

Solid Earth Discuss., referee comment RC3  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2021-100-RC3>, 2021  
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

## Reply on AC4

Anonymous Referee #2

---

Referee comment on "De-risking the energy transition by quantifying the uncertainties in fault stability" by David Healy and Stephen Paul Hicks, Solid Earth Discuss.,  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2021-100-RC3>, 2021

---

Dear authors,

I read the answers to my comments, and I have to say that I really hope that the Editor and all the SE readers will find the whole paper "well written, carefully explained and thoughtful". I still think that some parts should be improved, however I just reported my suggestions hoping to help.

In any case, I would like just to comment on the answer regarding  $T_s$  dependence on fluids.

The answer was:

We strongly disagree. Pore fluid pressure plays no part in the formal definition of slip tendency ( $T_s$ ) – see Morris et al., 1996[...].

In the Morris et al paper  $T_s$  is defined by  $\tau/\sigma$ .  $\sigma$  are, generally speaking, the principal stresses that might be interpreted as fluid pressure independent because effective stresses are not mentioned. However, in the same paper, Morris et al., 1996 calculated the  $T_s$  for the Yucca Mountain area and, while setting the input  $\sigma$ , the literally write:

[...] to a depth of 5 km and assuming an average rock density of 2.7 g/cm<sup>3</sup>,  $s_1 = 133$  MPa,  $s_2 = 58-108$  MPa, and  $s_3 = 63-72$  MPa. Assuming a water-table depth of 600 m (Stock et al., 1985), and interconnecting permeability hydrostatic pressure at 5 km will be 43 MPa. Thus, effective principal stresses would be:  $s_1 = \text{vertical} = 90$  MPa,  $s_2 = \text{N258E-N308E} = 45-65$  MPa (50%-72% of  $s_1$ ), and  $s_3 = \text{N608W-N658W} = 20-29$  MPa (22%-32% of  $s_1$ ), at 5 km beneath Yucca Mountain.

Please note that the effective stresses are those used by Morris et al., in their calculation of  $T_s$  (Figure 3). This is also confirmed by Lisle and Srivastava, 2004 that literally write: "If pore-fluid pressures are involved, then the stresses should be considered effective stresses."

If effective stresses should be used,  $T_s$  would change with changing Pf, also because  $\tau$  is Pore-pressure independent. I would say, thus, that I "strongly" believe that  $T_s$  does depend on Pf.

What can be independent from Pf is the  $T_s/T_{smax}$  ratio (defined as "T's" by Lisle and Srivastava, 2004). However,  $T_s$  and not T's is investigated in the present paper by Healy and Hicks.