabric on the rock 790 with variable rod sizes. b. Image of the rock matrix showing the disorientation of sepiolite fibers. 791 Inset: SAED pattern on the rock matrix. Mineral abbreviations acording to Whitney and Evans 792 (2010), Sep: sepiolite. 793 Figure 10. TEM images of a FIB-lamellae sample of a sepiolite fault rock a. General view of the 794 lamellae extracted from the red rectangle shown in Fig. 3a. Small letters show the position of 795 subfigures b, d and e whitin the extracted FIB-lamellae. Arrows indicate the direction of shear. b.

Feather structure following the direction of shear. c. General texture of the naturally deformed

797 sepiolite-rich fault rock. d. and e. Feather structures. Mineral abbreviations acording to Whitney 798 and Evans (2010), Sep: sepiolite. 799 Figure 11. a. High-resolution TEM image of the sepiolite crystal lattice with close to ideal d-800 spacing 1.21 nm. Insets show the intensity profiles along crystals A and B and average d-spacing 801 results. b and c. High-resolution images of the sepiolite crystal lattice with variable d-spacing from 802 1.10 nm to 1.24 nm. Mineral abbreviations acording to Whitney and Evans (2010), Sep: sepiolite. 803 Figure 12. HR-TEM images of individual fibers in the sepiolite-rich gouge. a. Fibers with lattice 804 spacing of 1.18 nm, slightly lower to those for ideal sepiolite. b. Fiber with lattice spacings 805 corresponding with a palygorskite crystal. 806 Figure 13. a. Low magnification image of the experimentally deformed smectite and palygorskite 807 gouge exhibiting two distinctively different textures of the rock. b. Magnification of texture 1 808 showing aggregates of smectite crystals. c. Magnification of texture 2 showing disoriented 809 palygorskite fibers. Mineral abbreviations acording to Whitney and Evans (2010), Gp: gypsum, Ilt: 810 illite, Pal: palygorskite, Sme: smectite. 811 Figure 14. a. TEM image and general view of the lamellae extracted from the red rectangle shown 812 in Fig. 7c b. Magnification of texture 1 showing aggregates of smectite crystals. inset. SAED 813 patterns of texture 1. c. Magnification of texture 2 showing disoriented palygorskite fibers. inset. 814 SAED patterns of texture 2. Mineral abbreviations acording to Whitney and Evans (2010), Pal: 815 palygorskite, Sme: smectite. 816 Figure 15. a. Low magnification TEM image showing the general texture of the sepiolite fault 817 gouge under wet deformation and kinked sepiolite laths b. TEM image on the feather-like 818 structures that form the matrix after deformation c. HR-TEM image of sepiolite crystals in the 819 sepiolite fault gouge material under wet deformation. Mineral abbreviations acording to Whitney 820 and Evans (2010), Sep: sepiolite.

Figure 16. Variability in the octahedral cation content of the sepiolites, palygorskites and smectites
of the study and their chemical classification according to Suárez and García-Romero (2013). Ideal
octahedral cation oxide content for sepiolite and palygorskite are plotted according to García-
Romero and Suárez (2010).
<b>Figure 17.</b> Ternary plot of major octahedral cations in smectite crystals from the fault rock in blue,
lutitic wall rock in red and marly wall rock in green. Yellow and light-blue squares correspond to
smectite crystals from the fault plane analysed after homoionization with K and Ca respectevly.
Figure 18. a. Sepiolite crystal and selected areas for microanalysis b. TEM-AEM analysis of three
selected areas of sepiolite crystal.
Figure 19. Permeability measurements on the two gouges with increasing confining pressure on
a triaxial deformation apparatus.

# Supplementary Material

Supplementary Table 1. Structural formulas calculated from AEM data for smectites normalized to  $O_{10}(OH)_2$ . All Fe as Fe<sup>3+</sup> and  $^{IV}Al = (4 - Si)$ .

		Sample						Formula					
		0 ap.ro	Si	AllV .	AlVI	Fe	Mg (oct)		Ca	K	Na	Mg (inter)	∑ inter.
		1 GP-3-1	3.890	0.110	0.752	0.563	0.685	2.000	0.000	0.299	0.000	0.248	0.547
		2 GP-3-3	3.913	0.087	0.918	0.529	0.553	2.000	0.000	0.264	0.000	0.187	0.452
		3 GP-3-4 4 GP-3-5	3.844 3.896	0.156 0.104	1.225 1.374	0.384 0.278	0.391 0.348	2.000 2.000	0.017 0.035	0.384 0.313	0.000	0.064 0.035	0.465 0.383
		4 GP-3-5 5 GP-3-6	3.757	0.104	1.409	0.278	0.348	2.000	0.033	0.313	0.000	0.033	0.363
		6 GP-3-7	3.786	0.214	1.391	0.331	0.278	2.000	0.052	0.314	0.000	0.036	0.403
		7 GP-3-8	3.956	0.044	1.240	0.295	0.465	2.000	0.104	0.260	0.000	0.021	0.385
		8 GP-3-9	3.806	0.194	1.092	0.539	0.370	2.000	0.000	0.156	0.000	0.204	0.360
		9 GP-3-10	3.783	0.217	1.038	0.540	0.422	2.000	0.087	0.192	0.000	0.136	0.415
		10 GP-3-11	3.876	0.124	1.011	0.541	0.419	1.971	0.157	0.314	0.000	0.000	0.471
		11 GP-3-12 12 GP-3-13	3.865	0.135 0.016	1.159	0.385 0.398	0.000 0.422	1.544 2.000	0.192 0.069	0.420 0.139	0.000	0.000	0.612 0.288
		12 GP-3-13 13 GP-3-14	3.984 3.716	0.284	1.180 1.329	0.398	0.422	2.000	0.053	0.139	0.000	0.080 0.118	0.504
		14 GP-3-15	3.708	0.292	1.113	0.492	0.395	2.000	0.053	0.457	0.000	0.062	0.572
		15 GP-3-16	3.728	0.272	1.260	0.401	0.339	2.000	0.070	0.279	0.000	0.097	0.445
		16 GP-3-17	3.780	0.220	1.181	0.473	0.347	2.000	0.035	0.385	0.000	0.056	0.476
		17 GP-3-18	3.869	0.131	1.118	0.503	0.379	2.000	0.000	0.260	0.000	0.125	0.385
		18 GP-3-19	3.997	0.003	1.057	0.365	0.578	2.000	0.035	0.174	0.000	0.169	0.378
		19 GP-3-20	3.754	0.246	1.256	0.419	0.325	2.000	0.017	0.384	0.000	0.076	0.478
		20 GP-3-21 21 GP-3-22	3.874 4.005	0.126 0.000	1.049 1.214	0.491 0.312	0.461 0.474	2.000 2.000	0.000	0.456 0.191	0.000	0.065 0.132	0.521 0.323
	ge	21 GP-3-22 22 GP-3-23	3.841	0.159	1.133	0.402	0.474	2.000	0.122	0.191	0.000	0.132	0.323
	Sol	23 GP-3-24	3.755	0.245	1.095	0.511	0.388	1.994	0.071	0.511	0.000	0.000	0.582
	Fault gouge	24 GP-3-25	3.830	0.170	1.124	0.455	0.421	2.000	0.052	0.280	0.000	0.103	0.436
	-au	25 GP-3-26	3.673	0.327	1.307	0.334	0.359	2.000	0.070	0.387	0.000	0.080	0.537
		26 GP-3-1	3.904	0.096	1.153	0.416	0.431	2.000	0.069	0.208	0.000	0.090	0.368
		27 GP-3-2	3.860	0.140	1.088	0.421	0.491	2.000	0.070	0.491	0.000	0.000	0.561
		28 GP-3-3	3.880	0.120	0.989	0.589	0.422	2.000	0.000	0.139	0.000	0.202	0.340
		29 GP-3-4	4.071	0.000	0.699	0.437	0.864	2.000	0.000	0.175	0.000	0.202	0.376
		30 GP-3-5 31 GP-3-6	3.841 3.606	0.159 0.394	1.221 1.452	0.279 0.261	0.500 0.287	2.000 2.000	0.000 0.035	0.192 0.279	0.000	0.233 0.166	0.425 0.480
		32 GP-3-7	4.033	0.000	1.004	0.589	0.398	1.991	0.000	0.273	0.000	0.000	0.480
		33 GP-3-8	3.759	0.241	1.187	0.400	0.413	2.000	0.000	0.191	0.000	0.231	0.422
		34 GP-3-9	3.724	0.276	1.595	0.225	0.180	2.000	0.052	0.191	0.000	0.080	0.323
		35 GP-3-10	3.979	0.021	1.283	0.191	0.526	2.000	0.000	0.174	0.000	0.186	0.360
		36 GP-3-1	3.783	0.217	1.317	0.331	0.352	2.000	0.035	0.331	0.000	0.084	0.450
		37 GP-3-2	3.534	0.466	1.390	0.247	0.000	1.637	0.247	0.495	0.000	0.000	0.742
		38 GP-3-3 39 GP-3-4	3.722	0.278 0.299	1.242 1.509	0.454	0.303	2.000 2.000	0.035 0.017	0.315	0.000	0.098 0.180	0.448
		39 GP-3-4 40 GP-3-5	3.701 3.834	0.299	1.344	0.362 0.278	0.130 0.379	2.000	0.000	0.034 0.156	0.000	0.180	0.232 0.350
SS		41 GP-3-6	3.690	0.310	1.386	0.367	0.246	2.000	0.000	0.455	0.000	0.051	0.506
g		42 GP-3-7	3.751	0.249	1.077	0.576	0.347	2.000	0.000	0.244	0.000	0.176	0.420
am		43 GP-3-8	3.919	0.081	1.201	0.369	0.404	1.974	0.000	0.562	0.000	0.000	0.562
d s		44 GP-3-9	3.919	0.081	1.121	0.435	0.443	2.000	0.000	0.366	0.000	0.079	0.445
ate		45 GP-3-10	3.847	0.153	1.204	0.383	0.413	2.000	0.000	0.278	0.000	0.144	0.422
re		46 GP-3-11	3.861	0.139	1.339	0.296	0.365	2.000	0.035	0.330	0.000	0.052	0.417
Untreated samples		47 GP-12-1 48 GP-12-2	3.931 3.670	0.069 0.330	0.845 0.945	0.776 0.681	0.379 0.373	2.000 2.000	0.017 0.000	0.103 0.262	0.000	0.155 0.221	0.276 0.483
-		49 GP-12-3	3.699	0.301	1.154	0.508	0.338	2.000	0.035	0.438	0.000	0.065	0.539
		50 GP-12-4	3.652	0.348	1.470	0.346	0.184	2.000	0.017	0.104	0.000	0.197	0.318
		51 GP-12-5	4.016	0.000	1.339	0.343	0.318	2.000	0.000	0.103	0.000	0.076	0.179
		52 GP-12-6	4.005	0.000	1.238	0.447	0.316	2.000	0.017	0.069	0.000	0.097	0.183
	Lutites	53 GP-12-7	4.009	0.000	1.106	0.449	0.445	2.000	0.000	0.121	0.000	0.143	0.264
		54 GP-12-8	4.003	0.000	0.853	0.453	0.661	1.967	0.331	0.087	0.000	0.000	0.418
1		55 GP-12-9	3.981	0.019	1.371	0.395	0.234	2.000	0.000	0.069	0.000	0.092	0.161
1		56 GP-12-10 57 GP12-2	3.748 3.924	0.252 0.076	1.205 0.792	0.468 0.799	0.326 0.409	2.000 2.000	0.000	0.121 0.226	0.000	0.229 0.129	0.350 0.355
1		57 GP12-2 58 GP12-3	3.488	0.512	1.578	0.799	0.409	2.000	0.000	0.226	0.000	0.129	0.333
		59 GP12-4	3.806	0.194	0.935	0.712	0.352	2.000	0.000	0.139	0.000	0.204	0.343
1		60 GP12-5	3.879	0.121	1.259	0.552	0.190	2.000	0.000	0.172	0.000	0.069	0.241
1		61 GP12-6	3.941	0.059	1.055	0.720	0.226	2.000	0.000	0.051	0.000	0.117	0.168
		62 GP12-7	3.809	0.191	0.939	0.748	0.313	2.000	0.017	0.191	0.000	0.139	0.348
1		63 GP12-8	3.826	0.174	0.835	0.730	0.435	2.000	0.000	0.122	0.000	0.243	0.365
1		64 GP12-9	3.618	0.382	1.574	0.329	0.098	2.000	0.035	0.087	0.000	0.162	0.283
1		65 GP12-10	4.031	0.000	1.223	0.431	0.346	2.000	0.000	0.155	0.000	0.033	0.188

Fig.														
											0.349			
Fig.				3.644			0.226							
TO GP1-6 3.767 0.233 1.306 0.467 0.228 2.000 0.000 0.156 0.000 0.152 0.308 71 GP1-7 3.775 0.225 1.092 0.527 0.334 1.952 0.105 0.492 0.000 0.000 0.097 0.388 3.759 0.241 1.500 0.278 0.222 2.000 0.000 0.313 0.000 0.074 0.388 73 GP1-9 3.946 0.054 1.331 0.363 0.305 2.000 0.000 0.208 0.000 0.076 0.283 73 GP1-9 3.946 0.054 1.331 0.363 0.305 2.000 0.000 0.208 0.000 0.076 0.283 74 GP1-10 3.756 0.244 1.452 0.329 0.219 2.000 0.035 0.208 0.000 0.093 0.335 76 GP1-13 3.653 0.377 1.058 0.613 0.329 2.000 0.069 0.278 0.000 0.025 0.373 76 GP1-14 3.980 0.020 1.272 0.431 0.298 2.000 0.069 0.278 0.000 0.023 0.551 77 GP1-14 3.980 0.020 1.272 0.431 0.298 2.000 0.069 0.086 0.000 0.047 0.202 78 GP1-15 3.582 0.418 1.004 0.650 0.346 2.000 0.140 0.334 0.000 0.075 0.549 79 GP1-16 3.990 0.010 1.216 0.403 0.368 1.986 0.088 0.245 0.140 0.000 0.473 82 GP1-17 3.849 0.151 1.218 0.416 0.366 2.000 0.052 0.243 0.000 0.025 0.432 82 GP1-19 3.716 0.284 1.296 0.417 0.287 2.000 0.104 0.313 0.000 0.025 0.442 83 GP1-20 3.672 0.328 1.309 0.383 0.309 2.000 0.104 0.174 0.000 0.127 0.405 84 GP1-17 3.849 0.151 1.218 0.329 0.323 2.000 0.069 0.121 0.000 0.127 0.405 85 GP1-23 3.762 0.328 1.309 0.383 0.309 2.000 0.104 0.174 0.000 0.127 0.405 85 GP1-24 3.867 0.313 1.102 0.629 0.175 1.906 0.210 0.349 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.559 88 GP1-24 3.867 0.313 1.102 0.629 0.175 1.906 0.210 0.349 0.000 0.000 0.559 92 GP3-3 3.564 0.336 1.080 0.389 0.531 2.000 0.159 0.549 0.000 0.000 0.559 92 GP3-3 3.564 0.336 1.080 0.389 0.531 2.000 0.159 0.549 0.000 0.000 0.559 92 GP3-3 3.564 0.336 1.080 0.389 0.531 2.000 0.159 0.549 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.559 92 GP3-3 3.863 0.137 1.145 0.537 0.346 0.228 0.104 0.191 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.559 92 GP3-3 3.866 0.336 1.325 0.419 0.297 2.041 0.140 0.262 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.559 92 GP3-3 3.866 0.194 1.196 0.539 0.243 1.998 0.053 0.779 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.365 1.000 0.996 0.996 0.996 0.900 0.900 0.900 0.900 0.365 1.000 0.996 0.996 0.900 0.900 0.900 0.900 0.365 1.000 0.996 0.900 0.900 0.900 0.900 0.900 0.900 0.900 0.900 0.900 0.900 0.900 0.900 0.900 0.900 0.900 0.														
TI GP1-7 3.775 0.225 1.092 0.527 0.334 1.952 0.105 0.492 0.000 0.000 0.597 72 GP1-8 3.755 0.241 1.500 0.278 0.222 2.000 0.000 0.0313 0.000 0.074 0.388 73 GP1-9 3.946 0.054 1.331 0.363 0.305 2.000 0.000 0.313 0.000 0.076 0.288 0.000 7.75 GP1-10 3.756 0.244 1.452 0.329 0.219 2.000 0.035 0.208 0.000 0.093 0.335 75 GP1-12 3.855 0.145 1.244 0.434 0.322 2.000 0.069 0.278 0.000 0.025 0.373 0.375 0.569 1.276 GP1-13 3.653 0.377 1.058 0.613 0.329 2.000 0.1023 0.455 0.000 0.003 0.581 77 GP1-14 3.980 0.020 1.272 0.431 0.298 2.000 0.102 0.400 0.334 0.000 0.075 0.549 79 GP1-15 3.582 0.418 1.004 0.650 0.346 2.000 0.104 0.334 0.000 0.075 0.549 79 GP1-15 3.582 0.418 1.004 0.650 0.346 2.000 0.052 0.243 0.000 0.085 0.380 80 GP1-17 3.849 0.151 1.218 0.416 0.366 2.000 0.052 0.243 0.000 0.085 0.380 81 GP1-18 3.834 0.166 1.319 0.363 0.319 2.000 0.138 0.155 0.000 0.027 0.320 82 GP1-19 3.716 0.284 1.296 0.417 0.287 2.000 0.104 0.134 0.000 0.027 0.320 83 GP1-20 3.672 0.328 1.309 0.338 0.309 2.000 0.104 0.174 0.000 0.127 0.405 84 GP1-12 3.843 0.157 1.349 0.329 0.323 2.000 0.069 0.121 0.000 0.110 0.301 85 GP1-22 3.774 0.226 1.235 0.452 0.313 2.000 0.069 0.121 0.000 0.102 0.362 87 GP1-24 3.867 0.338 1.305 0.399 0.296 0.000 0.069 0.191 0.000 0.102 0.362 88 GP1-25 3.640 0.360 1.251 0.420 0.280 1.951 0.228 0.333 0.000 0.000 0.559 90 GP3-19 3.522 0.478 1.239 0.336 0.460 2.035 0.177 0.478 0.000 0.000 0.559 93 GP3-19 3.522 0.478 1.239 0.336 0.460 2.035 0.177 0.478 0.000 0.000 0.556 93 GP3-19 3.522 0.478 1.239 0.336 0.460 2.035 0.177 0.478 0.000 0.000 0.556 93 GP3-19 3.522 0.478 1.239 0.336 0.440 0.597 2.005 0.316 0.228 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.556 93 GP3-19 3.522 0.478 1.239 0.336 0.460 2.035 0.177 0.478 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.556 93 GP3-19 3.522 0.478 1.239 0.336 0.460 2.035 0.177 0.478 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.556 93 GP3-19 3.522 0.478 1.239 0.336 0.460 2.035 0.177 0.478 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.556 93 GP3-19 3.522 0.478 1.239 0.336 0.450 0.000 0.000 0.559 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.00				3.550										
Page			70 GP1-6	3.767	0.233	1.306	0.467	0.228	2.000	0.000	0.156	0.000	0.152	0.308
Page   1.0   3.946   0.054   1.331   0.363   0.305   2.000   0.000   0.208   0.000   0.076   0.283   74   GP1-10   3.756   0.244   1.452   0.329   0.219   2.000   0.035   0.208   0.000   0.093   0.335   75   GP1-12   3.855   0.145   1.244   0.434   0.322   2.000   0.069   0.278   0.000   0.093   0.335   76   GP1-13   3.623   0.377   1.058   0.613   0.329   2.000   0.069   0.278   0.000   0.003   0.581   77   GP1-14   3.980   0.020   1.272   0.431   0.298   2.000   0.069   0.086   0.000   0.047   0.202   0.78   GP1-15   3.582   0.418   1.004   0.650   0.346   2.000   0.140   0.334   0.000   0.075   0.549   0.006   0.000   0.473   0.000   0.473   0.000   0.473   0.000   0.473   0.000   0.473   0.000   0.473   0.000   0.473   0.000   0.473   0.000   0.473   0.000   0.473   0.000   0.473   0.000   0.473   0.000   0.075   0.549   0.000			71 GP1-7	3.775	0.225	1.092	0.527	0.334	1.952		0.492	0.000	0.000	0.597
THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY O			72 GP1-8	3.759	0.241	1.500	0.278	0.222	2.000	0.000	0.313	0.000	0.074	0.388
TO GP1-12   3.855   0.145   1.244   0.434   0.322   2.000   0.069   0.278   0.000   0.025   0.373   0.006   0.006   0.007   0.			73 GP1-9	3.946	0.054	1.331	0.363	0.305	2.000	0.000	0.208	0.000	0.076	0.283
Page				3.756	0.244	1.452	0.329		2.000		0.208	0.000		
79 GP1-16			75 GP1-12	3.855	0.145	1.244	0.434	0.322	2.000	0.069	0.278	0.000	0.025	0.373
79 GP1-16		- <del>N</del>	76 GP1-13	3.623	0.377	1.058	0.613	0.329	2.000	0.123	0.455	0.000	0.003	0.581
79 GP1-16		ق ا	77 GP1-14	3.980	0.020	1.272	0.431	0.298	2.000	0.069	0.086	0.000	0.047	0.202
No.   September		2	78 GP1-15	3.582	0.418	1.004	0.650	0.346	2.000	0.140	0.334	0.000	0.075	0.549
No.   Section			79 GP1-16	3.990	0.010	1.216	0.403	0.368	1.986	0.088	0.245	0.140	0.000	0.473
R2 GP1-19			80 GP1-17	3.849	0.151	1.218	0.416	0.366	2.000	0.052	0.243	0.000	0.085	0.380
R3 GP1-20   3.672   0.328   1.309   0.383   0.309   2.000   0.104   0.174   0.000   0.127   0.405			81 GP1-18	3.834	0.166	1.319	0.363	0.319	2.000	0.138	0.155	0.000	0.027	0.320
R4 GP1-21   3.843   0.157   1.349   0.329   0.323   2.000   0.069   0.121   0.000   0.110   0.301			82 GP1-19	3.716	0.284	1.296	0.417	0.287	2.000	0.104	0.313	0.000	0.025	0.442
R5 GP1-22   3.774   0.226   1.235   0.452   0.313   2.000   0.104   0.296   0.000   0.017   0.417     R6 GP1-23   3.762   0.238   1.305   0.399   0.296   2.000   0.069   0.191   0.000   0.102   0.362     R7 GP1-24   3.687   0.313   1.102   0.629   0.175   1.906   0.210   0.349   0.000   0.000   0.559     R8 GP1-25   3.640   0.360   1.251   0.420   0.280   1.951   0.228   0.333   0.000   0.000   0.559     R8 GP3-11   3.722   0.278   0.864   0.544   0.597   2.005   0.316   0.228   0.000   0.000   0.544     90 GP3-19   3.522   0.478   1.239   0.336   0.460   2.035   0.177   0.478   0.000   0.000   0.655     91 GP-3-2   3.579   0.421   1.298   0.368   0.333   2.000   0.158   0.439   0.000   0.000   0.596     92 GP-3-3   3.664   0.336   1.080   0.389   0.531   2.000   0.159   0.549   0.000   0.000   0.708     93 GP-3-4   3.890   0.110   1.157   0.451   0.417   2.025   0.087   0.278   0.000   0.000   0.365     94 GP-3-6   3.863   0.137   1.145   0.537   0.346   2.028   0.104   0.191   0.000   0.000   0.365     95 GP-3-7   3.397   0.603   1.584   0.196   0.213   1.994   0.053   0.729   0.000   0.000   0.783     96 GP-3-10   3.632   0.368   1.325   0.419   0.297   2.041   0.140   0.262   0.000   0.000   0.383     96 GP-3-15   3.806   0.194   1.196   0.539   0.243   1.978   0.087   0.330   0.000   0.000   0.341     100 GP-3-20   3.783   0.217   1.265   0.366   0.349   1.979   0.157   0.314   0.000   0.000   0.471     101 GP-3-21   3.849   0.151   1.184   0.624   0.225   2.033   0.035   0.208   0.000   0.000   0.243     102 GP-3-22   3.711   0.289   1.469   0.211   0.299   1.979   0.106   0.440   0.000   0.000   0.545     0.316			83 GP1-20	3.672	0.328	1.309	0.383	0.309	2.000	0.104	0.174	0.000	0.127	0.405
R6 GP1-23   3.762   0.238   1.305   0.399   0.296   2.000   0.069   0.191   0.000   0.102   0.362			84 GP1-21	3.843	0.157	1.349	0.329	0.323	2.000	0.069	0.121	0.000	0.110	0.301
87 GP1-24			85 GP1-22	3.774	0.226	1.235	0.452	0.313	2.000	0.104	0.296	0.000	0.017	0.417
88 GP1-25			86 GP1-23	3.762	0.238	1.305	0.399	0.296	2.000	0.069	0.191	0.000	0.102	0.362
89 GP3-11 3.722 0.278 0.864 0.544 0.597 2.005 0.316 0.228 0.000 0.000 0.544 0.597 9.005 0.316 0.228 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.544 0.597 9.005 0.316 0.228 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.545 0.400 0.000 0.000 0.655 0.400 0.000 0.000 0.555 0.400 0.000 0.000 0.596 0.200 0.000 0.000 0.596 0.200 0.			87 GP1-24	3.687	0.313	1.102	0.629	0.175	1.906	0.210	0.349	0.000	0.000	0.559
90 GP3-19 3.522 0.478 1.239 0.336 0.460 2.035 0.177 0.478 0.000 0.000 0.655 91 GP 3-2 3.579 0.421 1.298 0.368 0.333 2.000 0.158 0.439 0.000 0.000 0.596 92 GP 3-3 3.664 0.336 1.080 0.389 0.531 2.000 0.159 0.549 0.000 0.000 0.708 93 GP 3-4 3.890 0.110 1.157 0.451 0.417 2.025 0.087 0.278 0.000 0.000 0.365 95 GP 3-7 3.397 0.603 1.584 0.196 0.213 1.994 0.053 0.729 0.000 0.000 0.783 96 GP 3-10 3.632 0.368 1.325 0.419 0.297 2.041 0.140 0.262 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.402 97 GP 3-11 3.843 0.157 1.113 0.522 0.348 1.983 0.174 0.209 0.000 0.000 0.383 98 GP 3-15 3.806 0.194 1.196 0.539 0.243 1.978 0.087 0.330 0.000 0.000 0.417 1.06 0.97-20 3.783 0.217 1.265 0.366 0.349 1.979 0.157 0.314 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.471 1.01 GP 3-21 3.849 0.151 1.184 0.624 0.225 2.033 0.035 0.208 0.000 0.000 0.243 1.02 GP 3-22 3.711 0.289 1.469 0.211 0.299 1.979 0.106 0.440 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.545			88 GP1-25	3.640	0.360	1.251	0.420	0.280	1.951	0.228	0.333	0.000	0.000	0.560
90 693-19 3.522 0.478 1.239 0.336 0.400 2.035 0.177 0.478 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.596 92 69-3-3 3.664 0.336 1.080 0.389 0.531 2.000 0.159 0.549 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.708 93 69-3-4 3.890 0.110 1.157 0.451 0.417 2.025 0.087 0.278 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.365 94 69-3-6 3.863 0.137 1.145 0.537 0.346 2.028 0.104 0.191 0.000 0.000 0.294 95 69-3-7 3.397 0.603 1.584 0.196 0.213 1.994 0.053 0.729 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.294 96 69-3-10 3.632 0.368 1.325 0.419 0.297 2.041 0.140 0.262 0.000 0.000 0.402 97 69-3-11 3.843 0.157 1.113 0.522 0.348 1.983 0.174 0.209 0.000 0.000 0.383 98 69-3-15 3.806 0.194 1.196 0.539 0.243 1.978 0.087 0.330 0.000 0.000 0.417 99 69-3-16 3.745 0.255 1.548 0.210 0.315 2.073 0.000 0.350 0.000 0.000 0.350 100 69-3-21 3.849 0.151 1.184 0.624 0.225 2.033 0.355 0.208 0.000 0.000 0.243 101 69-3-21 3.849 0.151 1.184 0.624 0.225 2.033 0.355 0.208 0.000 0.000 0.243 102 69-3-22 3.711 0.289 1.469 0.211 0.299 1.979 0.106 0.440 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.545		а	89 GP3-11	3.722	0.278	0.864	0.544	0.597	2.005	0.316	0.228	0.000	0.000	0.544
92 GP-3-3 3.664 0.336 1.080 0.389 0.531 2.000 0.159 0.549 0.000 0.000 0.708 3.890 GP-3-4 3.890 0.110 1.157 0.451 0.417 2.025 0.087 0.278 0.000 0.000 0.365 94 GP-3-6 3.863 0.137 1.145 0.537 0.346 2.028 0.104 0.191 0.000 0.000 0.294 95 GP-3-7 3.397 0.603 1.584 0.196 0.213 1.994 0.053 0.729 0.000 0.000 0.783 96 GP-3-10 3.632 0.368 1.325 0.419 0.297 2.041 0.140 0.262 0.000 0.000 0.402 97 GP-3-11 3.843 0.157 1.113 0.522 0.348 1.983 0.174 0.209 0.000 0.000 0.383 98 GP-3-15 3.806 0.194 1.196 0.539 0.243 1.978 0.087 0.330 0.000 0.000 0.417 99 GP-3-16 3.745 0.255 1.548 0.210 0.315 2.073 0.000 0.350 0.000 0.000 0.355 100 GP-3-20 3.783 0.217 1.265 0.366 0.349 1.979 0.157 0.314 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.471 101 GP-3-21 3.849 0.151 1.184 0.624 0.225 2.033 0.355 0.208 0.000 0.000 0.243 102 GP-3-22 3.711 0.289 1.469 0.211 0.299 1.979 0.106 0.440 0.000 0.000 0.505		O	90 GP3-19	3.522	0.478	1.239	0.336	0.460	2.035	0.177	0.478	0.000	0.000	0.655
PROPERTY OF STATE OF			91 GP·3-2	3.579	0.421	1.298	0.368	0.333	2.000	0.158	0.439	0.000	0.000	0.596
94 GP-3-6   3.863   0.137   1.145   0.537   0.346   2.028   0.104   0.191   0.000   0.000   0.294   95 GP-3-7   3.397   0.603   1.584   0.196   0.213   1.994   0.053   0.729   0.000   0.000   0.783   96 GP-3-10   3.632   0.368   1.325   0.419   0.297   2.041   0.140   0.262   0.000   0.000   0.402   97 GP-3-11   3.843   0.157   1.113   0.522   0.348   1.983   0.174   0.209   0.000   0.000   0.383   98 GP-3-15   3.806   0.194   1.196   0.539   0.243   1.978   0.087   0.330   0.000   0.000   0.417   99 GP-3-16   3.745   0.255   1.548   0.210   0.315   2.073   0.000   0.350   0.000   0.000   0.350   100 GP-3-20   3.783   0.217   1.265   0.366   0.349   1.979   0.157   0.314   0.000   0.000   0.471   101 GP-3-21   3.849   0.151   1.184   0.624   0.225   2.033   0.035   0.208   0.000   0.000   0.243   102 GP-3-22   3.711   0.289   1.469   0.211   0.299   1.979   0.106   0.440   0.000   0.000   0.545			92 GP·3-3	3.664	0.336	1.080	0.389	0.531	2.000	0.159	0.549	0.000	0.000	0.708
99 GP-3-16 3.745 0.255 1.548 0.210 0.315 2.073 0.000 0.350 0.000 0.000 0.350 100 GP-3-20 3.783 0.217 1.265 0.366 0.349 1.979 0.157 0.314 0.000 0.000 0.471 101 GP-3-21 3.849 0.151 1.184 0.624 0.225 2.033 0.035 0.208 0.000 0.000 0.243 102 GP-3-22 3.711 0.289 1.469 0.211 0.299 1.979 0.106 0.440 0.000 0.000 0.545	I		93 GP·3-4	3.890	0.110	1.157	0.451	0.417	2.025	0.087	0.278	0.000	0.000	0.365
99 GP-3-16 3.745 0.255 1.548 0.210 0.315 2.073 0.000 0.350 0.000 0.000 0.350 100 GP-3-20 3.783 0.217 1.265 0.366 0.349 1.979 0.157 0.314 0.000 0.000 0.471 101 GP-3-21 3.849 0.151 1.184 0.624 0.225 2.033 0.035 0.208 0.000 0.000 0.243 102 GP-3-22 3.711 0.289 1.469 0.211 0.299 1.979 0.106 0.440 0.000 0.000 0.545	ě		94 GP·3-6	3.863	0.137	1.145	0.537	0.346	2.028	0.104	0.191	0.000	0.000	0.294
99 GP-3-16 3.745 0.255 1.548 0.210 0.315 2.073 0.000 0.350 0.000 0.000 0.350 100 GP-3-20 3.783 0.217 1.265 0.366 0.349 1.979 0.157 0.314 0.000 0.000 0.471 101 GP-3-21 3.849 0.151 1.184 0.624 0.225 2.033 0.035 0.208 0.000 0.000 0.243 102 GP-3-22 3.711 0.289 1.469 0.211 0.299 1.979 0.106 0.440 0.000 0.000 0.545	ij		95 GP·3-7	3.397	0.603	1.584	0.196	0.213	1.994	0.053	0.729	0.000	0.000	0.783
99 GP-3-16 3.745 0.255 1.548 0.210 0.315 2.073 0.000 0.350 0.000 0.000 0.350 100 GP-3-20 3.783 0.217 1.265 0.366 0.349 1.979 0.157 0.314 0.000 0.000 0.471 101 GP-3-21 3.849 0.151 1.184 0.624 0.225 2.033 0.035 0.208 0.000 0.000 0.243 102 GP-3-22 3.711 0.289 1.469 0.211 0.299 1.979 0.106 0.440 0.000 0.000 0.545	1.8	×	96 GP·3-10	3.632	0.368	1.325	0.419	0.297	2.041	0.140	0.262	0.000	0.000	0.402
99 GP-3-16 3.745 0.255 1.548 0.210 0.315 2.073 0.000 0.350 0.000 0.000 0.350 100 GP-3-20 3.783 0.217 1.265 0.366 0.349 1.979 0.157 0.314 0.000 0.000 0.471 101 GP-3-21 3.849 0.151 1.184 0.624 0.225 2.033 0.035 0.208 0.000 0.000 0.243 102 GP-3-22 3.711 0.289 1.469 0.211 0.299 1.979 0.106 0.440 0.000 0.000 0.545	ΙĔ		97 GP·3-11	3.843	0.157	1.113	0.522	0.348	1.983	0.174	0.209	0.000	0.000	0.383
99 GP-3-16 3.745 0.255 1.548 0.210 0.315 2.073 0.000 0.350 0.000 0.000 0.350 100 GP-3-20 3.783 0.217 1.265 0.366 0.349 1.979 0.157 0.314 0.000 0.000 0.471 101 GP-3-21 3.849 0.151 1.184 0.624 0.225 2.033 0.035 0.208 0.000 0.000 0.243 102 GP-3-22 3.711 0.289 1.469 0.211 0.299 1.979 0.106 0.440 0.000 0.000 0.545	우		98 GP·3-15	3.806	0.194	1.196	0.539	0.243	1.978	0.087	0.330	0.000	0.000	0.417
101 GP-3-21 3.849 0.151 1.184 0.624 0.225 2.033 0.035 0.208 0.000 0.000 0.243 102 GP-3-22 3.711 0.289 1.469 0.211 0.299 1.979 0.106 0.440 0.000 0.000 0.545	1		99 GP·3-16	3.745	0.255	1.548	0.210	0.315	2.073	0.000	0.350	0.000	0.000	0.350
102 GP·3-22 3.711 0.289 1.469 0.211 0.299 1.979 0.106 0.440 0.000 0.000 0.545			100 GP·3-20	3.783	0.217	1.265	0.366	0.349	1.979	0.157	0.314	0.000	0.000	0.471
			101 GP·3-21	3.849	0.151	1.184	0.624	0.225	2.033	0.035	0.208	0.000	0.000	0.243
103 GP:3-25 3.696 0.304 1.360 0.368 0.228 1.955 0.123 0.420 0.000 0.000 0.543			102 GP·3-22	3.711	0.289	1.469	0.211	0.299	1.979	0.106	0.440	0.000	0.000	0.545
			103 GP·3-25	3.696	0.304	1.360	0.368	0.228	1.955	0.123	0.420	0.000	0.000	0.543

**Supplementary Figure 1:** Diffractograms of air-dried oriented aggregates of the <2 μm fraction, for: a. The smectite- and palygorskite-rich fault gouge from Galera Village. and b. The sepiolite-rich gouge from the Rambla de los Pilares sector. Mineral abbreviations for clay minerals according to Bergaya et al. (2006), Kaol: kaolinite, K-Mica: white mica (including illite and muscovite), Sep: sepiolite, Sm: smectite, Pal: palygorskite. Non-clay minerals according to Whitney and Evans (2010), Chl: chlorite, Dol: dolomite, Pg: paragonite, Qz: quartz. The diffractogramswere obtained in a PANalytical X'Pert Pro diffractometer (CuKα radiation, 45 kV, 40 mA) equipped with an X'Celerator solid-state linear detector, using a step increment of 0.008° 2θ and a counting time of 10 s/step (Department of Mineralogy and Petrology, University of Granada).

