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Abstract

This project is a combination of two studies: The first is a paleomagnetic, rock magnetic and compaction study of the Cretaceous Pigeon Point Formation from northern California which was conducted to determine whether its anomalously shallow inclinations (Champion et al., 1984) are due either to 2500 km of northward displacement or compaction shallowing. The second is a test of the Jackson et al. (1991) model for correcting inclination shallowing using two sets of samples from New Mexico’s Nacimiento Formation and Argentina’s Corral Quemado Formation. The Nacimiento Formation has a known inclination shallowing of 8°, while the Corral Quemado Formation shows no inclination shallowing.

Champion et al.’s (1984) four sites from the Pigeon Point Formation (at the Pigeon Pt. locality) were augmented by collecting an additional three sites. Detailed alternating field demagnetization isolated a characteristic remanence at these three sites. The mean of the site means of the combined data set yields a direction (I=43.4°, D=349.0°, α95=10.2°), which is 23.1° shallower than the expected Cretaceous direction. Material collected from the Pigeon Point Formation was disaggregated by sonification, given a PDRM with I=60° and compacted in six separate experiments up to maximum pressures of 0.13 MPa with volume losses of over 50%. Inclination shallowing of 12°-20° was observed only after alternating-field demagnetization to 100 mT. When the inclination shallowing is plotted versus the samples' AAR, it lies on the theoretical curve for magnetic particles with a particle anisotropy a=4/3 (Jackson et al., 1991).

The AAR fabric of the collected Pigeon Point samples show a composite fabric due to compaction and turbidite deposition. A lineated fabric resulted from the turbidity flow, and a foliated fabric resulted from compaction. These two fabrics are end-members of magnetic grain distribution and correcting for each fabric gives
bounds to our inclination shallowing correction. These bounds range from a mean paleomagnetic direction of $D= 351.6^\circ$, $I= 53.1^\circ$ with $\alpha_{95}= 11.3^\circ$ for a lineated fabric, and $D= 349.4^\circ$, $I= 50.4^\circ$ with $\alpha_{95}= 10.4^\circ$ for a foliated fabric. This suggests that about one-half of the observed inclination shallowing of the Pigeon Point Formation can be explained by compaction/turbidite deposition effects.

The known inclinations and inclination errors of the Nacimiento and Corral Quemado Formations were plotted against measured anisotropy of anhysteretic remanence (AAR). This plot shows a large scatter in both data sets. The results from the Nacimiento and Corral Quemado Formations show there are factors other than particle anisotropy that affect inclination shallowing, as the model by *Jackson et al. (1991)* assumes.
Introduction

The debate about the importance of compaction-caused inclination shallowing in sedimentary rocks has been intensified recently by new developments in California tectonics. Anomalous paleomagnetic directions have been found in both sedimentary and batholithic rocks along the western coast of North America (Butler et al., 1991) (Fig. 1). Discordant paleomagnetic directions were initially reported by Teissere and Beck (1973) for the Cretaceous Peninsular Ranges batholith. The Peninsular Ranges batholith has a paleomagnetic declination which indicates 25° clockwise rotation about a vertical axis and an inclination which indicates 11° of northward transport with respect to interior North America since Cretaceous time, based on the assumption that paleohorizontal equals present horizontal (Teissere and Beck, 1973; Hagstrum et al.; 1985; Butler et al., 1991) (Fig. 2).

Anomalous paleomagnetic directions in Eocene, Paleocene, and Cretaceous marine sedimentary rocks have, to varying degrees, agreed with the anomalous batholithic results. Paleomagnetic inclination of the Tyee and Flournoy turbidites did not show any significant variations with coeval volcanic rocks and this encouraged others to undertake paleomagnetic studies of turbidites (Champion et al., 1984; Patterson, 1984; Hagstrum et al., 1985). Subsequent paleomagnetic investigations of turbidites on the Salinia terrane (Champion et al., 1984), Valle Formation (Patterson, 1984) and the Baja Peninsula units (Hagstrum et al., 1985) all showed a shallow inclination with respect to cratonic directions. Champion et al. (1984) reported results from Cretaceous and Paleocene turbidites of the Salinia terrane as indicative of 2500 km of northward transport of Salinia between Late Cretaceous and Eocene time. These results were further supported by Kanter and Debiche (1985) and Kanter (1988) who confirmed the arrival of Salinia by Eocene time, at the latest. Patterson (1984) reported the Upper Cretaceous Valle Formation of Baja California as having
northward transport of 1000 km, inferred from shallow inclinations, while Hagstrum et al. (1985) reported Mesozoic units of Baja California as indicative of 11° of post-Cretaceous northward latitudinal transport relative to cratonic North America. The data from Champion et al. (1984), Patterson (1984), and Hagstrum et al. (1985) all provide evidence for large amounts of northward transport (up to 2500 km).

Butler et al. (1991) however, raise serious questions about large scale transport interpretation. Recent metamorphic and K-Ar work (Silver et al., 1979; Silver and Chappell, 1988) indicate that the Peninsular Ranges batholith could have been tilted 21° about a northwest axis (Fig. 2). Removing this tilt would cause the batholith's anomalous direction to come into agreement with the expected cratonic field (Butler et al., 1991). This eliminates evidence for shallow inclinations in plutonic rocks and re-opens the possibility of compaction-caused inclination shallowing in sedimentary rocks that show discordant directions since Champion et al. (1984) and Hagstrum et al. (1985) had ruled out the effects of syndepositional inclination shallowing of Pigeon Point because of the presence of bioturbation. Bioturbation of the sediments suggests post-depositional remanence (pDRM) which has been shown to be accurate (Verosub, 1977; Kent, 1973; Tucker, 1980; Ellwood, 1984). Although sediments have been shown to carry an accurate post-depositional remanence (pDRM) (Irving, 1957; Verosub, 1977), the inclination of this signal has been shown to shallow during compaction both in the laboratory (Blow and Hamilton, 1978; Anson and Kodama, 1987; Deamer and Kodama, 1990; Kodama and Sun, 1992) and in marine sediments collected from Deep Sea Drilling Project cores (Arason and Levi, 1990; Tarduno, 1990; Celaya and Clement, 1988). One model for pDRM compaction shallowing suggests that while the porosity of the sediments is high, the magnetic grains are free to rotate and align themselves to the Earth's field, but when porosity decreases the magnetic grains are 'locked-in' and unable to realign to any changes in the magnetic field. This would suggest that the largest magnetic
grains have experienced the most compaction shallowing (Irving and Major, 1964; Hamano, 1980). Another model suggests inclination shallowing may instead result from adherence of elongate magnetite particles to clay particles (Anson and Kodama, 1987; Deamer and Kodama, 1990; Kodama and Sun, 1992). Once the magnetic particles become attached to the clay particles they are then believed to be rotated towards the bedding plane and follow the development of the clay fabric (Anson and Kodama, 1987; Deamer and Kodama, 1990). This would suggest that the finest magnetic grains would suffer the most inclination shallowing. In either model development of the magnetic fabric is a regular process.

Jackson et al. (1991) have developed a model to correct for compaction-induced inclination shallowing. This model uses the anisotropy of anhysteretic remanence (AAR) to recognize and correct for the effects of compaction on a sediment’s inclination. Jackson et al.’s model is based on the relationship between depositional remanent magnetization (DRM) intensity and the applied field strength (H):

$$\text{DRM} \propto H$$

therefore

$$\text{DRM} = \text{ARM} \times H$$

where anhysteretic remanence magnetization (ARM) is a proportionality constant that applies to both the vertical and horizontal components

$$\text{DRM}_{vert} = \text{ARM}_{vert} \times H_{vert}$$

$$\text{DRM}_{horz} = \text{ARM}_{horz} \times H_{horz}$$

Dividing these equations yields

$$\frac{\text{DRM}_{vert}}{\text{DRM}_{horz}} = \frac{\text{ARM}_{vert} \times H_{vert}}{\text{ARM}_{horz} \times H_{horz}}$$

(3)
Assuming a depositional fabric, which has \( \text{ARM}_{\text{vert}} \) as \( K_{\text{min}} \) and \( \text{ARM}_{\text{horz}} \) as \( K_{\text{max}} \), where \( K \) is the anisotropy's eigenvalue, equation (3) becomes

\[
\tan \theta_{\text{DRM}} = \frac{K_{\text{min}}}{K_{\text{max}}} \tan \theta_{H}
\]

which can be rearranged:

\[
\frac{K_{\text{min}}}{K_{\text{max}}} = \frac{\tan \theta_{H}}{\tan \theta_{\text{DRM}}}
\]

where \( \theta_{\text{DRM}} \) and \( \theta_{H} \) are the inclinations of DRM and the applied field, respectively.

The measurement of the tensor (K) therefore provides a method for recognizing and correcting for DRM inclination errors (Jackson et al., 1991).

Kodama and Sun (1992) have shown through laboratory experiments that Jackson et al's (1991) model does not apply to sediments in which magnetic particles were randomized during the early stages of compaction. This randomization can occur naturally through the process of bioturbation and in the early stages of compaction.

Any paleogeographic reconstructions based on the paleomagnetism of sedimentary rocks that do not take into account the effects of compaction may have inaccurate paleolatitudes. The low paleolatitudes of coastal California and Baja California suspect terranes may result from compaction-caused inclination shallowing rather than northward transport (Butler et al. 1991). Therefore, the recognition and correction of compaction effects on sedimentary rocks could change the tectonic/paleogeographic interpretation of California.

This project entails two major components. The first, and most significant part involves studying the effects of compaction on the Pigeon Point Formation of western California through standard paleomagnetic measurements, AAR measurement, and laboratory disaggregation and artificial compaction of those sediments. The second part of this study involves an independent test of Jackson et
al. 's (1991) theoretical model for correcting compaction-induced inclination shallowing by a rock magnetic study of the Nacimiento and Corral Quemado Formations in New Mexico and Argentina, respectively.
Figure 1
Location of Pigeon Point Formation in relation to terrane boundaries in coastal California, Baja California, and adjacent regions. (From Butler et al., 1991)
Figure 2

Equal-area projection of observed and expected paleomagnetic direction from the Peninsular Ranges batholith in southern California. Stippled area is 95% confidence limit. Tilt required to deflect expected direction to the observed direction is 21° (±5°) about an axis with azimuth 320° (±10°). (From Butler et al., 1991)
Methods

Pigeon Point

The Pigeon Point Formation was chosen for this project because previous studies of the Pigeon Point Formation have been used to support the northward transport of Salinia (Champion et al., 1984). The stratigraphy and sedimentology of the Pigeon Point Formation indicate a progradational depositional sequence with submarine fan to shelf environments (Howell and Vedder, 1978). The lower portion of the sequence is dominated by thick-bedded, coarse to medium-grained turbidites, while the middle section is dominated by layers of fine-grained silt and mud overlain by conglomerates and pebbly mudstone (Champion et al., 1984).

Twenty-nine samples were collected from three sites within the Pigeon Point Formation. The samples were taken from fine-grained layers because the coarse-grained layers frequently showed iron-oxide staining, which can cause overprinting of the original magnetic direction of a sample (Champion et al., 1984). Detailed alternating-field demagnetization was performed on twenty samples, and detailed thermal demagnetization was performed on the remaining nine samples. This small data set was augmented with samples provided by Duane Champion from four sites he had previously collected (Champion et al., 1984). Characteristic magnetizations for each sample were determined using principal component analysis (Kirschvink, 1980) of detailed alternating-field demagnetization data provided by Duane Champion. After demagnetization, anisotropy of anhysteretic remanence (AAR) was measured for each rock sample (McCabe et al., 1985), except those samples that were thermally demagnetized. Thermal demagnetization of the Pigeon Point sample resulted in the growth of secondary hematite. Since AAR measures the fabric of the remanence-carrying grains, the fabric would be altered with the introduction of
authigenic hematite and would not reflect the true magnetic fabric of the sedimentary rock.

Hand samples collected from Pigeon Point were disaggregated for compaction experiments using two different techniques: (1) small fragments were placed in an ultrasonic cleaning device or (2) a larger sample was exposed to an ultrasonic probe. These techniques were chosen to preserve the original shape of the rock's sedimentary grains while freeing the magnetic particles from the non-magnetic matrix. Thin sections made of Pigeon Point core samples were compared with smear-slides of the Pigeon Point disaggregated material, to verify that the original grain sizes of the samples were truly being preserved.

The compaction experiment involved making a slurry from the disaggregated material. Slurries were prepared by adding oven dried disaggregated sediments to instant ocean, a solution which chemically approximates ocean water. The slurries were prepared for individual experiments to avoid possible evaporation and changes in porosity. The slurry had a water content of 100% and an 80% porosity before compaction, which is equivalent to the porosity and water content of marine sediments at the water-sediment interface (Nobes, et al., 1986). The porosity was determined by the equation

$$\eta = \left[ \frac{\rho_g - \rho}{\rho_g \cdot \rho_w} \right] \quad (6)$$

where $\rho = (W_g + W_w)/(V_b)$ and $\eta$ is total porosity,

- $\rho_g$ is grain density,
- $\rho$ is natural bulk density,
- $\rho_w$ is water density,
- $W_g$ is weight of grains,
- $W_w$ is weight of water,
$V_b$ is bulk sample volume.

The grain density was assumed to be 2.6 g/cm$^3$ based on sample mineralogy determined by X-ray diffraction analysis. The analysis indicated the presence of the clay minerals kaolinite and illite and also quartz, which have grain densities of 2.594 g/cm$^3$, 2.660 g/cm$^3$, and 2.600 g/cm$^3$ respectively.

The slurry was placed in an acrylic cylinder (diameter = 1.5 cm) with a removable bottom plate. A porous stone was used as a plunger to compact the sediments. The samples were compacted with a continuous load applied to the plunger. Water dripping into the tank provided the load (see Hamano, 1980, Anson and Kodama, 1987, Deamer and Kodama, 1990; and Kodama and Sun, 1990 for more details). The time for each compaction experiment varied between 2-8 hours. The total run time is related to the final pressure of the compacted sample (approximately 0.0157 MPa/hr).

Compaction experiments with the disaggregated material were conducted in a known magnetic field ($50^\circ < I < 60^\circ$). This range of inclinations was selected since the expected inclination for the Pigeon Point Formation calculated from the Cretaceous pole for cratonic North America, is 66$^\circ$. The magnetic field was regulated using two pairs of Helmholtz coils. The samples were given a postdepositional remanence (pDRM) by stirring the sediments and letting them settle in the known magnetic field (Tucker, 1980). The magnetic remanence of the slurry was measured before compaction with a two-axis CTF cryogenic magnetometer. The final magnetic direction of the sample was determined by removing the compacted sample from the sample holder and alternating-field demagnetizing the sample.

Volume loss was monitored continuously during compaction. Samples were compacted to final pressures of 0.0314, 0.0471, 0.0628, 0.0785, and 0.1256 MPa (Fig. 3). These pressures were chosen to delineate the break in slope observed by Deamer
and Kodama (1990) and Sun and Kodama (1992) in the void ratio versus pressure compaction curves.

Once the compaction experiment was completed, AAR of the compacted sample was measured. The inclination and anisotropy data obtained from the compacted samples were then compared with theoretical curves from Jackson et al. (1991) which relate AAR anisotropy to the inclination shallowing (Fig. 4). From this comparison, an estimate of the individual magnetic particle anisotropy can be made.

Based on the estimated particle anisotropy, a theoretical curve of inclination shallowing vs. remanence anisotropy, based on the compaction experiments, for the Pigeon Point Formation could be generated using the formula:

\[
\frac{1}{f} \left( \frac{2}{3} \frac{1 + \frac{1}{q_x}}{q_z} \right) (a + 2 - 1)
\]

where \( q_x/q_z \) is the ratio of the maximum and minimum AAR magnitudes, \( 1/f \) is equivalent to \( \tan I_0/\tan I_c \), where \( I_0 \) and \( I_c \) are expected and compacted inclinations, respectively, and \( a \) is the particle anisotropy (Jackson et al. 1991). This curve assumes a slope which is a function of particle anisotropy, \( a \), based on a volume loss with one horizontal dimension held constant which results in a triaxial magnetic particle distribution. If we assume volume loss with the horizontal cross-section dimension held constant, the resulting magnetic particle distribution will be oblate. Whereas, if volume loss occurs with the vertical dimension and one horizontal dimension held constant, the resulting magnetic particle distribution would be prolate. Similar theoretical curves were generated assuming sample shapes which are oblate and prolate (See Appendices A, B, and C) (Fig. 5).
Using the theoretical curve generated for the Pigeon Point Formation from the compaction experiments, the following relationship can be used to determine $I_0$, the original inclination of the rocks:

$$
\ln \left( \frac{\tan I_0}{\tan I_c} \right) = \ln \left( \frac{1}{f} \right)
$$

(8)

where $1/f$ is derived from equation (7) and $q_x/q_z$ are AAR ratios.

The variables $q_x$ and $q_z$ are the eigenvalues of the maximum and minimum directions for anisotropy, respectively, and $I_c$ is the compacted inclination (Jackson et al., 1991).

**Test of Jackson et al.'s (1991) Model**

**Nacimiento Formation and Corral Quemado Formation**

Two sets of samples, obtained from R. F. Butler, serve as an independent test of Jackson et al.'s (1991) inclination-shallowing correction technique. The first set are samples collected from the Nacimiento Formation of the San Juan Basin, New Mexico. The Nacimiento Formation consists of a mid-Paleocene, flat-lying sequence of terrestrial sedimentary rocks. The paleomagnetic study by Butler and Taylor (1978) indicates a mean direction of magnetization ($I = 51.3^\circ$, $D = 343.9^\circ$). When compared to the Paleocene pole for North America, based on work by Diehl et al. (1983), the Nacimiento appears to have an average inclination shallowing of $8^\circ$ ($\pm 3^\circ$).

The second set of samples were collected from the Miocene-Pliocene continental sediments, claystones, siltstones and sandstones of the Catamarca Province in northwestern Argentina. The observed mean direction of magnetization for these samples is $I=46.9^\circ$, $D=26.6^\circ$ (Butler et al., 1984). The paleomagnetic directions obtained from the Catamarca Province are similar to the axial geocentric dipole direction for South America ($I=-45.9^\circ$, $D=0^\circ$) (Butler et al., 1984). These
results indicate that there is no inclination error evident since the mean inclination of
the sediments agrees with the predicted inclination for South America.

These samples provide an ideal independent test of Jackson et al.'s (1991)
model. The demagnetized directional data previously collected by Butler and Taylor
(1978) and Butler et al. (1984) combined with AAR measurements, as presented
here, provide the necessary information to test Jackson et al.'s (1991) theoretical
model.

The two sets of samples obtained from R. F. Butler had previously been
demagnetized by alternating-field demagnetization. Measurement of AAR was done
on all but four samples, two from each set, which had a very strong magnetic intensity
and could not be completely demagnetized. These samples had probably been used
for IRM acquisition.

Once AAR measurements were completed, Equation (8) could be used and a
plot of ln(kmax/kmin) vs. ln(tan Io/tan Ic) could be compared to Jackson et al.'s
Volume Loss vs. Pressure During Compaction

Figure 3
Volume Loss vs. Pressure for the six samples that were compacted. Each sample was plotted to observe the compaction behavior.
Theoretical Correction Curves for Compaction-Induced Inclination Shallowing (from Jackson et al., 1991)

Figure 4
Theoretical correction curves for compaction-caused inclination shallowing. (From Jackson et al., 1991) \( I_o \) and \( I_c \) are the expected and compacted inclinations, respectively. \( K_{\text{max}} \) and \( K_{\text{min}} \) are the eigenvalues for the maximum and minimum directions of anisotropy, respectively. \( a \) is the particle anisotropy.
Theoretical Correction Curves
Assuming Different Magnetic Particle Distribution

Figure 5
Theoretical inclination shallowing vs. anisotropy curve based on the model by Jackson et al. (1991) but assuming different magnetic particle distribution during compaction. The prolate curve assumes the y and z-directions of the deforming sample remain constant. The oblate curve assumes the x and y-directions of the sample remain constant during deformation (compaction). The middle curve assumes a triaxial magnetic particle distribution.
Results

Pigeon Point Formation

Rock Magnetic Results

Partial anhysteretic remanent magnetization (pARM) spectra reveal that the magnetic grains for the Pigeon Point Formation have coercivities which range from 20 mT to 70 mT (Fig. 6). This was the coercivity window used for the AAR measurements.

XRD Results

X-ray diffraction of the disaggregated sediments from the Pigeon Point Formation reveal high concentrations of quartz, kaolinite, and illite (Fig. 7). Therefore, the non-magnetic fraction of these rocks were assumed to consist of clay and silt matrix with a silica-rich cement. This assumption was confirmed by analyzing thin sections of core samples from the Pigeon Point Formation.

Paleomagnetic and AAR Results

The mean characteristic magnetization of thirteen samples from three sites in the Pigeon Point Formation collected in December 1991 is D=357.3°, I=56.6° with α(95)=12.3°. Due to the small number of samples which yielded a characteristic magnetization (n=9) we augmented our data set with twenty-one samples from four sites provided by Duane Champion. The mean of the site means for the combined data set (n=7) is D=349.0°, I=43.4° with α(95)=10.2° (Fig. 8). The combined data set agrees more closely to the mean direction published by Champion et al. (1984)
(D=320.1°, I=40.7° with α(95)=7.3°). This was originally used as evidence to support the theory of large northward transport.

AAR measurements on the Pigeon Point samples show a fabric in which the maximum axes cluster about the N-S horizontal direction with the minimum axes forming a girdle perpendicular to it (Fig. 9).

Compaction Results

Although forty-two compaction experiments were performed, results from only six of these experiments were useful. The initial experimental results did not appear to have any change in inclination due to compaction. Upon further examination of the experimental procedure, it was found that the samples had acquired a viscous remanent magnetization (VRM). Removal of the VRM by AF demagnetization on six samples, after compaction, revealed that these samples did experience compaction shallowing. The inclination shallowing could not be monitored during the experiments, as previously done by other researchers (Anson and Kodama, 1987; Deamer and Kodama, 1990; Kodama and Sun, 1991). These six samples allowed use of Jackson et al.'s (1991) model to correct for inclination shallowing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Magnetic Field</th>
<th>Initial Inclination</th>
<th>Compacted and AF Demagnetized Inclination</th>
<th>Maximum Pressure of Compaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>52.4°</td>
<td>58.5°</td>
<td>43.5°</td>
<td>.0785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>54.0°</td>
<td>61.4°</td>
<td>42.2°</td>
<td>.0785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>53.0°</td>
<td>58.7°</td>
<td>49.4°</td>
<td>.1256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>53.0°</td>
<td>59.6°</td>
<td>44.6°</td>
<td>.0314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>54.2°</td>
<td>55.2°</td>
<td>41.7°</td>
<td>.0471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>59.2°</td>
<td>64.9°</td>
<td>52.4°</td>
<td>.0628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before compaction, the slurries were stirred to give them a post depositional remanence (pDRM). The inclination acquired by the sediments before compaction was from 1° to 6° steeper than the magnetic field in which the sediments were compacted. The difference between magnetic field inclination and the inclination acquired did not appear to change with continued stirring of the samples.

The results from the compacted Pigeon Point sediments are plotted with the theoretical curves derived from Jackson et al. (1991) (Fig. 11). The compacted Pigeon Point sediments lie close to the theoretical curve with a particle anisotropy of, $a=4/3$. The compacted sediments do not have a perfect fit with the theoretical curve assuming either a prolate or an oblate magnetic particle distribution. Due to the scatter of the data between the prolate and oblate magnetic particle distributions, a distinction between the two curves could not be made. Based on these results the AAR of the Pigeon Point samples can be used to correct their inclinations for compaction shallowing assuming a particle anisotropy of $a=4/3$. 

21
Figure 6
pARM acquisition spectrum of Pigeon Point Formation. The coercivity peak is centered at 40 mT. The spectrum indicates the presence of magnetite.
Figure 7

X-ray diffraction analysis of disaggregated Pigeon Point samples. The analysis indicates large amounts of quartz with smaller amounts of illite and kaolinite. Y-axis is peak intensity in counts. X-axis is angle in degrees (2θ).
Nacimiento Formation and Corral Quemado Formation

The results (Fig. 12) for the Nacimiento Formation and Corral Quemado Formation show that both units have points that lie between the theoretical curves with particle anisotropy $a=4/3$ and $a=3$. Neither the Nacimiento Formation nor the Corral Quemado Formation have a good fit to the Jackson et al. (1991) model. The data from the Nacimiento Formation are scattered between the $a=4/3$ and $a=3$ curves, with approximately one-half of the data lying near the $a=4/3$ curve and one-half of the data lying near the $a=3$ curve. The data from the Corral Quemado Formation show most of the data lying below the $a=4/3$ curve, with some data points lying directly on the $a=4/3$ curve. The most obvious feature of data sets from both the Nacimiento and Corral Quemado Formations is the large amount of scatter in the data.
Pigeon Point
Site Means

Mean Inc = 43.36
Mean Dec = 348.95
Alpha 95 = 10.20

Figure 8
Equal-area stereographic projection of six site means from Pigeon Point. 95% confidence interval is represented by the circle.
Figure 9
AAR of samples taken from the Pigeon Point Formation. The directions are plotted in stratigraphic coordinates. Minimum axes of anisotropy are plotted as circles. Maximum axes of anisotropy are plotted by squares.
Figure 10
AAR of compacted Pigeon Point sediments. Minimum axes of anisotropy are plotted as circles. Maximum axes of anisotropy are plotted by squares.
Figure 11
Inclination shallowing vs. anisotropy for compacted Pigeon Point sediments plotted with the theoretical correction curves derived from Jackson et al. (1991) based on the shape of the magnetic particle distribution.
Figure 12
Inclination shallowing vs. anisotropy plotted for the Nacimiento Formation and Corral Quemado Formation against the theoretical correction curves derived from Jackson et al. (1991) but assuming different magnetic particle distribution during compaction.
Discussion

Compaction Data

The Pressure vs. Volume Loss curves (Fig. 3) all show a break in slope between pressures of 0.03 MPa and 0.07 MPa. In some cases, the plunger stuck after compaction had started. In general, all samples exhibit an initial rapid volume decrease from 0-0.03 MPa followed by lower rates of volume loss. This behavior is similar to previous experimental compaction work (Anson and Kodama, 1987; Deamer and Kodama, 1990; Kodama and Sun, 1991) on both synthetic and natural sediments. Total percent volume loss of the sediments after the abrupt change in slope ranged from 20-40%. These values are slightly lower than previous experimental work (Anson and Kodama, 1987; Deamer and Kodama, 1990; Kodama and Sun, 1991). One possible explanation for the lower values is that this set of experiments used slurries with a water content of 100%, while previous experimental work used water content up to 200%.

Correction Curves

In order to use the theoretical curves to correct for inclination shallowing with anisotropy (Jackson et al., 1991) the individual magnetic grain particle anisotropy, $a$ must be known. This parameter was not independently measured in this study. Instead, an estimation of $a$ was made by fitting curves to the Inclination Shallowing vs. AAR results from the compaction experiments assuming the Jackson et al. (1991) model.

Once compaction experiments and AAR measurements were completed, a plot of $\ln(\tan I_o/\tan I_C)$ vs. $\ln(k_{max}/k_{min})$ was constructed. The data from this study do not agree completely with the theoretical curves of Jackson et al. (1991) (Fig. 4). Jackson et al.'s. (1991) curves, however, were generated assuming the development of
a triaxial magnetic particle distribution during compaction. The triaxial case has volume loss with one horizontal direction (y-direction) (See Appendix A) held constant. This type of deformation is not consistent with the lineated fabric observed in the Pigeon Point Formation samples (Fig. 9).

The AAR of the Pigeon Point samples shows the maximum axes cluster about a N-S horizontal direction with the minimum and intermediate axes forming a girdle perpendicular to it. This fabric probably results from high flow velocities during deposition of a turbidite. At the top of a turbidity flow, where finer sediments are deposited, the flow direction is perpendicular to the maximum axes. This creates a perpendicular-to-flow lineation due to traction transport (Elwood et al., 1979). A compaction fabric would have then been imposed on this depositional fabric. Therefore, the Pigeon Point Formation has a composite fabric made up of a lineated, turbidity flow, depositional fabric and a foliated, compaction fabric.

To correct for inclination shallowing resulting from a lineated fabric, we generate a new set of correction curves based on the model by Jackson et al. (1991), assuming a prolate magnetic particle distribution in which the vertical direction (z-direction) and one horizontal direction (y-direction) are held constant during compaction. The prolate magnetic particle distribution correction curve is valid if the fabric in the Pigeon Point samples represents only the fabric resulting from the turbidity flow. Since the Pigeon Point samples probably have a composite fabric, which though dominated by the lineation probably also has effects of burial compaction, we also generate a new set of correction curves assuming an oblate magnetic particle distribution, where the two horizontal directions (x and y) are held constant. This fabric would result from a compaction. Correcting for the inclination shallowing caused by the composite fabric can be calculated using a theoretical correction curve derived from a combination of the prolate and oblate magnetic particle distributions (Fig. 5) instead. However, since we do not know the relative
contribution of each fabric, we will proceed by determining the compaction correction
for both types of fabric. This will allow us to put bounds on our inclination
shallowing correction.

Inherent in the assumption of a prolate ellipsoid for a lineated fabric (see
Appendix C) is

\[ q_x > q_y = q_z \]  \hspace{1cm} (9)

Where \( q_x, q_y, \) and \( q_z \) represent \( k_{\text{max}}, k_{\text{int}}, \) and \( k_{\text{min}}, \) respectively.

Since

\[ q_x + q_y + q_z = 1 \]  \hspace{1cm} (10)

Then from Equation (9)

\[ \frac{q_x}{q_y} = \text{ratio} = \frac{q_x}{q_z} \]  \hspace{1cm} (11)

Therefore the ratio of \( k_{\text{max}}:k_{\text{int}} \) is equal to \( k_{\text{max}}:k_{\text{min}} \) then Eqn. (8) can be written as

\[ \ln\left(\frac{k_{\text{max}}}{k_{\text{min}} + k_{\text{int}}}\right) = \ln\left(\frac{\tan(I_0)}{\tan(I_c)}\right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (12)

Similarly, the assumption for an oblate ellipsoid for a foliated fabric (see
Appendix B) is

\[ q_x = q_y > q_z \]  \hspace{1cm} (13)

recalling

\[ q_x + q_y + q_z = 1 \]  \hspace{1cm} (11)

then

\[ \frac{q_x}{q_z} = \text{ratio} = \frac{q_y}{q_z} \]  \hspace{1cm} (14)

And Eqn. (8) can be written as
\[
\ln \left( \frac{(k_{\text{max}} + k_{\text{int}})}{2(k_{\text{min}})} \right) = \ln \left( \frac{\tan(\theta)}{\tan(\theta_c)} \right) \tag{15}
\]

Equations (12) and (15) were invoked to correct for compaction-induced inclination shallowing for the Pigeon Point Formation for a particle anisotropy, \( a = 4/3 \), and assuming prolate and oblate magnetic particle distributions, respectively (Tables 2 and 3).

The 'corrected' mean of the site means, assuming a lineated fabric for the Pigeon Point Formation is \( D = 351.6^\circ, I = 53.1^\circ \) with \( \alpha(95) = 11.3^\circ \), and assuming a foliated fabric it is \( D = 349.4^\circ, I = 50.4^\circ \) with \( \alpha(95) = 10.4^\circ \) (Table 4) (Fig. 13) The inclination of the mean of the site means originally reported by Champion et al. (1984), in support of the large northward transport theory, is 40.7°. The corrected inclinations calculated here are 10°-13° steeper than those reported by Champion et al. (1984), but are still shallow compared to the expected Cretaceous inclination value of 66° for the Pigeon Point Formation.

Tectonic Implications

A new paleolatitude for the Pigeon Point Formation has been calculated (Table 4) that differs from the paleolatitude previously reported by Champion et al. (1984) by approximately 10°. The new paleolatitude predicts 1400 km to 1700 km of northward transport of the Pigeon Point Formation, with respect to the Late Cretaceous pole for cratonic North America.

Determination of displacements along local fault systems, the San Andreas and San Gregorio, can account for some the offset. Estimates of displacements on the San Andreas fault, based on molluscan faunal patterns and stratigraphic correlations, suggest 305 km of right-lateral displacement since early Miocene time (Champion et
al., 1984). Estimates of displacement of the San Gregorio fault system suggest a minimum of 90 km of right-lateral motion since Miocene time (Mullins and Nagal, 1981; Graham and Dickinson, 1978). Considering these fault systems can only accommodate about 400 km of the offset, we still need to account for 1000 km to 1200 km.

Once compaction-induced inclination shallowing is taken into account, (Fig. 14) it is apparent that the previous pattern of apparent latitudinal transport of the Santa Lucia allochthon (SLOA), which showed a linear decrease from 90 Ma to 55 Ma, is no longer accurate. The Pigeon Point Formation paleolatitude is now consistent with nearly all other SLOA and Baja-Borderland allochthon (BBA) paleolatitudes at approximately 75 Ma. The exception to this grouping is the Fish Creek Turbidites (McWilliams and Howell, 1982). This grouping of data indicates approximately 15° of apparent latitudinal transport and would suggest that the BBA and SLOA were not two separate terranes but that they both experienced transport as one system. Treating the SLOA and BBA as one system can reduce the need for complex motion histories needed to explain the more southerly latitudes of SLOA as previously interpreted (Butler et al., 1991). This interpretation also suggests that the results from the Cretaceous age Fish Creek Turbidites (McWilliams and Howell, 1982) should be examined for possible compaction shallowing.
Table 2
Pigeon Point Samples Corrected for Inclination Shallowing
Assuming a Prolate Magnetic Particle Distribution with $a = 1.33$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>$\ln (k_{\text{max}}/k_{\text{avg}})$</th>
<th>$\ln (1/f)$</th>
<th>Compacted</th>
<th>Corrected</th>
<th>Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclination</td>
<td>Declination</td>
<td>Inclination</td>
<td>Declination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP1</td>
<td>0.037826</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP2</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP3</td>
<td>0.054744</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP3-2</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP8</td>
<td>0.070957</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>320.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP16-2</td>
<td>0.037267</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>355.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP17</td>
<td>0.094674</td>
<td>1.240</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP19-2</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP21-2</td>
<td>0.063440</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>283.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>0.056853</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>346.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>0.046743</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>327.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>0.043905</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>328.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>0.066097</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>0.080413</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>334.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>0.077799</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>328.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-1</td>
<td>0.081628</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>355.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-1</td>
<td>0.077294</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>349.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-1</td>
<td>0.095555</td>
<td>1.258</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2</td>
<td>0.070071</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>341.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-1</td>
<td>0.080747</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>318.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-1</td>
<td>0.066454</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>336.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-1</td>
<td>0.051425</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-1</td>
<td>0.080483</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>346.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-2</td>
<td>0.040148</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>348.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-1</td>
<td>0.102330</td>
<td>1.398</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>304.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-1</td>
<td>0.048022</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>338.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-1</td>
<td>0.050012</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>350.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-1</td>
<td>0.063459</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>351.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-2</td>
<td>0.050348</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>346.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-1</td>
<td>0.061255</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>355.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*where $k_{\text{avg}} = (k_{\text{min}} + k_{\text{int}})/2$

Samples with prefix PP are samples collected for this study, all other samples are from Champion et al.'s (1984) study.
Table 3
Pigeon Point Samples Corrected for Inclination Shallowing
Assuming an Oblate Magnetic Particle Distribution with $a = 1.33$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>$\ln k_{avg}/k_{min}$</th>
<th>$\ln (1/l)$</th>
<th>Compacted Inclination</th>
<th>Corrected Inclination</th>
<th>Corrected Declination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP1</td>
<td>0.061189</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP2-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP3</td>
<td>0.061001</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP3-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP8</td>
<td>0.049932</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>320.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP16-2</td>
<td>0.046311</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>355.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP17</td>
<td>0.040850</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP19-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP21-2</td>
<td>0.049932</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>283.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>0.036332</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>346.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>0.034694</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>327.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>0.033452</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>328.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>0.047785</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>0.054327</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>334.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>0.053296</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>328.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-1</td>
<td>0.049811</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>355.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-1</td>
<td>0.062351</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>349.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-1</td>
<td>0.061870</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2</td>
<td>0.041306</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>341.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-1</td>
<td>0.053801</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>318.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-1</td>
<td>0.043472</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>336.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-1</td>
<td>0.036393</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-1</td>
<td>0.050345</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>346.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-2</td>
<td>0.032067</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>348.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-1</td>
<td>0.055025</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>304.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-1</td>
<td>0.041969</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>338.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-1</td>
<td>0.050157</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>350.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-1</td>
<td>0.039068</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>351.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-2</td>
<td>0.035683</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>346.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-1</td>
<td>0.050358</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>355.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*where $k_{avg} = [(k_{max} + k_{int})/2]$

Samples with prefix PP are samples collected for this study, all other samples are from Champion et al.'s (1984) study.
Figure 13

Equal-area stereographic projection of six site means from Pigeon Point corrected for inclination shallowing assuming different magnetic particle distributions.

- Pigeon Point Sites-This Study
- Site from Champion et al., 1984
Table 4
Predicted Paleolatitude, Paleomagnetic Field Directions, Latitudinal Offset and Total Offset of Pigeon Point from Different Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Paleolatitude (°N)</th>
<th>Inclination (°)</th>
<th>Declination (°)</th>
<th>Latitudinal Offset (°)</th>
<th>Total Offset (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected Cretaceous Pole</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>333.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champion et al. (1984)</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>320.1</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>2578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Study uncorrected for inclination shallowing</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>349.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>2353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Study corrected assuming prolate sample</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>351.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>1420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Study corrected assuming oblate sample</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>349.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>1709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nacimiento and Corral Quemado Formations

It is obvious from the results in Fig. 12 that there are other factors, besides magnetic particle anisotropy, controlling inclination shallowing. The results for the Corral Quemado Formation scatter around the ln(kmax/kmin) axis, which would indicates no inclination shallowing, although there is still some scatter. The results from the Nacimiento Formation have such a large amount of scatter that there does not seem to be any preference for the data toward the \( a=4/3 \) curve, which would be expected for a known inclination shallowing.

One explanation for these results could be related to the clay content and magnetic mineral grain sizes of both formations. If there is a range of magnetic grain...
sizes, with a range of grain anisotropy, there would be a large scatter on the inclination shallowing vs. anisotropy curves.

To better understand the results from the Nacimiento and Corral Quemado Formations a detailed rock magnetic study along with experimental compaction work needs to be done. The compaction experiments can confirm the results seen in Fig. 12, while the rock magnetic study can determine the magnetic grain particle anisotropies.
Figure 14
Apparent northward transport determined from Cretaceous and Paleogene sedimentary rocks of the Santa Lucia Orocopia (SLOA) and Baja-Borderland allochthon (BBA) versus age of geologic unit. Stippled data point is Pigeon Point paleolatitude predicted by Champion et al. (1984). New Pigeon Point paleolatitude determined by correcting for compaction-induced inclination shallowing is indicated by arrow. Vertical error bars are 95% confidence on latitudinal transport. Range of age is indicated by horizontal bar through each data point. (From Butler et al., 1991)
Conclusions

1. The Pigeon Point Formation has a composite fabric, from compaction and turbidity flow deposition, which has resulted in a shallowed inclination.

2. The shallowed inclinations of the Pigeon Point Formation have been corrected using the model by Jackson et al. (1991) along with experimental compaction studies on Pigeon Point sediments.

3. Based on corrections for compaction-induced inclination shallowing, the Pigeon Point Formation has experienced approximately 1500 km of northward transport, not 2500 km as previously reported by Champion et al. (1984). This amount of offset brings the Santa Lucia-Oroocopia allochthon (SLOA) in agreement with the offsets of the Baja-Borderland allochthon (BBA) at 72 Ma.

4. There needs to be more detailed rock magnetic and compaction studies work on the Nacimiento and Corral Quemado Formations in order to better understand the results seen in this study.
Appendix A
Triaxial Magnetic Particle Distribution

Assuming \( q_x > q_y > q_z \)

for a volume loss with one horizontal dimension held constant.

Where

\[
q_x + q_y + q_z = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{q_x}{q_y} = \text{ratio}
\]

assume

\[
q_y = \frac{1}{3}
\]

So

\[
q_x = \frac{2}{1 + \left( \frac{1}{\text{ratio}} \right)}
\]

and

\[
q_z = \frac{2}{3} \left( 1 + \text{ratio} \right)
\]

So

\[
\frac{1}{f} = \left( \frac{\left( \frac{2}{3} \right) (a + 2) - 1}{\left( \frac{2}{3} \right) (a + 2) - 1} \right)
\]
Appendix B
Oblate Magnetic Particle Distribution

Assuming an oblate ellipsoid for a foliated fabric.

Where

and

for \( q_x \)

1) \( 2q_x = 1 - q_z \)

2) \( q_z = \frac{q_x}{\text{ratio}} \)

3) \( 2q_x = 1 - \frac{q_x}{\text{ratio}} \)

4) \( 2q_x + \frac{q_x}{\text{ratio}} = 1 \)

5) \( q_x(2 + \frac{1}{\text{ratio}}) = 1 \)

therefore 6)

\( q_x = \frac{1}{2 + \frac{1}{\text{ratio}}} \)

for \( q_z \)

1) \( q_z + 2q_x = 1 \)

2) \( q_x = \frac{q_z}{\text{ratio}} \)

3) \( q_z + 2(q_z \times \text{ratio}) = 1 \)

4) \( q_z(1 + 2\times\text{ratio}) = 1 \)

therefore 5)

\( q_z = \frac{1}{1 + 2\times\text{ratio}} \)

So

\[
\frac{1}{f} = \left( \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2 + \frac{1}{\text{ratio}}}} \right) (a + 2) - 1
\]
Appendix C
Prolate Magnetic Particle Distribution

Assuming a prolate ellipsoid for a lineated fabric.
Where
and

Then for q_x
1) \( q_x + 2q_y = 1 \)
2) \( q_y = \frac{q_x}{\text{ratio}} \)
So 3) \( q_x = 1 - 2\left(\frac{q_x}{\text{ratio}}\right) \)
4) \( q_x + 2\left(\frac{q_x}{\text{ratio}}\right) = 1 \)
5) \( q_x\left(1 + \frac{2}{\text{ratio}}\right) = 1 \)
therefore \( q_x = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{\text{ratio}}} \)

for q_y
1) \( 2q_y = 1 - q_x \)
but 2) \( q_x = \text{ratio} \ast q_y \)
So : 3) \( 2q_y = 1 - \text{ratio} \ast q_y \)
4) \( q_y\left(2 + \text{ratio}\right) = 1 \)
therefore: \( q_y = \frac{1}{2 + \text{ratio}} \)

and

\[
\frac{1}{f} = \left(\frac{\frac{1}{\left(1 + \frac{2}{\text{ratio}}\right)}(a + 2) - 1}{\frac{1}{2 + \text{ratio}}(a + 2) - 1}\right)
\]
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