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ABSTRACT

The sensitivity of glaciers to climate and the resulting landscape changes has not been fully evaluated because of difficulties in extracting records of glacial advance, comparing sensitivities of different glacier types (ice sheets, ice caps, and alpine ice) for the same location, and measuring rates of episodic processes, which are common to glacial systems. This thesis applied innovative strategies to Cumberland Peninsula, Baffin Island, Arctic Canada, to achieve these objectives by i) radiocarbon dating currently exhuming, subfossilized bryophytes to test the sensitivity of cold-based ice cap growth to short-lived Holocene cooling events; ii) analysing the climate-sensitivities of all three glacier types by mapping and comparing their coeval ice margin extents during three short-lived but significant post-Last Glacial Maximum (LGM) climate changes (Heinrich Event-1, Younger Dyras, and the cooling associated with the regionally extensive Cockburn moraines); iii) quantifying the landscape evolution of upland plateaus by a novel approach, which couples the measurement of two cosmogenic radionuclides in pairs of tor surfaces to a Monte Carlo method to establish long-term rates of subglacial episodic erosion.

The radiocarbon results indicate that cold-based ice caps advanced instantaneously (within years) of major volcanic eruptions and also suggest that bryophytes may re-grow after thousands of years of ice entombment. The high-resolution ice-margin map coupled with the first glacial chronology through the interior of the peninsula, reveal that the three glacier types responded differently to post-LGM climate changes. Asymmetric retreat pattern of alpine glaciers indicates a first-order control by precipitation, possibly as a manifestation of sea-ice cover extent. Except for narrow, high-elevation coastal ridges, upland surfaces were covered by cold-based ice during Pleistocene glaciations that caused lowering of the landscape at an-order-of-magnitude slower rates than adjoining glacially-deepened valleys.

The results suggest that most of the peninsula was covered by a relatively climate-sensitive polythermal alpine glacier system, while the Laurentide Ice Sheet was restricted to the westernmost part of the peninsula where it coalesced with an expanded Penny Ice Cap. This and the quantification of episodic erosion rates provide a significant improvement of the conceptual model of paleo-ice dynamics on Cumberland Peninsula and the resulting Quaternary landscape evolution.
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CHAPTER 1 – Introduction

1.1 MOTIVATION

The last two and a half million years of Earth’s climate history have had a major impact on the Arctic for two reasons. First, owing to the steepening of the latitudinal temperature gradient during ice ages, the Arctic has a much greater sensitivity to small changes in global climate (Cite Ballantyne 2010 Geology paper). Second, the Pleistocene glacier system has significantly altered the Arctic landscape, but in a complex way because of the different styles of glaciations (ice sheets, ice caps, and alpine systems). The implications of higher sensitivity and complex effects of glacierization range from complete repopulation of terrestrial biota in glaciated regions, intensification of topographic relief, and transfer of sediment to the ocean. To quantify these impacts of glaciation in the Arctic three datasets are needed: (i) maps with clear distinction of glacier style operating throughout the Arctic linked to regional paleoclimate through estimates of paleo-glacier mass balance, (ii) precise glacial chronologies linking advances, still-stands, and retreat rates to climate time series and other forcing mechanisms, and (iii) analyses of Quaternary erosion rates of valleys and summits from interior plateaus to coastal fiords. Thus, the motivation of this thesis is to evaluate the broad contributions of decades of previous Arctic studies and to provide new data for a representative Arctic region, to help inform societal policy in Arctic regions and offer the boundary conditions needed for the application of the new generation of sophisticated numerical landscape evolution models for the Arctic.
1.2 GLACIAL PROCESSES AND ARCTIC LANDSCAPE RESPONSE TO CLIMATE CHANGE

High-latitude regions are more susceptible to the currently ongoing change in global climate than any other region on earth (Serreze and Francis, 2006; Miller et al., 2010; Serreze and Barry, 2011). This sensitivity to climate change is not only exemplified by the significant reduction of sea ice (Nghiem et al., 2007; Stroeve et al., 2007; Wang and Overland, 2009), accelerated melting of glaciers and ice caps (Gardner et al., 2011; Nghiem et al., 2012), and increased thawing of permafrost (Payette et al., 2004; Lawrence and Slater, 2005; Plug et al., 2008), but also the effects of these changes on the ecosystems (Oechel et al., 1993; Hinzman et al., 2005; Post et al., 2009) and the local people (Berkes and Jolly, 2002), who rely largely on hunting and finishing. Through feedbacks within the coupled ice-ocean-atmosphere system (Curry et al., 1995; Serreze and Francis, 2006; Miller et al., 2012), changes in the Arctic may have profound global impacts (McGuire et al., 2006; Anisimov, 2007). One way to better understand these current and future changes in the Arctic is to improve our knowledge of past responses of glaciers and ice caps to climate perturbations.

Over the last million years, climate has periodically shifted from longer cold periods (glacials) to warmer intervals (interglacials) causing large changes in global glacier volume (Lisiecki and Raymo, 2005) and glacier dynamics in the Arctic. It has been shown that these climate shifts are primarily linked to changes in the Earth’s orbit around the Sun (e.g., Huybers, 2006; Elderfield et al., 2012; Rial et al., 2013; Rybczynski et al., 2013). The resulting waxing and waning of glaciers and ice sheets led to an increase of erosion (Hallet et al., 1996; Glasser and Hall, 1997; Schaller et al., 2002) and consequent increase in sediment flux to adjacent ocean basins (Aksu and Piper, 1987;
Ottesen et al., 2009). However, whether Quaternary glaciations led to an increase of global erosion and sediment production is debated (Molnar, 2004; Willenbring and von Blanckenburg, 2010a; Hidy et al., 2014). Glacial erosion shaped the present landscape, likely exploiting a pre-existing drainage system (Sugden, 1978; Andrews and Miller, 1979; England, 1986). Deepening and widening of pre-existing valleys by glacial erosion is becoming better understood (e.g., Harbor and Wheeler, 1992; Harbor, 1995; Montgomery, 2002), and rates of active glacier erosion have either been directly measured (e.g., Briner and Swanson, 1998; Colgan et al., 2002; Staiger et al., 2005) or indirectly inferred from sediment volumes deposited in ocean basins during the Quaternary (e.g., Aksu and Piper, 1987; Dowdeswell et al., 2010; Steer et al., 2012). The basic processes governing glacial erosion have been assessed experimentally (Hallet, 1979, 1996) and with numerical models (MacGregor et al., 2009; Anderson, 2014). Feedbacks between glacial erosion and topography have been investigated (Marquette et al., 2004; Pelletier, 2004; Staiger et al., 2005; Stern et al., 2005; Briner et al., 2008; Kessler et al., 2008; Champagnac et al., 2014) and the correlation between climate, tectonic forcing and changes in topography due to glacial erosion have been debated (Molnar and England, 1990; Raymo and Ruddiman, 1992; Whipple et al., 1999; Montgomery et al., 2001; Grujic et al., 2006; Pelletier, 2008; Champagnac et al., 2012).

Despite these concerted contributions to our understanding of how climate controls the principle mechanisms, rates, and large-scale effects of glacial erosion and glacial dynamics, many processes in glacial geology have not yet been fully evaluated or quantified. The interaction of continental ice sheets with alpine glacier systems has not been investigated widely, particularly differences in response time to climate forcing...
(Oerlemans and Fortuin, 1992). Although the surface area of the world’s continental ice sheets is increasingly better known for the last and also previous glaciations (e.g., Dyke, 2004; Roy et al., 2004; Balco and Rovey, 2010; Hidy et al., 2013), the vertical extent of former ice sheets is less well constrained. The vertical extent of ice sheets has major implications for estimates of global glacier volume, ice dynamics and basal thermal conditions, as well as conceptual models for ice inception and evolution of ice sheets. For instance, two early opposing models were proposed for the inception and evolution of the Laurentide Ice Sheet (LIS) throughout the Quaternary (Flint, 1943; Ives, 1957). Numerical ice sheet models constrained by relative sea data have improved our understanding of ice flow and climate responses on a continental scale (e.g., ICE-5G, Peltier and Fairbanks, 2006; Simpson et al., 2009), but the relatively coarse resolution of these models make it difficult to test hypotheses of glacial geology at regional scales that are imperative for field geologists. These hypotheses regard the presence of ice-free enclaves for biologic refugia (Fernald, 1925; Belland and Brassard, 1988; Abbott et al., 2000; Waltari et al., 2004), the distribution of cold (frozen to substrate) and warm (wet, sliding) glacier basal thermal regime (Staiger et al., 2006), and the evolution of glacial landscapes through the Quaternary (Staiger et al., 2005; Briner et al., 2006). While the spatial distribution of the intensity of glacial erosion related to changes in basal thermal conditions has been investigated (Staiger et al., 2005; Briner et al., 2006), the long-term rate of glacial erosion under predominately cold-based conditions is not well constrained. In particular, rates of episodic erosion processes, such as sporadic plucking by cold-based ice, have been difficult to measure over the timescale of multiple glacial-interglacial
intervals, but may be a first-order control on the long-term landscape evolution of high latitude plateaus.

1.3 OBJECTIVES

This thesis aims to test different hypotheses regarding the origin and extent of ice cover in the eastern Canadian Arctic: (1) the instantaneous glacierization model (Ives, 1957; Ives et al., 1975) suggesting rapid expansion of permanent snowfields and plateau ice caps during snowline lowering, (2) the Nunatak Hypothesis (Ives, 1974; Ives et al., 1975) postulating that coastal summits remained ice-free during glaciations, (3) the Goldilocks model of intermediate ice sheet extent in the eastern Canadian Arctic (Miller et al., 2002), (4) the climate sensitivity idea suggesting that smaller glaciers respond faster to climate change than larger continental ice sheets (Oerlemans and Fortuin, 1992), and (5) the concept of selective linear erosion (Sugden, 1968, 1978) proposing enhanced glacial erosion by warm-based, sliding glaciers in fiords and valleys, while weakly erosive, cold-based ice protected upland plateaus.

1.3.1 General Thesis Objectives

In order to test these hypotheses, the following long-term objectives were proposed:

**Objective 1: Establish a high-resolution record of Holocene glacier responses to regional or hemispheric atmospheric changes.** While moraines provide evidence for *ice retreat*, records of *glacier advances* are difficult to establish on land in most regions. Furthermore, moraines are often obliterated by subsequent ice advances, so that they present an incomplete proxy for changes in glacier extent related to climate variation (Gibbons et al., 1984). Based on previous observations of preservation of fragile plant
remains beneath cold-based ice caps on Baffin Island (Falconer, 1966), the numerous thin plateau ice caps at various elevations on Cumberland Peninsula offer the potential of establishing a high-resolution record of ice cap expansion. The data allows testing of the hypothesis that small Arctic glaciers respond with sufficient sensitivity to record short-term climate perturbations caused by large volcanic eruptions proposed from contemporary work elsewhere on Baffin Island (Miller et al., 2012).

**Objective 2:** Examine the dynamics of different glacier types and test their sensitivity to late Pleistocene and Holocene climate change. By studying the interaction and retreat of LIS, polythermal alpine glaciers, and expanded local ice caps in an area where all three glacial styles coexist, it is possible to investigate differences in response to climate variation. The reconstruction of ice dynamics permits testing the hypothesis that small (alpine) glaciers respond more sensitively to climate change than larger (LIS) ice masses (Oerlemans and Fortuin, 1992).

**Objective 3:** Evaluate long-term rates of episodic erosion and determine the timing of last glacial plucking on upland plateaus. The timing of the last glacial plucking provides maximum-limiting constraint for the timing of ice coverage on plateaus in a historically well-scrutinized area, where the vertical extent of ice sheets has intensely been debated. Long-term rates of episodic erosion offer insights into landscape evolution on shorter timescales than provided by thermochronometry and establish the sources and rates of sediment-flux to the oceans.
1.4 RATIONALE FOR CHOSEN APPROACH

Cumberland Peninsula, the easternmost extent of Baffin Island, is an ideal location for these objectives because of the diversity of glacier type and basal thermal regimes, a rich history of glacial geology and geomorphology study by Europeans, Americans, and Canadians, and an opportunity of logistical support during two summer field seasons with the Geological Survey of Canada Geo-mapping for Energy and Minerals (GSC-GEM) program on Cumberland Peninsula. The short-term objectives required to attain the long-term goals outlined above are based on well-established and new geochronological techniques.

1.4.1 Short-Term Thesis Objectives

The short-term goals for General Objective 1 are: (1) Determine if bryophytes provide a reliable radiocarbon dating media for ice cap expansion and if they are affected by regrowth during intervening ice-free periods. (2) Test a hypothesis relating Little Ice Age glacier expansion to volcanism that was based on a bryophyte radiocarbon dataset in a different Arctic region (Miller et al., 2012) by determining if their bryophyte chronology is reproducible elsewhere. (3) Expand the existing record of glacier growth and decay further back in time to investigate the onset of renewed ice growth in the mid-Holocene.

The short-term goals for General Objective 2 are: (1) Provide new geochronological constraint for deglaciation in the interior of Cumberland Peninsula, Baffin Island, where previous age control was largely restricted to the coast. (2) Establish the paleo-flow pattern during the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM) and early deglaciation to examine complexities related to the interaction of an ice sheet and
associated marine-based ice stream with coalescent local fiord and alpine glaciers. (3) Map the deglaciation pattern of different glacier types (ice sheet, alpine glaciers, ice caps) at high-resolution throughout the Cumberland Peninsula to forecast past ice marginal positions throughout the region and establish patterns in retreat rates that can be compared to climate variation. (4) With new high-resolution maps of ice margins, reconstruct paleo-equilibrium line altitudes (ELA) for the entire peninsula at critical time periods (Heinrich Event 1, Younger Dryas, and Cockburn Moraine cooling event) to reveal the impact of local climate changes on the mass balance and dynamics of the three different glacier types.

The short-term goals for General Objective 3 are: (1) Develop a new approach to model complex cosmic ray exposure histories involving recurring burial by ice, gradual subaerial erosion, and episodic subglacial erosion. (2) Estimate the rate of episodic erosion by glacial quarrying and the timing of the last plucking event based on cosmogenic nuclides with a Monte Carlo method constrained by a proxy record of global ice volume change. (3) Associate the derived episodic erosion rates and timing of last plucking with local variation in bedrock characteristics and local and regional topography.

The following sections provide the rationale for using the chosen chronometers to address these objectives and the justification for returning to a well-studied location in the eastern Canadian Arctic.
1.4.2 Geochronometers

Radiocarbon dating is a well established and widely used geochronometer (Lowell, 1995; Guilderson et al., 2005), but in the Arctic it can only be applied scarcely, because typically only glacio-marine deposits are fossiliferous (e.g., Dyke, 1979). However, a unique archive of past climate change is preserved at the base of thin ice caps, which are frozen to the ground, thus protecting its substrate (Falconer, 1966; Carrara and Andrews, 1972; Miller et al., 2012). Delicate, sub-fossilized, in-situ rooted bryophytes and liverworts are currently being melted out along the rapidly receding margins of cold-based ice caps located on broad interfiord upland plateaus. Owing to the harsh environmental conditions on the wind-exposed plateaus, the fragile, weakly rooted material is quickly swept away destroying a unique record of former expansion of cold-based ice caps. The extraordinary warm summer temperatures in 2009 facilitated collection of organic matter at the margins of these ice caps for radiocarbon dating (Chapter 2) complementing only few previous studies (Anderson et al., 2008; Miller et al., 2012; Lowell et al., 2013; Miller et al., 2013b). Therefore, Chapter 2 provides an independent dataset to test the results of previous studies in a different region of high-latitude North Atlantic coastal areas.

The scarcity of radiocarbon datable material in the Arctic and the short half-life of $^{14}$C has limited the establishment of firm ages of glacial deposits. In many places, moraines and other glacial landforms have been correlated to each other by relative criteria based on cross-cutting relationships, geomorphic position, or differences in the degree of weathering of boulders and bedrock surfaces, and associated with global or regional climate records on the basis of these relative correlations. The glacial
stratigraphy can be better resolved with terrestrial cosmogenic nuclides (TCN, e.g., Lal, 1991; Gosse and Phillips, 2001). TCN analyses are widely applied to determine the age of surfaces or deposits using different approaches (e.g., depth profiles (Anderson et al., 1996; Braucher et al., 2009; Hidy et al., 2010) or burial dating (Nishiizumi et al., 1991; Granger and Muzikar, 2001; Hidy et al., 2013; Rybczynski et al., 2013)). They are also used to estimate average erosion rates (e.g., Lal, 1991; Nishiizumi et al., 1991; Briner and Swanson, 1998; Cockburn et al., 1999; Staiger et al., 2006; Belmont et al., 2007; Hidy et al., 2014). While in many glaciated regions (e.g., New Zealand, Schaefer et al., 2009) the TCN method provides the same precision as radiocarbon dating, in polar regions with cold-based glaciation, the lack of sufficient erosion to reset the cosmogenic nuclide clock causes exposure dating to overestimate the actual age. Nevertheless, in the absence of suitable material for radiocarbon and other Quaternary dating methods, it is the only technique available to help fill the gap of glacial chronology in interior regions.

Different TCN techniques are used in Chapter 3 to constrain the deglaciation history of the LIS, the expanded Penny Ice Cap (PIC), and independent, polythermal alpine glaciers, thus broadening the previously available age control to the interior of Cumberland Peninsula. The new and previously published age constraints are then combined with a high-resolution map of ice margin positions to derive a conceptual model of glaciation of Cumberland Peninsula. The dynamics of different ice masses are assessed for three different phases during deglaciation in response to late glacial and early Holocene climate change. Reconstruction of paleo-ELA at the three different time intervals reveal the change in environmental conditions during deglaciation.
Despite the significant advances in TCN dating over the last few decades, the assessment of former coverage by cold-based ice is still ambiguous in eastern Arctic Canada (e.g., Steig et al., 1998; Bierman et al., 1999; Marquette et al., 2004; Staiger et al., 2005; Gosse et al., 2006). While the former existence of cold-based ice coverage can be revealed by measuring two radionuclides with differing decay rates (Nishiizumi et al., 1991; Bierman et al., 1999; Gosse et al., 2006), the duration and timing of individual burial events cannot be resolved. Tors are prominent outcrops of weathered bedrock protruding through felsenmeer, regolith or till cover, which have been attributed to differential weathering during warmer pre-Quaternary climate and preservation under predominately cold-based ice (e.g., Stroeven et al., 2002; Gosse et al., 2006; Goodfellow et al., 2014). Besides coverage by cold-based ice, tors are also affected by gradual subaerial and episodic subglacial erosion. Chapter 4 presents a new TCN approach, which is used to quantify the timing and rate of sporadic plucking of weathered bedrock block. Constrained by a proxy for global ice volume (Lisiecki and Raymo, 2005), a Monte Carlo method computes complex histories of exposure, burial, and episodic plucking events to derive probability density functions of average ice-free time, total duration of complex exposure history, gradual subaerial erosion rates and, most significantly, episodic erosion rates by glacial plucking. Timing and rates of episodic erosion events have been difficult to determine (Macchiarioli, 1995; Phillips et al., 2006; Jansen et al., 2013; Fujioka et al., 2015); Chapter 4 thus presents a valuable contribution in understanding episodic erosion processes, particularly on weathered plateaus that have often been assumed to represent relict, ancient landscapes.
1.4.3 Study Area

The GSC-GEM project provided the logistical and financial support for fieldwork during two summers (2009 and 2010) on Cumberland Peninsula. Mineral exploration in Arctic regions is confronted with high risks, one of which are meagre knowledge of bedrock geology in remote glacier- and drift-covered regions and limited information about past ice-flow directions that would allow tracing anomalies in till geochemistry to their source. A second risk regards the difficulty in establishing the Cenozoic sediment flux to basins with petroleum potential such as Baffin Bay. An improved knowledge of sediment flux to the oceans will provide essential constraints for basin models simulating the reservoirs and maturing history of potential hydrocarbon sources. The helicopter support provided by the GSC-GEM project facilitated sample collection for this thesis throughout the high-latitude mountainous region with a relief similar to the Alps, hence enabling access to glacier margins and glacial deposits in the interior of the peninsula, as well as on upland plateaus (Fig. 1.1a). The diverse landscapes and rich assemblage of glacial deposits on Cumberland Peninsula have previously been studied to understand the increase of weathering degree with altitude (Boyer and Pheasant, 1974; Birkeland, 1978; Watts, 1979), to decipher the dynamics of ice cover (Miller, 1973; Dyke, 1979; Locke, 1987; Steig et al., 1998; Marsella et al., 2000), and to investigate the spatial variation of glacial erosion (Andrews and Dugdale, 1971; Sugden and Watts, 1977; Anderson, 1978; Bierman et al., 1999; Kaplan et al., 2001).

The previous research on Cumberland Peninsula provided the foundation for many theoretical models of glacier dynamics and basal thermal conditions. These models include the concept of selective linear erosion by polythermal ice cover (Sugden and
Watts, 1977; Sugden, 1978) or the notion of attitudinally distinct zonation of weathering degree (Ives, 1966; Boyer and Pheasant, 1974; Ives, 1975; Dyke, 1979). Recognition of glacial modification of tors on the northeastern coast of Cumberland Peninsula led Sugden and Watts (1977) to propose that the area had been selectively eroded with enhanced erosion occurring in troughs, which were occupied by sliding, warm-based outlet glaciers, and restricted erosion on upland plateaus that were protected beneath thin, cold-based ice caps. The increase of weathering degree of bedrock surfaces and boulders with altitude was either interpreted to indicate longer duration of subaerial exposure (Boyer and Pheasant, 1974; Dyke, 1979; Watts, 1979) or, alternatively, interpreted to signify non-uniform glacial erosion related to basal thermal conditions of the former ice cover (Sugden, 1968; 1978 Sugden and Watts, 1977). The differing interpretations of altitudinal weathering zones had implications for models of the extent of the LIS in the eastern Canadian Arctic. Longer subaerial exposure at higher elevations was related to successively more restricted ice cover, thus supporting a minimum ice sheet model for the last glaciation (Fig. 1.1b, Ives, 1978). This minimum model challenged a previous, widely accepted maximum model postulating an enormous LIS completely covered Cumberland Peninsula (and other coastal areas on Baffin Island) and extended onto the continental shelf (Flint, 1943). In contrast to the maximum model, the minimum ice sheet paradigm suggested that many high-elevation areas had never been ice covered, and thus may have served as refugia for biota during glacial intervals (evident from disjunct species populations, Fernald, 1925; Belland and Brassard, 1988; Abbott et al., 2000; Waltari et al., 2004). Evidence for more extensive ice in fiords and tributary valleys emerged from TCN dating of boulders and bedrock, which was reconciled with
indications of ice-free conditions on intervening plateaus by a newly proposed intermediate ice sheet model (Fig. 1.1b). The so-called Goldilocks model proposes that low-gradient, warm-based outlet glaciers occupied fiords and valleys, while plateaus remained ice-free along the coast and were covered by thin, cold-based ice caps further inland (Miller et al., 2002).

**Fig. 1.1** Location of Cumberland Peninsula in Eastern Canadian Arctic and sites of previous glacial research. **A.** Digital elevation map of Cumberland Peninsula displaying the location of previous and new glacial geochronology. **B.** Schematic illustration of the three major conceptual ice-sheet models: Maximum model (Flint, 1943), Intermediate model (Miller et al., 2002), and Minimal model (Ives, 1978). Red box in inset shows location of Cumberland Peninsula in northeastern Canada. Approximate locations of elevation-profiles A and B for the vertical section are indicated with dashed lines. Vertical cross-section showing two elevation-profiles is adapted from (Miller et al., 2002).
1.5 ORGANISATION OF THESIS

In Chapter 2, the most recent history of renewed ice cap growth following the early to middle Holocene climate optimum is investigated by radiocarbon dating of bryophytes and faunal fossils collected within a metre of rapidly receding cold-based ice caps (Objective 1). The radiocarbon ages indicate when the organic material was covered by the expanding ice cap providing a distinctive measure of deteriorating climate conditions in the Arctic. The age distribution reveals discrete phases of ice cap growth that are shown to be related to both lower solar activity and decreased air temperatures associated with multiple successive volcanic eruptions. The striking similarity of the presented age distribution with previous data suggests that the climate change was at least of regional extent, if not globally significant. The manuscript of Chapter 2 has been published in Quaternary Science Reviews (May 2014).

The interaction of three different glacier systems that influenced Cumberland Peninsula is unraveled by detailed mapping of moraines and meltwater channels throughout the peninsula (Dyke, 2011a-f; 2013a-c). The conceptual model of ice cover and paleo-ice flow at LGM is presented in Chapter 3 (Objective 2). New glacial chronology is obtained from TCN exposure ages of boulders collected on selected moraines and near meltwater channels that record a continuous retreat sequence in a major alpine valley from the southwestern coast to the interior of the peninsula. The interaction of LIS and local fiord ice is investigated in a valley, in which a lake was concurrently dammed by outlet glaciers of both ice masses. The new chronological control is combined with previous data to derive the retreat pattern of the polythermal alpine glacier system based on the high-resolution map of ice margin positions. From
maps of ice extent during three distinct readvance phases (Heinrich Event 1, Younger Dryas and Cockburn-equivalent), retreat rates are inferred for independent alpine outlet glaciers, outlet glaciers of the PIC, and the land-based LIS. The dynamics of the different glacier types are compared with climate variability during deglaciation. Changes in paleo-ELA reveal the variation of environmental conditions during the late Pleistocene and early Holocene. Additionally, a TCN depth profile is used to resolve a middle Wisconsinan radiocarbon age from a mollusc shell, which was in disagreement with the morphostratigraphic correlation of the marine delta. The manuscript of Chapter 3 is currently being prepared for submission to *Quaternary Research*.

In *Chapter 4*, the rate of episodic erosion and the timing of last plucking are determined for tors on weathered upland plateaus (Objective 3). The rate of episodic erosion has been difficult to estimate, although it might be significantly higher than gradual erosion rates (Small et al., 1997; Muzikar, 2008, 2009). Estimating the total depth of glacial erosion of upland plateaus during the Quaternary is important, because even low erosion rates may contribute significantly to the sediment flux to the adjacent oceans, owing to the relatively large surface area of the plateaus (Dowdeswell et al., 2010; Steer et al., 2012). The new approach presented in *Chapter 4* has been developed to reduce the degrees of freedom in a complex system of alternating exposure intervals with subaerial gradual erosion and burial intervals with gradual or episodic subglacial erosion. Reduction of degrees of freedom is achieved by measuring the concentration of two radioisotopes with differing decay rates ($^{10}\text{Be}$, $t_{\frac{1}{2}} = 1.38$ Ma and $^{26}\text{Al}$, $t_{\frac{1}{2}} = 0.72$ Ma) in adjacent plucked and not-recently plucked surfaces. The timing of plucking can be constrained using three different depth functions (concentrations of both $^{10}\text{Be}$ and $^{26}\text{Al}$,
plus their relative abundances $^{26}\text{Al}/^{10}\text{Be}$). Long-term rates of episodic plucking of weathered bedrock blocks are determined with a Monte Carlo method that computes complex exposure histories constrained with a proxy record of global ice volume. Variation of episodic erosion rates is shown to be associated with both the location of the sampled tor in the landscape and local differences in fracture spacing of the bedrock. The results of Chapter 4 suggest that weathered plateaus are lowered by a slow rate (1 - 8 mm ka$^{-1}$), which is a magnitude lower than in adjacent, glacially-deepened valleys, but that the contribution to the sediment flux to the oceans cannot be neglected owing to the relative large surface area of high-elevation interfluves. A manuscript of this chapter is being prepared for submission to *Quaternary Science Reviews*.

The major contributions and implications of all manuscripts are summarized in *Chapter 5*. In light of the new data presented in this thesis, previous glacial geology and geomorphology work on Cumberland Peninsula is reviewed. Future research directions are discussed, which propose numerical modelling of late Wisconsinan ice dynamics on Baffin Island constrained by the new data presented in this thesis. Second, a strategy is presented to constrain the timing of regolith stripping from upland plateaus. Finally, the long-term evolution of the landscape of Cumberland Peninsula is considered with discussion of an approach to classify fragments of old surfaces from digital elevation models. Reconstruction of the former topography and improved understanding of the formation of, for instance, glacial cirques throughout the Quaternary would shed light onto the evolution of the current alpine landscape on Cumberland Peninsula.

The appendices include the methodological and chemical details of all chemistry and AMS experiments, so that they may be appropriately reproduced. They contain all of
the information required to recalculate the exposure ages, as TCN production rates and scaling routines are updated and nuclear cross-sections and half-lives are revised. Complete code scripts and selected modeling outputs are included to supplement the outputs provided in the manuscripts. Also included in the appendices are additional field photos and graphics that provide information for specific locations that were sampled or studied. The electronic supplementary file constrains a hand-coloured map of ice margin positions during deglaciation, which were inferred from a high-resolution map of ice margins derived from airphoto interpretation combined with new and previous geochronological constraint in the interior and along the coast.
CHAPTER 2 - Neoglacial Ice Expansion and Late Holocene Cold-Based Ice Cap Dynamics on Cumberland Peninsula, Baffin Island, Arctic Canada
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2.1 ABSTRACT

Radiocarbon dating of fossil flora and fauna collected along receding cold-based ice caps and cold-based sections of polythermal glaciers on Cumberland Peninsula reveal insights into Neoglacial ice expansion and late Holocene ice dynamics. The taphonomic advantages of subfossilized moss were exploited to precisely document regional expansions of ice caps through the late Holocene. When compared with climate proxies and records of volcanic eruptions, the moss radiocarbon age distributions indicate i) onset of Neoglaciación shortly after 5 ka, concomitant with increased sea ice cover, ii) intensification of ice expansion between 1.9 – 1.1 ka, followed by halt of ice growth, or ice recession during the Medieval Warm Period, and iii) renewed ice expansion after 0.8 ka, in response to cooling related to a combination of large volcanic eruptions and low solar activity. Overall, the observations support a model of near-instantaneous glacial response to regional climate controls and that these responses were synchronous throughout eastern Canadian Arctic and possibly eastern Greenland.

*Corresponding author: Email address: annina.margreth@dal.ca
2.2 INTRODUCTION

Small ice caps provide a useful archive of local paleoclimate because they are more responsive than larger, more sluggish and complex ice sheets or alpine glacier compounds (Paterson, 1994). Subfossil plant material collected in growth position along the margins of receding, small, cold-based ice caps provide a high-resolution record of ice cap expansion phases. Anderson et al. (2008) and Miller et al. (2012) associated the distribution of radiocarbon ages of moss collected from similar ice margins in northern Baffin Island (Fig. 2.1a) with decreases in solar irradiance and the impact of large volcanic eruptions. Miller et al. (2012) observed non-cyclic, sub-millennial, high-amplitude signals in their summed probability distribution of calibrated radiocarbon ages, and hypothesized that individual pulses of ice cap expansion during the Little Ice Age (LIA, AD 1100-1850, 750-100 yr BP, where yr BP refers to years before AD 1950) were triggered by large volcanic eruptions and concomitant positive sea-ice climate feedbacks.

To independently test the hypothesis proposed by Miller et al. (2012) that volcanism, solar irradiance, sea ice variability, and changes in regional atmospheric and paleoceanographic circulation are collectively the dominant primary controls on glacial responses in the eastern Canadian Arctic, we collected relict organic material along cold-based ice caps in a different region of Baffin Island (Cumberland Peninsula, Fig. 2.1). The new subfossil flora and fauna radiocarbon chronologies document the time of ice expansion from margins that were at least as retracted as they are today. Subfossilized, weakly rooted bryophytes are rapidly comminuted by winds and precipitation once uncovered by the receding ice margin. Therefore mosses are unlikely to be reworked. Unlike moraines which mark times of glacial maxima or retreat, recently exhumed
subfossil bryophytes provide precise maximum-limiting ages of ice cap expansion at that location. Our results support the hypothesis of Miller et al. (2012) and further reveal that late Holocene cold-based ice cap growth is in phase with both the general decrease in insolation and higher frequency (decadal- to century-scale) climate perturbations over the eastern Canadian Arctic. We also demonstrate the advantage of using subfossil plant materials which can be found in growth position and survive for only a few summers owing to their vulnerability to erosional processes once exhumed from cold-based glacial cover.

Fig. 2.1. A. Baffin Island and Greenland with locations of previous radiocarbon dates on fossil vegetation and new samples on Cumberland Peninsula: Anderson et al. (2008), Miller et al. (2012; 2013b) yellow triangle, Lowell et al. (2013) blue square, this study red diamond. GIS = Greenland Ice Sheet, BIC = Barnes Ice Cap, PIC = Penny Ice Cap. B. Southern part of Cumberland Peninsula with location of radiocarbon dated relict flora and fauna, collected along nine individual ice caps marked with red diamonds.
2.3 BACKGROUND

The uncovering of subfossilized flora from under a receding cold-based glacier has been previously documented in the Canadian Arctic (Falconer, 1966; Carrara and Andrews, 1972; Anderson et al., 2008; Miller et al., 2012). If the flora died as a result of ice cover, its chronology is related to the growth of the ice cap that entombed it. The chronological record of glacial advances can be further optimized by selecting flora that have a low probability of survival once re-exposed by a retreating ice margin. Delicate, in situ, rooted bryophytes on wind-swept, stony, polar desert sites have minimal preservation potential when uncovered. This taphonomic advantage avoids the drawbacks related to reworking of the fossil material, which is common for woody plants or faunal remains. In some instances, other flora (leaves, branches) or fauna (caribou bones, antler, and hides) are preserved, but the cause of death and the association with a precise contemporaneous ice margin position is usually undeterminable.

Areas with restricted lichen and other plant growth—recognized from aerial photos and in the field by their relatively light-tone—were interpreted to delimit the extent of permanent snow and ice cover during the last few centuries (Ives, 1962; Falconer, 1966; Carrara and Andrews, 1972). The absence of evidence for glacial erosion and subglacial drainage suggested that the ice caps were cold-based (Ives, 1962). The protective nature of cold-based glaciers was further revealed by the emergence of undisturbed patterned ground underneath a rapidly receding ice cap in northern Baffin Island (Tiger Ice Cap, 71° 20’ N, 78° 45’ W), where patches of dead moss were found near the ice margin (Falconer, 1966). A radiocarbon age of 330 ± 75 years (I-1204, uncalibrated, on Polytrichum juniperinum moss fragments; Falconer, 1966) suggested more widespread ice cover than today, which was corroborated by a similar radiocarbon age of 330 ± 90
years (Gak-3099, uncalibrated) on fossil moss and lichen collected below a lichen-kill trimline immediately in front of the Boas Glacier on Cumberland Peninsula (Carrara and Andrews, 1972).

Over the following decades, increasing evidence for more extensive LIA ice caps was found throughout the eastern Canadian Arctic (Andrews et al., 1976a; Locke and Locke, 1977; Williams, 1978). The light-toned areas were more precisely attributed to erosion of dead lichen, killed under permanent snow cover associated with the LIA. The previous ice margin positions, as observed in the field and from remotely sensed imagery (Fig. 2.2, Wolken et al., 2008) reveal that the LIA glaciation threshold and paleo-ELA were 200 – 300 m lower than present. Lowering of the ELA was attributed to reduction of the mean summer temperature by 1 - 3 °C (Locke and Locke, 1977; Williams, 1978).

In recent years, systematic sampling of moss emerging from receding cold-based ice caps has shown that widespread ice cap expansion occurred at 670 yr BP and intensified 500 years ago (Anderson et al., 2008; Miller et al., 2012). An absence of moss ages between 950 and 700 yr BP was interpreted to be related to reduced ice cover during the Medieval Warm Period (MWP, AD 950 – 1250, 1000 – 700 yr BP), known as a period of milder climate in Europe and elsewhere (Lamb, 1965; Bradley et al., 2003; Mann et al., 2009). Note that the interpretation of gaps in the moss chronology is an indication of lack of ice cover to kill the moss, not that there were no mosses living because of ice cover. This assumption can only be tested by showing (i) that there is independent evidence of warming or moisture-starvation during the moss age gaps, and (ii) that the gaps occur elsewhere in the region and are not just a local phenomena related to glacial dynamics. Individual peaks in the moss age probability distribution coincide
with large volcanic aerosol loading in the stratosphere, as well as reduced solar irradiance causing summer cooling and initiating ice cap expansion (Anderson et al., 2008). Simulations using global circulation models suggested that sea-ice and oceanic feedback systems sustained the initial cooling caused by shielding of solar radiance through stratospheric volcanic sulfur loadings (Miller et al., 2012). Thus, the main contribution of this work is to obtain an independent record from Anderson et al. (2008) and Miller et al. (2012, our sites are more than 600 km from most of theirs).

2.4 METHODS

2.4.1 Field Methodology

The southwestern part of Cumberland Peninsula is characterized by weathered upland plateaus intersected by glacially eroded valleys and fiords. The plateaus range in elevation from 400 to 900 m above sea level (asl) at the southwestern coast, increase to 1200 - 1900 m asl at the Penny Ice Cap and decrease again to 300 – 600 m asl toward the northwestern coast. Dyke et al. (1982) described in detail the major landforms and landscape elements of the region; five surficial maps at a scale of 1:100,000 (Dyke, 2011a-f) established new insights into the history of Holocene deglaciation. The extent of Neoglacial polythermal ice cover is defined by moraines along previous margins of warm-based ice lobes, and lichen-kill zones along previous cold-based ice margins. Margins of extant cold-based and polythermal plateau ice caps are indicated for AD 1958, mapped from air photos, superimposed by the marginal position at AD 2009, mapped from satellite images (Fig. 2.2). Besides plateau ice caps, the region exhibits other types of glacial systems including warm-based outlet glaciers descending from the plateaus and small cirque glaciers. The largest extant glacier is the Penny Ice Cap which
covers 6000 km$^2$ of Auyuittuq National Park. Ice from the north-easternmost extent of the Wisconsinan Laurentide Ice Sheet is preserved at the base of the Penny Ice Cap (Fisher et al., 1998).

Fig. 2.2. A. Light-toned lichen kill zone surrounding cold-based ice cap on Cumberland Peninsula. Lichen kill zone in the picture is approximately 250 m wide. Note the sharp trimline between the lichen-free area and the dark outside area with mature lichen cover. Location of picture is indicated by blue arrow in map below. B. Lichen-kill map derived from satellite imagery showing the ice cap extent AD 2009 in blue and the ice margin mapped from air photos from AD 1958 in light blue. Red diamonds mark location of fossil vegetation collected around two of the shown cold-based ice caps (number 6 and 7 in Fig. 2.1b and Fig. 2.3). Lichen-kill zones, shown in yellow, have been mapped by classifying high reflectance areas on Landsat 7 images after elimination of ice, water, and vegetation through thresholding respective sensitive bands.
Nine cold-based ice caps or cold-based zones of polythermal ice caps were targeted for sampling of recently emerged subfossil organic matter (Fig. 2.3). We chose ice caps at different elevations and of different sizes to examine the topographic influence on ELA lowering and the regional extent of ice expansion in response to climate deterioration.

**Fig. 2.3.** Sample sites on Cumberland Peninsula from nine different ice caps. **A.** Overview of all sample sites at the head of Kingnait Fiord (KF); extant ice cover is shown in blue, PF = Pangnirtung Fiord. **B.** Enlargement of central part of map shown in A, and inset maps of smaller peripheral ice caps with ice margins from AD 2009.

Samples of in situ rooted dead moss (typically hand-sized clumps) and other fossil vegetation were collected during transects along ice cap margins (Fig. 2.4). We examined most closely the recently deglaciated zone within 1 m of the ice margin. Each sample was inspected for modern plant growth or re-growth, water and sediment were gently removed, and samples were placed into an air-tight Ziploc freezer bag and kept in a freezer before and after shipment from the field.
Fig. 2.4. Preservation of fossil flora and fauna beneath receding cold based ice-caps.  

**A. and B.** Moss (samples 09SRB-K085A-01 and 09SRB-K057A-01, respectively) found in-situ on soil and gravel within 5-10 cm of the current ice margin (pictures: K. Kosar).  

**C.** Detail of a collected moss clump (09SRB-A387A-01, UCIAMS-77686, mode 1.56 ka, Table 2.1).  

**D.** Moss fragments of two samples submitted for AMS radiocarbon analysis above: *Racomitrium lanuginosum* (UCIAMS 77695, mode 0.17 ka), below *Andreaea blyttii* (UCIAMS 83969, mode 3.24 ka).  


**F.** Caribou antler and organic material (09SRB-A383A-01, UCIAMS-78111, mode 1.7 ka) found within 1m of extant ice margin.
2.4.2 Sample Characterization and Analysis

In total, 64 organic samples were collected in the field and afterwards characterized and separated according to the type of material. Isolation of macrofossils followed standard procedures of wet sieving in water using Canadian Standard Tyler series sieves with mesh openings of 0.85 mm (20 mesh) and 0.425 mm (40 mesh). All material greater than 0.425 mm was examined using a binocular microscope. The coarse organic residue (>0.85 mm) comprised a tangled mass of a few types of mosses and liverworts, interspersed with lichens. For each sample, mosses and liverworts were separated microscopically and placed in containers according to type. Some of the dated mosses and liverworts were identified by fossil bryologist Jan Janssens, Lambda-Max Ecological Research, Minneapolis, Minnesota and by bryologist Jennifer Doubt, Canadian Museum of Nature, Ottawa. Monospecific plant fragments or individual, similarly preserved moss and liverwort macrofossils were selected for dating. In preparation for dating, all rhizoids (roots) were removed. Fifty macrofossil sub-samples comprising tundra mosses (44), liverworts (3), rooted wood rush (*Luzula* sp.) (1), snowbed willow leaves (*Salix herbacea*) (2) and three fossil sub-samples of caribou (bone, antler and molar) were radiocarbon dated (Table 2.1). Twenty-six macrofossils were further analyzed with eleven species of mosses and one species of liverwort identified (Table 2.2).

**Table 2.1.** (Next page) Details of all radiocarbon dated samples. Calibration of conventional $^{14}$C ages was done with the downloaded version of the Calib 6.1.0 program (Stuiver and Reimer, 1993) using the Northern Hemisphere IntCal09 curve (Reimer et al., 2009). Calibrated ages are given for full age ranges including multiple individual age ranges. Median and mode are based on the probability distribution function. Ages are given as ka or as before AD 1950. Last column indicates the affiliation of each sample to an age group discussed in the text: Group 1 = 4.7 – 3.3 ka, Group 2 = 1.9 – 1.2 ka, and Group 3 = 0.74 – 0.17 ka.
Table 2.2 Characterization of 26 sub-samples with eleven species of mosses and one species of liverwort identified by fossil bryologists Jan Janssens, Lambda-Max Ecological Research, Minneapolis, Minnesota, and by bryologist Jennifer Doubt, Canadian Museum of Nature Ottawa.

Recently it has been reported that bryophytes exhumed beneath the cold-based ice margin of Teardrop Glacier in central Ellesmere Island show signs of re-growth and that it is possible to regenerate several moss species in growth chamber experiments (in vitro, La Farge et al., 2013). This differential preservation of macrofossils was not evident in field collection but noted under microscopic examination of the material. With microscopy, a few moss samples were observed to contain dissimilarly preserved bryophytes of one type suggesting regeneration or re-growth of modern or younger bryophytes (Fig. 2.5). Younger-looking fragments have rounded cross-sections and preserve mm-long fibrous white awns (supplementary file, Fig. A1.1). In the field it may be possible to see these features under a powerful hand-lens. To test whether these
dissimilarly preserved macrofossils yield younger ages due to the mixing of modern and fossil $^{14}$C, we radiocarbon dated both flattened macrofossils and younger-looking macrofossils from two samples.

All radiocarbon measurements were performed at the Keck Carbon Cycle AMS Laboratory at the University of California, Irvine, CA. The radiocarbon ages were corrected for measured carbon isotope fractionation. Calibration of the radiocarbon ages was done with the Calib 6.1.0 program (Stuiver and Reimer, 1993) using the Northern Hemisphere IntCal09 calibration curve (Reimer et al., 2009).

Fig. 2.5 Moss fragments from the same sample (09SRB-K141A-01 above, 09SRB-K131A-01 below) showing dissimilar preservation. A. Flattened *Polytrichum juniperinum* radiocarbon dated to 4.22 ka (mode, UCIAMS-83988, Table 2.1). B. A single fragment of younger-looking *Polytrichum juniperinum* with remnant white awns, which was initially excluded for dating and later dated to 4.08 ka (mode, UCIAMS-135208). C. Flattened moss fragment (*Polytrichum/Pogonatum*) radiocarbon dated to 3.38 ka (mode, UCIAMS-83985). D. A single fragment of younger-looking moss fragments (*Polytrichum/Pogonatum*) was initially excluded for dating and later dated to 1.76 ka (mode, UCIAMS-135210).
2.5 RESULTS

The calibrated ages are reported as 1σ and 2σ ranges of the age distribution (cal ka BP, reported as ka or a), as well as the median and the mode of the probability distribution (Table 2.1). We prefer to consider the full 2σ age ranges of a dated moss, but if a point estimate of the calibrated ages range is required for a particular statistical analysis, we use the mode of the probability distribution to represent the best estimate of the true age (Michczynski, 2007). For comparison with paleoclimate proxies, we use summed probability plots, despite the possible amplification of individual peaks through the calibration process (supplementary file, Fig. A1.2 - A1.4, Chiverrell et al., 2011; Bamforth and Grund, 2012; Williams, 2012; Armit et al., 2013).

To test the reproducibility of the AMS analysis, we radiocarbon dated different organic material from two samples. Snow bed willow (Salix herbacea) leaves and Andreaea sp. moss fragments (UCIAMS - 77688 and - 118699, respectively) from one sample yielded indistinguishable radiocarbon ages within 1σ error (mode of both calibrated age ranges is 0.3 ka, Table 2.1). However, for the second sample snow bed willow leaves yielded a modern (post-bomb) radiocarbon activity (UCIAMS - 83935), while Pohlia sp. moss fragments returned an older radiocarbon age (UCIAMS -118706, mode 1.22 ka). Reworked willow leaves are easily transported by wind and may have blown into sample site. We are uncertain of the cause of the modern radiocarbon activities measured for Polytrichum sp. and Pogonatum sp. moss fragments (UCIAMS-77694). However, preservation of these moss macrofossils is nearly perfect including intact white awns suggesting that this sample may originate from modern moss (supplementary file, Fig. A1.1).
To test the differences in preservation of macrofossils from the same moss type within one sample, we radiocarbon dated dissimilarly preserved macrofossils under the assumption they may represent different generations of moss growth (with time). Two measurements of younger-looking fragments retaining remnants of white awns of *Polytrichum juniperinum* (UCIAMS -135208 and -135209, modes 4.08 and 3.98 ka, respectively) yielded slightly younger radiocarbon ages than flattened *Polytrichum juniperinum* fragments (UCIAMS- 83988, mode 4.22 ka) from the same sample (Fig. 2.5 a-b, Table 2.1). The calibrated age ranges of the three measurements nearly overlap indicating that these fragments originate from the same plant growth generation (Fig. 2.6a). However, younger-looking fragments of *Polytrichum/Pogonatum* (UCIAMS - 135210 and -135211, modes 1.76 and 1.83 ka, respectively) from the other sample returned consistent, yet younger radiocarbon ages than the flattened *Polytrichum/Pogonatum* macrofossils (UCIAMS- 83985, mode 3.38 ka, Fig. 2.5 c-d, Table 2.1). Corresponding bimodal radiocarbon ages were measured on two samples (UCIAMS -118705 and -83986, modes 1.89 and 3.34 ka, respectively) located along the same ice margin in close proximity to this sample suggesting different generations of moss growth (Fig. 2.6 b-c). This interpretation is supported by field evidence that this sample was collected along an ice margin resting against a steep ridge protecting the sampling site from strong wind or precipitation (Fig. 2.6d). In this specific location, subfossil organic material covered during an earlier ice expansion phase was preserved throughout an interim period of ice recession. During this interval new moss was growing that was again covered by a subsequent ice advance event.
Fig. 2.6 Calibrated age ranges and sampling location of samples containing dissimilarly preserved macrofossils. A. Probability density functions of younger-looking macrofossils (UCIAMS-135208 and -135209, modes 4.08 and 3.98 ka, respectively) and flattened macrofossils (UCIAMS-83988, mode 4.22 ka) of sample 09SRB-K141A-01. B. Probability density functions of samples collected in close proximity along a steep ridge displaying a bimodal age distribution indicating two generations of moss growth. Older generation: flattened macrofossils of sample 09SRB-K131A-01 (UCIAMS-83985, mode 3.38 ka) and sample 09SRB-K134A-01 (UCIAMS- 83986, mode 3.34 ka); younger generation: younger-looking macrofossils of sample 09SRB-K131A-01 (UCIAMS-135210 and -135211, modes 1.76 and 1.83 ka, respectively) and sample 09SRB-K133A-01 (UCIAMS-118705, mode 1.89 ka). C. Map of ice cap 5 showing sample locations along ice margin with the mode of the calibrated radiocarbon ages (sample numbers have been shortened for clarity). Blue = ice cap extent AD 2009, light blue = ice extent AD 1958, grey = topographic contours, yellow = lichen-kill zones as mapped in Fig. 2.2b. D. Steep ridge (approximately 10 m high) at sampling locations 09SRB-K131A-01, 09SRB-K132A-01 (not dated), and 09SRB-K133A-01 providing protection of the sample sites from high wind speeds and slope wash.
The analyzed samples, collected at elevations between 890 and 1510 m asl, yielded calibrated ages ranging from 4.7 to 0.17 ka (modes) defining three distinct age groups (Fig. 2.7). The oldest grouping (group 1) is defined by only nine dates dating between 4.7 - 3.3 ka, with minimal overlap (Table 2.1, Fig. 2.7d). The largest number of dates (n = 23) delineate age group 2, ranging continuously between 1.9 – 1.2 ka except for one small gap. Group 3 is defined by 16 samples ranging nearly continuously between 0.74 – 0.17 ka, apart from a short gap (50 a) separating the oldest four samples. Owing to the large variation in radiocarbon activity over the past 300 years, calibration of the youngest seven samples yielded large uncertainties extending their age range to modern times but there is no reason to suspect that they are truly modern (e.g., they lack bomb \(^{14}\text{C})

Although we focused on moss chronology, the opportunistic fauna dates allow a comparison of an ice-marginal chronology independent from the fragile bryophyte records. The three caribou samples differ significantly in age and each date is concurrent with at least one moss sample, albeit not always collected at the same site. The caribou molar sample was collected from a carcass resting on regolith and just emerging from the ice margin, with the head and neck (with tissue) exposed (Fig. 2.4e). The age of the caribou molar (UCIAMS -78110, mode 3.24 ka) is slightly younger than a moss sample collected nearby (UCIAMS -83969, mode 3.64 ka) suggesting that the caribou died on the ice cap or close to an ice margin during a phase of ice cap expansion. Because the association between death of the caribou and ice growth is uncertain (i.e., the caribou may have died several years before incorporation into the ice cap due to its higher preservation potential) these samples are not included in the summed probability plots.
(Fig. 2.7c). However, for comparison they are included in the summed probability plots of individual ice caps in the supplementary file (supplementary file, Fig. A1.5).

Fig. 2.7 Calibrated ages of all vegetation samples collected on Cumberland Peninsula (excluding three caribou ages). A. Histogram of mode of calibrated ages in 50 year bins. B. Elevation of each sample plotted against the mode of the calibrated age, different shapes and colours of points mark samples from individual ice caps: 1 = blue square, 2 = yellow circle, 4 = green triangle, 5 = pink circle, 6 = blue diamond, 7 = red square, 8 = brown triangle, 9 = orange diamond, 3 = not shown. C. Summed probability distribution excluding youngest seven dates yielding calibrated ages ranging from modern to 460 a. D. Block diagrams of all calibrated age ranges. Large uncertainty of one sample due to small small size (single macrofossil measured).
2.6 DISCUSSION

2.6.1 Cumberland Peninsula Moss Data

Assuming that ice cover was responsible for moss death, we relate the moss ages to periods of ice advance. At most sampling locations, exhumation of subfossil vegetation during interim ice recession phases permitted rapid erosion of the dead, weakly-rooted mosses by a combination of wind, slope wash, or precipitation impact. Therefore, these sites are inferred to have been continuously covered by cold-based ice (and to have been exposed within weeks of our sampling). A gap in the moss age distribution means that we did not field collected mosses that died during the age gap. However, it does not imply that the ice caps completely melted during that time, because continuous ice cover was required to preserve the subfossil moss covered during earlier expansion phases. In rare circumstances, subfossil moss fragments have the potential to be preserved in wind sheltered locations allowing for recolonization of mosses during an interim recession phase. On ice cap 5, bryophytes re-grew either through regenerative processes (asexual or vegetative reproduction) or colonized sexually by spore production at the collection site. The site was subsequently covered by renewed ice advance retaining organic material from two different expansion events.

The Group 1 expansion phase marks the regional onset of Neoglacialiation, which is documented by nine dates collected along four different ice caps at elevations between 1035 – 1461 m asl. Despite the few samples contained in this age group, their distribution across different ice caps indicates that this early expansion phase is at least regional in extent, which has been recently corroborated by similar radiocarbon ages on rooted tundra vegetation in northern Baffin Island (Fig. 2.8, Miller et al., 2013b). A more precise timing of the onset of Neoglacialiation might have been attained if higher elevations
had been sampled. It is unclear from our limited dataset if the summits were completely ice free prior to Neoglacialiation. However, Miller et al. (2013b) obtained pre-Holocene ages on rooted vegetation from four small plateau ice caps on northern Cumberland Peninsula, suggesting that the Penny Ice Cap is not the only extant ice cap to persist from the late Wisconsinan (Fisher et al., 1998). Due to the limited sample size, it is impossible to infer uninterrupted expansion between 4.7 and 3.3 ka nor halt of ice growth after 3.3 ka, but it is certain that the majority of these sites had to remain ice covered since their entombment. Hence, these ice caps persisted throughout the gap between 3.3 and 1.9 ka, followed by renewed ice expansion documented by the younger moss radiocarbon ages at similar or lower elevations (groups 2 and 3).

![Fig. 2.8 Comparison of summed probability distributions of new and previously published fossil plant data.](image)

**Fig. 2.8** Comparison of summed probability distributions of new and previously published fossil plant data. **A.** Cumberland Peninsula (n = 40). **B.** Baffin Island (n = 135, Anderson et al., 2008; Miller et al., 2012; 2013b). **C.** Greenland: only youngest age at each sample site is shown (n = 12, Lowell et al., 2013). **D.** Summed probability plot of all datasets combined. Note: the summed probability plots are normalised, so that the amplitude of the peaks of different probability plots cannot directly be compared to each other, because of different size of sample numbers in each dataset. Vertical scale of probability density function > 1.7 ka is doubled (scale to the right) for better readability.
Because of the limited number of samples in group 1, it is difficult to infer causes for the gap in age distribution between 3.3 and 1.9 ka. Potentially, no plants were preserved during this interval due to oscillating or retreating ice margins. However, deglaciation could not have been complete, since ice must have persisted at most sites with older radiocarbon ages. At one unique sample location organic material from both ice advances just prior and just after the age gap was preserved indicating that the ice margin had retreated during the age gap (Fig. 2.6b). Because of the high elevation of the ELA in the early Neoglacial, local factors had a larger influence in ELA change leading to more spatially variable ice marginal dynamics. Therefore, the observed similarity of sample elevations of the following ice expansion phase (group 2) might be attributed to these variable ice margin dynamics.

Intensified ice expansion is inferred from the tight suite of radiocarbon ages measured on 23 samples (group 2) ranging between 1.9 and 1.2 ka. These samples were collected along six different ice caps at elevations (1024 - 1423 m asl) equivalent to or below the elevation of the early Neoglacial samples (group 1). The clustering of samples between 1.58 – 1.53 ka (mode, n = 7), 1.41 – 1.34 ka (n = 6), and 1.22 – 1.16 ka (n = 5) suggests three discrete pulses of ice growth within this expansion interval (Fig 2.7a and 2.7c).

The second gap in radiocarbon ages (1.1 – 0.74 ka) corresponds largely to the MWP. This interval of oscillating or retreating ice margins must have been regional in extent, as no samples of this age were preserved, supporting our assumption that in general, dead moss does not survive long unless covered by ice. The tight clustering of samples before and after this hiatus gives us some assurance that, while more samples
would provide a greater confidence in our interpretations, well-dated independently-recognized climate changes are clearly apparent in the existing dataset.

Age group 3 indicates renewed ice advance during the LIA documented at four different ice caps at elevations between 877 and 1309 m asl (n = 16 samples). In the Northern Hemisphere, the LIA was the largest glacier expansion during the last 5 ka, accounting for the conspicuous lichen-kill zones around ice caps. Three clusters of ages ranging between 0.74 – 0.64 ka (n = 4), 0.50 – 0.48 ka (n = 3), and 0.35 – 0.17 ka (n = 9) are observed, including the youngest seven samples (Fig. 2.7a). We note that the amplitude of the corresponding sharp peaks in the summed probability distribution (excluding the youngest seven samples) appear to be exaggerated due to risers (steep slopes) in the $^{14}$C calibration curve (Reimer et al., 2009) compared to the peaks in the preceding expansion interval (Fig. 2.7c, supplementary file, Fig. A1.2 – A1.4). The complex structure of the moss age distribution, suggesting several periods of intensified ice advance each persisting for several decades or a century, is supported by earlier notions of a tripartite or more complex model of ELA cooling (Bradley and Jonest, 1993; Bradley, 2000; Wanner et al., 2008).

We interpret both hiatuses, having a total duration of 1.7 ka (or 30% of the last 5 ka), as evidence for retracted or oscillating ice cap margins. Conversely, net expansion of ice cap margins is inferred from the abundant radiocarbon ages corresponding to the remaining intervals of the last 5 ka. The general decrease in both sample age and elevation with time since the onset of Neoglaciation supports an interpretation that long-term average ice expansion was caused by general lowering of the ELA related to declining summer temperatures over the past 5 ka (Fig. 2.7b). A rough estimate of
temperature change can be obtained from a linear regression line \((r^2 = 0.11)\) fitted through all sample points \((n = 48,\) including the seven youngest samples). The average ELA was at around 1261 m asl at the onset of the Neoglacial and dropped to about 1040 m asl at the end of LIA (inferred from the intercept of regression line at 5 and 0 ka, respectively) resulting in a rate of decrease of \(44 \pm 19\) m per millennium. Using a lapse rate of \(4.9 \pm 0.4\) °C per 1000 m measured at the surface of several Arctic Ice Caps (Gardner et al., 2009), we calculate a long term decrease in temperature of \(1.1 \pm 0.5\) °C over the past 5 ka on Cumberland Peninsula, and an average rate of temperature change of \(-0.22 \pm 0.09\) °C ka\(^{-1}\). As mentioned above the early Neoglacial ELA lowering was probably affected more strongly by local factors. At this stage ice expansion mainly occurred through lateral growth by winter snow, which survived summer melt. During the LIA, on the other hand, ice expansion was mainly controlled by persistent regional ELA lowering. Ice caps during the LIA also consisted increasingly of polythermal ice margins, which maybe were affected by a time-delay between ELA depression and ice advance through internal creep.

It is noteworthy that the elevation vs. time correlation is much tighter for individual ice caps (correlation coefficient ranging between 0.41 and 0.98 for four ice caps) yielding similar estimates of cooling (supplementary file, Fig. A1.5). The variability in the observed cooling rate (slope of the regression line) can be attributed to local factors affecting the ELA at each ice cap. These additional influences are based on prevailing wind directions, regional precipitation patterns, solar exposure, and other glaciological factors, such as response time, hypsometry and ice dynamics. The retreat of the ice margin may be affected differentially by the same factors, leading to dissimilar patterns.
of ice retreat compared to the expansion phase. This discrepancy between ice advance and retreat patterns may also explain the smaller sample size of the earlier expansion phase (group 1), as these sites had to retain their ice covers through several retreat phases. A mean temperature decrease (-2.4 ± 0.5 °C) over the past 5 ka and cooling rate (-0.47 ± 0.09 °C ka⁻¹) calculated by averaging the values for the individual ice caps thus only represents a minimum value of the long-term, regional temperature change. This cooling rate is about twice the estimate based on linear regression through all samples (see above), which also has a lower coefficient of variance. Therefore, this larger estimate is considered to be more representative, which is comparable to the cooling rate calculated by Miller et al. (2013b) over the same time interval. It is important to note that these estimates do not account for potentially higher elevations of ELA at the onset of Neoglaciaion or for lower elevations reached during the maximum of the LIA, as evident by the widespread lichen-kill trimlines.

The calculated drop in temperature is comparable to the estimated increase of temperature of 1 – 3 °C since the LIA, inferred from exposed lichen-free zones (Locke and Locke, 1977; Williams, 1978). Retreat rates of cold-based ice caps accelerated during the last three decades, suggesting that the modern warming is the greatest seen at any sample sites since at least 5 ka (Gardner et al., 2011). Modelling the sensitivity of snow extent to temperature change revealed that a consistent lowering of the perennial snowline can occur within one melt season, with amplification of the temperature perturbation by positive sea ice-ocean feedbacks (Berdahl and Robock, 2013). Most of the plateaus on Baffin Island are in a critical elevation range that are affected by widespread changes of snow and ice cover in response to small temperature changes.
This sensitivity of ice cap initiation to small temperature changes supports the instantaneous glacierization hypothesis proposed by Ives (1957; 1975), suggesting that inception of continental ice sheets occurred over high-elevation plateaus with subsequent advance and merging in lower-lying areas. On the other hand, this sensitivity also implies that slight increases in temperature can cause immediate withdrawal of ice margins at varying elevations due to local controlling factors, hence explaining the complex response of the ice caps to recent warming. Extant ice caps are currently undergoing wholesale retreat at all elevations, exposing subfossilized moss of widely different ages.

2.6.2 Comparison With Other Vegetation Data

Our interpretation of the age distribution of moss collected along extant ice margins is consistent with the model proposed by Anderson et al. (2008) and Miller et al. (2012; 2013b). They interpreted radiocarbon ages of rooted tundra vegetation to date the last time the collection site was ice free and related the death of the organic material to the inception of permanent ice cover at each location. The frequency of radiocarbon ages (specifically peaks and gaps on a summed probability diagram) of their Baffin Island dataset is very similar to our Cumberland Peninsula results (Fig. 2.8). However, a different interpretation of fossil plant data has recently been proposed by Lowell et al. (2013), who investigated the late Holocene expansion of a local ice cap in eastern Greenland using multiple proxies, including sediment cores from a threshold lake (Fig. 2.1a). Based on multiple lines of evidence, they interpret the radiocarbon age distribution to mark times of restricted ice and absence of radiocarbon ages to indicate intervals of ice growth. Lowell et al. (2013) mostly dated woody parts of dwarf shrubs
(Salix arctica and Dryas octopetala) that have a longer potential residence time on the surface before being buried beneath a cold-based ice cap. Moreover, Arctic willow (Salix arctica) is a long-lived, slow growing decumbent shrub that can live to be a hundred years old or more (Raup, 1965). Therefore, their radiocarbon ages may not reflect the timing of ice growth as accurately as would a chronology based on mosses that have much shorter life cycles. Lowell et al. (2013) suggest that the plant death is caused by deteriorating environmental conditions resulting in expansion of snow cover, but that widespread ice expansion only began during the hiatus in their plant ages, concurrent with the onset of glacial sedimentation in the threshold lake located outside of the LIA glaciation limit.

Interestingly, the plant data of Lowell et al. (2013) embrace the same time intervals as the age distributions on Baffin Island (Anderson et al., 2008; Miller et al., 2012; 2013b, and this paper, Fig. 2.8). In Fig. 2.8c we include the only youngest age at each sampling location of Lowell et al. (2013) to reduce the possibility that death of the plant may have occurred before the ice margin advanced at the sample site. All three data sets indicate synchronized ice expansion pulses in the LIA and all three show paucity of dates during the preceding MWP. We note that the MWP appears to have had a later onset in eastern Greenland and in northern Baffin Island than on Cumberland Peninsula. This discrepancy may be attributed to an insufficient number of samples in the Cumberland Peninsula dataset, or it may indicate that ice caps on Cumberland Peninsula are more sensitive to other mass balance forcings. For example, the large peninsula may have been affected by reduced sea-ice cover in the surrounding water bodies (Cumberland Sound, Davis Strait, and Baffin Bay) at the onset of the MWP (see discussion below). The
Cumberland Peninsula dataset also reveals additional ice extension phases before 1.4 ka, which are not as well documented in the aforementioned studies, but have recently been confirmed by Miller et al. (2013b) in an enlarged dataset from Baffin Island.

This overall agreement among different north Atlantic Arctic regions suggests a common cause for ice growth most likely related to pan-Arctic, if not global, climate changes. The same conclusion was also drawn by Miller et al. (2013a) who discuss in detail the differing interpretation of relict vegetation data and demonstrate how the Greenland dataset (Lowell et al., 2013) can be brought to conformity with the North Baffin dataset (Anderson et al., 2008; Miller et al., 2012), and by inference the Cumberland Peninsula moss dates.

2.6.3 Climate Forcing

Following a maximum at 11 ka, summer insolation steadily decreased in polar and mid-latitudes in the Northern Hemisphere throughout the Holocene (Huybers, 2006), inducing declining temperatures in the Arctic. Colder summer temperatures initiated renewed glacier advances following widespread ice withdrawal during the early to middle Holocene thermal optimum (8 - 5 ka; Kaufman et al., 2004). Early Holocene warm temperatures and onset of Neoglacialiation at around 4.5 ka have been documented on northern Cumberland Peninsula from paleoclimate records obtained from lake sediments (Wolfe and Härtling, 1996; Wolfe et al., 2000; Kerwin et al., 2004; Miller et al., 2005; Francis et al., 2006; Frechette et al., 2006). High concentrations of exotic pollen in lake sediments during the Holocene thermal optimum have been related to prevailing southerly winds (Miller et al., 1999). Ice expansion during Neoglacialiation is recorded by large ice-cored moraines on Cumberland Peninsula. These are dated by
lichenometry (Miller, 1973; Davis, 1985), based on the rate of lichen growth on boulders since stabilization of the moraine following initial ice retreat (Miller and Andrews, 1972). Although the moraine record is generally incomplete due to obliteration of older moraines by subsequent more extensive advances (e.g., Gibbons et al., 1984), good agreement between moraine stabilization and ice expansion phases can be seen throughout Neoglacialiation. Taking into account the large uncertainties intrinsic to lichenometry (generally larger than 20%, Miller and Andrews, 1972), our early ice expansion phase (4.7 – 3.3 ka) correlates well with the oldest moraine stabilization at around 3.8 – 3.6 ka and 3.3 ka (Miller, 1973; Davis, 1985). The following moraine building events at 2.4 – 2.2 ka and 2 – 1.9 ka are not represented in the moss data set (hiatus between 3.3 – 1.9 ka), but the subsequent moraine stabilization phase at 1.15 – 0.9 ka corresponds to the transition into the MWP. The youngest lichenometric dates at 0.65 – 0.5 ka, 0.4 – 0.2 ka, and after 0.1 ka document short-term ice recession and moraine stabilization during the LIA and match well with the three ice expansion pulses recorded in our moss data (0.74 – 0.64 ka, 0.50 – 0.48 ka, and 0.35 – 0.17 ka).

Although declining air temperatures related to gradually decreasing summer insolation is also documented in the delta $^{18}$O record from Penny Ice Cap, no consistent correlation between ice expansion phases and intensification of temperature decrease can be seen throughout the Neoglacial (supplementary file, Fig. A1.6c; Fisher et al., 1998). Similar gradually declining delta $^{18}$O trends are apparent in other Arctic and Greenland ice cores (supplementary file, Fig. A1.6), with additional variation evident in the temperature and accumulation reconstructions of the GRIP and GISP2 ice cores (Dahl-
Jensen et al., 1998; Alley, 2000). In addition to the long-term cooling trend, the moss datasets and the other paleoclimate proxies reveal higher-frequency climate variations.

Changes in oceanic circulation affecting sea surface temperature and extent of sea ice influence terrestrial climate on centennial to millennial timescales, especially in coastal regions. Minimum sea-ice conditions prevailed in the early and middle Holocene (11.5 - 6 ka), with subsequent increase of sea ice in the northwest North Atlantic inducing changes in albedo and the regional heat budget (de Vernal and Hillaire-Marcel, 2006; Fisher et al., 2006). These changes in oceanic circulation are associated with prevailing atmospheric circulation patterns, with negative phases of the Arctic Oscillation (AO) and the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) favoring colder conditions in the Eastern Canadian Arctic (Hurrell et al., 2001). During the late Holocene, a short-lived swing to positive NAO phase, in association with higher solar irradiance and less active tropical volcanism, has been proposed to explain the warmer conditions during the MWP (Mann et al., 2009; Trouet et al., 2009). Besides atmospheric circulation patterns, variability in solar irradiance and multiple volcanic eruptions occurring within few successive years also affect climate on decadal timescales, and can therefore induce atmospheric perturbations favourable for ice cap expansion. For instance, the last intensive phase of LIA has been related to a prolonged sunspot minimum, the Maunder minimum, lasting from AD 1630 – 1715 (320 - 235 yr BP, Eddy, 1976; Wanner et al., 2008). While short-term variations (2 – 3 years) in air temperature have been noticed subsequent to large explosive volcanic eruptions, it has been proposed that a series of eruptions over a short time can induce decadal-scale cooling (Robock, 2000).
The high-precision radiocarbon ages obtained from the fossil organic material reveal sub-centennial ice cap expansion pulses during the past 2 ka that can be compared to proxy records for solar irradiance and volcanism. Although the amplitude of some peaks in the summed probability distribution are exaggerated through the calibration process due to risers (steep parts) in the calibration curve, their occurrences still reflect real structure in the data (supplementary file, Fig. A1.2 – A1.4).

Past solar activity can be estimated from variation of $^{10}$Be concentration measured in ice cores (Steinhilber et al., 2009) or atmospheric $^{14}$C activity changes recorded in the radiocarbon calibration curves (Vieira et al., 2011). Differences in these solar irradiance reconstructions are related to diverse uncertainties intrinsic to either method (Fig. 2.9a). Large explosive volcanic eruptions inject large amounts of aerosols and sulfur gases into the stratosphere, where they are transformed into sulfur aerosols (Robock, 2000). Therefore, volcanic sulfate deposits in polar ice cores are used as proxies of past volcanic activity, and the global extent of the stratospheric sulfur loading can be inferred using several ice cores from both hemispheres (Gao et al., 2008). Sulfate concentrations measured in a single ice core provide higher resolved records of past volcanic eruptions for the past 2 ka (Sigl et al., 2013) and are also available for the entire Holocene (Zielinski et al., 1994; Zielinski and Mershon, 1997). Although the Northern Hemisphere index of stratospheric volcanic sulfate injection (Gao et al., 2008) shows a strong correlation with individual peaks in moss radiocarbon age distribution during the LIA (supplementary file, Fig. A1.2), we primarily use the high-resolution, single-core proxy records for comparison with our fossil moss dataset (Fig. 2.9b). It is important to note that both timescales of the volcanic eruption proxies and the solar activity record based
on the $^{10}$Be concentration in ice cores (Steinhilber et al., 2009) are independent of the radiocarbon dating method used to date the fossil flora and fauna and the atmospheric $^{14}$C-based solar irradiance proxy (Vieira et al., 2011). The timescale for the volcanic activity archives is based on cross-reference with well-dated ice cores established from a combination of annual accumulation layers and measurement of multiple parameters with strong seasonal variability pinned to known volcanic time markers (Sigl et al., 2013).

Fig. 2.9 Comparison of moss radiocarbon age distribution with proxies of climate forcing. A. Solar irradiance calculated from $^{10}$Be ice core record (Steinhilber et al., 2009) and atmospheric $^{14}$C variation (IntCal04, Vieira et al., 2011). B. Atmospheric sulfate aerosol loading: volcanic sulfate deposition in GISP 2 ice core over the last 5 ka (black, axis to the right, Zielinski and Mershon, 1997) and high-resolution record based on NEEM S1 ice core for the last 2 ka (green, axis to the left, Sigl et al., 2013). C. Summed probability distributions for all previously published fossil plant data (gray; youngest/site, Lowell et al., 2013; Miller et al., 2013b; this paper), and the Cumberland Peninsula dataset on its own (red). Vertical scale of probability density function $> 1.7$ ka is doubled (scale to the right) for better readability.
Again, in agreement with northern Baffin Island results (Anderson et al., 2008; Miller et al., 2012), we find a strong correlation between peaks in the Cumberland Peninsula moss age distribution and both large volcanic eruptions and low solar activity over the past 800 years. In addition to the observed strong correlation between inception (675 – 650 a) and intensification (520 – 450 a) of ice cap expansion during the LIA in northern Baffin Island, we find further links between volcanic activity and ice cap expansion in the later part of the LIA just prior to the Maunder minimum (320 – 235 a). Continued ice cap growth throughout the LIA was facilitated by sustained high volcanic activity and generally low solar activity (Fig. 2.9). The agreement between the moss radiocarbon age distribution and volcanism or low solar irradiance is less convincing further back in time, possibly because of the decreasing resolution of the volcanic record and underlying influences of the calibration process on the moss age distribution (see supplementary file, Fig. A1.2 – A1.4). Nevertheless, there are possibly meaningful correlations between moss dates and volcanic eruptions at about 1.65 ka (Cumberland peak), 1.42 ka (riser of Cumberland distribution), 1.35 ka (peak in Cumberland moss distribution), 1.25 ka (riser in Cumberland distribution), as well as 1.05 ka and 1.01 ka (Baffin Island moss data). The few samples comprising group 1 impede a clear correlation with the volcanic eruption record. However, tentative associations of clusters of volcanic eruptions with moss radiocarbon ages can be seen at around 4.25 ka, 3.8 ka, 3.65 ka, and 3.4 ka, supported by both the Cumberland Peninsula record and the extended Baffin Island database (Miller et al., 2013b). As explored by Miller et al. (2012), short-term climate perturbation might be sustained and amplified by positive sea ice-ocean-atmosphere climate feedbacks enhancing climate variability in the Arctic.
2.7 CONCLUSION

In many Arctic regions with polythermal ice coverage, records of past ice cap expansion preserved in dead vegetation are currently being exposed along rapidly receding cold-based ice margins. The dead vegetation is composed of delicate subfossilized mosses, liverworts, willow leaves, and lichens, which are quickly eroded by wind and slope wash. Therefore, records of early expansion phases are generally eradicated during recession phases and only sites that remained continually covered by ice until today reveal the onset of Neoglaciation. Potentially, even older organic material is still buried under ice at higher elevations.

The age distribution of subfossil moss collected on Cumberland Peninsula indicates that the middle to late Holocene climate was more variable than what might be expected from the monotonic decrease of insolation and, therefore, climate was additionally influenced by high-frequency forcings. The discrete pulses of ice expansion inferred from the peaks in moss age distribution after 2 ka indicate sudden lowerings of ELA in response to intensified coolings superimposed on a general trend of declining summer temperatures throughout the middle to late Holocene. Preservation of subfossil moss samples older than 3 ka generally required permanent ice cover until the year of collection (AD 2009), and thus document that sporadic periods of oscillating or retreating ice margins were insufficient in magnitude to expose these sites. In rare circumstances, older organic material may be preserved during ice recession in protected locations and such sites should be sampled with caution. Overall, the ice expansion record accords with evidence of moraine stabilization inferred from lichenometry, both suggesting a complex structure to LIA cooling.
The complex structure of the LIA glacier record and other late Holocene ice advances signifies the importance of short-term climate perturbations resulting from large explosive volcanic eruptions and solar irradiance variability. As suggested by Miller et al. (2012), positive internal ocean-atmosphere feedbacks may have sustained and amplified these atmospheric perturbations. Changes in sea-ice coverage related to oceanic circulation dynamics affect climate on centennial to millennial timescale and are thought to have initiated ice expansion during the onset of the Neoglacial. A hiatus in subfossil moss age distributions observed in northern Baffin Island and in this study coincides with changes in the mode of atmospheric circulations patterns (NAO and AO) as well as with higher solar irradiance and less active tropical volcanism inferred for the MWP.

A general decrease in elevations of samples with time (Fig. 2.7b) indicates that ice expansion was caused by lowering of ELA due to decreasing temperatures or increasing precipitation. Based on regression lines fitted to four individual ice caps, a mean temperature decrease of $2.4 \pm 0.5 \, ^\circ C$ is inferred for the past 5 ka, which is associated with irregular lowering of the ELA throughout Neoglacial culminating in the LIA. The accelerated retreat of cold-based ice caps in recent decades suggests that the current warming exceeds temperatures experienced in the Arctic over the past 5 ka. Additional samples from other ice caps over wider elevation ranges and different Arctic regions are required to i) more closely define the regional onset of Neoglacial and better constrain the early ice expansion phases, ii) test the synchronicity of ice growth throughout the North Atlantic Arctic as suggested by Miller et al. (2013a) and this study, and iii) to
better understand the association between short-term atmospheric perturbations and persistent climate deterioration through internal ocean-atmosphere feedback mechanisms.
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3.1 ABSTRACT

The interaction of the Laurentide Ice Sheet with an expanded local Penny Ice Cap and an extensive polythermal alpine glacier complex covering most of Cumberland Peninsula is the most studied but still poorly understood dynamical glacier system in Arctic Canada. The first high-resolution mapping of glacial deposits of the entire peninsula is here combined with new cosmogenic nuclide and radiocarbon chronological constraints to reconstruct ice margin positions of all three glacier types for the most prominent late glacial cooling events (Heinrich Event 1, Younger Dryas, and Cockburn-equivalent). From these maps we derive post-Last Glacial Maximum ice retreat rates. While the retreat rates for the thinner alpine complex are more responsive to north Atlantic temperature changes than the neighbouring ice cap and ice sheet, a north-south asymmetry in alpine glacier retreat rates is apparent. The distribution of paleo-equilibrium line altitudes, now available for the three cooling intervals, reveals a pattern similar to the retreat history, and suggests that the alpine complex on Cumberland Peninsula was significantly controlled by sea-ice limitations to winter moisture since the Last Glacial Maximum.
3.2 INTRODUCTION

Cumberland Peninsula on Baffin Island is in an interesting location with respect to late Pleistocene glacial history and one of the most studied regions in Arctic Canada for ice dynamics and glacial landscape evolution. Part of the fascination with the peninsula resides in the fortuitous interaction during the Wisconsin Glaciation of three independent glacier systems: The northeastern fringe of the Laurentide Ice Sheet (LIS), the expanded Penny Ice Cap (PIC) (still one of the largest extant ice caps in Arctic Canada, >6,000 km², Fig. 3.1), and an expanded alpine glacier complex, the remnants of which cover about a third of the eastern part of the peninsula with valley and cirque glaciers (some reaching tidewater) and summit ice caps. Cumberland Sound, which defines the southern coast of the peninsula, was occupied by LIS ice, which for much of its history produced a prominent ice stream (Cumberland Sound Ice Stream, CSIS) that extended across the continental shelf during the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM, Jennings, 1993; Jennings et al., 1996).

Despite the significant amount of geomorphic and glacial geologic work on Cumberland Peninsula during the last five decades (Fig. 3.1a, e.g., Miller, 1973; Andrews et al., 1976b; Sugden and Watts, 1977; Dyke, 1979; Dyke et al., 1982; Locke, 1987; Wolfe, 1994; Steig et al., 1998; Bierman et al., 1999; Wolfe et al., 2000; Miller et al., 2002), previous analysis of the paleo-ice dynamics was restricted by limited access other than to some segments of the coast. In 2009 and 2010, the Geomapping for Energy and Minerals (GEM) project for Cumberland Peninsula provided a remote camp in the interior of the peninsula and helicopter support to map most of the peninsula at an uniformly higher resolution (scale 1:100,000, Dyke 2011a-f; 2013a-c).
The overall objectives of the research included i) to analyse the glacial dynamics among the different ice systems on the peninsula during and since the LGM, and ii) to relate any observed differences and trends in the dynamics to paleoclimate and glaciological controls. An additional goal was to revisit sites with records that had previously generated tenuous or problematical interpretations or led to debates regarding the regional ice dynamics. In particular, the improved pattern of deglaciation presented
in this paper provides constraints on the dynamics of the CSIS, which is an important element of the northeastern sector of the LIS. To achieve these objectives, we obtained the first chronology for glacial deposits throughout the interior of the peninsula. The new age control is combined with published chronologies and new high-resolution maps of glacial deposits (Dyke, 2011a-f; Dyke, 2013a-c) are used to locate and interpolate ice marginal positions for three major late-glacial cooling events corresponding to the end of a composite Heinrich Event 1 (H-1, ~20 - 14.6 ka, Stanford et al., 2011), to the end of the Younger Dryas (YD, 12.9 – 11.7 ka, Rasmussen et al., 2006) and the Cockburn moraines of the LIS (9.5 - 8.5 ka, Miller and Dyke, 1974; Andrews and Ives, 1978; Briner et al., 2009). Reconstruction of paleo-equilibrium line altitudes (ELA) for these time intervals offers insights into the spatial variation of glacier response to late glacial cooling and warming and together with retreat rate patterns reveal that precipitation is a likely first order control on the alpine ice dynamics.

3.3 BACKGROUND

Conceptual ice sheet models for the Eastern Canadian Arctic have changed considerably over the last half century (Fig. 3.1b) and Cumberland Peninsula was one of the main stages where the debates were played out. The idea of a single-dome ice sheet (Flint, 1943) that completely covered northeastern Canada was eventually dismissed on the basis of observations that highly weathered upland plateaus lacked any evidence of glacial erosion or deposition (Ives, 1966), the occurrence of disjunct species populations in high latitude coastal highlands of Baffin Island and Labrador (Fernald, 1925), and the inference of multiple dispersion centres for the LIS (Dyke and Prest, 1987). A minimum ice sheet model was proposed on Cumberland Peninsula and elsewhere in eastern Canada
to accommodate ice-free conditions on upland plateaus that served as refugia for fauna and flora (Ives, 1974; Ives, 1978). The minimum ice sheet model and associated ‘Nunatak Hypothesis’ received further support from subsequent detailed fieldwork throughout the eastern Canadian Arctic and especially on Cumberland Peninsula (Miller, 1973; Dyke, 1979; Locke, 1987). However, the occasional occurrence of erratic blocks and subtle glacial modification of tors on upland plateaus of Cumberland Peninsula indicated extensive coverage at higher elevation areas by cold-based ice (Sugden and Watts, 1977), challenging the Nunatak Hypothesis. Thus, several first-order conundrums could not be explained with a single simple ice cover model, partly owing to the limited mapping resolution, limited available chronology, and non-uniqueness of interpretations of the same datasets.

Attempts to reconcile mapped ice volumes with those inferred from marine oxygen isotopes records have been challenged by an overall dearth of ice marginal chronology, sparse controls on vertical ice limits, and difficulties in interpreting both. Evidence for an extensive LIS during the Late Wisconsinan was retrieved from sediment cores obtained from the floor of Cumberland Sound (Jennings, 1993) and on the adjacent continental shelf and slope (Jennings et al., 1996). Foraminiferal assemblages and radiocarbon dating indicated that ice occupied Cumberland Sound until ~13.4 $^{14}$C ka revealing that the marine-based LIS extended onto the continental shelf for a significantly longer period relative to more southern regions (Jennings, 1993). Later, Jennings et al. (1996) postulated that the CSIS advanced twice to the continental shelf, once approximately between 34 and 21 $^{14}$C ka followed by recession and re-advance during the Younger Dryas at around ~11 $^{14}$C ka (radiocarbon ages are indicated here consistent with how they
were stated by A. Jennings). TCN exposure dating of boulders and bedrock along the southwestern coast also suggested that fiords and intervening plateaus were ice covered during the last glaciation (Bierman et al., 1999; Marsella et al., 2000; Kaplan et al., 2001). Samples collected from boulders on the Duval Moraines above Pangnirtung Fiord yielded a bimodal age distribution with peaks at ~22 ka and ~10 ka (Fig. 3.1a, Marsella et al., 2000). Terrestrial cosmogenic nuclide (TCN) concentrations in bedrock surfaces above these moraines revealed complex exposure histories that were interpreted to indicate cold-based ice cover during the last glaciation (Bierman et al., 1999; Kaplan et al., 2001). Kaplan’s recognition of a trimline delineating weathered bedrock on the highlands and scoured rock in valleys and fiords suggested that the CSIS had a low-gradient along the outer half of the sound (Fig. 3.1a). The geometry and dynamics of the CSIS was simulated in a numerical ice sheet model (Kaplan et al., 1999).

Detailed mapping of the increase in rock weathering with altitude (Boyer and Pheasant, 1974; Dyke, 1979; Watts, 1979) and reconstructions of relative sea level histories based on radiocarbon dating of shells from ice marginal deltas (England and Andrews, 1973; Dyke, 1979; Locke, 1987) suggested that the late Wisconsinan ice extent around Cumberland Peninsula was more restricted than previously thought. These field studies were synthesized into a map depicting the early and late Foxe (Wisconsinan) glacial limits at a scale of 1:500,000 (Dyke et al., 1982) indicating that large areas of the peninsula remained ice-free during the last glaciation (Nunataks, Fig. 3.1b, Ives, 1974; 1978). Additionally, it was recognized that local cirque glaciers and ice caps advanced independently from the LIS and occupied fiords and valleys in eastern and northeastern Cumberland Peninsula (Fig. 3.1a, Miller, 1973; Hawkins, 1985; Locke, 1987), a
significant departure from the assumption of ice sheet glaciation first, followed by Holocene alpine systems during deglaciation. Further evidence for restricted ice cover was recovered from sediment cores obtained from tarns located on the interfluves of coastal fiords (Wolfe and Härtling, 1996; Steig et al., 1998). The stratigraphy and radiocarbon dating of the cores indicated continuous sedimentation since the last interglaciation (Wolfe et al., 2000), which was corroborated by the lack of till deposits in the lake basins. This conclusion was augmented by TCN dating of boulders on moraines down slope of one of the lakes revealing that actively eroding ice remained below the lake elevations (Steig et al., 1998).

The concept of selective linear erosion (Sugden, 1977, 1978) offered a possible solution for the conundrum by proposing that wet, sliding, warm-based ice eroded the substrate and dry cold-based ice frozen to the bed protected the weathered upland plateaus. Altitudinal weathering contrasts were thus interpreted to indicate changes in subglacial erosion related to basal thermal conditions. This notion led to a new conceptual model of ice extent in the eastern Canadian Arctic which seemingly reconciled many of the conflicting interpretations (Goldilocks model, Miller et al., 2002). Their conceptual model proposed an intermediate LIS extent (Fig. 3.1b) with fast-moving, low-gradient outlet glaciers occupying marine embayments and fiords, while slow-moving ice that was frozen to the bed covered the intervening upland plateaus. Because slow-moving ice has steeper surface gradients, it was proposed that it terminated inland from the coast, so that high-elevation coastal terrain remained ice free during the last glaciation (Miller et al., 2002). Although the Goldilocks model provided a framework that was consistent with many of the observations, the LGM ice model was
based on limited field evidence from the interior of the peninsula. Therefore, high-resolution maps depicting the different ice masses that covered Cumberland Peninsula and additional geochronology data, particularly from the interior, are required to test the Goldilocks model, to address the remaining conundrums regarding the anomalous readvance of the CSIS during the YD, and to investigate the variation of ice dynamics in response to post-LGM climate changes.

3.4 METHODS

3.4.1 Geochronology

The principal targets for chronology included selected ice marginal positions from coast to interior and a glaciolacustrine subaqueous fan in a lake that was dammed at one end by the LIS and at the other end by local valley ice. We also needed to resolve the significance of a new date of 43.1 ± 0.4 cal ka BP (cal ka BP is used for re-calibrated radiocarbon ages with BP indicating time before the year 1950), on mollusc shell from a glaciomarine delta that appeared to have been deposited during the current interglacial. The abundance of quartz in boulders on moraines and erratics near meltwater channels allowed us to use cosmogenic $^{10}$Be. Samples for TCN exposure dating were collected from large flat-topped boulders that consisted of Proterozoic fine- to medium-grained metatonalities or medium- to coarse-grained gneisses and granodiorites with 8% to 30% quartz (Fig. 3.2, Table A2.1). Most samples were obtained by cutting 2 - 3 cm deep grooves with a gas-powered diamond-blade cutoff saw and removing 2 - 4 cm wide by 8 - 10 cm long blocks of rock by chisel and hammer. Where joint planes were suitable, thin chips of rock were knocked off by hammer and chisel from the surface of the boulders. Thickness of the sample, surface inclination, boulder geometry, landscape
position, and condition of the sampled surface (weathering degree, type of weathering, lichen cover, lithology and grain-size) were noted. No samples had topographic shielding and shielding by snow cover was minimised by selecting wind-exposed sites and the highest boulders possible (correction for the effect of snow cover will increase the ages by a few percent at most). Approximately 2 kg of rock were collected from the centre of near-horizontal top surfaces (<10° inclination) of large boulders (>1 m height). Lichen and loose minerals were removed with a wire brush, and the rock pieces were crushed in a jaw crusher and disk pulverizer, and dry sieved for separation of grain size fraction 350 – 500 μm.

Two cosmogenic nuclide depth profiles (e.g., Hidy et al., 2010) were collected from pits dug into the surface of glacio-lacustrine and glacio-marine deposits. The raised glaciomarine delta is situated on the southern coast of Cumberland Peninsula (65.42 °N, 64.25 °W, 20.5 m asl, Ujuktuk Fiord, Fig. 3.3a), and the glaciolacustrine deposit is located in Nacsac Valley (here referred to as Moon Valley, as in previous publications) north of Pangnirtung connecting the west coast of Pangnirtung Fiord with the Kolik River valley (66.35°N, 65.73 °W, 574 m asl, Fig. 3.3b). The pits were excavated by hand in locations that appeared to be stable, i.e., lacking conspicuous cryoturbation features and away from gulley edges, or other evidence of post-depositional modification. The stratigraphy of the deposits was described before collection of samples (Fig. 3.4, supplementary file, Table A2.1, Fig. A2.5). The profiles consisted of five 2-kg coarse sand samples, each collected from an approximately 5 cm thick swath at depths ranging between 35 and 150 cm below the mixing zone (mixing was caused by cryoturbation and in places bioturbation, and can be easily distinguished from unmixed sediment on the
basis of sedimentary structure). The sand samples were rinsed, dried, and dry sieved to separate the 350 – 500 μm size fraction. For one of the profiles, the sieved size fraction was increased to 250 – 500 μm, and larger clasts were crushed and sieved for size fraction 350 – 500 μm to obtain enough quartz mass. The sieved and crushed material were purified separately, and purified quartz of both batches were combined in equal proportions for each depth profile sample (20% sieved : 80% crushed) based on the relative mass of available purified quartz in both batches.

For all TCN samples, quartz purification was achieved by a combination of physical (magnetic separation, sand abrasion) and chemical (aqua regia, HF etching, and multiple cycles of dilute HF ultrasonication) procedures (Kohl and Nishiizumi, 1992). For rock samples, 35 g of quartz were spiked with 200 mg of ⁹Be-carrier solution (produced by J. Klein from a shielded beryllium crystal extracted from the Homestake Gold Mine, the carrier has 1015 μg Be g⁻¹ and a long-term average ¹⁰Be/⁹Be of 4×10⁻¹⁵ at Lawrence Livermore National Lab) before dissolution in a mixture of hydrofluoric and perchloric acid. For the depth profiles, considering the potential short exposure time and low production rate with depth, 100 – 150 g of quartz was dissolved after addition of 200 mg carrier. Extraction of Be was completed by a combination of ion chromatography and pH-controlled precipitations of Be-hydroxides, followed by evaporation and ignition to BeO using a Bunsen burner. Be-oxides were mixed with high purity niobium (1:1 by volume) and sent to Lawrence-Livermore National Lab for accelerator mass spectrometry (AMS) analysis. AMS measurements were completed in three separate runs in April 2010 and October 2011 using standard 07KNSTD3110 (¹⁰Be/⁹Be 2.85 x 10⁻¹²) and yielding a 1-σ precision of <3% for most samples (except for two, with 7.4 and 9.3%
precision). Process blanks for the three AMS runs ranged between $4.9 \times 10^{-15}$ to $1.7 \times 10^{-14}$, which were used for subtraction of background concentrations that were <1% for all samples. Total uncertainty of calculated $^{10}$Be concentrations includes AMS measurement error, blank correction error, and 2% uncertainty for chemistry processing, added in quadrature (Table 3.1). Exposure ages were calculated with the CRONUS KU online calculator version 1.0 (http://web1.ittc.ku.edu:8888/) using the new $^{10}$Be production rate (Borcher et al., in press) and time-variant, nuclide-specific scaling scheme of Lifton et al. (2014), and assuming a low subaerial erosion rate of 1 mm ka$^{-1}$ (Chapter 4). The depth profiles were modeled with a geologically-constrained Monte Carlo approach (Hidy et al., 2010) that allows simultaneously solving for exposure ages and inheritance with constraints on erosion rates. Solutions for the depth profiles were found at 1σ confidence level (supplementary file, Table A2.3, Fig. A2.3 and A2.5 – A2.6).

Previously published studies provide additional chronological constraint in other parts of Cumberland Peninsula. However, the previous data were calculated assuming a higher production rate and using a different half-life for $^{10}$Be decay. These two effects cause 10-15 % younger ages than those calculated with the new, lower production rate (Borcher et al., in press), and the revised $^{10}$Be half-life (Chmeleff et al., 2010; Korschinek et al., 2010). Because essential information required for re-calculation of exposure ages was not stated in the original publication, we cannot currently correct the previous data for the change in $^{10}$Be half-life and productions rates.

*Hiatella arctica* shells collected in a 3.5 m thick foreset package at the top of a 15 m thick ice-marginal, glaciomarine delta at the head of Ujuktuk Fiord, and shells of
Mytilus edulis collected in the upper section of a 30 m thick sandy marine terrace at American Harbour (Fig. 3.1) were radiocarbon dated at the Keck Carbon Cycle AMS Laboratory at the University of California, Irvine, CA. Calibration of these two ages has been completed with the Calib 7.0.2 program (Stuiver and Reimer, 1993) using the marine 13 calibration curve (Reimer et al., 2013) with an additional ΔR correction of 140 a or a total ΔR of 540 a as applied for this region in recent studies (Table 3.3, Dyke, 2004; McNeely et al., 2006). Previously published radiocarbon dates on marine shells referred to below are similarly calibrated, but for samples measured at the Geological Survey of Canada (GSC) radiocarbon laboratory ‘normalized corrected’ radiocarbon ages were used (McNeely and Brennan, 2005). Previously published dates on terrestrial materials are calibrated using the Northern Hemisphere IntCal09 calibration curve (supplementary file, Table A2.4, Reimer et al., 2009).

### 3.4.2 Surficial Deposits

Surficial mapping was completed by airphoto interpretation at a scale of 1:60,000 followed by field verification during the summers of 2009 and 2010. Raised marine deposits were visited for measurements of the marine limit with a Wallace and Tiernan surveying altimeter as well as sample collection for radiocarbon dating and TCN depth profiles. Mapped moraines were searched for boulders suitable for TCN dating (>1m high to limit the effects of rolling, snow cover, and exhumation from under till by frost heave or moraine erosion), and glacier paleoflow directions were measured opportunistically on striated bedrock (multifaceted and lee-side surfaces where available) in order to assess the validity of ice flow features mapped from airphotos. The revised
field maps were then compiled into nine map sheets published at a scale of 1:100,000 (Dyke 2011a-f; 2013a-c).

A map of ice margin positions depicting the retreat of glaciers throughout the peninsula was compiled from the mapped moraines and lateral meltwater channels through topographic correlation. Field and airphoto measurements of ice flow directions were combined with interpretations from the ice margin map. A database of over 200 previously available dates (radiocarbon, TCN, and optical stimulated luminescence (OSL)) and the new TCN ages presented here was used to provide numerical chronology for the mapped ice margin positions. Based on this chronological control, the extent of three distinct ice advances (moraine building) was mapped throughout the peninsula. From these maps, a minimum estimate for paleo-ELA was inferred using the highest elevation of lateral moraines (Meierding, 1982; Porter, 2000). The interpolated isolines of paleo-ELA were corrected for isostatic rebound inferred from relative sea level data (Dyke, 1979; Kaplan and Miller, 2003; Cowan, 2015; Hughes Clarke et al., 2015) and estimated eustatic sea level for the specific time interval (supplementary file, section A2.4, Miller et al., 2011). While eustatic sea level does not account for gravitational rise of sea level due to the mass of ice in the region, the uncertainty related to the simplified approach used here is within the uncertainty for estimation of the elevation of lateral moraines and interpolation of relative sea level data. Therefore, inferred changes in ELA through time should be interpreted with caution, but they reveal general patterns in temperature and precipitation change in the region.
Fig. 3.2 Examples of moraines and erratic selected for exposure dating (see Table 3.1 and Fig. 3.3 for locations). A. Double crested lateral moraine (indicated by red arrows) near the mouth of the fiord on the southwestern coast of Cumberland Peninsula, where samples E025 - E027 were collected. B. Surface of sample E039 looking towards sample E040 (marked by red arrow) located in a broad part of the valley. C. Sample E002 on lateral moraine in the interior of the peninsula. D. Glaciolacustrine delta (depth profile of samples E282A-01 to -05) dammed simultaneously by LIS and Pangnirtung Fiord ice cross-cutting an alpine moraine (indicated by red arrow). E. Sample A353 on the second recession moraine deposited by Pangnirtung Fiord ice. F. Sample E284A-02 on LIS recession moraine.
Table 3.1 TCN data chronology for boulders collected in the 'central valley' and in Moon Valley.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Boulder height</th>
<th>$^{10}Be$ concentration</th>
<th>$^{10}Be$ age</th>
<th>Weighted mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d-d)</td>
<td>(d-d)</td>
<td>(m)</td>
<td>(cm)</td>
<td>(10^9 atom g^-1)</td>
<td>(ka)</td>
<td>(ka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E002A-01</td>
<td>66.25</td>
<td>63.70</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.86 ± 0.05</td>
<td>20.6 ± 1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E002A-02</td>
<td>66.17</td>
<td>63.86</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E003A-01</td>
<td>66.17</td>
<td>63.85</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.76 ± 0.03</td>
<td>10.3 ± 0.9</td>
<td>10.0 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E004A-01</td>
<td>66.17</td>
<td>63.85</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.72 ± 0.02</td>
<td>9.7 ± 0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E044B-01</td>
<td>65.84</td>
<td>64.47</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2.11 ± 0.20</td>
<td>29.3 ± 1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E052A-01</td>
<td>65.82</td>
<td>64.45</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.21 ± 0.09</td>
<td>19.2 ± 1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E058A-01</td>
<td>65.71</td>
<td>64.49</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.36 ± 0.04</td>
<td>23.6 ± 2.0</td>
<td>11.7 ± 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E060A-01</td>
<td>65.71</td>
<td>64.49</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.68 ± 0.02</td>
<td>11.7 ± 0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E059A-01</td>
<td>65.70</td>
<td>64.51</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1.17 ± 0.04</td>
<td>20.8 ± 1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E060A-02</td>
<td>65.70</td>
<td>64.51</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E057A-01</td>
<td>65.20</td>
<td>64.34</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E026A-01</td>
<td>65.20</td>
<td>64.34</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.73 ± 0.02</td>
<td>14.1 ± 1.2</td>
<td>14.3 ± 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E027A-01</td>
<td>65.20</td>
<td>64.34</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.75 ± 0.03</td>
<td>14.6 ± 1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A167A-01</td>
<td>-65.31</td>
<td>-65.31</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.87 ± 0.03</td>
<td>11.1 ± 0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A167A-02</td>
<td>-65.31</td>
<td>-65.31</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.03 ± 0.03</td>
<td>13.2 ± 1.1</td>
<td>11.1 ± 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A167A-03</td>
<td>-65.31</td>
<td>-65.31</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.49 ± 0.05</td>
<td>19.1 ± 1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A237A-01</td>
<td>-66.31</td>
<td>-66.61</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.69 ± 0.02</td>
<td>10.1 ± 0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A237A-02</td>
<td>-66.31</td>
<td>-66.61</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.72 ± 0.03</td>
<td>10.6 ± 0.9</td>
<td>10.2 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A237A-03</td>
<td>-66.31</td>
<td>-66.61</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.69 ± 0.02</td>
<td>10.1 ± 0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E224A-01</td>
<td>-66.34</td>
<td>-66.82</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.76 ± 0.02</td>
<td>11.2 ± 0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E224A-02</td>
<td>-66.34</td>
<td>-66.82</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0.78 ± 0.02</td>
<td>11.3 ± 1.0</td>
<td>11.2 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E224A-03</td>
<td>-66.34</td>
<td>-66.82</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.07 ± 0.03</td>
<td>15.7 ± 1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E223A-01</td>
<td>-66.34</td>
<td>-66.74</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.06 ± 0.03</td>
<td>14.6 ± 1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E223A-02</td>
<td>-66.34</td>
<td>-66.74</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.79 ± 0.02</td>
<td>10.7 ± 0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E223A-03</td>
<td>-66.34</td>
<td>-66.74</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1.71 ± 0.06</td>
<td>23.0 ± 2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E224A-01</td>
<td>-66.34</td>
<td>-66.73</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.37 ± 0.04</td>
<td>18.8 ± 1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E224A-02</td>
<td>-66.34</td>
<td>-66.73</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.64 ± 0.02</td>
<td>6.6 ± 0.8</td>
<td>18.8 ± 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E224A-03</td>
<td>-66.34</td>
<td>-66.73</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.51 ± 0.07</td>
<td>35.0 ± 3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Abbreviated sample ID for clarity, full sample ID in Table A2.1
2) Error includes AMS measurement uncertainty, weighted blank correction, and 2% uncertainty
3) Computed using the depth profile calculator by Hidy et al. 2010, stated is ± uncertainty

Table 3.2 TCN chronology for two depth profiles. **Top:** Raised glacio-marine delta, capped by a glacio-lacustrine layer (sampled) in the ‘central valley’ (Lat. 65.42, Long. -64.25, 20.5 m asl). Depositional age is determined for the four uppermost samples (see text and Fig. 3.4). **Bottom:** Glaciolacustrine delta deposited in ice-dammed lake in Moon Valley (Lat. 66.35, Long. -65.73, 574 m asl; see supplementary file, Fig. A2.5).
3.5 GEOCHRONOLOGY RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

3.5.1 Boulder Exposure Ages

While samples were collected at various targeted and opportunistic locations throughout the peninsula (high boulder height was a limiting factor), two dynamical systems received greater focus: retreat history of alpine ice from Cumberland Sound back to cirque sources, and the separation of the LIS from locally sourced fiord ice in the western portion of the Peninsula.

The TCN data for 29 boulders and two depth profiles are presented in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 and summarized in Figure 3.3. Three samples yielded insufficient currents during AMS analysis to measure $^{10}\text{Be}/^{9}\text{Be}$ ratios, likely caused by incomplete purification of quartz in quartz-poor samples. Calculated exposure ages of the other samples range from $8.6 \pm 0.8$ to $35 \pm 3$ ka (Table 3.1, Fig. 3.3, all error ranges are stated with $1\sigma$ confidence level throughout the paper). The spread in ages has significantly reduced the confidence and precision of the chronology at any location. However, by using stratigraphic constraints (end moraine ages decrease upvalley) and comparison with other available radiocarbon and exposure dating chronology, it is possible to provide an interpretation of the age distribution. Most of this variation is interpreted to be related to a number of exposure ages that appear to be too old relative to the neighbouring ages or for their stratigraphic position. The anomalously old exposure ages may be best

Table 3.3  New radiocarbon data on marine shells collected from raised marine deltas in 2009. Sample locations are indicated in Fig. 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCIAMS</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Latitude (d.d.)</th>
<th>Longitude (d.d.)</th>
<th>Elevation (m)</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>$d^{13}\text{C}$ (‰)</th>
<th>Fraction Modern (%)</th>
<th>$d^{14}\text{C}$ (‰)</th>
<th>14C age (BP)</th>
<th>Calibrated age (cal ka BP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77704</td>
<td>09SR8-4027</td>
<td>66.42</td>
<td>-66.25</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>Myaella arctica</td>
<td>1.71 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.0371 ± 0.0004</td>
<td>-992.95 ± 0.43</td>
<td>3900 ± 490</td>
<td>43.1 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77705</td>
<td>09SR8-K015</td>
<td>66.25</td>
<td>-66.54</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>Mytilus edulis</td>
<td>-0.78 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.3873 ± 0.0009</td>
<td>-616.39 ± 0.91</td>
<td>7695 ± 20</td>
<td>8.0 ± 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* measured with a Wallace and Tiernan surveying altimeter
* calculated with Calib 7.0.2 (Stuiver and Reimer, 1993) using marine 13 calibration curve (Reimer et al., 2013), 1o uncertainty stated
explained by inherited TCN concentrations from exposure prior to their final deposition, signifying insufficient erosion during glacial transport. This explanation is consistent with the interpretations by others for similar positive-tail distributions in the exposure ages in TCN datasets on Baffin Island (e.g., Davis et al., 1999; Marsella et al., 2000; Briner et al., 2006). The most probable average inheritance for the amalgamated sand grains in the top of the delta at the head of Ujuktuk Fiord is $2.5 \times 10^4$ atoms g$^{-1}$ (supplementary file Table A2.3), corresponding to an exposure age of $5.7 \pm 0.6$ ka (assuming a time-averaged site production rate of 4.1 atoms g$^{-1}$ a$^{-1}$, supplementary file Table A2.2). Likewise, the estimated average inheritance for the amalgamated sand grains in the glaciolacustrine delta in Moon Valley is $8.8 \times 10^4$ atoms g$^{-1}$ (supplementary file Table A2.3), which corresponds to an exposure age of $12 \pm 1.1$ ka (assuming a time-averaged site production rate of 7.0 atoms g$^{-1}$ a$^{-1}$, supplementary file Table A2.2). These high inheritance concentrations are a rough indication of the average TCN concentrations throughout the subglacial catchment that fed the deltas. It is also apparent that locations exhibiting the greatest range in exposure ages tend to be in the interior of the peninsula, whereas replicate boulder exposure ages on coastal and deep valley sites reproduced better (Fig. 3.3). This correlation supports the interpretation that inheritance has caused much of the scatter in ages, because the fiord ice should be more erosive than the summit ice that tends to be cold-based (Chapter 4, Briner et al., 2014).

Two boulders yielded ages that are too young for their respective morpho-stratigraphic positions. These could be related to exhumation through till that was not apparent at time of collection, overturning of boulders by cryoturbation, toppling of boulders early in the exposure history so that differences in lichen patterns are
indistinguishable, or significantly greater snow cover than assumed. While there is no apparent correlation between boulder height and exposure age that would support this interpretation (supplementary file Fig. A2.1), these are the most logical explanations (Briner et al., 2005; Applegate et al., 2010; Heyman et al., 2011; Applegate et al., 2012). We rule out unrecognized problems with the chemistry or AMS analyses because the depth profile concentrations can be explained with exposure histories that fit within their 1σ measurement precisions (supplementary file Fig. A2.3 and A2.5). Because inheritance can cause ages to be too old by a factor of 2 or more, whereas the effect of post-depositional processes will only change the ages by a few percent, we chose the youngest date(s) (indicated in red in Fig. 3.3) on a set of moraines to represent the age of the deposition (in italics, Fig. 3.3). However, we note that the presented TCN data could also be interpreted in other ways, if different processes are assumed to cause the spread of calculated exposure ages. The exposure ages that remain after culling the youngest exposure ages at each site provide chronological control on the deglaciation history of an alpine outlet glacier in a major central alpine valley, which we refer to as ‘central valley’ in the following sections (Fig. 3.3a) and the timing of initial separation of the LIS and local fiord ice in Moon Valley (Fig. 3.3b).

The chronology established from boulder exposure ages in the ‘central valley’ reveals that the alpine outlet glacier retreated from the coast at 14.3 ± 0.8 ka (weighted mean is stated if two or more ages are available at one location, samples E026 and E027, Table 3.1). A prominent sequence of moraines and meltwater channels in a wider area of the main valley are dated to 11.7 ± 0.9 ka (sample E060, Table 3.1) by one of six boulders collected on the associated till deposit. Final retreat to the interior is constrained
by two boulders collected on one of the innermost recessional moraines (close to modern glaciers) that are dated to 10.0 ± 0.4 ka (samples E003 and E004, Table 3.1).

In Moon Valley, the outermost LIS moraine was deposited at 14.6 ± 1.2 ka based on one of three boulders (sample E223A-01, Table 3.1), and the next younger LIS moraine is dated to 11.2 ± 0.4 ka based on two out of three boulders (samples A284A-01 and -02, Table 3.1). While the maximum position of Pangnirtung Fiord ice could not be dated because of a lack of suitably large boulders, the recessional moraine, part of the Duval moraine system, yielded an age of 10.2 ± 0.3 ka (samples A351–A353, Table 3.1). The alpine moraine deposited by ice flowing southward from a cirque was most likely deposited at 18.8 ± 1.6 ka (middle age of three boulders, sample E224A-01, Table 3.1), because the cross-cutting relationship with the glacio-lacustrine delta indicates that it has to be older than the formation of the lake.

The ages of the recessional moraines of both LIS and Pangnirtung Fiord ice are comparable to the younger mode established previously for the Duval moraines along Pangnirtung Fiord (modes ~22 ka and ~10 ka, Marsella et al., 2000). Except for the alpine moraine in Moon Valley, we have not found ages corresponding to the older Duval moraine mode. Surmising from the high number of boulders we measured that incurred inheritance, it would be reasonable to suggest that the older mode (~22 ka) is also an artifact of inherited concentrations. However, the close agreement of a half dozen of the previously published samples with ages of 18.9 ± 1.4 to 25.3 ± 1.3 ka is difficult to explain solely by inheritance, since inherited concentration should yield a more dispersed age distribution (Marsella et al., 2000). The older mode may correlate with the initial
advance of the CSIS postulated by Jennings et al. (1996) to have occurred between ~34 \(^{14}\)C ka and ~21 \(^{14}\)C ka. A lack of ages corresponding to the older mode elsewhere along the southwestern coast might be attributed to the complete confluence of alpine outlet glaciers and Cumberland Sound ice stream, during which no ice marginal moraines were deposited.

Fig. 3.3 New TCN data and indication of locations of pictures shown in Fig. 3.2. A. Ice recession in the ‘central valley’ occupied by an alpine outlet glacier. Red box indicates location of Moon Valley shown in detail in B. PF: Pangnirtung Fiord, KF: Kingnait Fiord, UF: Ujuktuk Fiord. B. Moon Valley west of Pangnirtung Fiord (PF), where a lake was concurrently dammed by the LIS and local fiord ice. A glaciolacustrine delta deposited at the margin of the lake, which cross-cuts a moraine deposited by a preceding advance of an alpine glacier on the northern slope of the valley, was dated with a TCN depth profile and a boulder deposited on the delta. Exposure ages shown are calculated for a subaerial erosion rate of 1 mm ka\(^{-1}\). KRV: Kolik River Valley.

3.5.2 Depth Profile Chronologies

_Ujuktuk Fiord glaciomarine delta._ The glaciomarine delta on the south coast has a depth profile exposure age of 12.4 \(^{-1.0/2.8}\) ka calculated using only the four shallowest samples (Fig. 3.4, Table A2.3, Fig. A2.3). The deepest sample of this depth profile has a
significantly higher TCN concentration than the next deepest sample, suggesting that the lowest sediment has a higher inheritance. The deepest sample was collected just above a shell-bearing zone (Fig. 3.4). As seen in the adjacent gully section and coastal scarp, the shells are contained in a 3.5 m thick foreset package at the top of a 15 m thick ice-marginal, glaciomarine delta that is capped by a 1.5 m thick glaciofluvial topset layer. It is possible that part of the deepest TCN sample included some of the foreset sediments, hence a different initial TCN concentration. A *Hiatella arctica* shell collected in the shell-rich area with several well preserved species on the wind-eroded scarp of the delta has been radiocarbon dated to 43.1 ± 0.4 cal ka BP (Table 3.3, see section below) indicating the possibility of an unconformity within the depth profile that is dated to 12.4 ±1.0/±2.8 ka (separating the four shallow samples from the deepest sample). The top of the delta is wind eroded (Fig. A2.5) with scattered cobbles and boulders on the topset surface; they may represent a combination of eolian lag, outwash flood deposits, and ice rafted debris. At the location of the depth profile, net erosion of the glaciofluvial topset layer was estimated to range between 30 and 100 cm. This estimate of net eroded thickness was used in the depth profile calculator to constrain the age and inheritance of the depth profile (Table 3.2, Table A2.2 – A2.3). If less net erosion is assumed, calculated exposure ages are too young to fit into the morpho-stratigraphic moraine sequence based on the new chronology (Fig. 3.3a).

*Moon Valley fan constraint on LIS glacial maximum position.* Besides the boulder exposure age of 14.6 ± 1.2 ka (samples E223A-01, Table 3.1) obtained for the outermost LIS moraine, the initial retreat of the LIS is also constrained by a TCN depth profile collected from a glacio-lacustrine delta deposited in a small lake that was dammed
between the LIS margin and the local ice occupying Pangnirtung Fiord. The age of $14.7 - 1.6^{+2.5}_{-1.5} \text{ ka}$ obtained from the depth profile (Fig. A2.5) agrees closely with the boulder exposure age for the moraine damming the lake.

![Fig. 3.4](image)

**Fig. 3.4** Stratigraphic description of the raised glacio-marine and glacio-lacustrine complex delta (right column) and detail of uppermost 1.6 m (left column), in which samples for a TCN depth profile (red squares) were collected. **A.** Oblique air photograph of the delta (view NE taken in 2010) near the head of Ujuktuk Fiord at the southwestern coast of Cumberland Peninsula (see Fig. 3.3a for location). Location of depth profile on the delta is marked by red arrow. **B.** Photo viewing E showing the lowest section of the exposed horizontal finely bedded silty sand with gravelly lenses. **C.** Shells of *Hiatella arctica* in growth position in upper section of glaciomarine foreset sequence (scale shows cm), which is capped by glaciofluvial topsets. **D.** Depth profile in the uppermost 1.6 m of the glaciofluvial portion of the raised delta.

### 3.5.3 Radiocarbon Chronologies

The *Hiatella arctica* shell collected in the topset layer of the glacio-marine delta at the head of Ujuktuk Fiord (Fig. 3.3a) yielded a calibrated radiocarbon age of $43.1 \pm 0.4$
cal ka BP (Table 3.3). This age is significant, because this delta is the only OIS-3 marine deposit known from the Cumberland Sound area and it implies that minimum OIS-3 ice recession was at least about a third of the OIS-2 recession (from the coast to the interior). Furthermore, it indicates that crustal depression caused by ice cover during OIS-4 was not completely compensated during that part of OIS-3, and the shell age provides a maximum-limit for the timing of ice advance to LGM.

The *Mytilus edulis* shell sample, collected from a raised marine deposit (32 m asl) at American Harbour northwest of Pangnirtung Fiord (Fig. 3.1, Fig. A2.1h), yielded a calibrated radiocarbon age of $8.0 \pm 0.1$ cal ka BP (Table 3.3). This age is in agreement with previous chronology obtained from a nearby raised marine deposit below a terrace at 28 m (DIC-334, *Hiatella arctica*, calibrated age $8.3 \pm 0.1$ cal ka BP, Dyke, 1979, Table S2.4). It provides a minimum age for LIS recession. However, better minimum limiting ages for ice recession through Cumberland Sound have been obtained previously in Pangnirtung Fiord and Usualuk Valley northeast of our sample site (Fig. 3.1, see discussion below, Dyke, 1979, LeBlanc et al., 2011). The significance of the newly obtained date is that *Mytilus edulis* is regarded as a thermophile in this region and Cumberland Sound is near its geographic limit on the Canadian side of Baffin Bay (Aitken and Gilbert, 1989). The new $8.0 \pm 0.1$ cal ka BP date thus provides a minimum limiting age for incursion of subarctic waters into an ice free Cumberland Sound.

3.6 ICE FLOW AT LGM

Streamlined glacial bedforms mapped from airphotos and striae on bedrock surfaces were the primary ice flow indicators used. Care was taken to avoid measuring striae that may be affected by small-scale topographical anomalies. Cross-cutting striae
and striae on lee-side surfaces protected from the primary ice flow were sought to provide
directions and relative timing of ice flow from a slightly different direction, but none
were observed. Small scale (nail-head striae, crescentic gouges, stoss-lee features) and
large-scale bedrock erosional features (roches moutonnées and other glacially
streamlined bedrock forms) were used to infer dominant ice flow direction. Moraine
shape (concave up ice), lateral moraine dip, and orientation of lateral meltwater channels
also helped constrain glacier geometry and dominant ice flow direction during
deglaciation.

Although the highest plateaus near Cape Mercy at the southern tip of the peninsula
(Fig. 3.5) are mantled with felsenmeer showing no sign of glacial erosion, somewhat
lower plateaus just north of there are glacially scoured and inscribed by a set of eastward
trending bedforms that cross the width of the landmass. Because these bedforms
originate in onshore flow from Cumberland Sound, they indicate that the CSIS inundated
the southernmost tip of the peninsula. The sharp inland limit of this flowset indicates that
the ice stream lateral margin was up to 18 km north of Cape Mercy at its widest, and the
elevation of the scoured terrain indicates that the ice stream surface was >300 m above
present sea level as it exited onto the continental shelf in Davis Strait. West of this
flowset, there is no onshore bedform evidence of the CSIS east of Pangnirtung Fiord. We
infer, therefore, that the boundary between the CSIS and alpine outlet glaciers lay outside
of the coast within the sound.
Fig. 3.5 Generalized ice flow at LGM: Most of the peninsula is covered by polythermal alpine glaciers (yellow shading). The land-based LIS (pink shading) only extended to west of Pangnirtung Fiord (PF), while the marine-based LIS (green shading) occupied Cumberland Sound causing deflection of the alpine ice flow at the southwestern coast of the peninsula. The expanded PIC coalesced with the LIS to the southwest, whereas the eastern PIC margin remained dynamically independent. CM: Cape Mercy, NPF: North Pangnirtung Fiord.
Abundant and well preserved bedforms and striae in scoured terrain farther north along the southeastern coast demonstrate persistent west to east flow, which is oblique to many NW-SE orientated valleys and fiords. This persistent flow pattern requires ice thicker than the topographic relief. However, along the southwest coast, ice flow directions vary but the overall flow direction was to the west and southwest, opposite to any flow that might possibly be related to an over-riding LIS. We interpret the ages of the ice flow indicators to represent the LGM ice configuration (Fig. 3.5), because there is only one set of striae preserved at each location visited, the striae and small- and large-scale landforms yield accordant directions, and the flow directions are consistent at nearby sites. Based on the opposing flow patterns, an alpine ice divide is inferred to have extended from the northeastern to the southwestern coast, generally setting atop the highest mountain ranges. Thus almost all of Cumberland Peninsula east of the PIC was covered by an alpine glacier system during the last glaciation. The highest plateaus and summits in this region, including many adjacent to extant glaciers, show no obvious sign of glacial scouring and instead are mantled by felsenmeer. The rest of the terrain is glacially scoured and (or) till covered. Hence, we infer that the alpine glacier complex was polythermal, thick enough to cover (almost) all of the topography but too thin to attain a warm base on the highest parts. The alpine ice divide funneled ice through most valleys and fiords of the peninsula, except for Pangnirtung and North Pangnirtung Fiords (Fig. 3.5). These fiords and fiords north of North Pangnirtung Fiord were filled by outlet glaciers of an expanded PIC that coalesced with the LIS on its western side, but remained dynamically independent on its eastern margin. The land-based LIS only extended onshore to the west of Pangnirtung Fiord, where it coalesced with the expanded PIC to
the north. Despite dedicated searches for ice flow indicators or provenance-indicating lithologies, there is no evidence for the LIS east of 65.74°W. This interpretation is based on ice flow direction and the lack of high concentrations of calcium, magnesium or inorganic carbon in tills collected throughout the peninsula for geochemical analysis (Gammon et al., 2011). Elevated calcium concentrations would indicate origin of ice flow in the Foxe Basin, which is underlain by Paleozoic sediments. Limited land-based LIS extent on Cumberland Peninsula is corroborated by previous observation of dispersal of limestone erratics on Baffin Island (Andrews and Miller, 1979). Kaplan (1999) found a single dolomite erratic along the southeast coast of Cumberland Peninsula within the area we inferred was overridden by LIS, but two days of helicopter sampling of till adjacent to the head of Cumberland Sound by us failed to turn up a single carbonate erratic. While the land-based LIS did not cross the peninsula during the LGM, the CSIS impinged the southernmost tip of the Cumberland Peninsula at Cape Mercy (described above) causing eastwards deflection of ice flow from the fiords along the Cumberland Sound coastline (Fig. 3.5). Extension of the CSIS onto the continental shelf is supported by radiocarbon ages offshore (Jennings, 1993; Jennings et al., 1996).

3.7 DISCUSSION

3.7.1 Regional Deglacial Ice Dynamics

Based on moraines, lateral meltwater channels, and ice-contact deltas, over 100 ice margins have been mapped from air photos and field observations (Fig. 3.6). The new deglacial geochronology (Fig. 3.3) complemented by previously published TCN data (Steig et al., 1998; Marsella et al., 2000; Kaplan et al., 2001; Miller et al., 2002) and radiocarbon data (England and Andrews, 1973; Miller, 1973; Dyke, 1979; Dyke et al.,
1982; Brigham, 1983; Locke, 1987; Jennings, 1993; Miller et al., 2002; LeBlanc et al., 2011), and geomorphic position permit the correlation of three prominent ice marginal positions throughout the peninsula (Fig. 3.7 – 3.9). Ice marginal positions (moraines) are interpreted to represent re-advances of alpine ice at the end of H-1 at ~14.6 ka (Fig. 3.7), shortly after retreat of the CSIS from the outer part of the Sound (Jennings, 1993; Jennings et al., 1996; Kaplan et al., 2001), then at the end of the YD cold interval at ~11.7 ka (Fig. 3.8), and finally during the Cockburn substage, when the widespread Cockburn moraines were deposited by the LIS at ~9.5 ka (Fig. 3.9, Miller and Dyke, 1974; Andrews and Ives, 1978; Briner et al., 2009). Retreat rates for the intervening interstadials are inferred from these maps (Fig. 3.10) as well as the change in ELA through deglaciation (Fig. 3.11).

3.7.2 Heinrich Event 1 Re-Advance

At 14.6 ka, most of Cumberland Peninsula was still covered by alpine ice, the PIC extended to the northwestern coast, and the land-based LIS terminated in Moon Valley just west of Pangnirtung Fiord (Fig. 3.7). The CSIS had retreated through the deepest section of the Sound and the ice margin probably was located just west of the mouth of Pangnirtung Fiord adjacent to a prominent Laurentide recessional moraine onshore. Along most of the coast, ice was located at the mouths of embayments, fiords and valleys, but between Touak Fiord and Cape Mercy alpine ice still extended onto the (modern) continental shelf. This position is consistent with a closer proximity of the ice divide to the coast (Fig. 3.7) at this time relative to the younger readvances. We assume that parts of the northeastern coast between Cape Dyer and Reid Bay remained ice free at and after the LGM (see discussion below).
Fig. 3.6 Ice margin positions, inferred from mapped moraines and meltwater channels, are shown as black lines. The ice margins depict the retreat of outlet glaciers of the predominant polythermal glacier system, the PIC, and the land-based LIS west of Pangnirtung Fiord (PF).
Fig 3.7 Early deglacial ice extent at ~14.6 ka. Yellow circles indicate new chronological constraint, yellow triangles indicate previous TCN data, and yellow square indicates previous radiocarbon data used to infer ice extent. BI: Broughton Island, MB: Merchants Bay, RB: Reid Bay, CD: Cape Dyer, SF: Sunneshine Fiord, TF: Touak Fiord, CM: Cape Mercy, UF: Ujuktuk Fiord, KumF: Kumlien Fiord, PF: Pangnirtung Fiord.
Recession of the CSIS through the deepest section of the sound is inferred from previous data indicating that Cape Mercy and the outermost areas of the southwestern coast were deglaciated between 12.4 – 14.4 ka (Kaplan et al. 2001, adjusted to ~14 – 16 ka with new production rate and lower \(^{10}\)Be half-life). Considering relative sea-level data, Kaplan and Miller (2003) proposed that the ice stream rapidly retreated from the outer sound, followed by slower retreat through the narrowest part of the sound (between Ujuktuk and Kumlien Fiord), with subsequent fast retreat through the deepest section of the sound to Kingnait Fiord (Fig. 3.7). Prior retreat of the CSIS is required for the formation of moraines, meltwater channels, and raised marine deposits at the mouth of fiords and major valleys along the southwestern coast of Cumberland Peninsula. This retreat pattern of the CSIS, inferred from terrestrial data, is largely consistent with radiocarbon dating of marine sediment cores indicating that initial retreat from the continental shelf occurred no later than 15.9 ± 2.2 cal ka BP followed by retreat of the CSIS through the deepest section at around 12.1 ± 0.4 cal ka BP (Table A2.4, BETA-7405 and AA-3939, respectively, Jennings, 1993). The older age was derived from correction of an even older radiocarbon age of bulk organic matter (Jennings, 1993). Calibrating the uncorrected radiocarbon date yields an age of 23.6 ± 2.2 cal ka BP (Table A2.4, BETA-7405 orig.), which agrees better with the later interpretation that the CSIS initially advanced between 34 and 21 \(^{14}\)C ka followed by ice recession and subsequent re-advance during the Younger Dryas at ~11 \(^{14}\)C ka (see discussion below, Jennings et al., 1996).

The land-based LIS and local ice stood at their oldest recessional moraines in Moon Valley west of Pangnirtung Fiord, where outlet glaciers of both ice masses
simultaneously dammed a lake, as indicated by concordant ages obtained for the depth profile in the glaciolacustrine delta (14.7 ± 1.6 /-2.5 ka) and a boulder exposure age on the oldest LIS moraine (14.6 ± 1.2 ka). Because all ice marginal features suggest that higher ground emerged earlier from the ice, we conclude that the plateaus adjacent to Moon Valley were deglaciated at about 16 - 18 ka (Fig. 3.7). That conclusion contradicts previous work indicating continuous sedimentation in tarns on these plateaus (Wolfe, 1994; Wolfe and Härtling, 1996). Wolfe and Härtling (1996) suggested that the unconsolidated lake sediments would have been eroded by covering ice, and thus concluded that the lake basins remained ice-free throughout the last glaciation. However, new and previous TCN data (Chapter 4, Bierman et al., 1999) indicate that the plateaus were covered by weakly erosive, cold-based ice caps during the last glaciation. These TCN results favour the subsequent reinterpretation of the lake record as a deglacial sequence followed by Holocene organic deposition, which are separated by a depositional hiatus from the underlying organic sediments (Frechette et al., 2006). Interestingly, Wolfe and Härtling (1996) had already considered this interpretation as one of three possible explanation of their radiocarbon data, but disregarded it as unlikely in favour of the ice-free interpretation.

In the Merchants Bay region (Fig. 3.7), previous TCN exposure dating of a series of moraines revealed successively younger ages with lower elevation (Steig et al., 1998) indicating diminishing ice extent since OIS-3. Ice-free conditions on the plateaus beyond the highest moraine ridge are supported by radiocarbon and OSL dating of lake sediments demonstrating continuous sedimentation on the plateaus since the last interglacial (Wolfe et al., 2000). Previous research on Broughton Island also suggested that ice covered only
the lower-lying areas of the island during the early Wisconsin, and was restricted to the channel between Broughton Island and Cumberland Peninsula during a re-advance in OIS-2 following significant retreat in the middle Wisconsinan (OIS-3, England and Andrews, 1973; Andrews et al., 1976b; Brigham, 1983). Because we do not have additional age constraints on the northeastern coast, we assume that the H-1 ice margin (Fig. 3.7) corresponds to the lowest moraine dated by Steig et al. (1998) and that ice did not extend across Broughton Island. Contrary to the Goldilocks paradigm, we believe that the plateaus on Broughton Island and in the Merchants Bay region were covered during the last glaciation, albeit by thin, weakly erosive, cold-based ice (Chapter 4). Therefore, we suggest that the unconsolidated lake sediments were protected beneath perennial ice ceasing sedimentation during glacial stages.

Moraines along Sunneshine Fiord in the Cape Dyer area (Fig. 3.7) have been previously assigned to the early Wisconsinan and an older glaciation based on relative weathering data augmented with radiocarbon and amino acid recrimation dating of marine shells collected from raised marine deltas (Locke, 1987). TCN exposure dating of boulders deposited on the moraines revealed that the moraines may be associated with ice margins of the early and late Wisconsinan (Miller et al., 2002). Following Miller et al. (2002), we place the Late Wisconsinan ice margin on the inner two moraine ridges, which is further supported by an age of 15.0 ± 0.2 cal ka BP for an aquatic moss in basal sediments of Donard Lake located just outside of the Sunneshine Fiord moraines (Table A2.4, CAMS-23554, Moore et al., 2001). However, we cannot preclude the possibility that the entire nested moraine sequence was formed during the Late Wisconsinan. In this scenario, the infinite radiocarbon age (≥57 ^14C ka, CAMS-11337, Table A2.4, Miller et
al. 2002) on paired mollusc valves in a raised marine delta associated with the outermost moraine would need to have been preserved beneath the late Wisconsinan ice advance (see discussion in following section). Approximately 20 km NW of the Sunneshine Fiord delta, however, it appears that the ice did not advance during the LGM to a raised marine delta which has been dated to 41.1 ± 0.8 cal ka BP (Table A2.4, QL-979, Miller, 1979; Locke, 1987). The mollusc shells on this delta are fragile and well preserved (including internal mother-of-pearl (nacre)) so the date seems viable. Field observations of that delta confirmed that there is no overlying till or boulder scatter and no evidence of deformation or truncation of the delta. Therefore, we support the previous interpretation that the coastal stretch between Cape Dyer and Reid Bay, including outer Sunneshine Fiord, remained ice-free during OIS-2 (Fig. 3.7).

Preservation of a raised marine delta deposited during middle Wisconsinan ice retreat is also documented by the newly acquired finite 43.1 ± 0.4 cal ka BP radiocarbon age on *Hiatella arctica* collected from a marine terrace in Ujuktuk Fiord along the southwestern coast of Cumberland Peninsula (Table 3.3, Fig. 3.3a). The marine terrace is capped by glacio-fluvial deposits dated to 12.4 \( ^{10.0/2.8} \) ka by a TCN depth profile. These sands are indistinguishable from the underlying marine sequence (Table 3.2, Fig. 3.4). Despite the vulnerable location of the delta at the head of a large fiord, the outlet glacier advancing to the mouth of the fiord during OIS-2 did not erode the entire delta indicating that basal thermal conditions may have varied spatially.

### 3.7.3 Younger Dryas Re-Advance

By the end of the Younger Dryas cold stage, wide stretches (40 – 60 km) of the coastline remained ice-free and glaciers were limited to fiords (Merchants Bay region and
Touak Fiord area), the head of the fiords (southeastern coast) or further inland (southwestern coast, Fig. 3.8). In the Pangnirtung Fiord area ice (partly fed by PIC) still stood within the Duval moraine system with only minor recession of the ice margin (3 - 5 km in Moon Valley).

Jennings et al. (1996) postulated that the CSIS re-advanced to the continental shelf during the Younger Dryas cold period based on evidence for a dolomite-rich detrital carbonate layer in a sediment core from the Labrador sea. In particular, the high dolomite concentration of this detrital carbonate layer compared to previous layers in the same core, and the recognition of a similar layer in a core from Sunnehine Fiord in the Cape Dyer area (Andrews et al., 1996), led Jennings et al. (1996) to conclude that it correlated with an ice advance in Cumberland Sound. However, Jennings et al. (1996) also proposed an alternate interpretation based on the high fraction of shelf-dwelling foraminifera in the detrital carbonate layer, which suggested that the layer could also be deposited by a gravity flow caused by failure of the continental shelf that was overloaded with glacial sediments. Onshore, despite targeted searches, we did not find any evidence for a re-advance of CSIS during the YD, thus supporting Jennings et al. (1996) alternate interpretation that the dolomite-rich layer did not mark an ice-marginal position. Furthermore, it is unlikely that the marine-based LIS re-advanced >300 km through the Cumberland Sound, while the terrestrial LIS margin simultaneously retreated ~3 km by 11.2 ± 0.4 ka, as indicated by the new chronological control obtained from the second recession moraine.
Fig 3.8 Ice extent at the end of the YD cold interval (~11.7 ka). Yellow circles indicate locations of age constraint for the interpreted ice extent. BI: Broughton Island, MB: Merchants Bay, TF: Touak Fiord, PF: Pangnirtung Fiord.
At the northeastern margin of the PIC, outlet glaciers still extended to the mouth of fiords and coastal valleys, as indicated by a minimum limiting age of 11.4 ± 1.3 cal ka BP obtained from a *Mya truncata* shell collected in the bottomset silts overlain by deltaic foresets of a raised glacio-marine deposits in the middle of Narpaing Fiord (just north of Fig. 3.8, Table A2.4, GaK-2574, Dyke et al., 1982). In the ‘central valley’ ice advanced in the broadest part of the valley during the Younger Dryas cold interval. Subsequent ice recession left a remarkable set of nested moraines and meltwater channels, possibly indicating annual ice margin positions. In the intervening area between Kingnait Fiord and Pangnirtung Fiord, the youngest age of three erratic boulders deposited on a till plain indicates that the area deglaciated shortly after the YD cold interval (11.1 ± 0.9 ka, Table 3.1, Fig. A2.2g). Local ice occupying Pangnirtung Fiord retreated only a short distance (~5 km) from its H-1 position by 10.2 ± 0.3 ka (Fig. 3.3a). This age obtained for the recessional moraine approximately agrees with the younger mode of the bimodal age distribution previously determined for the Duval moraine and equivalent moraine ridges (discussed above, Marsella et al., 2000).

### 3.7.4 Cockburn-Equivalent Re-Advance

In most areas, the innermost pre-Neoglacial moraine ridges can be correlated with the prominent Cockburn moraines, which were deposited along the northeastern and northern margins of the LIS (Miller and Dyke, 1974; Andrews and Ives, 1978). Cockburn moraines are primarily dated by fossiliferous ice-marginal glaciomarine deposits ranging in age from 9.5 to 8.5 cal ka BP (Miller and Dyke, 1974; Andrews and Ives, 1978; Briner et al., 2009). The moraines wrap around the heads of fiords in a nearly continuous line paralleling the outer coast of Baffin Island from Bernier Bay in the
northwest to Forbisher Bay in the south. The Ranger moraine, at the head of Cumberland Sound and on westernmost Cumberland Peninsula, is the local member of the Cockburn moraine system. It extends almost continuously from the mouth of Clearwater Fiord to the western lobe of the PIC, which is presently over-riding it (inset in Fig. 3.9, Dyke, 1979; Dyke et al., 1982). Outlet glaciers of the PIC still occupied valleys along its northeastern and southwestern margin, but in places the PIC had retreated to or behind its present day margin, as illustrated by the cross-cutting mentioned above (Miller, 1973; Dyke, 1979; Dyke et al., 1982). East of the PIC, the Cockburn-equivalent re-advance was restricted to the interior of Cumberland Peninsula, where the alpine glacier system had separated in several smaller ice masses (Fig. 3.9).

In the ‘central valley’ ice had retreated to the highest part of the valley. Two boulders on the most distal of a set of end moraines that are only a few kilometres beyond the LIA moraines of cirque glaciers provide a maximum limiting age for recession to this point (10.0 ± 0.4 ka, Table 3.1). We thus infer that the youngest Pre-Neoglacial moraines here are likely of Cockburn age.
Farther north, the alpine glacier system had retreated towards the late ice dispersal centre at the heads of Padle Fiord and Boas Fiord (Fig. 3.9). Because the fiords were ice free during cooling associated with these moraines, local cirque glacier complexes were free to expand into the sides of fiords on the northeastern coast to form some of the best developed and well preserved Holocene lateral and end moraines on the peninsula. Because of their exceptional development (Dyke 2013 b; c), we correlate them with the Cockburn moraines, as have others (Hawkins, 1985). By Cockburn time, the most dominant alpine glacier system probably had just retreated to a position north of Cirque Lake (pass between Kingnait Fiord and Padle Fiord) and south of Akvaqiak Lake (near the head of Padle Fiord), where basal lake sediments are dated at 9.5 ± 0.1 cal ka BP (Table A2.4, NSRL-10139, Frechette and de Vernal, 2009) and to Pangnirtung Pass (Fig. 3.9).

Additional constraint for ice extent during this interval is provided by previous radiocarbon dating of mollusc shells at various locations (Fig. 3.9). At the northeastern margin of the PIC, outlet glaciers still occupied valleys and as indicated by both *Mya truncata* ages of 10.0 ± 0.2 cal ka BP at the head of Quajon Fiord (shown in Fig. 3.9, Table A2.4, GaK-5479, Dyke et al., 1982) and 9.2 ± 0.2 cal ka BP in Okoa Bay in ice-contact sediment (just north of Fig. 3.9, Table A2.4, St-3816, Miller, 1973; Dyke et al. 1982). At the head of Kingnait Fiord, the minimum-limiting age for ice recession prior to readvance during the Cockburn-equivalent cold interval is given by *Mya truncata* shells collected in bottomset clayey silts below foresets terminating at a terrace at 16 m asl (GSC-2083, calibrated to 9.4 ± 0.4 cal ka BP, Table A2.4, Dyke, 1979; McNeely and Brennan, 2005). Near the Pangnirtung airstrip, two radiocarbon ages on *Mya truncata*
and other shells collected from a bulldozer cut and a borehole drilled into the 50 m asl marine-limit delta signify ice recession of the PIC outlet glacier by 9.6 ± 0.1 cal ka BP (Table A2.4, UCIAMS-85913, LeBlanc et al., 2001; GSC-2001, Dyke, 1979). At the same time, PIC outlet glaciers occupied Usualuk Valley and an adjacent valley as indicated by a radiocarbon age of 9.6 ± 0.1 cal ka BP obtained from *Portlandia arctica* collected in badland sandy silts of a raised marine-limit delta (GSC-2183, Table A2.4, Dyke, 1979; McNeely and Brennan, 2005). By implication, the LIS had withdrawn to the Ranger moraine by this time (Dyke, 1979). The LIS then separated from the western margin of the PIC, which subsequently re-advanced to form the outer PIC moraines. The marine-based LIS prevailed at the mouth of Clearwater Fiord at the head of Cumberland Sound until 6.4 ± 0.1 cal ka BP (inset map Fig. 3.9, Table A2.4, DIC-334, Dyke, 1979; McNeely and Brennan, 2005), implying slow retreat of LIS from the Ranger moraine.

### 3.7.5 Deglacial Retreat Rates

Retreat of the alpine glacier system was previously documented along the coast west of Broughton Island (Miller, 1973) and in the Cape Dyer area (Fig. 3.1, Locke, 1987; Miller et al., 2002). Ice occupied the fiords west of Broughton Island until approximately 11.4 ± 1.3 cal ka BP (Table A2.4, GaK-2574, Dyke et al. 1982), followed by rapid deglaciation of the fiords between 7 - 6 ka and final withdrawal to the current northwestern margin of the PIC by 5.8 ± 0.1 cal ka BP (Table A2.4, GaK-3273, Dyke et al. 1982). Miller (1973) estimated average ice retreat rates of 15 - 20 m a⁻¹ for the PIC outlet glaciers in this region.
The newly mapped ice marginal positions and recession pattern derived in the preceding sections permits more precise calculations of retreat rates for withdrawal of the alpine glacier system, outlet glaciers of the PIC, and the land-based LIS. Figures 3.7 – 3.9 show that the alpine glacier system retreated asymmetrically with fastest withdrawal along the southwestern coast and slowest retreat along the northeastern coast. This asymmetry of recession displaced the ice dispersal centre from an LGM ice divide system located over the mountain ridges to final centres near the heads of Padle and Boas Fiords. Intermediate ice retreat presumably occurred along the lower southeastern coast, where the ice margin extended onto the continental shelf during the LGM.

Retreat rates can be calculated for the ‘central valley’, where we have the tightest chronological control (Fig. 3.3a). Here, ice initially retreated through Ujuktuk Fiord at an average rate of 20 m a⁻¹ (recession from 14.3 ± 0.8 ka to 11.7 ± 0.9 ka) during the Bølling-Allerød interstadial (14.6 – 12.9 ka, Rasmussen et al., 2006). Final retreat to the interior is correlated with the Preboreal interstadial (11.7 – 9.5 ka, Rasmussen et al., 2006; 2007) and occurred at an average rate of approximately 30 m a⁻¹ (11.7 ± 0.9 ka – 10.0 ± 0.4 ka). Based on the ice margin positions shown in Figures 3.7 – 3.9, retreat rates from the northeastern coast are estimated to vary between 12 - 15 m a⁻¹ for ice withdrawal from the coast (Merchants Bay region) to the fiord mouth during the Bølling-Allerød interstadial, and 15 - 25 m a⁻¹ for ice recession through the fiords during the Preboreal interstadial. Retreat rates at the southeastern coast (Touak Fiord) can only be estimated for the Preboreal interstadial averaging about 15 – 20 m a⁻¹ for final retreat to the interior of Cumberland Peninsula (Table 3.4).
In comparison, ice retreated more slowly through Pangnirtung Fiord with initial retreat approximating 1 m a\(^{-1}\) (14.6 ± 1.2 ka – 10.2 ± 0.3 ka, Fig. 3.3b) and subsequent withdrawal to Pangnirtung Pass with an estimated rate of 18 – 23 m a\(^{-1}\), which is comparable with the retreat rates inferred for the alpine glacier system (Fig. 3.8 – 3.9). This initial slow rate of ice withdrawal is consistent with the requirement that the Pangnirtung Fiord ice was at least partly, if not wholly, sourced by the PIC. Owing to its greater volume and fewer tidewater outlets, the PIC response to the Bølling-Allerød warming is expected to be more sluggish than the smaller alpine systems. Additionally, during 1.3 ka of this period, the YD ice advance would have temporarily reversed and ceased ice recession, causing the retreat rates to appear even slower. For similar reasons, the land-based LIS initially only retreated with an approximate rate of 1.2 m a\(^{-1}\) (14.6 ± 1.2 ka – 11.2 ± 0.4 ka, Fig. 3.3b) before accelerated withdrawal to the Ranger moraine during the following Preboreal interstadial with an average rate of ~60 m a\(^{-1}\) (11.2 ± 0.4 ka – 9.6 ± 0.1 ka, Dyke, 1979).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate variation</th>
<th>Time ka</th>
<th>Ice mass</th>
<th>Retreat rate m a(^{-1})</th>
<th>Time constraint ka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bølling - Allerød</td>
<td>14.7 - 12.9</td>
<td>Alpine SW coast, initial retreat through fiord</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.6 - 11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alpine NE coat</td>
<td>12 - 15</td>
<td>&lt;14.6 - 11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pangnirtung (PIC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.6 - 10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land-based LIS</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>14.6 - 11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Dryas</td>
<td>12.9 - 11.7</td>
<td>moraine building phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-boreal</td>
<td>11.7 - 9.5</td>
<td>Alpine SW coast</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.7 - 10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alpine NE coat</td>
<td>12 - 25</td>
<td>~11.7 - ~10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alpine SE coat</td>
<td>12 - 20</td>
<td>~11.7 - ~10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pangnirtung (PIC)</td>
<td>18 - 23</td>
<td>10.6 - ~10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land-based LIS</td>
<td>~60</td>
<td>11.3 - 9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 Association of retreat rates of the different ice masses on Cumberland with late glacial and early Holocene climate variation. Yellow shading: alpine glacier system, blue shading: PIC outlet glacier, red shading: land-based LIS.
In summary, the variation of retreat rates for the different sectors of the alpine glacier system, outlet glaciers of the PIC in Pangnirtung Fiord, and the LIS appear to coincide with distinct late glacial and early Holocene climate events seen in Greenland ice cores (Fig. 3.10 top, Table 3.4). The initial retreat of alpine outlet glaciers from the coast occurred during the Bølling-Allerød interstadial (Rasmussen et al., 2006). During the following YD cold interval, ice margins re-advanced to the mouths of many fiords along the northeastern coast, while a prominent sequence of moraines and meltwater channels was formed in the broadest section of the ‘central valley’ (Fig. 3.8). Average retreat rates of the alpine glacier system during the following Preboreal interstadial are of the same magnitude than for the earlier Bølling-Allerød interstadial (Fig. 3.10 bottom). The last moraine building phase can be associated with a brief cold interval between 9.5 and 9.2 ka (Fig. 3.10, Vinther et al., 2006; Rasmussen et al., 2007; Axford et al., 2009). Apparently very few cirque glaciers along the northeastern coast re-advanced during the last major cold interval (8.2 ka event, Fig. 3.10, Axford et al., 2009; Young et al., 2012). However, closer dating of the putative Cockburn correlatives, especially where they are multi-crested, may reveal moraines of this age. During the subsequent Holocene thermal optimum (8 - 5 ka, Kaufman et al., 2004; Gajewski, 2015), many (all?) of the alpine glaciers possibly vanished. The most interesting results of the spatial and temporal variations in retreat rates is that, in general, ice retreat appears to have been slower on the northern sloping alpine glaciers than the southern sloping alpine glaciers. Generally, the smaller alpine systems were initially more responsive to climate warming than the larger PIC and LIS (Fig. 3.10 bottom left). However, once the LIS margin retreated, ice recession occurred much faster than the PIC or alpine glacier system (Fig. 3.10 bottom
right). Similar results have been observed globally (Oerlemans and Fortuin, 1992), and further insight in the spatial asymmetry may be gained by an analysis of the post-LGM ELAs throughout the peninsula.

**Fig 3.10** **Top.** Palaeoclimatology inferred from NGRIP (green: measured 20 year averages, blue: slight smoothing, Vinther et al., 2006) Blue shading = cold intervals: composite Heinrich Event 1 (H-1, Stanford et al., 2011), Younger Dryas (YD, Rasmussen et al., 2006), 9.5 and 9.2 ka (9.2, Vinther et al., 2006; Rasmussen et al., 2007; Axford et al., 2009), 8.2-ka event (8.2, Young et al., 2012). Red shading = warm intervals: Bølling-Allerød (B-A, Rasmussen et al., 2009), Pre-boreal (PB, Rasmussen et al., 2006; 2007), Holocene thermal optimum (HTO, Kaufman et al., 2004; Gajewski, 2015). **Bottom.** Inferred average retreat rates for the Bølling-Allerød interstadial (left) and the Pre-boreal interstadial (right). Note different vertical axis. Yellow: alpine glacier system, blue: PIC outlet glacier, magenta: land-based LIS.

3.7.6 *Paleo-ELA Reconstructions*

Maps of paleo-ELA distribution throughout the peninsula were derived from the maximum elevation of lateral moraines assigned to the three specific time intervals (supplementary file, Fig. A2.7 – A2.9). Owing to erosion or non-deposition of the upper reaches of lateral moraines, the inferred paleo-ELAs are minimum estimates (Meierding,
Large uncertainties also arise from the available elevation data, particularly in the interior of the peninsula where topographic data is only available at a scale of 1:250,000 with contour intervals of 100 m. Along the coast, topographic data are available at a scale of 1:50,000 with contour intervals of 40 m. Furthermore, current elevations of lateral moraines need to be corrected for isostatic rebound of the area since deposition of the moraines (supplementary file, section A2.4). Available sea-level data (Dyke, 1979; Kaplan and Miller, 2003; Cowan, 2015; Hughes Clarke et al., 2015) were combined with an estimate of eustatic sea level (Miller et al., 2011) at each time interval to infer the magnitude of isostatic rebound, which may contribute up to 50 m of uncertainty for a given region and time. Correction for eustatic sea level during deglaciation is debated (Osmaston, 2006; Hanson and Hooke, 2011), but it is required on Cumberland Peninsula to attain enough separation of reconstructed paleo-ELA gradients (Fig. 3.11, supplementary file, section A2.4). While the paleo-ELA of a specific location may not be precise, the patterns of ELA-change during deglaciation are significant and can be linked to associated changes in temperature and precipitation (Fig. 3.11).

Contours of paleo-ELA inferred for the three different time intervals during deglaciation show declining ELA towards all three coasts of the peninsula (Fig. 3.11, supplementary file Fig. A2.7 – A2.10). Concurrent with the withdrawal of ice toward the northeastern coast, ELA contours shift northeastward. Paleo-ELAs for the Cockburn-equivalent time slice are only extracted for alpine moraines, so that contours are centred on the high elevation alpine topography in the interior of the Peninsula. This pattern differs markedly from modern ELA contours that are centred on the PIC, which were derived from the lowest elevation of extant cirque glaciers (Fig. A2.11, Andrews and
Miller, 1972). Interestingly, the modern ELA contours resemble more closely the paleo-ELA pattern for the YD cold stage than the later Cockburn-equivalent cold interval. Since extant glaciers are not in equilibrium with current climate, the inferred modern ELA might be too low and as such may be more closely related to climate conditions during the Little Ice Age (Andrews and Miller, 1972). Paleo-ELAs have been previously inferred for late Foxe moraines in the Merchants Bay area, which was essentially synonymous with the Cockburn stage (Hawkins, 1985) accordant to the assignment in this paper (Fig. 3.9, Dyke, 2013b, c). Our inferred paleo-ELA distribution for this time interval again bears a closer resemblance to the modern ELAs of Hawkins (1985) and not his late Foxe paleo-ELAs, which are approximately 200 – 300 m below the modern ELAs. Some of the discrepancy between the previous studies and our data might be related to the more precise elevation data available today. To evaluate the asymmetry between the north and south sloping glaciers observed in the glacier retreat rates, the paleo-ELA trends were plotted on a topographic profile along the former alpine ice divide (Fig. 3.5), which coincides approximately with the longer axis of the elliptical pattern of paleo-ELA contours (Fig. 3.10). At the southwestern coast, paleo-ELA increased approximately 60 m between the end of H-1 (14.6 ka) and the end of the YD (11.7 ka) time intervals. This increase in ELA corresponds to roughly 0.3 ºC warming based on a lapse rate of 4.9º C km⁻¹ (Gardner et al., 2009). However, at the northeastern coast, paleo-ELAs first decrease between the end of H-1 and the end of the YD but increase again during the Cockburn-equivalent cold stage, particularly further inland over the high alpine topography (Fig. 3.10). This pattern is consistent with glacier volumes attaining equilibrium during the longer duration of the YD relative to the short-lived and
less intense Cockburn event. Instead of a temperature signal, the drop in ELA during the YD might indicate higher precipitation along the northeastern coast, in relation perhaps to decreasing sea ice cover offshore. Currently, the Cape Dyer region receives twice as much precipitation as Pangnirtung (Moore et al., 2001), which is also reflected by the modern ELA pattern (Fig. A2.11, Andrews and Miller, 1972). Reduced sea ice cover after 13 ka has been inferred from dinocyst assemblages in a sediment core from Labrador Sea and after 10 ka from a sediment core in northern Baffin Bay (de Vernal and Hillaire-Marcel, 2006). The increased moisture source provided by less sea ice and orographic effect on precipitation could have led to lowering of ELA during the YD cold stage, which is also supported by evidence for slower retreat of alpine glaciers in this region compared to the southwestern coast. Warming during the following Preboreal interstadial led to an increase of ELAs in the interior and steepening of the ELA profile towards the coast.

3.8 CONCLUSIONS

New radiocarbon and TCN chronology and a new high-resolution map of ice margin positions have made it possible to analyse differences in the ice dynamics of an extensive alpine glacier system, the PIC, and the LIS. Measurements of ice flow indicators and large-scale bedrock erosional landforms reveal that the majority of Cumberland Peninsula was covered by an independent alpine glacier system with only the southernmost tip being overridden by the CSIS and the land-based LIS merely encroaching the part west of Pangnirtung Fiord.
Fig. 3.10 Reconstruction of paleo-ELA for three time intervals during deglaciation shown along profile A-A’ from the southwestern to the northeastern coast of Cumberland Peninsula and in plain view.
Response time of the different ice masses to late Pleistocene and early Holocene climate changes varied considerably. Initial sluggish retreat of LIS and PIC outlet glaciers (1 - 2 m a\(^{-1}\) between 14.6 – 11.7 ka) contrasted with an order of magnitude faster retreat rate for the alpine system over the same time period. Retreat rates of the land-based LIS accelerated considerably during the Preboreal interstadial (~60 m a\(^{-1}\) for LIS), while the PIC outlet glacier and the alpine glacier system continued retreating at similar rates (~20 m ka\(^{-1}\)). Whereas the alpine glacier system reacted more sensitively to late Pleistocene warming, there was a large variation among rates for different regions of the peninsula. In general however, outlet glaciers quickly receded from the southwestern coast with average rates 20 – 30 m a\(^{-1}\), while glaciers retracted more slowly along the northeastern coast (12 - 25 m a\(^{-1}\)). This slower retreat may be linked to increased precipitation at the northeastern coast related to reduction in sea ice cover in the adjacent marine basins as suggested by decreasing paleo-ELAs in that region. At the southwestern coast paleo-ELAs increased slightly between 14.6 and 11.7 ka implying that air temperatures increased approximately 0.3°C during this time interval.

Preservation of unconsolidated glacio-marine sediments deposited during an intervening ice withdrawal in the middle Wisconsinan interstadial by a re-advancing outlet glacier is revealed by radiocarbon dating of mollusc shells and a TCN depth profile indicating that basal thermal conditions may have varied spatially. The interpretation that most sampled boulders contain inherited TCN concentrations suggests either ice-free or cold-based ice conditions in the source area of the boulders and insufficient erosion during glacial transport. The spatial pattern of the inherited concentrations is consistent with valley and fiord ice being warm-based and more erosive than the highland plateau.
regions. The pronounced difference in weathering degree of freshly scoured valleys and regolith mantled plateaus together with evidence for ice coverage of upland areas denote the polythermal character of the alpine ice cover. This conclusion suggests that ice cover was comparatively thin on plateaus, which deglaciated before recession of outlet glaciers in adjacent valleys.
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4.1 Abstract

Rates of episodic quarrying of weathered bedrock blocks by cold-based ice and the timing of the last plucking event have been determined for tors on weathered plateaus on Cumberland Peninsula. By measuring terrestrial cosmogenic nuclide concentrations in bedrock surfaces of different surface weathering degrees at the same tor, we demonstrate how to determine the complex exposure and erosion history involving recurring cold-based ice cover. Average durations of ice cover and total complex (burial plus exposure) histories are estimated based on a simple model of periodic glacial-interglacial cycles. The nature and rate of subaerial and subglacial erosion are assessed with a Monte Carlo approach that computes plausible exposure histories based on a proxy record of global ice volume. Parameters defining the exposure history have to fit for all surfaces sampled at the same site, while parameters defining the exhumation of the surfaces through occasional plucking of overlying bedrock blocks are modelled for each sample individually. Constant subaerial erosion rates by abrasion are limited to low values (<3 mm ka\(^{-1}\)), corroborated by nuclide concentrations measured on two tors located on coastal ridge crests that have never been glaciated. Subglacial erosion of tors by plucking of fractured bedrock blocks usually exceeds abrasion, indicating prevailing cold-based
ice conditions on the summit plateaus. Rates of episodic quarrying (1 – 7 mm ka\(^{-1}\)) vary between differentially weathered surfaces at the same site as well as between tors exhibiting different degrees of glacial modification. Variation of episodic erosion rates is associated with topographic position of the sampled tors and fracture density of the bedrock. With the exception of two coastal summits that appear to never have been glaciated, all summits were covered by cold-based ice during LGM, but many of the tors were last modified in pre-ultimate glaciations. Tors that exhibit the smallest degree of glacial modification were last plucked >400 ka ago and most probably >1 Ma ago. Tors that are most glacially modified were last plucked prior to LGM and most probably 200-250 ka ago. Despite late Pleistocene intervals of ice cover, tor-studded landscapes of Cumberland Peninsula are of considerable antiquity.

4.2 INTRODUCTION

The erosion history of both upland surfaces and valleys must be known to determine temporal and spatial variability in rates of relief generation, sediment flux to oceans, and isostatic uplift over 10\(^3\) to 10\(^6\)-year timescales. For high-latitude dissected coastal plateaus, the large area of upland plateaus suggests that even slow erosion of these surfaces may be significant (Dowdeswell et al., 2010; Steer et al., 2012) owing to polythermal ice and periglacial processes during glaciations and extensive regolith development during warm periods (von Blanckenburg, 2005). In these regions, rates and styles of valley incision by streams and glaciers has been relatively well analysed (e.g., Davis et al., 1999; Briner et al., 2008; Kessler et al., 2008). However, determining the exhumation rates of upland plateaus at timescales shorter than those determined from thermochronometry has been difficult because the rates are slow and the controlling
processes do not operate continuously in a changing climate. Because episodic erosion rates may significantly exceed gradual erosion rates (Small et al., 1997; Muzikar, 2008, 2009), determining rates of sporadic erosion is crucial for constraining rates of landscape lowering and the evolution of high-latitude highland plateaus.

The concentration and ratio of terrestrial cosmogenic nuclides (TCN) vary predictably with depth below bedrock surfaces and can be used to measure episodic rates of erosion. By using twin or triplet samples from adjacent bedrock surfaces that share an exposure history (ice cover, subaerial erosion), climate, and similar lithological properties but exhibit contrasting degrees of weathering because of plucking, it is possible to determine the long-term average total erosion rate (episodic and constant gradual erosion) from glacial and other processes. In this paper, we describe a new approach using TCN data from such differentially weathered surfaces to examine the nature and determine the rates of subaerial and subglacial erosion that prevail on weathered upland plateaus. For this purpose, we collected samples from tors — conspicuous towers of coarsely fractured bedrock protruding metres to decametres above blockfields, regolith cover, and till plains. The differentially plucked tors provide an opportunistic means to collect samples at different depths without the need for drilling, and to use the TCN concentrations and ratios to establish the most probable timing of last plucking and therefore maximum limiting age of last ice cover. Constrained by a climate time-series, a Monte Carlo method is used to generate variable histories of ice cover, fracture densities (thickness of joint blocks), subaerial erosion rate, and timing of subglacial plucking, with which the TCN data can be modelled to provide a probability distribution for episodic erosion rates. The results are used to relate the rate of plucking (i.e., sudden removal of a joint block at
the base of a glacier used here synonymously with quarrying), abrasion, and subaerial history on different summits to the extent and style of glacierization, variation in bedrock properties, and regional and local topography. The inferred rate of total erosion is compared with long-term sediment flux to the ocean and exhumation histories determined by low-temperature thermochronology. The measured TCN concentrations reveal that episodic subglacial erosion by quarrying is slow yet amounts to a tenth of the erosion rates incising fiords and valleys over the Quaternary.

4.3 PREVIOUS STUDIES OF EPISODIC EROSION

Geomorphologic processes are often dominated by episodic erosion events that are controlled by climate, tectonic processes, lithology, or autogenic cyclicities (e.g., Womack and Schumm, 1977). It is difficult to quantify the long-term rate of erosion attributed to episodic events, although they may exceed steady rates (Small et al., 1997; Muzikar, 2008, 2009). For instance, landscapes dominated by wasting processes have infrequent but high-volume erosion events that equal or exceed incremental bedrock and soil denudation rates over longer timescales (Kirchner et al., 2001; Antinao Rojas, 2009).

Glacial plucking is an episodic process, which has been shown to be primarily controlled by fracture spacing and the roughness of the glacier bed (Anderson, 2014). Smaller blocks are more likely to be quarried, so that landscapes with higher fracture density are lowered more rapidly (Dühnforth et al., 2010). With additional knowledge or assumptions of the glacial history, the rate of plucking has been estimated using TCN in bedrock surfaces (Macchiaroli, 1995; Phillips et al., 2006; Jansen et al., 2013; Fujioka et al., 2015). For instance, the rate of glacial quarrying was first determined assuming that a single plucking event occurred during the last glaciation (Macchiaroli, 1995). Most of
the previous studies focussed on quarrying and abrasion by warm-based valley glaciers or ice sheets (Briner and Swanson, 1998; Davis et al., 1999; Colgan et al., 2002). But on surfaces with low erosion rates (Nishiizumi et al., 1991; Small et al., 1997; Phillips et al., 2006) TCN concentrations are a mixed signal of exposure during interglacial intervals, shielding during one or more glaciations, episodic plucking of bedrock blocks during some glaciations, and gradual erosion of the surface by subglacial abrasion or subaerial processes. Quantification of low erosion rates on plateaus is important, because low-relief, high-elevation surfaces are often used as reference points for estimates of total glacial erosion in adjacent valleys assuming that the plateaus remained nearly unaltered throughout the Quaternary (Small and Anderson, 1998).

4.4 GLACIAL DYNAMICS OF THE STUDY AREA

Cumberland Peninsula on Baffin Island has been the locus for numerous studies of bedrock weathering, extent of past ice cover, and amount of glacial erosion (Andrews and Dugdale, 1971; Miller, 1973; Boyer and Pheasant, 1974; Miller and Dyke, 1974; Andrews et al., 1976b; Sugden and Watts, 1977; Anderson, 1978; Dyke, 1979; Watts, 1979; Dyke et al., 1982; Steig et al., 1998; Bierman et al., 1999; Davis et al., 1999; Marsella et al., 2000; Kaplan et al., 2001; Miller et al., 2002). The peninsula provides a detailed record of past ice cover by the northeastern fringe of the Laurentide Ice Sheet (LIS), the expanded Penny Ice Cap, and alpine-type polythermal glaciers throughout the cirque-scalloped terrain that forms the core of the eastern half of the peninsula (Fig. 4.1). The extent of ice cover on weathered plateaus during the last (Wisconsinan) glaciation has been extensively debated (Sugden and Watts, 1977; Dyke et al., 1982; Steig et al., 1998; Bierman et al., 1999; Bierman et al., 2001; Wolfe et al., 2001). The debate was
temporarily subdued by a proposal by Miller et al. (2002) that reconciled the previous contradictory maximum (Flint, 1943) and minimum (Ives, 1978) ice cover models with an intermediate level of ice cover. A ‘Goldilocks’ conceptual model recognizes the preservation of undisturbed pre-Wisconsinan sediments in tarns (Wolfe, 1996; Wolfe and Härtling, 1996; Wolfe et al., 2000) and the advanced weathering degree of plateaus suggested ice-free conditions for at least the last glaciation in some regions. The model is also consistent with glacial modification of tors (Sugden and Watts, 1977; Watts, 1979) and TCN concentrations measured on erratic boulders scattered on the plateaus and on weathered bedrock surfaces of tors (Bierman et al., 1999; Marsella et al., 2000), which indicate coverage by predominately cold-based ice during the last glaciation. However, although coverage of tors at some time by cold-based ice could be revealed by measuring the concentration of two radionuclides with differing decay rates (Bierman et al., 1999; Marsella et al., 2000; Kaplan et al., 2001), the exact timing of the last ice cover could not be uniquely determined from these data alone. A revision to the Miller et al. (2002) glacial dynamical interpretation has developed from recent and higher resolution mapping of glacial geology (Dyke, 2011a-f; Dyke, 2013a-c) and improved deglacial chronology in the interior of the peninsula (Margreth et al., 2014; Chapter 3). An estimate of the most probable timing of ice cover on the plateau summits is necessary, and a quantitative assessment of what controls the rate of glacial modification is required to quantify the landscape response to climate change.
Fig. 4.1 Cumberland Peninsula with locations of sampled tor sites.  
A. Map of eastern Canada and Greenland with location of Cumberland Peninsula indicated by red box.  
B. Shaded relief map of Cumberland Peninsula showing previous sample locations of tors (black squares, B = Bierman et al., 1999; M = Marsella et al., 2000; K = Kaplan et al., 2001) and new sample locations (red circles, sites numbered from 1 – 12 from north to south). Extant ice caps are shown in blue and the occurrence of the Paleoproterozoic Qikiqtarjuaq plutonic suite is indicated in orange (adapted from Sanborn-Barrie et al., 2011). Locations of detailed relief maps shown in Fig. 4.8 are marked by black squares.  
C. Detailed map of red box shown in B with sample locations around Pangnirtung Fiord (PF). Location of detailed relief map shown in Fig. 4.8 is marked by black square. Mapped ice margins (Dyke, 2013b) are shown as black lines.
4.5 METHODS

The new approach to determine the rate of episodic quarrying and the timing of last plucking are based on TCN concentrations measured in nearby differentially weathered bedrock surfaces. Although it has been specifically developed for tors on weathered plateaus, the method could also be applied to interglacial scarp retreat during felsenmeer development on highland summits. In addition, parts of the method could be adapted for studying other episodic erosion processes, such as rockfall, toppling, and coastal cliff retreat of medium to coarsely fractured rock. In general, the question of timing of last plucking or long-term rate of erosion requires multiple parametric constraints for which limited or no data are available. The challenge is to reduce the degrees of freedom in the system. One approach is to use more than two TCN with different production mechanisms and half-lives. Another solution, as we adopted, is to use two nuclides measured at different depths, with the benefit of knowledge of cosmic ray attenuation through mass (ca. 100 to 1000 g cm\(^{-2}\)).

Before describing the new approach in section 4.6, we provide details of sample collection, preparation and accelerator mass spectrometry (AMS) analysis in sections 4.5.1 and 4.5.2 (supplementary file sections A3.1 – A3.2). In order to interpret the TCN concentrations, we describe the exposure histories (i.e., cycles of cosmic ray exposure interrupted by cold-based ice cover) in terms of TCN production, decay, gradual subaerial erosion, and episodic plucking of bedrock blocks (section 4.6). We first derive the pertinent equations using a simple cyclic ice-cover model with constant relative durations of ice-free and ice-cover intervals (section 4.6.1, supplementary file section A3.3 – A3.4) and then apply realistic ice cover histories based on global or regional
climate time series (section 4.6.2). Then we employ a Monte Carlo approach to determine the timing of last glacial plucking and episodic erosion rates (section 4.6.3, supplementary file section A3.5).

4.5.1 Sample Collection

On Cumberland Peninsula we have collected samples from twelve strategically-located tor sites over a variety of elevations, coastline proximity, and landscape position (Fig. 4.1). On four sites we sampled two or more differentially weathered surfaces. The pairs and triplets of samples consist of at least one clearly weathered surface and one much fresher surface (e.g., Fig. 4.2 a-b). Significantly, the samples at a given site were in close proximity and apparently lithologically similar, which allows the assumption of a shared exposure history from the point of view of cosmic ray flux, atmospheric and ice shielding, interglacial subaerial erosion rates over >10^3 year timescales, and long-term (10^6 year) landscape evolution. The weathered surfaces have slightly higher granular relief, subrounded to rounded edges, and often exhibit 30 - 45 cm wide weathering pits (samples were taken at a distance from the pits). The fresh surfaces have a relatively smooth relief, sharper edges, and weathering pits are absent. We assume that the fresher surfaces were plucked most recently based on these weathering differences. At one location, besides three samples from weathered bedrock surfaces, three additional samples were collected from large (1-4 m high) erratic blocks of a slightly different lithology from the underlying bedrock. For all samples, approximately 2 kg of orthogneiss or metasediment were obtained either by chisel and hammer exploiting weakened joint planes or exfoliation layers or, more typically, by cutting four or more 2 cm-deep grooves with a gas-powered diamond blade cutoff saw and removing bars of
sample by chisel and hammer. Site location, sample thickness, inclination of the surface, condition of the sampled surface (weathering degree, type of weathering, lichen cover, lithology and grain-size), and shielding of the sample surface by surrounding topography, sediment, and snow were recorded or estimated. The majority of samples had $2\pi$ exposure and were from flat and horizontal surfaces, more than 30 cm from an edge.

4.5.2 Sample Preparation and AMS Analysis

The specific sample processing and chemistry procedures for preparation of $^{10}\text{Be}$ and $^{26}\text{Al}$ oxide targets at the Dalhousie Geochronology Centre for these samples are summarised in supplementary file section A3.1, which also presents the chemical data for the samples. A total of 26 samples were processed for $^{10}\text{Be}$ and $^{26}\text{Al}$ from quartz. Before dissolution of 35 g of pure quartz, 180 - 200 mg of $^9\text{Be}$ carrier solution was added (produced by J.Klein from a shielded beryl crystal extracted from the Homestake Gold Mine that has 1015 $\mu\text{g Be g}^{-1}$ at the time of sample preparation and a long-term average $^{10}\text{Be}/^9\text{Be}$ of $4\times10^{-15}$ atom/atom at Lawrence Livermore National Lab). Owing to the $<40$ g masses of quartz dissolved, and depending on the estimated native Al concentration, varying masses of $^{27}\text{Al}$ carrier solution was added (0 – 2800 mg, plasma standard solution, from Alfa Aesar, 1000 $\mu\text{g Al g}^{-1}$). AMS was completed at Lawrence-Livermore National Lab in 3 runs between June 2010 and October 2011, against standards 07KNSTD3110 ($^{10}\text{Be}/^9\text{Be}$) and KNSTD10650 ($^{26}\text{Al}/^{27}\text{Al}$). Average precisions of the sample measurements were 2% for $^{10}\text{Be}$ and 3% for $^{26}\text{Al}$. Three samples with higher Al-AMS uncertainty (>7%) have been re-analysed after additional quartz purification. Blank corrections were <1% except for three low-concentration samples yielding a higher correction of up to 4%. Total reported error includes the following
sources, added in quadrature: weighted uncertainty in process blank, a 2% error for chemistry processing and Be carrier concentration, uncertainty in Al measurement for $^{26}$Al samples (5% reproducibility was reported for all samples analysed with ICP-MS by MAXXAM Inc., Halifax, and <2% for ICP–OES at the Dalhousie Geochronology Centre). Total errors are <3% for $^{10}$Be concentrations and <6% for $^{26}$Al concentrations.

4.6 PRINCIPLES OF THE TCN APPROACH FOR EPISODIC EROSION

The cosmic ray flux is attenuated with mass causing the spallogenic and muogenic TCN production to decrease in a predictable way below a rock surface (Fig. 4.2, Gosse and Phillips, 2001). The new approach is based on cosmogenic $^{26}$Al and $^{10}$Be produced in quartz, because their half-lives ($^{26}$Al = 0.72 Ma, Nishiizumi, 2004; $^{10}$Be = 1.378 Ma, Chmeleff et al., 2010; Korschinek et al., 2010) and production rates are suitable for revealing recurring burial by weakly erosive ice over timescales of $10^4$ to $10^6$ a. Spallogenic production by fast neutrons dominates in $<$1000 g cm$^{-2}$ rock mass depth (density times thickness) and $^{26}$Al is produced 6.75 times faster than $^{10}$Be (Nishiizumi et al., 1989; Balco et al., 2008) at the surface. Because relative production of $^{26}$Al to $^{10}$Be is larger for negative and fast muons, which are weakly attenuated compared to fast neutrons (Heisinger et al., 2002a; 2002b; Braucher et al., 2003; 2011), the relative abundances of $^{26}$Al to $^{10}$Be increase predictably with greater depth (Fig. 4.2). Therefore, three separate TCN-depth functions (concentrations of $^{10}$Be and $^{26}$Al, and their ratios) can be used to infer the timing of last plucking (supplementary file section A3.3, section 4.6.1) and subglacial episodic erosion rate (section 4.6.3) reducing the degrees of freedom (i.e., the number of variable parameters).
Fig 4.2 Schematic illustration of variation of TCN concentrations and ratios with depth, which is employed to determine the timing of plucking on a relatively less weathered surface sampled along with a more weathered surface at the same tor (illustrated here for site 10, Fig. 4.1, oblique aerial view shown in Fig. A3.2d). A. Sampling of a weathered surface (A355, Table 4.2) at the top of the tor. Note the rounded edges of the bedrock blocks and enhanced weathering along horizontal and vertical joint planes. Weathering pits up to 50 cm wide and 20 cm deep occur on these blocks (Fig. 4.4e). B. Fresher surface (A356, Table 4.2) on the eastern margin of the tor. The exposed tor plinth has sharp edges and no weathering pits. C. Decrease of TCN concentration with depth. At the time of plucking, the TCN concentration (gray circles and dashed lines) in the newly exposed surface is equivalent to the concentration below the weathered surface at depth \( z_r \) (here approximately 1 m). New depth profiles (gray solid lines) develop following plucking, but the difference between the measured concentrations (gray squares) of the fresher and weathered surface (extrapolated to depth \( z_r \)) is indicative of the time since plucking. D. Ratio depth profiles for continuous exposure without intermittent burial. The freshly exposed surface initially has a slightly higher ratio that decreases to the spallogenic production ratio after the plucking event. The ratio depth profile is significantly affected by intermittent burial by ice (see text, supplementary file Fig. A3.5).

The basic concepts of the new approach is illustrated for the example of a granite with wide spacing of horizontal and vertical fractures. If one block \( z_r \) (g cm\(^{-2}\)) thick is plucked, the TCN concentrations at the newly plucked surface are predictably less than
the concentrations of the adjacent non-plucked surface, and the newly plucked surface has a higher $^{26}$Al/$^{10}$Be (Fig. 4.2). Immediately after the plucking event, the concentrations and ratio of the plucked surface are the same as a rock at $z_r$, depth below the non-plucked surface. However, after subaerial exposure the TCN concentrations below the plucked surface increase faster than in the non-plucked rock shielded at depth $z_r$, and the $^{26}$Al/$^{10}$Be of the plucked surface decreases toward 6.75. The difference between the TCN concentrations and ratios on the plucked surface and below the unplucked surface (at depth $z_r$) are proportionate to exposure time. Therefore, the time since plucking and long-term episodic erosion rate can be estimated by measuring two TCN in a pair of plucked and non-plucked surfaces (supplementary file section A3.3).

4.6.1 Considering a Non-Constant Burial History

While it is possible to apply the strategy we use in non-glaciated regions, we specifically treat the glaciated setting as our interest lies in the measurement of long-term episodic erosion rates on high latitude summit plateaus. In such areas, the concentration and ratio variation with depth is complicated by (i) shielding of the bedrock surfaces by ice, (ii), episodic subglacial plucking, (iii) and subglacial abrasion, in addition to subaerial (interglacial) erosion. Burial by glacial ice of sufficient thickness (>4500 g cm$^{-2}$, i.e., >45 m of water-equivalent ice) can effectively shield the plucked and non-plucked surfaces from cosmic rays (i.e., only 0.2% of subaerial production will occur at the rock surface below 50 m of ice), so that TCN concentrations and $^{26}$Al/$^{10}$Be decrease during ice cover intervals as a result of radioactive decay. We use the term ‘complex exposure history’ to describe the exposure history of a rock that endures alternating periods of exposure and burial or partial burial with gradual and episodic erosion over its
total history. Burial implies a surface has been previously exposed, and is distinct from simple shielding, which may or may not be constant. Because deep muogenic TCN produced during ice-free intervals in rocks that are exhuming upwards may still record a complex exposure history over long periods of time (> 1 Ma), it is important to establish a similarly long proxy for the glacial-interglacial history.

In a simple first approximation, we consider a periodic sequence of alternating ice-free and ice-cover episodes, each with constant ice thickness \( z_{\text{ice}} \). Assuming an instantaneous change in ice thickness and subaerial erosion rate, as well as an invariant ratio of ice-free to ice-cover duration (e.g., 20:80), the equations for TCN concentration in quartz at the rock surface for alternating exposure and burial intervals can be written as:

\[
N_{\text{int}_k} = \frac{P_i}{\lambda_i} + e^{-\lambda_i^'f_t\tau_c} \left[ N_{\text{glc}_{k-1}} - \frac{P_i}{\lambda_i} \right] \quad \text{eq}(1)
\]

\[
N_{\text{glc}_k} = \frac{P_i}{\lambda_i} e^{\left( -\frac{z_{\text{ice}}\rho_{\text{ice}}}{\lambda_i} \right)} + e^{-\lambda_i^'(1-f_t)\tau_c} \left[ N_{\text{int}_k} - \frac{P_i}{\lambda_i} + e^{\left( -\frac{z_{\text{ice}}\rho_{\text{ice}}}{\lambda_i} \right)} \right] \quad \text{eq}(2)
\]

with \( \lambda_i^' = \lambda + \frac{\varepsilon \rho_t}{\Lambda_i} \quad \text{eq}(3) \)

where \( N_{\text{int}} \) and \( N_{\text{glc}} \) (atoms g\(^{-1}\)) are the concentrations at the end of the interglacial and glacial of the \( k \)'th cycle of duration \( \tau_c \) (a) with \( f \) the fraction of ice-free time (i.e., 0.2). \( P_i \) (atoms g\(^{-1}\) a\(^{-1}\)) is the production rate and \( \Lambda_i \) (g cm\(^{-2}\)) is the attenuation lengths for fast neutrons and fast or negative muons. \( \lambda \) (a\(^{-1}\)) is the decay constant, \( \varepsilon \) (cm a\(^{-1}\)) is the constant subaerial erosion rate during ice free intervals, \( \rho_t \) (g cm\(^{-3}\)) is the bulk rock density, and \( z_{\text{ice}} \) (cm) and \( \rho_{\text{ice}} \) (g cm\(^{-3}\)) are the thickness and density of ice (Table 4.1).
During ice cover, the concentration lost to decay is large compared to the meagre muogenic production beneath 50 m of ice.

## Complex exposure history model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>References / Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference (^{11} \text{Be}) production rate neutron spallation</td>
<td>(P_{\text{nu}})</td>
<td>4 atoms (\text{g}^{-1} \text{a}^{-1})</td>
<td>Borcher et al., in press.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference production rate of (^{26} \text{Al}^{/}/^{3} \text{He})</td>
<td>(R_\alpha)</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>Balco et al., 2008; based on Nishizumi et al., 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference production rate fast muons (% tot prod.)</td>
<td>(\mu)</td>
<td>5.0% for (^{11} \text{Be}), 0.6% for (^{26} \text{Al})</td>
<td>Lifton et al., 2014; following Heisinger et al., 2002a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference production rate negative muons (% tot prod.)</td>
<td>(\mu^-)</td>
<td>1.5% for (^{11} \text{Be}), 1.8% for (^{26} \text{Al})</td>
<td>Lifton et al., 2014; following Heisinger et al., 2002a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attenuation lengths for neutron spallation</td>
<td>(\lambda_{\text{nu}})</td>
<td>1500 g cm(^{-2})</td>
<td>Balco et al., 2008; Giosse and Phillips, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attenuation lengths for fast muons</td>
<td>(\lambda_f)</td>
<td>4220 g cm(^{-2})</td>
<td>Heisinger et al., 2002a; Braucher et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attenuation lengths for negative and fast muons</td>
<td>(\lambda_{\mu})</td>
<td>1500 g cm(^{-2})</td>
<td>Heisinger et al., 2002a; Braucher et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-life for (^{11} \text{Be})</td>
<td>(\lambda_{\text{Be}})</td>
<td>1.378 Ma</td>
<td>Cheleff et al., 2010; Korschinskii et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-life for (^{26} \text{Al})</td>
<td>(\lambda_{\text{Al}})</td>
<td>720 ke</td>
<td>Nishizumi, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant subaerial erosion rate</td>
<td>(\varepsilon)</td>
<td>i.e., 1 mm k.a(^{-1}) = m Ma(^{-1})</td>
<td>MC method: uniform variation between 0 - 4 mm k.a(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock density</td>
<td>(\rho_r)</td>
<td>2.65 g cm(^{-2})</td>
<td>Based on ice surface elevations of ice sheet model constrained by relative sea-level data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice density</td>
<td>(\rho_i)</td>
<td>0.9 g cm(^{-2})</td>
<td>Based on timing of deglaciation determined for region (Chapter 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete burial by ice (equivalent to 17 m of rock overburden)</td>
<td>(z_{\text{bw}})</td>
<td>5000 cm</td>
<td>MC method: lognormal distribution (mean 76 cm, variance 38 cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of last ice-free interval (deglaciation time)</td>
<td>(t_{\text{mol}})</td>
<td>i.e., 15 ka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickness of shielding bedrock block</td>
<td>(z_i)</td>
<td>i.e., 60 cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of periodic glacial-interglacial cycles (orbital pacing)</td>
<td>(t_e)</td>
<td>i.e., 100 ka, 10 ka or 1 ka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cyclic ice cover variables (different for each sample):

| ratio of ice-free time and ice-cover time | \(f\) | i.e., 22% | Dependent on assumed subaerial erosion rate |
| total duration of complex history | \(t_{\text{com}}\) | i.e., 600 ka | Dependent on assumed subaerial erosion rate |

### MC method variables:

| durations of individual exposure and burial intervals | \(\Delta t\) | i.e., 4 permil | Uniform variaton between 3.5 - 4.5 ppm in 0.5 ppm steps |
| total duration of complex history | \(t_{\text{mol}}\) | i.e., 215 Ma | Variation between 0 - 3 Ma depending on value of \(\Delta t\) |
| Number of plucking events | \(n\) | i.e., 8 Ma | Randomly chosen between one and max number of burial events |
| Occurrence of plucking events | \(t_{\text{pl}}\) | i.e., 220 ka | Occuring at the end of the burial events, randomly chosen amongst burial events |

### MC method sensitivity tests:

| Plucking of for block during last glacial cycle | \(z\) | 50 cm | Effect on estimate of episodic erosion rate |
| Ice thickness | \(s_{\text{ic}}\) | 700 cm | |
| Deglaciation time | \(t_{\text{mol}}\) | 20 or 11 ka | |
| Thickness of plucked bedrock block | \(z\) | | Uniform variaton between 10 - 200 cm |

### Table 4.1

List of parameters used to calculate complex exposure histories. References for chosen values are listed where applicable. Scaling of production rates to the sample location follows Lifton et al. (2014) using the particle-specific flux spectra given in Sato et al. (2008). Calculation of site-specific production rates by fast and negative muons is also based on Lifton et al. (2014) following Heisinger et al. (2002a; 2002b). Variables for cyclic ice cover history are determined for each sample individually (Table 4.2). Variation of variables for Monte Carlo (MC) method are listed separately or given in the last column where applicable. Variables changed for sensitivity test are given at the bottom.
TCN accumulation in a ‘surface’ under a bedrock block of thickness \( z_r \) is given by:

\[
N_{\text{int}_k}^{z_r} = \frac{p_i}{\lambda_{\text{int}}^i} \times e^{\left(-\frac{z_r \rho c}{\lambda_{\text{int}}^i}\right)} + e^{-\lambda_{\text{int}}^i f t_c} \times \left[N_{\text{int}_k}^i - \frac{p_i}{\lambda_{\text{int}}^i} \times e^{\left(-\frac{z_r \rho c}{\lambda_{\text{int}}^i}\right)}\right] \quad \text{eq(4)}
\]

\[
N_{\text{glc}_k}^{z_r} = \frac{p_i}{\lambda_{\text{glc}}^i} \times e^{\left(-\frac{z_{\text{glc}} \rho c + z_r \rho c}{\lambda_{\text{glc}}^i}\right)} + e^{-\lambda_{\text{glc}}^i (1-f) t_c} \times \left[N_{\text{glc}_k}^i - \frac{p_i}{\lambda_{\text{glc}}^i} \times e^{\left(-\frac{z_{\text{glc}} \rho c + z_r \rho c}{\lambda_{\text{glc}}^i}\right)}\right] \quad \text{eq(5)}
\]

These equations (\( \text{eq(1-5)} \)) describe a saw-tooth trajectory for a given bedrock surface represented in a \(^{26}\text{Al}/^{10}\text{Be} \) vs. \(^{10}\text{Be} \) burial plot (Fig. 4.3) after multiple glaciations. For long continuous exposures, the \(^{26}\text{Al}/^{10}\text{Be} \) ratio gradually decreases until secular saturation of both isotopes is reached depending on subaerial erosion rate (green erosion island in Fig. 4.3, Lal, 1991). In the case of repeated exposure and burial episodes, the ratio decreases rapidly during burial and increases again during exposure, defining a saw-tooth path within the burial field (blue trajectories, Fig. 4.3). The location of the trajectory within the burial field is most strongly controlled by the relative duration of ice-free and ice-cover intervals (\( f \)) and subaerial erosion rate (\( \varepsilon \)). Decreasing the relative duration of interglacial exposure (smaller \( f \)) deflects the trajectory to the left, while increasing the relative exposure duration shifts the trajectory closer to the continuous exposure line (red top line, Fig. 4.3a). Including a gradual subaerial erosion rate deflects the trajectory to the left and a higher transient saturation ratio (end of trajectory) is reached for long cyclic ice cover histories (>4 Ma, Fig. 4.3b). Although not included in \( \text{eqs (1-5)} \), steady glacial erosion (abrasion) would deflect the trajectory even farther to the left and further increase the transient saturation ratio (Fig. 4.3b). Note that the total duration of each glacial-interglacial cycle (\( t_c \)) only affects the amplitude of the oscillations with shorter \( t_c \) narrowing the saw-teeth (cf., Bierman et al., 1999). A \( t_c = 1 \)
ka trajectory can be viewed as a ‘time-integrated’ production rate approximating the TCN accumulation and decay through longer cycles (Fig. 4.3a). The TCN concentrations in a subsurface rock parcel (eqs (4-5)) evolve in a similar manner, but the trajectory is deflected to the left at a distance controlled by $z_r$ (Fig. 4.3c). For a sampled surface that had been glacially plucked, the TCN concentrations initially follow a trajectory for a surface shielded at a depth equivalent to the total rock overburden. After a plucking event, the trajectory for the plucked surface starts to shift to the right to reach the trajectory of the remaining rock overburden. Following the final plucking event, the trajectory again shifts to the right reaching the trajectory of an exposed surface (dark blue line in Fig. 4.3c represents two plucking events, marked by the star symbols, each removing 50 cm thick blocks).

The trajectory, which passes through the measured TCN concentration, provides an approximation for the average exposure history of the sampling site (i.e., average ice-free time $f$ for an assumed gradual subaerial erosion rate $\varepsilon$, Fig. 4.3d), if it can be assumed that the last plucking event occurred long enough ago so that the TCN concentrations have reached the trajectory of an exposed surface (0 cm thickness, Fig. 4.3c). The best fitting trajectory for an assumed $\varepsilon$ is found using a chi-square approach simultaneously solving for $f$ and the total duration of complex history $t_{tot}$ (distance along the trajectory from zero $^{10}$Be concentration to the measured sample, Fig. 4.3d). The values of $t_{tot}$ determined with this approach only provide a minimum estimate of total complex history (sum of alternating burial and exposure durations), because plucking is not yet taken into account (see section 4.6.3). We can constrain the maximum limit of $\varepsilon$ based on field evidence and independent TCN data (see section 4.7). However, larger assumed $\varepsilon$ would require larger
and would increase $t_{tot}$. Uncertainty in estimated $f$ and $t_{tot}$ are derived from the 1σ range of the probability density function based on the calculated chi-squared values.

### 4.6.2 Ice Cover History Model

The cyclic ice cover model introduced in section 4.6.1 is oversimplified, but it allows assessing the dependencies of the complex exposure model on the value and range of input variables. The results of the cyclic ice cover models are also used for comparison with the results based on a proxy record for ice cover. A more realistic ice cover history can be derived by assuming orbital pacing of glacial cycles, with obliquity driven 41-ka cycles dominating before the transition to longer eccentricity-based 100-ka cycles at 900 ka (Fig. 4.3c, Elderfield et al., 2012; Rial et al., 2013). An accurate ice history model is important because the TCN concentrations and ratios are particularly sensitive to the duration of more recent exposures, especially the current ice-free period. We considered using local climate records that would provide precise proxies of ice cover history. However, these records only extend to the last interglacial interval (Penny Ice Cap core, Fisher et al., 1998), the last glacial cycle (NGRIP, Andersen et al., 2006; Rasmussen et al., 2006; Vinther et al., 2006; Svensson et al., 2008), and the penultimate glaciation (GRIP, Dansgaard et al., 1993). Therefore, we use the globally-stacked marine core record LR04 from Lisiecki and Raymo (2005), which provides a >5 Ma long record of past global ice history, and we presume that past ice cover on Cumberland Peninsula scaled with global ice volume change. Continued cooling during the Pleistocene is reflected by generally decreasing durations of interglacials, so that the $f$ decreases over time (supplementary file section A3.5, Fig. S3.10). Production of TCN during the Pliocene should not be significant owing to decay and the relatively increased production.
as the rock exhumes. Simple sensitivity tests verify that time series > 3 Ma do not alter the timing or rate calculations.

4.6.3 Monte Carlo Method for Estimation of Episodic Erosion Rate

We use a Monte Carlo (MC) method (Rubinstein and Kroese, 2011) to (i) estimate the rate of episodic erosion by plucking and (ii) constrain the timing of last glacial plucking at the sampled tor sites on Cumberland Peninsula. The MC method is necessary to compute production and decay for all possible ice cover and plucking histories, to accommodate the various controls on concentration (e.g. $\varepsilon, f, z_r$) and to test the sensitivity to other variables (e.g., $z_{ice}$ and $t_{deg}$). The MC method consists of an outer loop defining the environmental variables applying to all samples from the same location, and an inner loop determining the plucking variables for each sample individually.

In the outer loop, environmental parameters $f, \varepsilon$ and $t_{tot}$ are randomly varied within pre-defined constraints (Table 4.1). The LR04 record is divided into ice-free and ice-cover intervals by choosing different values of $\delta^{18}O$ ranging from 3.5 to 4.5 permil stepped through in 0.05 permil steps (arbitrarily chosen but reasonable boundaries and step size). Subaerial erosion rates are selected from an uniform distribution ranging from 0 to 4 mm ka$^{-1}$ based on observations of grain-scale grusification and height of protruding quartz veins (Bierman et al., 1999; Margreth, 2015). The duration of total complex history is limited to 3 Ma, but it is varied for each model run (Table 4.1) and many runs require less than 2 Ma to explain the measured TCN concentrations. In the inner loop, a wide range of combinations of number and timing of plucking events and of plucked thicknesses are tested for the more weathered surface (tor tops) until a solution lies within the 1$\sigma$ error range of the measured nuclide concentrations. We have restricted the model
to one plucking event per glaciation based on the generally advanced weathering degree of the sampled tors indicating limited modification in the past. Once the TCN data measured on the more weathered surface can be explained, then different sets of plucking variables (within the limits of environmental variables accepted for the weathered surface) are tested for the fresher surface until an accepted solution is found. The inner loop is broken if no solution is found for a maximum number of attempts (i.e., 500 sets of plucking variables) and a new set of environmental variables is generated until a pre-defined total number of solutions is obtained (i.e., 10,000 accepted solutions). The total number of Quaternary plucking events ranges randomly from one to the number of glaciations and the occurrence of the events is randomly chosen amongst the glaciations. The thickness of plucked bedrock blocks is derived from a log-normal distribution based on the horizontal joint spacing observed in the region. Additional parameters, such as frequency of plucking events or the rate of episodic erosion can be computed for both samples (weathered and fresh). The frequency of plucking is calculated by dividing the number of plucking events by the total duration of complex history for each model run. Taking the thicknesses of all removed bedrock blocks into account, a rate of landscape lowering attributed to episodic plucking of bedrock blocks can be calculated.
Fig 4.3 Normalised burial plot with cyclic ice cover model shown for a burial depth derived from multiplying the constant ice thickness by the fraction of total time the site is covered by ice ([z_{ice} \cdot \rho_{ice} \cdot (1-f) \cdot t_c] / t_c). The right, solid red line defines continuous exposure with no erosion and solid green lines represent continuous exposure with varying erosion rates (defining the green erosion island). The left, solid red line indicates continuous burial, and the lower black line defines the decay path of a buried saturated surface. Black sub-vertical lines (longer dashes) indicate minimum duration of exposure and black sub-horizontal lines (shorter dashes) indicate minimum duration of continuous burial. **A.** Saw-tooth trajectory of a cyclic ice cover model shown for different ratios of ice-free to ice-cover time (percentage of ice-free time in the total duration of a glacial-interglacial cycle). Constant subaerial erosion rate is 0 mm ka\(^{-1}\). Larger oscillations represent invariant 100 ka glacial cycles; amplitude of 1 ka glacial cycle oscillation decreases to a line. **B.** Trajectory for 22% ice-free time and no constant subaerial erosion (light blue), 1 mm ka\(^{-1}\) subaerial erosion (orange), and additional 1 mm ka\(^{-1}\) constant glacial erosion (abrasion, magenta). Transient saturation (end of trajectory) is reached at higher ratios for larger total constant erosion. **C.** Trajectory for 22% ice-free time and no constant subaerial erosion shown for 0, 50 and 100 cm of rock overburden (light blue). Trajectory for a surface that has been exposed by plucking of two bedrock blocks of each 50 cm is shown in dark blue (22 glacial-interglacial intervals of initially 41-ka duration and 100-ka duration for the last 9 intervals) with plucking events marked by dark blue stars. **D.** Measured concentrations and 1σ error ellipse of sampled surface, through which a trajectory with no constant subaerial erosion is fitted yielding an estimate of average ice-free time (f) at the site and a minimum estimate of total complex history (t_{tot}).
To obtain a continuous probability distribution of all tested parameters, the weighted chi-squared value ($\chi^2$, Taylor, 1997) is computed for each set of plucking variables. For the environmental parameters, the weighted chi-squared values of all samples collected at the same site are summed ($\sum \chi^2$), from which the maximum is saved if the same set of environmental variables is considered multiple times. For the sample-specific parameters, the largest weighted chi-squared value is saved for a particular set of plucking variables.

To test the sensitivity of the results obtained from the chosen assumptions, we have varied the constant ice thickness, used different distributions of plucked block thicknesses, and altered the duration of the last ice-free interval (Table 4.1). On Cumberland Peninsula, we have not determined the deglaciation time of weathered uplands plateaus directly, but we have based our estimate on geomorphic evidence that the plateaus were deglaciated before the adjacent valleys and fiords (Chapter 3).

4.7 RESULTS

4.7.1 TCN Sample Site Characterization

The location of the twelve sampled tors ranges from narrow high-elevation coastal ridges to broad interior plateaus and low-elevation coastal plateaus (Fig. 4.1, Table 4.2). Except for one sample location (site 4, Fig. 4.1), the sampled tors occur in medium- to coarse-grained quartzo-feldspathic plutonic rocks (granodiorites, tonalites and quartz-diorites of the Paleoproterozoic Qikiqtarjuaq suite, Fig. 4.1, Sanborn-Barrie et al., 2011; Sanborn-Barrie and Young, 2013; Sanborn-Barrie et al., 2013b; Jackson and Sanborn-Barrie, 2014). Site 4 is located in silimanite-bearing semipelite (Fig. 4.4a) of the Paleoproterozoic Hoare Bay Group (Sanborn-Barrie et al., 2013a). The sampled tors
range from true tors (Andre, 2004; Hall and Phillips, 2006) consisting of towers of weathered bedrock blocks including nearly detached corestones (Fig. 4.4 a-b), to tor-like features, which are reduced to a few layers of bedrock blocks above a solid bedrock plinth (Fig. 4.4 c-d). The sampled surfaces are differentially weathered, with some surfaces exhibiting gnammas up to 20 - 50 cm deep and 50 - 80 cm wide and protruding quartz veins (Fig. 4.4 e-f, Fig. 4.2a), while other surfaces are smooth and hardly affected by grusification (Fig. 4.4d, Fig. 4.2b). Following the model of glacial modification of granite tors developed by Hall and Phillips (2006), we have classified the sampled tor sites into five stages of progressive modification (Table 4.2). Stage 1 tors (sites 1 & 4, Fig. 4.1, Fig. 4.4 a-b) preserve delicate weathering features indicating no glacial modification (Hall and Phillips, 2006). Removal of corestones on stage 2 tors (sites 8 & 9, Fig. 4.1) suggest slight glacial modification. The majority of our sites (sites 5-7 & 10-12, Fig. 4.1, Fig. 4.4c) are stage 2-3, 3, and 3-4 tors, from which weathered tor blocks have been removed and the tor plinth is exposed on the margins (e.g., Fig. 4.2 a-b). Tor plinths are largely exposed on two sites (2 & 3, Fig. 4.1, Fig. 4.4d), classified as stage 4-5 tors. At site 3 we noted a rounded cobble of a distinctively different granitic lithology (supplementary file, Fig. A3.2g), and at site 5, we collected samples from two weathered erratic blocks and a large, less weathered, angular erratic block (supplementary file, Fig. A3.2 h-i). While we interpret them all as glacial erratics, the rounded cobble may have been a corestone from an overlying lithological unit that has since been eroded.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Site description</th>
<th>Sample description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>narrow ridge with high-weathered hor. at summit; individual terraces of well-rounded blocks separated by 1 m wide, weathered, vertical joints; horizontal joints weathered, so that uppermost blocks nearly detached; joint spacing 0.5-3 m; enhanced granular disintegration (granification); largest granules 50 cm wide, 30 cm deep; also on northern horizon of ridge.</td>
<td>weathered tor surface at southern end and of outcrop, 40 cm wide granules, surface rough. ED5A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>E-w oriented ridge of three terr-like outcrops, ridge seems to be streamlined from the end. 1 m wide, 30 cm high, 0.5 m wide, vertically jointed. Weathered and deepened, ridge deep at vertical joints on northern end, 10 cm wide, 15 cm deep.</td>
<td>sampled homogeneously block 0.8 m above level, vertical joints show incipient widening and deepening. E65A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>sampled weathered surface on top of talus; tor ridge, horizontal joint spacing 0.5-0.5 m, no granules. E74A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded bedrock blocks 2-4 m above ground, granules 20 cm wide, 10 cm deep. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, angular to slightly rounded block, parts embedded in regolith, large bedrock granules. E21A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded bedrock block 1-3 m above ground, granules 20 cm wide, 10 cm deep. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded bedrock block 1-2 m above ground, granules 20 cm wide, 10 cm deep. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, angular to slightly rounded block, parts embedded in regolith. E22A-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded bedrock block 1-2 m above ground, granules 20 cm wide, 10 cm deep, 30 cm prismatic. E22A-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, angular block, largest block on site, surface appears freshier than other samples surfaced. E22A-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded block on top of tor ridge, no granules, granular disintegration (granification). E34A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded block, on top of 10 cm wide, 20 cm deep. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded block, 1 m above solid, at 10 cm wide, 20 cm deep, 30 cm prismatic. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded block, 1 m above solid, at 10 cm wide, 20 cm deep. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded block, 1 m above solid, at 10 cm wide, 20 cm deep. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded block, 1 m above solid, at 10 cm wide, 20 cm deep. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded block, 1 m above solid, at 10 cm wide, 20 cm deep. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded block, 1 m above solid, at 10 cm wide, 20 cm deep. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 19</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded block, 1 m above solid, at 10 cm wide, 20 cm deep. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded block, 1 m above solid, at 10 cm wide, 20 cm deep. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 21</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded block, 1 m above solid, at 10 cm wide, 20 cm deep. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 22</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded block, 1 m above solid, at 10 cm wide, 20 cm deep. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded block, 1 m above solid, at 10 cm wide, 20 cm deep. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 24</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded block, 1 m above solid, at 10 cm wide, 20 cm deep. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 25</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded block, 1 m above solid, at 10 cm wide, 20 cm deep. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 26</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded block, 1 m above solid, at 10 cm wide, 20 cm deep. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded block, 1 m above solid, at 10 cm wide, 20 cm deep. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 28</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded block, 1 m above solid, at 10 cm wide, 20 cm deep. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 29</td>
<td></td>
<td>large, rounded block, 1 m above solid, at 10 cm wide, 20 cm deep. E22A-01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.2** Detailed geomorphic description of tor sites and sampled surfaces.

*1 according to Gribbin and Phelps (2009)  
2 according to Selborne-Barnes et al., 2011; Selborne-Barnes and Young, 2013; Selborne-Barnes et al., 2015b, Jackson and Selborne-Barnes, 2014*
Fig. 4.4 Representative pictures of sampled tor sites. A. Stage 1 tor (site 4) in sillimanite-bearing semipelite. Note difference in appearance of weathering compared to other tors located in the plutonic Qikiqtarjuaq suite (B, D, E granodiorite; C, F quartz-diorite – tonilite). B. Stage 1 tor (site 1) capped with nearly detached corestones and well-rounded weathered bedrock blocks. C. Stage 3 tor (site 7) where corestones have been removed. D. Stage 5 tor (site 2) where most upstanding weathered bedrock blocks have been eliminated and the tor plinth is largely exposed. E. Typical weathering pit on a stage 3 tor surface (site 10). Samples have been collected at a distance to gnammas. F. Protruding quartz vein on stage 2 tor surface (site 8). Samples collected at this site consist of these quartz veins.
4.7.2 TCN Results

Measured $^{10}$Be concentrations range between 2 and $82 \times 10^5$ atoms g$^{-1}$, while $^{26}$Al concentrations range between 10 and $425 \times 10^5$ atoms g$^{-1}$ (Table 4.3). These concentrations are higher than those measured on boulders on late glacial moraines throughout Cumberland Peninsula (0.7 and $1.5 \times 10^5$ $^{10}$Be atoms g$^{-1}$, Margreth 2015). Discordance between apparent exposure ages calculated from the $^{10}$Be and $^{26}$Al concentrations (supplementary file Table A3.1) and low $^{26}$Al/$^{10}$Be ratios (Table 4.3) for a given $^{10}$Be concentration indicate that most samples experienced at least one period of burial that interrupted the exposure history of a sampled surface. All samples have apparent exposure durations that predate the last deglaciation of the summits (ca. 15 ka, Margreth, 2015), and most samples have apparent ages that exceed 100 ka. While the entire dataset appears broadly scattered on a burial plot (Fig. 4.5), consideration of their geographic position, intensity of weathering, and degree of glacial modification explains all of this variability.

Three samples, collected from the two sites classified as stage 1 tors (sites 1 & 4), have the highest concentrations and relatively high ratios ($5.2 – 6.6$, Table 4.3). Their apparent $^{10}$Be ages are 0.4, 0.6, and 1.0 Ma (Table A3.1). These samples (purple error ellipses, Fig. 4.5), plotting close to the continuous exposure line or within the constant erosion island, were collected from high-elevation narrow ridges along the northeastern coast of Cumberland Peninsula (Fig. 4.1 & 4.4 a-b) where glacial cover is unlikely. The advanced weathering features observed on these ridges corroborate long subaerial exposure with relatively little, if any, burial by ice. Assuming these samples have reached secular equilibrium, the measured concentrations imply long-term steady
subaerial erosion rates of 0.8 – 1.6 mm ka\(^{-1}\) (Table A3.1). If saturation has not yet been reached, the inferred erosion rates are maximum estimates. This calculated range of erosion rates provides a good approximation for an interglacial steady erosion rate occurring at the other sites with similar lithologies.

### Table 4.3 TCN data. Measured concentrations and concentrations normalized to a sea-level, high-latitude (SLHL) location at 66.50°N, 65.20°W.

| Tor site | Sample ID  | Measured concentrations | Concentrations normalized to SLHL  \\
|----------|------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
|          |            | \(^{10}\text{Be} \)
| a        |            | concentration \(^{10}\text{Be}\) & \(^{26}\text{Al} \)
|          |            | \(\text{atom g}^{-1}\) & \(\text{atom g}^{-1}\) & \(-\) & \(\text{atom g}^{-1}\) & \(\text{atom g}^{-1}\) |
| 1        | E065A-01   | 50.15 ± 1.05 & 329.35 ± 19.14 & 6.57 ± 0.41 & 20.08 ± 0.42 & 133.31 ± 7.75 |
| 2        | E066A-01   | 37.51 ± 0.84 & 225.37 ± 12.92 & 6.01 ± 0.37 & 15.07 ± 0.34 & 91.53 ± 5.25 |
| 3        | E04A-01    | 6.35 ± 0.18 & 40.14 ± 2.72 & 6.32 ± 0.46 & 4.51 ± 0.13 & 28.65 ± 1.94 |
| 4        | E07A-01    | 5.71 ± 0.19 & 40.58 ± 2.72 & 6.05 ± 0.44 & 4.00 ± 0.11 & 24.35 ± 1.53 |
| 5        | E022A-01   | 82.32 ± 1.80 & 424.74 ± 16.91 & 5.16 ± 0.23 & 26.00 ± 0.57 & 136.03 ± 5.42 |
|          | E022A-02   | 22.35 ± 0.51 & 126.18 ± 7.59 & 5.65 ± 0.36 & 8.89 ± 0.20 & 50.71 ± 3.05 |
|          | E022A-03   | 3.21 ± 0.09 & 12.36 ± 0.56 & 3.85 ± 0.21 & 1.28 ± 0.04 & 4.97 ± 0.23 |
|          | E022A-04   | 17.29 ± 0.38 & 100.80 ± 5.78 & 5.83 ± 0.36 & 6.88 ± 0.15 & 40.53 ± 2.32 |
|          | E022A-05   | 4.62 ± 0.13 & 19.89 ± 1.05 & 4.30 ± 0.26 & 1.84 ± 0.05 & 8.00 ± 0.42 |
|          | E022A-06   | 20.57 ± 0.45 & 121.17 ± 6.95 & 5.89 ± 0.36 & 8.18 ± 0.18 & 48.72 ± 2.79 |
| 6        | A346A-01   | 1.95 ± 0.05 & 9.49 ± 0.69 & 4.86 ± 0.38 & 0.78 ± 0.02 & 3.82 ± 0.28 |
|          | A348A-01   | 14.52 ± 0.44 & 81.84 ± 4.98 & 5.64 ± 0.38 & 6.09 ± 0.18 & 34.69 ± 2.11 |
|          | A347A-01   | 10.33 ± 0.28 & 63.92 ± 3.81 & 6.19 ± 0.41 & 4.34 ± 0.12 & 27.17 ± 1.62 |
|          | A347A-02   | 18.03 ± 2.55 & 9.86 ± 0.56 & 5.67 ± 0.44 & 3.18 ± 0.10 & 19.75 ± 1.33 |
|          | A347A-01   | 4.67 ± 0.13 & 26.26 ± 1.23 & 5.62 ± 0.31 & 1.97 ± 0.05 & 11.17 ± 0.52 |
| 7        | E030A-01   | 14.06 ± 0.40 & 78.74 ± 4.99 & 5.60 ± 0.39 & 7.07 ± 0.20 & 39.90 ± 2.53 |
| 8        | E020A-01   | 23.97 ± 0.65 & 124.80 ± 7.14 & 5.21 ± 0.33 & 9.81 ± 0.27 & 51.63 ± 2.95 |
|          | E021A-01   | 28.63 ± 0.61 & 140.86 ± 8.58 & 4.92 ± 0.32 & 11.75 ± 0.25 & 58.42 ± 3.56 |
| 9        | E022A-01   | 13.67 ± 0.35 & 68.56 ± 4.26 & 5.02 ± 0.34 & 4.95 ± 0.13 & 25.11 ± 1.56 |
| 10       | E035A-01   | 15.70 ± 0.40 & 89.65 ± 5.24 & 5.71 ± 0.36 & 8.57 ± 0.22 & 49.26 ± 2.88 |
|          | E036A-01   | 5.75 ± 0.17 & 35.67 ± 2.40 & 6.20 ± 0.46 & 3.16 ± 0.10 & 19.75 ± 1.33 |
| 11       | A186A-01   | 13.59 ± 0.42 & 73.63 ± 4.31 & 5.42 ± 0.36 & 6.47 ± 0.20 & 35.38 ± 2.07 |
|          | A188A-01   | 17.77 ± 0.45 & 92.20 ± 5.44 & 5.19 ± 0.33 & 8.48 ± 0.21 & 44.38 ± 2.62 |
|          | A187A-01   | 12.37 ± 0.32 & 73.00 ± 4.27 & 5.90 ± 0.38 & 5.90 ± 0.15 & 35.14 ± 2.05 |
| 12       | E221A-01   | 7.07 ± 0.21 & 37.02 ± 2.03 & 5.23 ± 0.33 & 3.36 ± 0.10 & 17.74 ± 0.98 |
|          | E221A-02   | 40.57 ± 4.45 & 7.15 ± 0.67 & 5.99 ± 0.20 & 2.59 ± 0.13 & 28.32 ± 1.63 |

\(a\) abbreviated sample ID, full sample ID is given in supplementary material Table A3.1

\(b\) 1σ error includes AMS measurement uncertainty, weighted blank correction, 2% sample preparation uncertainty, and for \(^{26}\text{Al}\) uncertainty for native Al measurement (5% ICP-MS and <2% ICP-OES)

\(c\) normalization to sea-level, high-latitude (SLHL) location 66.50°N, 65.20°W, 0 m above sea level

\(d\) AMS Al uncertainty >7% possibly related to large native Al concentration (Table A3.1)

\(e\) AMS Be analysis might be affected by impurities in quartz, samples not further discussed
The three sampled erratic blocks, collected near a stage 3 tor (site 5), yielded the lowest TCN concentrations, as well as some of the lowest ratios (3.9 - 4.9, Table 4.3; gray error ellipses, Fig. 4.5) suggesting that they had been buried for >750 ka and exposed for a comparatively short time (Table A3.1). This scenario is unlikely since it does not match the burial histories of all other sites. Alternatively, the TCN concentrations can be interpreted as indicating surfaces that had been continuously exposed for a long time (> 1 Ma) at a rock depth of >2.5 m (no subaerial erosion is required for at least one block, Fig. A3.3) and subsequently flipped (Fujioka et al., 2015). A third interpretation of these samples is recent overturning of a weathered tor block that had periodically been shielded by ice (>1.4 m blocks, <5 ka since overturning). However, the slightly different lithology (~cm-sized feldspar phenocrysts) indicates an origin of the blocks from a different location, for which the TCN production parameters and glacial history are unknown. The low ratios may also be due to high concentrations of native Al in the quartz, which affected the AMS measurements. The same problem may apply to three bedrock surfaces (one sample at site 6, two samples at site 12) that yielded relatively low $^{10}$Be concentrations and ratios (orange error ellipses, Fig. 4.5, supplementary file section A3.1) and plot outside a cluster constituted by most other sampled tor surfaces.
Fig. 4.5 Normalised burial plot with all 26 samples collected on the 12 tors on Cumberland Peninsula. Burial plot is shown for a trajectory of 22% ice-free time (light blue) assuming no constant subaerial erosion rate and a constant ice thickness of 50 m during burial intervals. A trajectory for 27% ice-free time and 1 mm ka\(^{-1}\) subaerial erosion rate is shown in orange. Details of burial plots as in Fig. 4.3. Samples are shown for the normalised concentrations (black dots) and 1\(\sigma\) measurement uncertainties (coloured ellipses). Continuously exposed surfaces (purple) plot close to the erosion island. Three erratic blocks (gray) have low concentrations and low ratios. Three samples (yellow) may be affected by impurities in the quartz and are not further discussed. Samples plotting within the large black ellipse are interpreted to have experienced complex exposure histories (section 4.6.1). Green samples are classified as stage 2 tors and the most weathered surface on the stage 2-3 tor that have only slightly been glacially modified. Blue samples comprise sites classified as stage 3, weathered surfaces of stage 3-4 tors, and fresher surfaces on the stage 2-3 tor. The fresher surfaces of stage 3-4 tors are shown in red, together with the samples classified as stage 4-5 tors.

All remaining samples plot in an elongated cluster in the burial field (black ellipse, Fig. 4.5). These samples can be interpreted to have experienced a complex exposure history that can either be approximated by periodic recurring ice cover (section 4.6.1) or by a proxy record for global ice volume (LR04, section 4.6.3). In this section, the results derived from the simple, periodic ice cover history (section 4.6.1) are discussed (Table
4.4 middle panel), while the results derived from the MC method using LR04 are discussed in the next section 4.7.3 (Table 4.4 right panel).

By fitting a trajectory for 1-ka cycles through each sample point (approximating time-integrated production, section 4.6.1), we can estimate the fraction of ice-free time \( f \) and minimum duration of total complex history \( t_{tot} \) for each sampled bedrock surface (Table 4.4). One sample (site 9, stage 2 tor) plotting slightly below and to the left of the cluster (green ellipse farthest to the left, Fig. 4.5) yields the lowest fraction of ice-free time \( (10.9^{+1.1/_{-1.1}} \%, \text{ for 1 mm k}^{-1} \text{ subaerial erosion rate}, \text{Table 4.4}) \). The values of ice-free time calculated for all other samples of the elongated cluster (sites 2, 3, 5 bedrock surfaces, 6-8, 10-12) ranges from \( 18.8^{+1.5/_{-20.8}} \% \) to \( 38.6^{+4.2/_{-41.9}} \% \) with an average of 27\% (Table 4.4). Despite the considerable range of measured TCN concentrations and ratios (including overlap with the continuous exposure line at 1\( \sigma \) for many of the samples), the clustering of these samples implies that these sites experienced similar glacial histories. Note that the estimated values of ice-free time vary for different bedrock surfaces sampled at a given site, but they are still within the estimated 1\( \sigma \) error range, which are quite large, particularly for the higher side (Table 4.4). Additional processes, for instance plucking of overlying bedrock blocks, would explain some of this variation. Considering the effect of plucking, (Fig. 4.3c) the average value of 27\% would be a minimum estimate of ice-free time for these surfaces.

The duration of total complex history \( t_{tot} \), equivalent to the distance along the trajectory fitted to each sample, ranges from 330 ka to 2.45 Ma (for 1 mm k\(^{-1} \) subaerial erosion based on the saturated samples at sites 1 & 4, Table 4.4). As indicated in section 4.6.1, these estimates should be interpreted as a minimum duration because plucking of
overlying bedrock blocks has not been taken into account in this simple model (the MC approach will, section 4.7.3). The complex history durations determined with this approach (e.g., 1015 ka, sample A304, Table 4.4) are twice as long as the estimates of minimum durations of a single (e.g., 192 ka, sample A304, Table A3.1) exposure interval followed by a single (e.g., 295 ka, sample A304, Table A3.1) burial interval (Fig. A3.1). Recurring intervals of exposure and burial require longer total complex histories to reach the same TCN concentrations and ratios than a much simpler burial history of a continuous first exposure interval followed by a continuous single burial interval.

Table 4.4 Estimated values using a cyclic ice cover history (section 4.6.1) and generated by the Monte Carlo (MC) method (section 4.6.3). Error ranges are given for 1σ confidence level based on the concentration measurement uncertainty, which in turn considers AMS measurement uncertainty, weighted blank correction, 2% chemistry procedure error, and, for $^{26}\text{Al}$, native Al concentration measurement uncertainty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tor site</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Cyclic ice cover history</th>
<th>Total complex exposure history</th>
<th>occurrence of last plucking event</th>
<th>MC simulation results</th>
<th>Subaerial erosion rate</th>
<th>$t_{ms}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fraction ice-free (ka) (%)</td>
<td>(ka) (ka) (ka) (ka) (ka)</td>
<td>(ka) (ka) (ka) (ka) (ka)</td>
<td>(mm ka$^{-1}$) (mm ka$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>(per mill) (per mill) (per mill)</td>
<td>(mm ka$^{-1}$) (mm ka$^{-1}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E06A-01</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E06A-01</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>E06A-01</td>
<td>36.4 4.7 49.3 333 91 1564</td>
<td>250 93 423 3.5 1.5 6.6 4.25 0.42 0.12</td>
<td>1.2 0.7 2.0</td>
<td>1 0.4 0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E04A-01</td>
<td>20.3 0.0 60.0 550 225 547</td>
<td>250 102 431 3.3 1.2 7.5 3.85 0.13 0.48</td>
<td>1.3 0.8 1.9</td>
<td>1 0.4 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E04A-01</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E022A-01</td>
<td>33.1 3.0 37.1 971 191 696</td>
<td>500 183 620 1 0.0 4.8</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E022A-02</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E022A-03</td>
<td>29.1 2.1 44.4 178 257 493</td>
<td>400 176 260 3.0 1.1 4.9 4.25 0.32 0.07</td>
<td>0.2 0.0 1.5</td>
<td>1 0.2 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E022A-04</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E022A-05</td>
<td>38.6 4.2 41.9 696 226 514</td>
<td>500 213 343 2.5 1.1 4.0</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E022A-06</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A34A-01</td>
<td>21.2 1.2 40.6 940 308 614</td>
<td>300 76 825 1.0 0.0 6.8 3.9 0.11 0.36</td>
<td>0.3 0.0 2.5</td>
<td>1 0.2 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A34A-01</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A34A-01</td>
<td>23.9 1.6 38.5 1015 315 716</td>
<td>500 246 665 3.0 0.0 6.0 3.85 0.04 0.41</td>
<td>0.1 0.0 2.2</td>
<td>1.5 0.6 0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>E020A-01</td>
<td>26.9 2.5 13.6 1600 142 nd</td>
<td>1000 590 483 1.3 0.3 4.7 3.85 0.06 0.34</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 1.4</td>
<td>0 1.3 1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E021A-01</td>
<td>26.9 2.2 8.9 2451 nd</td>
<td>1250 672 430 0.5 0.0 3.5 3.85 0.06 0.34</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 1.4</td>
<td>0 1.3 1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E022A-01</td>
<td>26.9 2.2 8.9 2451 nd</td>
<td>1250 672 430 0.5 0.0 3.5 3.85 0.06 0.34</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 1.4</td>
<td>0 1.3 1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>E022A-01</td>
<td>10.9 1.3 4.6 1776 341 1361</td>
<td>100 0 1749 1.0 0.0 5.4 3.60 0.07 0.19</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 2.8</td>
<td>2.4 0.7 0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A35A-01</td>
<td>22.8 2.8 38.9 910 187 627</td>
<td>500 195 751 3.9 0.0 4.9 4.25 0.34 0.10</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 1.8</td>
<td>1 0.2 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A35A-01</td>
<td>20.3 0.0 62.5 412 167 541</td>
<td>200 162 12 7.3 3.0 4.4 4.25 0.34 0.10</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 1.8</td>
<td>1 0.2 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A18A-01</td>
<td>18.8 1.5 20.8 1220 236 726</td>
<td>500 245 528 3.3 1.3 5.4 3.80 0.05 0.24</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 1.7</td>
<td>1.5 0.5 0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A18A-01</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A18A-01</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A18A-01</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>E022A-01</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E022A-02</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E022A-03</td>
<td>27.1 1.1 54.8 472 182 459</td>
<td>250 86 506 3.3 1.4 6.4 4.10 0.29 0.25</td>
<td>0.7 0.2 2.5</td>
<td>1 0.4 0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*abbreviated sample ID; full sample ID is given in supplements material Table A3.1
*calculated assuming a constant subaerial erosion rate of 1 mm ka$^{-1}$; in error includes concentration measurement uncertainty
values derived from probability density functions based on maximum weighted chi square values
nd = not determined
TCN concentrations and ratios, as well as total complex history and estimates of minimum burial durations, appear to vary systematically with sample elevation (Fig. 4.6). This correlation has previously been observed in other regions and was the basis of supporting the Nunatak Hypothesis (Brook et al., 1996; Steig et al., 1998; Gosse et al., 2006). TCN concentrations increase and ratios decrease with altitude. The correlation is strongest if only the most weathered surfaces at each site are considered. The scatter can be attributed to plucking, which exposes deep surfaces with lower TCN concentrations but higher ratios (section 4.6.1). Likewise, estimates of total complex history and minimum burial durations increase with elevation considering only the most weathered surfaces at each site (the exposure history of fresher surfaces is more strongly controlled by the timing of last major erosion event and not elevation).

![Graphs showing variation of selected TCN data and derived values with elevation of sampled tors.](image)

**Fig. 4.6** Variation of selected TCN data and derived values with elevation of sampled tor sites. $^{10}$Be concentrations are normalized to a sea-level, high-latitude location at 66.50°N, 65.20°W. Green circles: stage 2 tors and most weathered surface on stage the 2-3 tor. Blue squares: stage 3 tor, weathered surfaces of stage 3-4 tors, and fresher surfaces of stage the 2-3 tor. Red diamonds: Stage 4-5 tors and fresher surfaces on stage 3-4 tors.
4.7.3 Timing of Last Plucking and Rate of Episodic Erosion

The results in the previous two sections have ignored the effect of plucking. The estimates of $f$ and $t_{tot}$ derived above are based on a simple periodic ice cover model assuming a constant subaerial erosion rate. To accommodate multiple plucking events with varying block thicknesses, we use the MC method described in section 4.6.3. Since it is based on a globally-stacked marine oxygen proxy for past ice volume change (Lisiecki and Raymo, 2005), the MC method provides an opportunity to study the nature of subaerial weathering and former glacial conditions including sporadic plucking events. The timing of deglaciation is based on published and new deglacial chronology for the region (summarized in Margreth, 2015). Several consistency checks can test the sensitivity of the MC method. For instance, the MC model yields shorter ice-free intervals (equivalent to lower $f$ values in the cyclic ice cover model) in runs where the transition between glaciations and interglaciations is set at lower $\delta^{18}O$ values (colder climate, the value of $\delta^{18}O$ is uniformly varied between 3.5 to 4.5 permil with a stepsize of 0.05 permil). When pairs or triplets of samples are analysed simultaneously, the environmental parameters ($\delta^{18}O$ value, $\epsilon$, and $t_{tot}$) are most strongly influenced by the most weathered surface (Table 4.4, note that $t_{tot}$ determined with the MC method is considerably longer than estimated in section 4.7.2). Stage 2 tors require the longest total histories with decreasing durations for more progressively modified sites (stages 3-5). Furthermore, after numerous runs of the MC method with different parameter ranges, the results clearly reveal that variation in subaerial erosion rate at each site is not significant, because the rates are consistently slow (all are $<3 \text{ mm ka}^{-1}$). This finding agrees with the low steady state erosion rates determined from the continuously exposed sites 1 and 4.
(Table A3.1). Therefore, contrasts in weathering and TCN concentrations within and among tor sites can be attributed to the degree of glacial modification and the location of the tor within the glaciated landscape.

The most important outcomes of the MC method are (i) constraints for the fraction of time the summits were ice free, (ii) estimates for the timing of the last plucking event at a tor site, and (iii) the long-term average episodic erosion rate due to plucking for each sampled bedrock surface (Table 4.4). Compared to the simple cyclic ice cover model (section 4.6.1 and 4.7.2), the MC method yields longer average ice-free time that depends on the δ¹⁸O exposure and burial interval transition value (supplementary file section A3.5). This discrepancy is caused by relatively longer exposure intervals during the early Pleistocene before continued cooling led to increasing durations of glacial (Fig. A3.10).

For most sites, the timing of last glacial plucking is not well constrained (Fig. 4.7) owing to a strong dependence on the thickness of the plucked bedrock block, subaerial erosion rate, and fraction of ice-free time (δ¹⁸O value, supplementary file section A3.5, Fig. A3.12). Low rates of subaerial erosion limit the timing of last plucking, while relatively longer ice-free time is required for more recent plucking (Fig. A3.12). The range of possible timing of last plucking is largest for stage 2 tors and the most weathered surface of the stage 2-3 tor (0.4 – 1.9 Ma, 1σ error range, Fig. 4.7, Table 4.4); intermediate for stage 3 tors, weathered surfaces on stage 3-4 tors, and fresher surfaces on the stage 2-3 tor (0.2 – 1.2 Ma); and narrowest for stage 4-5 tors and the fresher surfaces at the margins of stage 3-4 tors (40 – 680 ka). This pattern is expected because the parts of the tor sites that appear fresher were probably those that were plucked more recently than the more weathered surfaces. The mode of the probability distribution functions
(pdfs) is >1 Ma for stage 2 tors and the most weathered surface of the stage 2-3 tor. It is between 300 and 500 ka for stage 3 tors, weathered surfaces of stage 3-4 tors, and fresher surfaces of the stage 2-3 tor. The mode decreases to 200 - 250 ka for stage 4-5 tors and fresher surfaces of stage 3-4 tors. The climate time series used for the MC method necessitates that summit plateaus were ice covered during all middle and late Pleistocene glaciations. Calculating the TCN concentrations that would have been measured in the sampled surfaces prior to continuous exposure since oxygen isotope stage 3 (OIS-3, i.e., 60 ka, Fig. A3.4) reveals that some surfaces would have required prolonged burial before re-exposure during OIS-3. However, prolonged burial since OIS-4 is difficult to reconcile with the periodic climate shifts in the Quaternary. This result is particularly valuable for summits where no erratics are available for exposure dating, or where erratics have high TCN inheritances.

The range of episodic erosion rates, computed by dividing the total thickness of all plucked bedrock blocks by the total duration of simulated complex history for a given MC method run, is insensitive to the value of subaerial erosion rate or the value of δ¹⁸O dividing LR04 in glacial and interglacial intervals (supplementary file section A3.5). Episodic erosion rates range between 0.5 and 6.5 mm ka⁻¹ (1σ range) for stage 2 tors and the most weathered surface of the stage 2-3 tor. It increases to 1.0 – 10.2 mm ka⁻¹ for stage 3 tors, weathered surfaces on stage 3-4 tors, and fresher surfaces of the stage 2-3 tor. Episodic erosion rates range between 2.0 – 15.7 mm ka⁻¹ for stage 4-5 tors and fresher surfaces on stage 3-4 tors (Fig. 4.8, Table 4.3). The mode of the probability distribution functions ranges between 0.5 – 1.3 mm ka⁻¹ for stage 2 tors and the most weathered surface of the stage 2-3 tor. It increases slightly to 1.0 – 3.8 mm ka⁻¹ for stage
3 tors, weathered surfaces on stage 3-4 tors, and fresher surfaces of the stage 2-3 tor. The mode increases to $3.5 - 7.3 \text{ mm ka}^{-1}$ for stage 4-5 tors and fresher surfaces on stage 3-4 tors (Fig. 4.8, Table 4.4). Larger episodic erosion rates determined for the fresher surfaces is corroborated by the most recent timing of last glacial plucking calculated for these samples, whereas the weathered surfaces require plucking to have occurred a longer time ago (Fig. 4.7).

**Fig 4.7** Comparison of timing since last glacial plucking with the stacked marine benthic $\delta^{18}O$ record (Lisiecki and Raymo, 2005). **Bottom:** LR04 is shown with reversed vertical axis, so that cold intervals are pointing down (green original data, blue slight smoothing used for MC method). The record is divided in ice-free and ice-cover intervals for a $\delta^{18}O$ value of 4 permil. **Top:** Timing since last glacial plucking plotted against elevation of sampled tor site (multiple samples are slightly offset for better visibility). Green: stage 2 tors and most weathered (wth) surface on stage the 2-3 tor, blue: stage 3 tor, weathered surfaces of stage 3-4 tors, and fresher (frh) surfaces of the stage 2-3 tor, and red: stage 4-5 tors and fresher surfaces of stage 3-4 tors.
Fig 4.8 Correlation of Monte Carlo (MC) method results with topographic location of sampled tor sites. **Centre:** Shaded-relief maps and contours (40 m intervals) showing examples of A. narrow coastal ridge (stage 1 tor), B. broad interior plateau (stage 2, 2-3, and 3-4 tors), and C. low-elevation coastal plateaus (stage 4-5 tors). Locations of maps are indicated in Fig. 4.1. **Periphery:** Probability density functions (pdfs) of values derived from the MC method (red calculated probability, blue smoothed probability, solid black line mode, and dashed black lines 1σ error ranges). Environmental parameters: δ¹⁸O, subaerial erosion rate, total duration of complex history; sample-specific parameters: timing of last glacial plucking, episodic erosion rate, plucking frequency. Note that the horizontal axis is the same for similar pdfs. Simplified burial plot displays variation of TCN concentration and simplified map indicates location of individual samples, which are colour coded according the classification of glacial modification (stage 1 purple, stage 2 green, stage 2-3 blue/green, stage 3 blue, stage 3-4 red/blue, stage 4-5 red).
4.8 DISCUSSION

The TCN data and MC method provide constraints on rates of subaerial weathering as well as broad constraints on rates of episodic subglacial erosion of weathered plateaus on Cumberland Peninsula (Fig. 4.8). It is also possible to distinguish and quantify both the subaerial erosion rate and the steady subglacial erosion rate (abrasion). On a continuously exposed surface, higher subaerial erosion rates shift the saturation point to increasingly higher ratios (erosion island endpoints, Lal, 1991; section 4.6.1, Fig. 4.3). Similarly, slow rates of steady subglacial abrasion (i.e., 1 mm ka\(^{-1}\), Fig. 4.3b) shift the transient saturation point of complex exposure trajectories to higher ratios. Because most of the summits were ice covered 70 – 80 % of the time over the Quaternary (average \(f = 0.27\) for 1 mm ka\(^{-1}\) subaerial erosion rate determined with cyclic ice cover model, Table 4.3), TCN ratios measured at most sites require extremely slow or zero subglacial abrasion. This finding is consistent with the notion of weakly erosive cold-based ice cover of the highland plateaus. Only the samples with the highest ratios (stage 4-5 tors and fresher surfaces on stage 3-4 tors, red ellipses Fig. 4.5) would permit discernable rates of subglacial abrasion. Steady subglacial erosion must be negligible for stage 3-4 tors because of the relatively low ratios measured for the weathered surfaces. Therefore, only stage 4-5 tors may have been affected by glacial abrasion, although the rate even there must have been <2 mm ka\(^{-1}\). In comparison, glacial abrasion rates of >100 mm ka\(^{-1}\) have been estimated in predominately warm-based valleys (Hallet et al., 1996; Briner and Swanson, 1998; Davis et al., 1999; Staiger et al., 2005).

The range of calculated episodic erosion rates (1 - 16 mm ka\(^{-1}\), 1σ error range of all probability distributions, Table 4.3) always exceeds the range of subaerial erosion rates
for a given site (Fig. 4.8). This finding supports previous notions that, over longer
timescales, sporadic erosion involving higher volumes of material (e.g., plucked bedrock
blocks of sufficient thickness, or deep-seated landslides) outpaces steady erosion for a
given system (Kirchner et al., 2001). Computed episodic erosion rates are influenced by
the time since last plucking, particularly for the freshest surfaces sampled (supplementary
file section A3.5, Fig. A3.13). This effect is comparable to measurements of basin-wide
erosion rates, which yield higher erosion rates following large landsliding events (i.e.,
triggered by an earthquake) with subsequent progressive decrease to values of
background steady erosion rates (Niemi et al., 2005; Antinao Rojas, 2009).

The TCN concentrations and MC results are related to the extent of glacial
modification, topographic position, and lithological properties of the sampled tor sites.
These relationships are based on a limited dataset, but are consistent with previously
reported observed or inferred relationships. Episodic erosion rate, and hence degree of
glacial modification, is controlled by the location of the tor in the landscape and fracture
density of the bedrock. As demonstrated previously (Dühnforth et al., 2010; Anderson,
2014), glacial plucking is increased with narrower joint spacing, which is corroborated by
our MC results. For instance, at site 11 (stage 2-3 tor) large weathered tor blocks (2-4 m
tall, Fig. A3.2a, Table 4.2) stand above an exposed plinth opposite a ridge composed of
multiple layers of bedrock blocks 0.5 – 1 m thick (Fig. A3.2b). The sample obtained
from one of the large tor blocks (most weathered surface) yields lower episodic erosion
rates than the two samples collected from the exposed plinth and from the top of the
layered tor ridge (Table 4.4). This difference suggests that the large tor blocks (with
higher rock mass strengths due to fewer fractures) withstood plucking while smaller
blocks (lower rock mass strengths due to higher fracture density) were more frequently removed from the layered ridge. Both stage 4-5 tors (sites 3 & 4) have comparatively small joint spacing (0.5 – 0.8 m) making them more susceptible to plucking.

The importance of local topography is revealed by tors on high narrow coastal interfluvies along the northeastern coast of Cumberland Peninsula that remained ice-free throughout the Quaternary (sites 1 & 4, Fig. 4.1). The ridges are too narrow and wind-exposed to permit significant snow accumulation and ice cap formation (Fig. 4.8a). This conclusion is corroborated by ice sheet models that are constrained by relative sea level data. The models project the coastal ridges above the paleo-ice surface (Staiger et al., 2005; Tarasov et al., 2012). Continuous cosmic ray exposure is supported by the high TCN concentrations (Table 4.3) that can be explained with gradual steady-state erosion rates of 0.8 – 1.6 mm ka$^{-1}$ (Fig. 4.5, Table A3.1). These two sites are of special interest in light of the long debate in this region about the existence of ice-free (and potentially botanically viable) terrain during glacial maxima. Although such terrain was evidently much more limited than previously thought (cf, Dyke et al., 1982), the fact that we included two such sites in a sample of 12 sites means that it is worthwhile prospecting similar sites along eastern Baffin Island for comparable TCN concentrations.

Episodic erosion is also controlled by the topographic position of the sampled tor within a given plateau (Fig. 4.8b). Stage 2 tors (sites 8-9) are located at or close to local summits (~2 km apart) of broad plateaus (>60 km$^2$, NW section shown in Fig. 4.8b). The samples collected at these high elevation sites, together with the most weathered surface of the stage 2-3 tor (site 11), have relatively high TCN concentrations but low ratios indicating prolong burial by ice and long total complex histories (Fig. 4.6). A history of
long durations of ice cover is also supported by low $\delta$ values determined with the cyclic ice cover model (section 4.6.1, Fig. 4.3) and relatively lower glacial-interglacial transition values of $\delta^{18}$O favoured by the MC method (Table 4.3). This result suggests that ice caps initiated at higher elevations as soon as the regional equilibrium line altitude (ELA) descended below the summits (Margreth et al., 2014). Owing to divergent ice flow at the summit and generally thin ice cover, the ice remained cold-based, which limited the glacial modification of stage 2 tors. Minimal glacial modification is supported by the calculated low episodic erosion rates ($0.5 - 1.3$ mm ka$^{-1}$, 1$\sigma$ error range, $0.5 - 6.5$ mm ka$^{-1}$, range of modes, Fig. 4.8) and the requirement for an earlier last plucking event ($0.4 - 1.9$ Ma, 1$\sigma$ error range, $>1$ Ma, modes, Fig. 4.7). At site 11, the low episodic erosion rate and early last plucking derived for the most weathered surface are attributed to the large size of the sampled tor block (Fig. A3.2a).

Sites with stage 3 & 3-4 tors (5-7, 10-12, Fig.4.1) are located on the rims of broad plateaus (Fig. 4.8b) or on a large bevel on a gentle valley slope. These sites were likely covered later by the descending ice caps in response to further lowering of the regional ELA, which is supported by generally longer ice-free times derived for the cyclic ice cover model and the higher $\delta^{18}$O glacial-interglacial transition values favoured by the MC calculations (Table 4.3). Changes in ice dynamics (and perhaps a shift from cold-based to temporary warm-based conditions) at the slope break of the plateaus facilitated more frequent plucking, which more efficiently exposed the bedrock plinth at the margin of those tors. More intense glacial modification, inferred from field observation, is corroborated by higher episodic erosion rates ($2.9 - 11.9$ mm ka$^{-1}$, 1$\sigma$ error range, $5.5 - 7.3$ mm ka$^{-1}$, range of modes, Table 4.4), as well as lower TCN concentrations and higher
ratios determined for the samples collected on the tor plinth (Fig. 4.6 & 4.8). Meanwhile, the samples obtained from the weathered bedrock blocks at the centre of the same tor have higher TCN concentrations but lower ratios (Fig. 4.6) and yield smaller episodic erosion rates (2.9 – 7.8 mm ka\(^{-1}\), 1\(\sigma\) error range, 1.0 mm ka\(^{-1}\), modes, Table 4.4) indicating relatively less frequent plucking than on the plinth (Fig. 4.8).

Stage 4 and 5 tors (sites 2 & 3, Fig. 4.1) are located on small low-elevation plateaus along the northeastern coast of Cumberland Peninsula (Fig. 4.8c). Thickening of outlet glaciers in adjacent fiords may have caused longer periods of warm-based ice conditions at these sites, so that most highly weathered bedrock blocks have been eroded, exposing the root of the tors. The enhanced glacial modification observed in the field, and first brought to our attention by Sugden and Watts (1977), is supported by higher episodic erosion rates (2.0 – 10.8 mm ka\(^{-1}\), 1\(\sigma\) error range, 3.3 – 3.5 mm ka\(^{-1}\), range of modes, Table 4.4) similar to the values obtained for the tor plinth on stage 3-4 tors and equally low TCN concentrations and high ratios (Fig. 4.6). A white quartzite cobble observed on site 3 indicates glacial entrainment and transport of this distinctive erratic to the tor.

Increasing glacial modification of tors from the summits to the edges of plateaus has been previously recognised on Cumberland Peninsula (Sugden and Watts, 1977; Watts, 1979), as well as in the Cairngorms in Scotland (Hall and Phillips, 2006). Sugden and Watts (1977) proposed a continuum of alteration of tors from essentially unmodified at summits to increasingly higher modification towards the fiords. However, the MC method results suggest that most tor modification occurred prior to the last glaciation, hence implying that tor modification cannot be used to infer basal ice conditions during LGM. For instance, the broad plateau shown in Figure 4.8b may have been influenced by
the LIS during earlier glaciations (probably inducing temporary warm-based conditions at
the edges of the plateau), but during the last glaciation the LIS only reached the valley
just north of the plateau (Fig. 4.1, Dyke, 2011b; Dyke, 2013b; Margreth, 2015). More
intense glacial modification of tors at the edge of the plateaus may also be caused by
higher basal shear stresses related to topographically-influenced steeper slopes of the
glacier bed and ice surface. Pedersen et al. (2014) showed theoretically that glacial
erosion increases at the edge of a plateau-like landscape due to increased basal shear
stress, while low basal shear stresses limit glacial erosion at the centre of the plateau
independently of the prevailing basal thermal conditions.

While our results reveal faster rates for episodic erosion for weathered plateaus
compared to subaerial erosion, total erosion of summits on Cumberland Peninsula is
small compared to glacial deepening of adjacent valleys throughout the Quaternary. The
total plateau lowering of 5 – 50 m (based on a combined 2 – 18 mm ka\(^{-1}\) of subaerial
weathering and episodic erosion (total 1\(\sigma\) error range) during the Quaternary determined
with our approach is comparable to values inferred from TCN data of bedrock and till in
other polar landscapes (Andre, 2004; Marquette et al., 2004; Briner et al., 2006; Phillips
et al., 2006; Staiger et al., 2006). Our total lowering depth is a minimum estimate for the
entire Cumberland highland because tors are by nature the slower-eroding remnants of a
lowering landscape. However, the tors are only a few metres above the average local
ground level suggesting that the overall lowering depth of the plateaus may be only
slightly greater. The low subaerial and episodic erosion rates signify the long-term
stability of the plateaus, while relatively fast flowing, warm-based ice rapidly deepened
the valleys previously carved by Mesozoic and Paleogene fluvial drainage (Briner et al.,
The plateaus have therefore been interpreted as the last vestige of a pre-Quaternary landscape (Dyke, 1993; Kleman and Stroeven, 1997; Fabel et al., 2002; Hattestrand and Stroeven, 2002; Stroeven et al., 2002; Briner et al., 2003; Fjellanger et al., 2006) that can be used as ‘geomorphic markers’ (Anderson, 2002) to infer the total amount of glacial erosion and induced isostatic uplift in response to erosional unloading during the Quaternary (Small and Anderson, 1998; Steer et al., 2012). While our results indicate that the tors have been exhumed during the Quaternary, the dissected plateau landscape may have been inherited from a previous episode of deep weathering (Krabbendam and Bradwell, 2014). Although episodic and subaerial erosion of the plateaus are an order of magnitude lower than glacial erosion in adjoining valleys and fiords, the plateaus may have contributed a significant amount of sediment throughout the Quaternary due to the relatively large area of upland regions. On Cumberland Peninsula, low-relief plateaus constitute approximately 15% of the total surface area (based on discrimination of high-elevation areas from trend surfaces fitted to digital elevation maps of the peninsula combined with discrimination of low slope <12° areas), while glacially deepened valleys comprise 30% of the surface area. By comparing offshore sediment volumes with total amount of glacial erosion, Steer et al. (2012) estimated that high-altitude, low-relief surfaces were lowered by 100 – 150 m during the Pleistocene in western Norway. They suggested that the majority of erosion on the plateaus occurred during the Pliocene and early Quaternary, followed by a shift of glacial erosion to lower elevations deepening the fiords and valleys during the late Pleistocene. Such bimodal distribution of Quaternary glacial erosion has been supported by recent numerical modelling (Herman et al., 2011; Pedersen et al., 2014). However, our MC
results suggest that plucking of tor blocks continued throughout the middle and late Pleistocene (Fig. 4.7)

Estimates of late Quaternary sedimentation rates in Baffin Bay vary between 2 – 10 cm ka\(^{-1}\), from which maximum denudation rates of 1.7 cm ka\(^{-1}\) for Canadian Shield areas are deduced (Aksu and Piper, 1987). This denudation rate lies at the higher end of estimates of long-term exhumation of 7 – 20 m Ma\(^{-1}\) determined from low-temperature thermochronology for Baffin Island (McGregor et al., 2013; Creason, 2015). The total lowering rate of 2 – 18 mm ka\(^{-1}\) (1\(\sigma\) error range of subaerial weathering plus episodic erosion) obtained for the weathered plateaus is comparable to the thermochronologically-derived exhumation rate suggesting that denudation of the summit plateaus remained steady over much of the Cenozoic.

4.9 CONCLUSIONS

With new approaches we have shown that it is possible to constrain the episodic and steady subaerial and subglacial erosion rates of summit plateaus by measuring TCN concentrations on adjacent bedrock surfaces exhibiting different degrees of weathering. The MC-based approach provides estimates of the fraction of ice-free time during a glacial-interglacial cycle, the probable last time of subglacial plucking for a sampled surface, and total thickness loss due to a combination of episodic and steady erosion processes. The resolution of the output can be improved with independent constraints of boundary conditions such as climate over the past few million years, timing of the last deglaciation of the site, and average fracture density of material that has been eroded.
Adding episodic and steady erosion mechanisms, summits on Cumberland Peninsula have been eroding at rates between 2 - 18 mm ka$^{-1}$ over the Quaternary, with the highest rates on sites located at the edges of plateaus (stage 3-4 tors) as well as at the tor tops on low-elevation coastal plateaus (stage 4-5 tors). Constant subglacial erosion (abrasion) is sufficiently slow relative to plucking that it can be excluded for most sampled tors with only the two sites from the low-elevation coastal plateaus recording discernable but low rates of abrasion during short intervals of warm-based ice conditions. Slow subaerial weathering rates of <3 mm ka$^{-1}$ are determined from TCN concentrations measured in bedrock surfaces on non-glaciated high coastal ridge tors and corroborated by the results of the MC method. Timing of last glacial plucking is consistently more recent for fresher appearing surfaces and tors with higher degree of glacial modification.

Our results indicate that long-term denudation of summit plateaus is (i) slow but not negligible, since erosion on the summits notably contribute to the Quaternary sediment flux to the oceans similarly to Norway, (ii) slower than valley incision, but similar to thermochronologically-derived exhumation rates 7 - 20 m Ma$^{-1}$, and (iii) indicate that cold-based ice cover is capable of eroding the landscape by episodic entrainment of weathered bedrock blocks.

Our constraints on ice-free time over the Quaternary and the timing of last ice plucking provide (i) reconciliation of previous dilemmas in published TCN results for Cumberland Peninsula, which are explained by the notion that a depressed $^{26}$Al/$^{10}$Be does not necessarily imply burial during the last glaciation, (ii) refinements of the most recent conceptual model of ice volume and extent throughout the entire peninsula (previous studies were mostly coastal), and (iii) enhancement of our understanding of ice dynamics.
in regions where ice sheets, valley glacier systems, and independent ice caps interact. Although the methods have been developed for the specific case of episodic plucking of weathered bedrock blocks by predominately cold-based ice, some elements of our approach are transferable to other episodic processes, for instance, to determine the timing and rates of coastal cliff retreat and rockfall or toppling events.
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CHAPTER 5 – CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

The new insights into the surficial geology of the entire area of Cumberland Peninsula derived from detailed mapping, new geochronological constraints and an innovative approach to interpret cosmic-ray isotope data presented in this thesis provide the necessary information to constrain numerical landscape evolution models that may help understanding unresolved problems of Arctic glacial geology. These problems concern i) the existence of ice-free enclaves for biota, ii) the interaction and dynamics of different ice masses on a regional scale, iii) the influence of progressive glacial erosion of the landscape on the dynamics of successive glaciations, and iv) the long-term evolution of Arctic glaciated landscapes that selectively preserve fragments of former topography during excavation of a distinctively alpine landscape.

The preceding chapters describe the approaches used and results obtained from addressing the objectives of this thesis stated in Chapter 1. Taken together, Chapters 2 – 4 provide a comprehensive review of the Quaternary geology of Cumberland Peninsula augmenting previous research, which was mainly focused on selected regions along the coast. This thesis examines the dynamics of different glacial styles (ice sheet, alpine glaciers, and ice caps) that influenced the area during different time intervals (Holocene – Chapter 2, Wisconsinan – Chapter 3, Pleistocene – Chapter 4). By considering the entire peninsula, a conceptual model of the glaciation on Cumberland Peninsula could be established based on high-resolution maps of surficial deposits and new geochronological constraints obtained for the interior and higher elevation areas that had little previous age control, owing to the inaccessibility of the mountainous terrain.
5.1 MAJOR CONCLUSIONS OF THESIS AND IMPLICATIONS

The following sections summarize the key findings of Chapters 2 – 4 and relate them to the long-term objectives introduced in Chapter 1. For two chapters, new geochronological approaches were developed or improved. These approaches include 1) radiocarbon dating of delicate, subfossilized mosses that are currently melting out along margins of receding cold-based ice caps, and 2) modelling of complex terrestrial cosmogenic nuclide (TCN) exposure histories to fit measured concentrations of two radioisotopes with differing decay rates collected from differentially weathered bedrock surfaces at the same tor. In addition to the development of new and improved geochronological methods, a combination of surface and subsurface exposure dating and radiocarbon dating was used to establish the chronology of deglaciation since the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM) and infer changes in paleo-equilibrium line altitudes (ELA) on Cumberland Peninsula.

5.1.1 Radiocarbon Dating of Moss

Subfossilized, weakly rooted tundra vegetation, which is currently melting out along quickly retracting cold-based ice margins, presents a unique archive of past climate change. The low probability of preservation of such delicate material on the wind-swept stony polar desert plateaus suggests that the sampling locations remained ice covered since entombment of the plants. Therefore, we interpret the radiocarbon ages obtained from the organic matter as maximum-limiting ages of the expansion of ice caps from positions that were at least as retracted as they are today. Distinct peaks in the radiocarbon age distribution occur at 1.58 – 1.53 ka (n = 7 samples), 1.41 – 1.34 ka (n = 6), 1.22 – 1.16 ka (n = 5), and during the Little Ice Age at 0.74 – 0.64 ka (n = 4), 0.5 –
0.48 ka (n = 3), and 0.35 – 017 ka (n = 9). The results of Chapter 2 are important because of the difficulty of obtaining a record of ice advance in areas where few lake records are available (Objective 1).

Because the retreat pattern of ice caps differed from the pattern of ice advance, mosses of different ages are concurrently melting out along withdrawing ice margins. The correlation of peaks (and risers) in the age distribution with the timing of large volcanic eruptions confirms a previous hypothesis (Miller et al., 2012) and reveals the sensitivity of thin, cold-based ice caps to short-term, low-amplitude climate perturbations. Through amplification by positive sea-ice – ocean – atmosphere feedbacks (Miller et al., 2012), these kind of climate forcings can cause extensive ice expansion, particularly on plateaus that lie in the critical elevation range with respect to the modern ELA (above which there is positive snow balance and glacier growth), so that a small lowering of ELA can cause an instantaneous widespread glacierization of the region. Extrapolating these findings to Milankovitch orbital-forcing timescales of $10^4$ years, this instantaneous glacierization process could also have initiated the growth of continental ice sheets or a polythermal alpine glacier system, as previously proposed by Ives (1957; 1975).

The new dataset from Cumberland Peninsula extends the correlation between ice cap expansion and short-term atmospheric perturbation caused by large volcanic eruptions during the last 2 ka. Exhumation of subfossilized organic material that was covered by expanding ice caps nearly 5 ka ago and remained ice covered until shortly before sample collection suggests that the current warming is the largest seen or longest sustained since the early to middle Holocene thermal optimum, or potentially, since the
last interglacial (Miller et al., 2013b). The close agreement between the new dataset for Cumberland Peninsula and previous datasets from another region of Baffin Island (Anderson et al., 2008; Miller et al., 2012; Miller et al., 2013b) and eastern Greenland (Lowell et al., 2013) demonstrates the reproducibility of the approach and suggests a common cause for ice cap expansion in the North Atlantic Arctic region. Additional data are required to confirm the established relation between ice advance and short-term climate perturbations for the middle Holocene and to find supplementary links to other climate forcings, as for instance changes in atmospheric or oceanic circulation. Additional data could be obtained in the future from collection of organic material along the same ice caps and from ice caps with a broader range of elevation, which should release older ages along individual flow lines by further ice margin retreat.

Finally, the study provides a significant contribution to others who may attempt this moss-dating approach. Regrowth of bryophytes after millennia of entombment was documented by radiocarbon dating of dissimilarly preserved macrofossils from the same moss type collected at the same location. The younger-looking fragments (with remnants of white awns) yielded consistent younger ages than a flattened fragment of the same moss type, indicating re-growth during a brief, intervening ice-recession phase. The re-grown bryophytes may contaminate the $^{14}$C from the dead portions of the moss, as suggested at another location, where younger-looking fragments yielded slightly younger but overlapping (within 1σ) calibrated age ranges than flattened macrofossils. Regrowth of bryophytes may also explain the presence of two samples in our dataset that were shown to be isotopically modern. Therefore, sample sites and individual samples should be carefully screened in the field to minimize the slight potential of re-growth of older
organic material during brief ice-recession phases. Samples should be kept dark, cold, and dry, and processing should be completed as soon as possible to reduce the opportunities for regrowth. Contamination of older organic material with re-grown bryophytes can also be detected during sample preparation by noticing dissimilar preservation of macrofossils. Reliable ages for ice cap expansion can be obtained by careful selection of similarly preserved (flattened or old-looking) macrofossils for radiocarbon dating. The notion of dissimilar preservation of macrofossils also supports the growing number of observations that refute the ice age refugium concept and Nunatak Hypothesis, if mosses are able to regenerate after thousands of years of ice cover. Regeneration of several species of subfossilized bryophytes, collected from a cold-based ice cap on Ellesmere Island, succeeded recently in in-vitro growth chamber experiments (La Farge et al., 2013). These experiments, showing that bryophytes can be revitalized following millennia of cryogenic suspension, indicate that subglacial plant refugia may be more significant than refugia on Nunataks to explain disjunct species populations.

5.1.2 Wisconsinan Ice Dynamics

Detailed mapping at a scale of 1:100,000 of most of Cumberland Peninsula (Dyke, 2011a-f; Dyke, 2013a-c) provides the basis for a conceptual model of Wisconsinan glaciation and deglaciation in the region. The peninsula was influenced by three different ice masses: Laurentide Ice Sheet (LIS), expanded Penny Ice Cap (PIC), and polythermal alpine glaciers. During the last glaciation, alpine glaciers thickened to form a major ice divide system over the main mountain ranges, which were beyond the reach of other ice masses. New TCN exposure ages, obtained from boulders and depth profiles in ice marginal deltas, are applied to the morphostratigraphic sequence of moraines and
meltwater channels in a major alpine valley (‘central valley’) from the oldest moraines near the southwestern coast to the youngest moraines in interior of the peninsula close to modern glacier termini. Additional age constraint was established in a valley, where LIS and local fiord ice concurrently dammed a lake, revealing the timing of separation of the two ice masses. The new chronological control, combined with previous geochronology, allows mapping of ice extent for three different re-advance phases during deglaciation: the end of a composite Heinrich Event (H-1, ~20 - 14.6 ka, Stanford et al., 2011), the end of the Younger Dryas (YD, 12.9 – 11.7 ka, Rasmussen et al., 2006), and Cockburn-equivalent cold intervals (9.5 – 9.2 ka, Rasmussen et al., 2007). Based on these maps, retreat rates for the different glacier types were inferred revealing the sensitive response of smaller ice masses (alpine glaciers) to the Bølling-Allerød warm interval (average rates 12 – 20 m a⁻¹ between 14.6 to 12.9 ka, Rasmussen et al., 2006) compared with the initial sluggish retreat of both the land-based LIS and an outlet glacier of the PIC (1 – 2 m a⁻¹). But the LIS withdrew more quickly (~60 m a⁻¹) during the subsequent Preboreal warm period (11.7 – 9.5 ka, Rasmussen et al., 2006; 2007) than the PIC and alpine outlet glaciers (12 – 30 m a⁻¹) suggesting rapid destabilization of the northeastern margin of the LIS. Reconstruction of paleo-ELA for the three different time intervals offers insight into the cause of asymmetric retreat pattern of the alpine glacier system. While paleo-ELA rose approximately 60 m along the southwestern coast between the H-1 and YD cold intervals (equivalent to a temperature increase of 0.3°C using a lapse rate of 4.9 °C km⁻¹ (Gardner et al., 2009)), paleo-ELAs decreased along the northeastern coast in the same time interval. Decreasing ELAs might be caused by increasing precipitation perhaps
related to a reduction of sea ice cover in the marine basins east of Cumberland Peninsula (de Vernal et al., 2008).

Surprising was the discovery of the composite age of an ice-marginal raised delta located at the head of a fiord on the southwestern coast of Cumberland Peninsula. A radiocarbon age of 43.2 ± 0.4 ka obtained from *Hiatella arctica* shells seemed to be in disagreement with the morphostratigraphic position of the delta within the established retreat sequence in the ‘central valley’. A TCN depth profile obtained from the uppermost 1.6 m of the delta revealed an unconformity between the four shallower samples, which were used to constrain an exposure age of 12.4 ^-1.0 / +2.8^ ka, and the deepest sample, which has a higher TCN concentration than the sample above. The lowest sample in the profile was collected just above the shell-bearing zone suggesting that the lower part of the profile, and hence the lower part of the delta, was deposited during a middle Wisconsinan interval of ice recession. Protection of the delta during the following re-advance of an outlet glacier to the mouth of the fiord is documented by TCN exposure ages from boulders on a lateral moraine and the TCN depth profile from the top layer of the delta. Preservation of a large raised marine delta under thin, cold-based ice has previously been reported for the northeastern coast of Baffin Island (Davis et al., 2006). But the case reported here is on a lower inner fiord wall, where preservation is less likely. Nevertheless, it illustrates that during some glacial cycles even fiord glaciers were minimally erosive, at least locally. The notion of buried soils in two ~1 m deep profiles dug into a marine delta near the mouth of Kingnait Fiord (Birkeland, 1978) indicates that this prominent glaciomarine deposit may also have been formed in multiple
phases suggesting that the late Wisconsinan age assigned by TCN dating of boulders on its surface (Marsella et al., 2000) may only date the last stage of delta formation.

The high percentage of large boulders, deposited on moraines or near meltwater channels, that contain significant inherited TCN concentrations signifies the long subaerial exposure or limited erosion due to predominately cold-based cover in the source area of the boulders. To circumvent the problem of inheritance, cosmogenic $^{14}\text{C}$ produced in the surface of rocks could be measured (Jull et al., 1994; Lifton et al., 2001; Naysmith et al., 2004). Owing to the short half life of 5,730 years (Godwin, 1962), any inherited inventory of \textit{in-situ} \textit{$^{14}\text{C}$} accumulated during previous exposure intervals quickly decays under ice cover. An ultra-high vacuum system for extraction of \textit{in-situ} \textit{$^{14}\text{C}$} is currently being built at the Dalhousie Geochronology Centre (DGC). For many samples analysed for $^{10}\text{Be}$, enough purified quartz is available for additional measurement of the \textit{in-situ} \textit{$^{14}\text{C}$} concentration. Additionally, samples of boulders collected from moraines documenting the further retreat of the LIS and the subsequent separation from the western margin of the PIC are available for \textit{in-situ} \textit{$^{14}\text{C}$} analysis. Analysing the \textit{in-situ} \textit{$^{14}\text{C}$} content of these samples would further constrain the late glacial and early Holocene retreat rates of the LIS enabling more detailed comparison of the dynamics of the different ice masses on Cumberland Peninsula and inferring their sensitivity to climate variation.

5.1.3 \textit{Quaternary Complex Exposure Histories}

Rates of episodic erosion have been difficult to estimate, owing to the numerous parameters that control the cosmic-ray exposure histories of surfaces affected by episodic erosion events. The new approach presented in \textit{Chapter 4} uses the concentration of two
radionuclides with differing decay rates ($^{10}\text{Be}$, $t_{1/2} = 1.38 \text{ Ma}$ and $^{26}\text{Al}$, $t_{1/2} = 0.72 \text{ Ma}$) measured in adjacent plucked and non-plucked surfaces of tors in order to reduce the degrees of freedom of the multiple parameter system. The timing of last plucking is derived from three different depth functions (concentrations of both $^{10}\text{Be}$ and $^{26}\text{Al}$, and their relative abundances $^{26}\text{Al}^{/10}\text{Be}$) that are calculated based on a simple, periodic ice cover history. To estimate the rate of episodic erosion, a Monte Carlo (MC) method had to be developed that computes complex cosmic exposure histories involving multiple plucking events. Constrained by a proxy-record of global glacier volume (Lisiecki and Raymo, 2005), the MC method provides probability density functions of (i) the total duration of complex histories (exposure + burial), (ii) gradual subaerial erosion rates, (iii) rates of episodic plucking of weathered bedrock blocks, and (iv) the timing of last glacial plucking.

Estimates of the total duration of complex histories give minimum-limiting ages for the formation of tors, thus signifying the antiquity of the landscape that has been modified during Pleistocene glaciations (Marquette et al., 2004; Gosse et al., 2006; Krabbendam and Bradwell, 2014). Among the twelve sampled tors, two sites located on narrow, high-elevation, coastal ridges are shown to have never been glaciated. The TCN concentrations measured on these sites indicate that bedrock is eroding at low constant rates ($0.8 – 1.6 \text{ mm ka}^{-1}$), which is corroborated by low values ($<3 \text{ mm ka}^{-1}$) for subaerial erosion rates derived by the MC method. For the remaining tor sites, predominately cold-based ice cover is inferred based on the relatively high TCN concentrations and concurrent low $^{26}\text{Al}^{/10}\text{Be}$ that restrict subglacial abrasion to much lower rates than estimated for subglacial erosion by episodic plucking. Episodic erosion rates and the
timing of last glacial plucking correlate well with the classification of tors according to the degree of glacial modification established from field observations (Hall and Phillips, 2006). Furthermore, the variation of episodic erosion rate between different tor sites and different surfaces at the same tor can be related to the topographic position of the tors and local differences in bedrock joint spacing. Tors located at the summits of broad interior plateaus require the longest complex histories (1.5 – 2.4 Ma), yield the lowest episodic erosion rates (0.5 – 1.3 mm ka⁻¹, range of modes), and have last been plucked more than 1 Ma ago (range of modes). Tors located at the edge of the same plateaus have last been plucked more recently (300 – 500 ka, range of modes), yield higher episodic erosion rates (1.0 – 3.8 mm ka⁻¹, range of modes) and require shorter complex histories (~1 Ma) indicating larger modification during Pleistocene glaciations. The highest episodic erosion rates (3.5 – 7.3 mm ka⁻¹, range of modes), most recent last plucking (200 – 250 ka, range of modes), and shortest complex histories (<1 Ma) are inferred for bedrock surfaces at the margin of tors located at the edge of broad plateaus as well as for tors located on low-elevation coastal plateaus. High episodic erosion rates determined for tors on low-elevation coastal plateaus corroborate the notion of strongest glacial modification signifying the possibility for short-term, warm-based thermal conditions at these locations. Tors with relatively small block thicknesses yield higher episodic erosion rates and more recent last plucking supporting previous notions that narrower joint spacing facilitates plucking (Dünnforth et al., 2010; Anderson, 2014). The timing of last glacial plucking provides maximum-limiting constraints for the timing of last ice cover, but the new approach presented in Chapter 4 suggests that the sampled plateaus, with the exception of the two narrow, coastal ridges, were covered by cold-based ice
during the LGM. This result is important, because of the long-lasting debate on Cumberland Peninsula about the vertical extent of ice cover during the late Wisconsinan and the existence of biological refugia.

The estimated episodic erosion rates are generally larger than the inferred rates of gradual subaerial erosion indicating that episodic erosion rates are significant for the long-term evolution of dissected high-latitude landscapes. Since tors are the slowest eroding parts of the landscape, total erosion of upland plateaus amounts to at least 5 – 25 m over the Quaternary. While the estimated total erosion rate of 2 – 8 mm ka\(^{-1}\) is an order of magnitude lower than rates for adjacent, glacially carved valleys (Davis et al., 1999; Staiger et al., 2005) and glacial cirques (Anderson, 1978), the erosion of upland plateaus may significantly contribute to the sediment flux to the oceans, owing to the relatively large surface area.

The estimate for the timing of last glacial plucking can be considerably improved, if the thickness of the plucked bedrock block can be inferred from field observations. Therefore, fracture spacing should be measured while sampling differentially weathered surfaces at the same tor. Ideally, the relationship between both surfaces (i.e., the number and thicknesses of blocks that once covered the fresher surface) should be known. Ice coverage at the LGM can be confirmed or rejected by measuring in-situ \(^{14}\)C concentrations in the leftover purified quartz from the sampled bedrock surfaces. If the tors were covered by ice during the LGM, then the in-situ \(^{14}\)C concentrations would reveal the precise timing of deglaciation. On the other hand, if the tors were ice-free at the LGM, then the in-situ \(^{14}\)C concentrations should be saturated providing accurate estimates for rapid, gradual subaerial erosion rates. The new approach presented in
Chapter 4 has been specifically developed for estimation of episodic glacial plucking of tor on weathered upland plateaus, but parts of the approach could be adapted to assess other geomorphic processes, as for instance lateral retreat of plateau escarpments, sporadic rockfall from glaciated valley slopes, and toppling in medium to coarsely fractured rock.

5.2 FUTURE WORK

While implications for future work are stated at the end of each of the previous section, more general prospective research directions are now considered. First, the improved understanding of the dynamics and interaction of different glacier types presented in this thesis (Chapters 2 - 4) and other research accomplished over the last decade (e.g., Briner et al., 2006; Davis et al., 2006; Staiger et al., 2006; Kessler et al., 2008; Briner et al., 2009) provide additional constraints for numerical ice sheet models of the evolution of ice cover on Cumberland Peninsula and on Baffin Island. Second, since the episodic erosion rates estimated in Chapter 4 do not account for stripping of regolith (layer of unconsolidated, residual material above solid bedrock) at the beginning of the Pleistocene glaciations, the Regolith Hypothesis (Clark and Pollard, 1998; Clark et al., 2006) is discussed followed by the presentation of possible approaches to constrain the timing of regolith stripping on Cumberland Peninsula. Third, the long-term evolution of the alpine landscape of Cumberland Peninsula is considered with future work attempting to discern fragments of the previous topography by semi-automatic classification of the landscape from digital elevation models (DEM, Drăguț and Eisank, 2012; Jarnà, 2014).
5.2.1 Numerical Ice Sheet Models

Previously published constraints for the late Wisconsinan ice dynamics on Baffin Island (e.g., Briner et al., 2006; Davis et al., 2006; Staiger et al., 2006; Kessler et al., 2008; Briner et al., 2009) and Chapter 3 of this thesis have focused on the LGM deglacial record. However, the inception of ice sheets and subsequent expansion and coalescence of different ice masses are not well understood. Geologically-constrained numerical models have been used to investigate the evolution and dynamics of ice sheets on a continental scale (Peltier and Fairbanks, 2006; Tarasov et al., 2012), but the relatively coarse resolution of these models makes it difficult to investigate glacial dynamics of smaller areas, such as Cumberland Peninsula (~42,000 km²). Although promising results have been obtained for modelling of specific regions to address particular problems (Kaplan et al., 1999; Staiger et al., 2005; 2006), the evolution of ice cover on Cumberland Peninsula during the last glaciation has not been studied with a numerical model. New sophisticated ice sheet models with dynamical nesting of high resolution areas are now able to model polythermal ice cover in selected regions within the framework of a larger scale simulation of a sector of a continental ice sheet (e.g., Roberts et al., 2009; Simpson et al., 2009; Stokes et al., 2012; Tarasov et al., 2012; Lecavalier et al., 2014). The boundary conditions of these models are constrained by glacial geological data for relative sea level or deglaciation. In the case of Cumberland Peninsula, this thesis now provides not only the deglacial record for three different ice masses (Chapter 3), but also a proxy for ice cap expansion in response to atmospheric cooling (Chapter 2) and estimates of long-term episodic erosion rates on upland plateaus (Chapter 4) offering further constraints for the sensitivity and dynamics of cold-based parts of glacier systems.
Furthermore, new TCN data from detrital quartz in till could confirm the distribution of basal thermal regime and intensity of glacial erosion (e.g., Staiger et al., 2006) and the development of a polythermal alpine glacier system on Cumberland Peninsula.

Other objectives that could be addressed with numerical ice sheet models include the Nunatak Hypothesis (Ives, 1957; 1974) and the flow of the LIS across Baffin Island. The distribution and extent of ice-free areas (Nunataks) could be assessed with a numerical ice sheet model, which would help resolving interdisciplinary questions such as what areas were available for biological refugia during the LGM. The results of Chapter 4 indicate that Nunataks on Baffin Island may were probably much more restricted than previously hypothesized (Ives, 1957; 1974). However, the documentation of dissimilarly preserved bryophyte macrofossils presented in Chapter 2 provides an alternate explanation for the occurrence of disjunct species in the Arctic. Revitalization of bryophytes after millennia of cryogenic suspension (La Farge et al., 2013) suggests that cold-based ice caps offered refugium for flora during glaciations thus not requiring ice-free areas with favourable environmental conditions for plant growth. The occurrence of ice-free areas along the coast of Cumberland Peninsula (Chapter 4) might also be attributed to the particular location of the area with respect to the flow of LIS from Foxe Basin. Considering the major conduits of LIS across Baffin Island (Fig. 5.1), it is intriguing that the LIS was capable of covering the high-elevation topography northwest of Home Bay and Clyde Fiord, but it failed to invade Cumberland Peninsula. Reasons for this flow pattern might be the expansion of the local PIC obstructing the LIS flow in the region and the proximity of a topographic trough (Cumberland Sound) that funneled the majority of LIS flow past the peninsula. The dynamics of LIS and relative
importance of ice conduits on Baffin Island could be addressed by numerical ice sheet models that are constrained by previously published data for relative sea level and deglaciation patterns augmented with the new chronological constraint presented in this thesis. The model could be tuned with available data on ice streams occupying Hudson Strait (Andrews and MacLean, 2003; Andrews et al., 2012) and other ice streams on Baffin Island (De Angelis and Kleman, 2007; Margold et al., 2014).

**Fig. 5.1** Top: Digital elevation model of Baffin Island indicating the major flow directions of LIS from the Foxe Dome and the locations of topographic profiles displayed below. BIC: Barnes Ice Cap, PIC: Penny Ice Cap, CF: Clyde Fiord, HB: Home Bay, QP: Quivitu Peninsula, CD: Cape Dyer, CS: Cumberland Sound, FB: Frobisher Bay. **Bottom:** Topographic profiles along the flow directions of LIS across Baffin Island from Foxe Basin (left) to Baffin Bay or Davis Strait (right). Map and Profiles have been retrieved from GeoMapApp.
5.2.2 The Regolith Hypothesis

A thick mantle of regolith (loose residual autochthonous material weathered from local bedrock) presumably covered most areas of the Baffin Island landscape after the warm weathering conditions of the mid Pliocene warm period (Marquette et al., 2004; Staiger et al., 2006; Hidy et al., 2013; Rybczynski et al., 2013). The Regolith Hypothesis postulates that the thick regolith mantle was stripped during successive warm-based glaciations in the early Pleistocene, thus gradually exhuming the fresher bedrock. Higher basal shear stresses over the exhumed bedrock (compared to lower basal shear stresses over a clay-rich regolith with smoother surface) are invoked to explain the transition from 41-ka to 100-ka long glacial cycles during the middle Pleistocene transition in absence of apparent changes in the Earth’s orbital parameters (Clark and Pollard, 1998; Clark et al., 2006). Although the stripping of regolith at the beginning of the Pleistocene glaciations would not significantly affect the results presented in Chapter 4, constraining the timing of regolith stripping would provide additional information about the preservation of ancient landscapes and their subsequent glacial modification (Sugden and Watts, 1977; Dyke, 1993; Stroeven et al., 2002; Marquette et al., 2004; Staiger et al., 2005; Gosse et al., 2006; Krabbendam and Bradwell, 2014), the formation of tors (e.g., Goodfellow et al., 2014), and changes in the dynamics of ice cover in the eastern Canadian Arctic (e.g., Clark and Pollard, 1998; Refsnider and Miller, 2010). Minimal erosion by cold-based ice cover on weathered summit plateaus has been confirmed by measurements of TCN concentrations in bedrock surfaces (Stroeven et al., 2002; Gosse et al., 2006).

Preservation of relict pre-Quaternary landscapes, despite Pleistocene modification by glacial and periglacial processes, has been recognized in many polar glaciated areas
(Andrews et al., 1972; Sugden and Watts, 1977; Dyke, 1993; Marquette et al., 2004; Gosse et al., 2006; Staiger et al., 2006; Krabbendam and Bradwell, 2014). The most direct evidence for preservation of ancient landscapes was presented by Andrews et al. (1972) from Paleogene palynomorphs found in a thin limestone cover of Precambrain bedrock on northern Baffin Island. Sugden and Watts (1977) and Dyke (1993) described subtle modification of the landscapes of Arctic Islands by cold-based ice cover. Marquette et al. (2004) and Staiger et al. (2005) revealed the persistence of ancient material under cold-based ice by measuring the concentration of weathering products and TCN in soils and till covering upland plateaus. Based on detailed investigation of the geomorphology and bedrock structure, Krabbendam and Bradwell (2014) concluded that the typical ‘cnoc-and-lochan’ (knoll and lake) landscape of northwestern Scotland actually represents the etch-surface (weathering front) from a former period of intense weathering that had been modified by glacial erosion.

Related to the preservation of relict landscapes is the discussion of the formation process of tors (Linton, 1955; Palmer and Neilson, 1962; Dahl, 1966; Ives, 1966). The two-stage formation model postulates that tors were formed under a thick mantel of regolith during a period of warmer and more humid climate and subsequently exhumed by stripping of the regolith early in the Quaternary (Linton, 1955). Conversely, the one-stage model invokes progressive emergence of tors from a thin regolith cover throughout the Quaternary (Palmer and Neilson, 1962) implying that tors are much younger than proposed for the two-stage model.

Major changes in the dynamics of ice sheets during the middle Pleistocene transition have been inferred from the spatial distribution of chemically altered
weathering products in tills on northeastern Baffin Island. Refsnider and Miller (2010) related the preservation of tills that contained high amounts of weathering products on upland plateaus to the gradual exhumation of bedrock by stripping of regolith in adjacent valleys. The stripping of regolith in valleys caused a persistent alteration of the flow of ice leading to the dynamic decoupling of thin, ice cover on plateaus from fast-flowing ice in troughs. Additional evidence for stripping of regolith has been inferred from the chemical variation of sediments in Baffin Bay that were related to changes in the source area of the glacially transported material on the adjacent mainland (Thiébault et al., 1989; Andrews, 1993).

Different techniques have been used to constrain the timing of regolith stripping and assess the origin of weathered plateaus: chemical fingerprinting of weathering products in tills and remnants of saprolite (Marquette et al., 2004; Roy et al., 2004; Refsnider and Miller, 2010; Ebert et al., 2012), measurement of in-situ $^{10}$Be and $^{26}$Al concentrations in tills (Staiger et al., 2006), and analysis of meteoric $^{10}$Be in till, saprolite, or glacigenic deposits on coastal lowlands (Ebert et al., 2012; Refsnider and Miller, 2013). The chemical analyses of till and bedrock samples from Cumberland Peninsula (Gammon et al., 2011; Whalen et al., 2012) provide the data required to calculate indices of chemical alteration (Nesbitt and Young, 1982; Brimhall and Dietrich, 1987; Chadwick et al., 1990; Riebe et al., 2001; Riebe et al., 2003), which may reveal spatial variations in the incorporation of weathered material in tills. Unprocessed till samples could be used for additional determinations of in-situ $^{10}$Be and $^{26}$Al concentrations and meteoric $^{10}$Be content, that could be compared with similar analyses of marine and glacial sequences of the Quivitu Peninsula (Fig. 5.1, located slightly further north of the study area of this
thesis, Nelson, 1980; 1981; 1982). These analyses could reveal the antiquity of tills and the source of the glacial sequences deposited on the Quivitu Peninsula, which could potentially disclose the timing of regolith stripping on Cumberland Peninsula. Likewise, produced \(^{10}\)Be, the meteoric \(^{10}\)Be content of till or saprolite is a measure of the antiquity of the deposits. Meteoric \(^{10}\)Be is produced in the atmosphere through interaction of secondary cosmic radiation with oxygen isotopes, transferred to the ground by precipitation, and retained in soil or till through tight attachment to clay- and silt-sized particles (Willenbring and von Blanckenburg, 2010b). The meteoric \(^{10}\)Be content of deposits thus indicates the duration of \(^{10}\)Be deposition from the atmosphere, which is retained when the material is re-deposited by, for instance, glacial transport. Therefore, early glacigenic deposits on coastal lowlands have higher meteoric \(^{10}\)Be content disclosing their origin from weathered regolith. Subsequent glacier advances increasingly exhumed unweathered bedrock, so that the meteoric \(^{10}\)Be signal from weathered regolith is diluted by fresh material with low (or no) \(^{10}\)Be content.

### 5.2.3 Long-Term Landscape Evolution

The distinct position of Cumberland Peninsula with respect to the northeastern margin of the LIS led to the formation of an exceptional alpine landscape carved by local cirque glaciers. Some of the cirques are presently glaciated while many are currently ice-free (Andrews and Dugdale, 1971). At the outer coast of Cumberland Sound, submerged cirques indicate that they were formed during several periods of lower relative sea level (Fig. 5.2a). To better understand the formation of these coastal cirques as well as cirques at higher elevations in the interior of the peninsula, the long-term evolution of the alpine landscape has to be examined. For the analysis of long-term landscape evolution, the
The former topography of Cumberland Peninsula has to be reconstructed. As indicated in Chapter 4, many upland plateaus have only been slightly modified during the Quaternary (maximum lowering by 25 m) preserving fragments of the pre-Quaternary landscape. These plateaus have been mapped as ‘Residuum’ of pre-Wisconsinan landscape (Wv map unit, Fig. 5.2c) and the now available maps (Dyke, 2011a, f, e, d, b, c; Dyke, 2013b, a, c) indicate that such areas occur throughout the peninsula. Interestingly, some of the best preserved plateaus coincide with the area of submerged cirques along the outer coast of Cumberland Sound (Fig. 5.2).

**Fig. 5.2** Submerged cirques and weathered upland plateaus mapped as ‘Residuum’ of a pre-Wisconsinan landscape. **A.** Cirques on Leopold Island with the floors lying below sea level (pictures taken to the east showing cirques on the western coast of Leopold Island). **B.** Location of the snapshot of surficial map shown in C at Cape Mercy (CM) is marked by the red box. **C.** Surficial map of Cape Mercy and Leopold Island (Dyke, 2011a), where weathered upland plateaus (map units Wv) occur concurrently with submerged cirques that were formed during intervals of lower relative sea level. Tv: Till veneer (0.5 – 2 m thick till cover), R2: Glacially scoured rock.
Semi-automatic classification of paleic surfaces (low-relief surfaces at high-elevation that escaped glacial scouring) in Norway from DEMs shows the potential for discerning fragments of former landscapes (Jarnå, 2014). This classification is based on parameters derived from the DEM, such as slope, roughness (the standard deviation of slope), and elevation. Testing of a similar program that classifies landscapes from DEMs (Drăguţ and Eisank, 2012) yielded encouraging results for coastal areas of Cumberland Peninsula (Fig. 5.3). For instance, areas mapped as ‘Residuum’ (Wv unit, Fig.5.2c) are generally classified at rough low hills with the exception of the plateaus described in Chapter 4 that are classified as smooth low hills. Besides these plateaus, glacially-scoured area, in places covered by a patches of till veneer (0.5 – 2 m), are as well classified as smooth low hills suggesting that the program can distinguish between less intensively glacially modified areas (i.e., Wv units along the coast) and more strongly glacially modified plateaus (i.e., broad interior plateaus also mapped as Wv units, Chapter 4). Glacial valleys with thick till cover (till blanket 2 – 10 m thick, Dyke, 2011a) and extensive areas with continuous till veneer cover are classified as irregular plains. Of course, some locations are classified inconsistently; in particular in areas with small-scale spatial changes in geomorphology. Further alteration of the program for the specific characteristics of the landscape on Cumberland Peninsula is required to refine the results of this approach. For instance, the method could potentially distinguish between different generations of preserved landscape fragments (peneplains) that could provide insights into the long-term evolution of the alpine landscape on Cumberland Peninsula.
Fig. 5.3 Semi-automatic landscape classification of the southwestern coast of Cumberland Peninsula (area approximately indicated by red polygon in inset map). The area blanked by the white area yielded unreasonable results by the classification algorithm, but the classification of rough low hills, smooth low hills, irregular plains, and flat plains show promising results, which can be refined by further tuning of the program.

The presented future research directions evolve from the work presented in this thesis. Field evidence for the spatial distribution of ice dynamics and basal thermal conditions can be better understood from modelling of glacial processes with sophisticated numerical ice sheet models. The distribution of areas predominately influenced by cold-based ice offer important targets for analyses of geochemical composition as well as in-situ and meteoric $^{10}$Be concentrations that could reveal the timing of the stripping of an old weathering mantle. Finally, the classification of landscapes from DEMs may help unraveling the long-term evolution of the alpine landscape of Cumberland Peninsula, and by inference many areas of the eastern Canadian Arctic.
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APPENDIX A1 - Supplementary File for Margreth et al. (2014): Neoglacial Ice Expansion and Late Holocene Cold-Based Ice Cap Dynamics on Cumberland Peninsula, Baffin Island, Arctic Canada

A1.1 DISSIMILAR PRESERVATION OF MACROFOSSILS

During sample characterisation and separation of individual macrofossils for radiocarbon dating, it became apparent that some macrofossils displayed near perfect preservation whereas other moss fragments were less preserved with flattened or discoloured leaves. In particular, preservation of *Polytrichum/Pogonatum* mosses in sample 09SRB-K049A-01, which yielded a modern radiocarbon activity (UCIAMS-77694, Table 2.1, main text), are pristine with intact, long, white awns at the leaf tips (Fig. A1.1 a-b). The white awns on the moss leaves are complete in length to a fine tip and most are in growth position (straight up). Other moss types in this sample, e.g., *Pohlia* sp., which were not submitted for dating, are green in colouration indicating chlorophyll-retaining mosses of modern age. Sample 09SRB-K049A-01 is a modern contaminant of a windswept mat of mosses with intact roots deposited at the collection site.

In selecting macrofossils for radiocarbon dating from other samples that contained this moss type (*Polytrichum/Pogonatum*), the pristine, modern aged mosses in sample 09SRB-K049A-01 were used as reference material for comparison. For example, the awns of *Polytrichum juniperinum* macrofossils in sample 09SRB-K141A-01 vary in length (mostly shorter), are often bent, and are absent on many of the leaf tips (Fig. A1.1c). These macrofossil moss fragments have been radiocarbon dated to 4.08 ka (mode, UCIAMS-135208, on a single moss fragment) and 3.98 ka (mode, UCIAMS-
135209, including five moss fragments). The similarity in ages (within 1σ AMS error) among these two measurements indicate that the ages indeed represent the time when the sample site was covered by ice or snow causing death of the organic material.

Another sample that contained dissimilarly preserved macrofossils of *Polytrichum/Pogonatum* is sample 09SRB-K131A-01 (Fig. 2.5 c-d in main text). For AMS analysis, macrofossils of similar preservation with flattened moss depicted in Fig. 2.5c (main text) were dated to 3.38 ka (mode, UCIAMS-83985, Table 2.1, main text). Two more dates from this sample on younger-looking mosses with remnant, incomplete or absent awns (Fig. 2.5d, main text) yielded ages of 1.76 and 1.83 ka (mode, UCIAMS-135210 (on single moss fragment) and -135211 (on few moss fragments), respectively) indicating two generations of moss growth at this site. These aliquots were all from a single sample that was collected from the base of a long steep bedrock ridge (Fig. 2.6, main text). The older-appearing 3.38 ka old sample is interpreted to be subfossil organic material that was covered and killed during an earlier ice expansion phase, but preserved throughout an interim period of ice recession, possibly because it was slightly sheltered from wind. During this ice free interval, *Polytrichum/Pogonatum* re-grew either through regenerative processes (asexual, vegetative reproduction) or by spore production (sexual reproduction). Sexual reproduction is favoured since both genera are prolific spore producers. Both the old and new growth was subsequently entombed by a later ice advance event and exhumed from the retreating ice margin in AD 2009.
Fig. A1.1 Dissimilarly preserved macrofossils of *Polytrichum/Pogonatum* mosses. **A.** & **B.** Pristine moss fragments of sample 09SRB-K049A-01 with complete white awns in upright growth position yielded a modern radiocarbon activity (UCIAMS-77694). **C.** Moss fragments of sample 09SRB-K141A-01 with missing or incomplete awns with some being bent. A single macrofossil (fifth from the top) has been dated to 4.08 ka (mode, UCIAMS-135208) and the five other macrofossils yielded a radiocarbon age of 3.98 ka (mode, UCIAMS-135209).

A1.2 EFFECTS OF CALIBRATION PROCESS ON SUMMED PROBABILITY PLOTS

Plateaus and risers (steeper slopes) of the Holocene calibration curve (measured $^{14}$C vs. treering calibrated age, IntCal09 (Reimer et al., 2009)) are mostly related to short-term variations in solar activity and Earth’s magnetic field strength (Stuiver et al., 1991). The effect of the shape of the calibration curve on calibrated age probability distributions has been previously recognized (e.g., Bartlein et al., 1995) and recently has gained more attention owing to a more widespread use of summed probability plots (Chiverrell et al., 2011; Bamforth and Grund, 2012; Williams, 2012; Armit et al., 2013).

Some of the peaks in our summed probability plot are related to risers and some low probability areas coincide with plateaus in the calibration curve (Fig. A1.2). Not all peaks or low probability areas in the moss age probability distribution correspond to risers or plateaus in the calibration curve. Vice versa, not all plateaus or risers in the calibration curve are represented as low probability areas or peaks in the moss age
probability distribution. However, it is interesting to explore the effect of plateaus and risers in the calibration curve on summed probability plots of radiocarbon ages to increase the confidence in the observed moss age probability distribution. Plateaus tend to smooth the summed probability distribution while risers condense several hundred years of measured radiocarbon ages into a small range of calibrated ages. The amplitude of the sharp narrow peaks is thus amplified through superimposition of multiple radiocarbon dates (Williams, 2012). Interestingly, during the Little Ice Age (LIA, AD 1100 - 1850, 750 - 100 yr BP) these peaks are also concurrent with high volcanic activity (Gao et al., 2008; Sigl et al., 2013). Representative radiocarbon ages were generated for each recorded large volcanic eruption using the R_simulate function of OxCal 4.2 (Bronk Ramsey, 2009) and calibrated in the same manner as was the relict moss data using Calib 6.1.0 (Stuiver and Reimer, 1993). In particular, the volcanism reconstruction by Gao et al. (2008) displays peaks that are synchronous with the peaks in the relict moss age distribution, whereas peaks are more subdued for the Sigl et al. (2013) volcanism record, which is based on a single Greenland ice core (Fig. A1.2b).
Fig. A1.2 Correspondence of some risers (steep slopes, grey shading) and some plateaus (brown shading) of the calibration curve to some peaks and some troughs in summed probability distributions. A. Volcanic activity reconstructed from multiple ice cores in the Northern Hemisphere (purple, volcanic stratospheric sulfate aerosol loading (Tg), Gao et al. 2008) and based on a single Greenland ice core (green, volcanic sulfate deposition (kg km\(^{-2}\)), Sigl et al. 2013). B. Summed probability distributions of Cumberland Peninsula moss data for the last 2 ka (red, excluding the youngest seven samples and two caribou samples) and both volcanic activity records (colours as above, excluding eruptions < 250 a). C. IntCal09 (blue) calibration curve and past variation of \(^{14}\)C concentration in the atmosphere (\(\Delta^{14}\)C, red).

Different methods have been proposed to account for the influence of the shape of the calibration curve on summed probability distributions. All of these methods are based on a summed probability distribution generated from a simulated dataset of equally distributed radiocarbon dates (50-year interval starting at 275 years up to 1975 years, n = 35, Fig. A1.3a, Chiverrell et al., 2011; Bamforth and Grund, 2012; Armit et al., 2013). The simulated radiocarbon dataset is calibrated using Calib 6.1.0 after assigning a 1\(\sigma\) error to each radiocarbon date (Fig. 1.3b-c). Simple approaches include subtraction of
the simulated summed probability anomalies (i.e., from evenly spaced radiocarbon dates) from the actual summed probability (moss data) for each calibrated year (one year interval) or the division of the latter by the former (Fig. A1.3d, Chiverrell et al., 2011).

We have derived a different method using the maximum probability of the simulated radiocarbon dataset (i.e., the highest peak in the simulated probability distribution) to normalise the measured summed probability distribution (moss data) for each calibrated year (one year bin) according to following equation:

\[
P(\text{normalised})_{\text{cal yr}} = \frac{P(\text{measured})_{\text{cal yr}} \times (P(\text{simulated})_{\text{max}} - P(\text{simulated})_{\text{cal yr}} \times f)}{P(\text{simulated})_{\text{max}}}
\]

Where
- \(P(\text{normalised})_{\text{cal yr}}\) is the normalised probability in a particular calibrated year
- \(P(\text{measured})_{\text{cal yr}}\) is the measured probability in the same calibrated year
- \(P(\text{simulated})_{\text{max}}\) is the maximum probability of the simulated dataset
- \(P(\text{simulated})_{\text{cal yr}}\) is the simulated probability in the same calibrated year
- \(f\) is a scaling factor

The maximum probability of the simulated radiocarbon dataset was chosen to minimise the residual effect of the calibration on the measured summed probability distribution. With this approach the amplitude of peaks in the actual summed probability distribution are scaled according to the simulated radiocarbon dataset, whose summed probability distribution is primarily a function of the shape (risers and plateaus) of the calibration curve (Fig. A1.2c). Interestingly, when simulating equally spaced (50-year interval starting at 275 years up to 1975 years, \(n = 35\), Fig. A1.4a) calendar years, which were then transferred into representative radiocarbon ages using R_simulate function of OxCal 4.2 (Fig. A1.4b) and re-calibrated using Calib 6.1.0 (Fig. 1.4c), the resulting probability density function appears fairly smooth without large troughs or peaks (Fig. 1.4d).
Fig. A1.3  Approaches to normalizing summed probability distributions.  A. Histogram of measured radiocarbon ages from relict moss samples for the last 2 ka in 50 year bins (red, excluding youngest seven samples and two caribou samples, n = 32) and simulated dataset of evenly spaced radiocarbon dates of similar size (n = 35, purple) shown on a conventional 14C ka timescale. B. Histogram of calibrated ages of both datasets shown above: modal probability of calibrated age ranges of moss samples (red), and modal probability of calibrated age ranges of simulated radiocarbon dates (purple), to which a 1σ error of 20 years was assigned before calibration (comparable to the average error of the moss radiocarbon ages). C. Summed probability plot of moss samples (red) and simulated dataset (purple), as well as a new approach derived to reduce the amplitude of individual peaks using the maximum probability of the simulated dataset (blue, scaling factor $f = 1$ (full scaling), green, $f = 0.5$ (half scaling)). D. Two previously used methods (Chiverrell et al. 2011), in which the simulated probability is subtracted from the measured probability for each calibrated year (light green, vertical axis to the left), and division of the latter by the former (red, vertical axis to the right).
Fig. A1.4  Comparison of Cumberland Peninsula moss data with a simulated dataset of equally spaced calendar ages of similar size.  A. Histogram of simulated dataset of equally spaced calendar ages shown on a ‘real’ (calendar) timescale (blue, n = 35).  B. Histogram of radiocarbon dates for simulated calendar age dataset (blue) and measured radiocarbon ages of moss samples for the last 2 ka (red, n = 32, excluding seven youngest samples and two caribou samples), both shown on a conventional radiocarbon timescale.  C. Histogram of (re-) calibrated simulated dataset (blue, modal probability of calibrated age ranges) and calibrated moss data (red, modal probability of calibrated age ranges).  D. Summed probability distributions of both dataset (colour coding as above).

A1.3 LOWERING OF REGIONAL ELA

The general trend of decreasing elevation of sample sites with time is more obvious if individual ice caps are considered (Fig. A1.5). Assuming that the organic material was killed due to ice advance related to a drop of the regional ELA, the change in elevation of sample sites with time can be used to approximate the drop in temperature with time. Using four ice caps, for which the fossil moss ages span more than 1 ka, we can estimate
the lowering of the regional ELA from the difference of the highest and the lowest sample elevation or the regression line fitted through the sample points (Table A1.1). The corresponding decline in temperature can be calculated using a temperature lapse rate of 4.9 ± 0.4 °C per 1000 m (Gardner et al., 2009). This approach, of course, assumes that ELA changes were not influenced by changes in amounts or seasonality of precipitation.

The calculated net temperature changes range from -0.8 to -2.4 °C, which occur over time intervals of 1.6 to 3.6 ka (Table A1.1a). The rate of net temperature change varies between -0.20 ± 0.10 to -1.12 ± 0.14 °C ka⁻¹ with comparable values calculated using both methods (difference of highest and lowest sample elevation vs. slope of regression line) for each ice cap. Ice cap 9, located furthest south, yielded the lowest rate of temperature change. For ice cap 4, two different values were calculated using the highest and lowest sample elevation difference, once including the youngest samples with non-unique calibrated age ranges and once excluding these samples. The rate of temperature change obtained using the slope of the regression line yielded a value in between the two former estimates. The range of values of the rate in temperature change obtained from different ice caps reflects the influence of local topographic conditions on ice expansion and may also be affected by the small number of samples collected at each site. Calculating the pooled mean of all slopes of the regression lines fitted through the individual ice caps, yield an overall cooling rate of -0.47±0.09 °C ka⁻¹ and a temperature decrease of -2.4 ± 0.5 °C over the past 5 ka. These estimates are roughly twice the values inferred from the regression line fitted through all collected samples (see main text: temperature change -0.22 ± 0.09°C ka⁻¹, temperature decline of -1.1 ± 0.5 °C over the
past 5 ka). The former value based on the regression fitted for individual ice caps is also comparable to the estimate for Neoglacial cooling (-2.7 ± 0.7 °C over 5 ka) obtained by Miller et al. (2013) from radiocarbon dated fossil vegetation collected along cold-based ice caps on Baffin Island (see main text for further discussion).

These values provide a rough minimum estimate of regional temperature change during Neoglacialiation because we have likely not captured the full range in elevation (i.e., older ages at higher elevation) and we did not reconstruct ELA during the maximum ice extent indicated by the lichen-kill trimlines. The inferred rate of temperature change may have been reversed during intervals of ice recession as indicated by the hiatuses in the moss data. The actual rate of short term temperature change was probably higher than the net rates determined here.

Table A1.1 Estimates of Neoglacial temperature change calculated from a) the highest and lowest elevation of individual moss samples and b) the regression line fitted through all sample points at a particular ice cap. A temperature lapse rate of 4.9 ± 0.4 °C per 1000 m was used to infer changes in temperature from elevation differences or from the slope of the regression lines (Gardner et al., 2009).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ice cap</th>
<th>a) Individual sample locations</th>
<th>b) Regression line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Δ Elev. (m)</td>
<td>Δ Time (ka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>496ᵃ</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>302ᵇ</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Pooled mean of all regression line slopes: | 0.097±0.017 | -0.47±0.09 | -2.4±0.5 |

ᵃIncluding youngest samples with non-unique calibrated age ranges  
bExcluding these youngest samples
Fig. A1.5  Elevation vs. age plots for all sampled ice caps (for location see Fig. 2.3 in main text). For each ice cap the summed probability age distribution is shown in red excluding the youngest samples with non-unique calibrated age ranges and in blue for all samples. Elevations are plotted against the mode of the calibrated age distribution of the samples. Note: the caribou samples have been included in the summed probability plots and their occurrence is indicated in the individual plots. Colours and shapes of elevation vs. age points are the same than used in Fig. 2.7b (in main text).
A1.4 PALEOCLIMATE PROXIES

In addition to the paleoclimate proxies discussed in Margreth et al., we have compared our moss age distribution with several other paleoclimate datasets (Fig. A1.6). However, none of these additional datasets showed clear correlations with peaks in the moss radiocarbon age distribution. We thus concluded that volcanism and changing solar activity were the most influential climate forcing on ice cap expansion on decadal to centennial timescales, prior to accelerated ice recession observed in recent years related to anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions. It seems that short-term atmospheric perturbations caused by large volcanic eruptions and varying solar irradiance are well documented in the Arctic fossil record owing to the sensitive response of cold-based ice caps to eruption-induced cooling. The same signal appears to be attenuated and possibly blended with regional climate effects in ice cores. The gradual decrease of summer insolation at high latitudes induced steadily declining temperatures and increased seasonality in the Arctic (Fig. A1.6b). This gradual decrease in temperature is documented by generally decreasing delta $^{18}$O values observed in many Arctic ice cores (Penny, Devon and Agassiz ice caps) over the last 5 ka (Fig. A1.6 c-e, Fisher, 1979; Fisher et al., 1983; 1995; 1998; Vinther et al., 2008). In the Devon ice core delta $^{18}$O values decline after reaching a pre-industrial maximum shortly before 4.5 ka. A similar smooth decline of delta $^{18}$O is observed in the NGRIP ice core (Fig. A1.6f, Vinther et al., 2006), whereas temperature reconstructions derived from the GRIP (Dahl-Jensen et al., 1998) and GISP2 (Alley, 2000) ice cores show slightly larger variation over the last 5 ka (Fig. A1.6 g-i). In particular, lower temperatures during the LIA and relatively warmer temperatures during the Medieval Warm Period (MWP, AD 950 – 1250, 1000 – 750 yr BP) are noticeable, but no more precise correlation can be seen between the Cumberland
Peninsula moss radiocarbon age distribution (Fig. A1.6a) and temperature or precipitation changes recorded in the Greenland ice cores (Fig. A1.6 f-i).

A varve record interpreted as summer temperature has been obtained from sediments at Donard Lake on Cumberland Peninsula (Fig. A1.7a, Moore et al., 2001). Annual couplets of light-coloured, coarser-grained layers and thin, dark-coloured, fine-grained layers (varves) are visible for the last 1.2 ka. The thickness of the coarser-grained layers reflects changes in average summer temperature affecting melting of the Caribou Glacier, which provided the main source of sediment. For calibration of varve thickness to summer temperatures, instrumental data from the Cape Dyer DEW Line radar site was used. Over the instrumental record a good agreement between varve thickness and June, July and August temperatures was seen, however with an additional variance probably related to spatial heterogeneity of climate variability (Moore et al., 2001). This spatial heterogeneity might also be the case when comparing the summer temperature record from Donard Lake with the fossil moss radiocarbon age distribution documenting ice cap expansion on upland plateaus approximately 150 km distant from Cape Dyer (Fig. A1.7b). Some of the peaks in the moss radiocarbon age distribution during the LIA seem to correlate with cold summer temperatures recorded at Donard Lake, but the varve thickness record shows a high variability from year to year and no clear trend in summer temperature change can be seen over the last 1.2 ka. In order to capture the response of plateau ice caps to the high-frequency climate variability recorded in the Donard Lake varve record, a larger moss sample size (hundreds) would be required. Moreover, different response times to climate change between cold-based ice
caps and warm-based glaciers could account for some differences between the moss data and the summer temperature record based on varve thickness.

Fig. A1.6 (Next page) Selected paleoclimate records are compared to moss age distribution over the last 5 ka. A. Cumberland Peninsula moss data (red, excluding youngest seven samples and three caribou samples; blue, only excluding three caribou samples). B. Integrated summer insolation at 65 °N (Huybers, 2006). C. Delta $^{18}$O values of Penny Ice Cap core (Fisher et al., 1998). D. Devon ice cap delta $^{18}$O record shown as 50 year averages (blue) and 5 year averages for the last 2.7 ka (blue, Fisher, 1979; Fisher et al., 1983). E. Agassiz ice cap delta $^{18}$O record (20 year averages, Vinther et al., 2008). F. NGRIP delta $^{18}$O record (20 year averages, Vinther et al., 2006). G. GRIP temperature record (Dahl-Jensen et al., 1998). H. GISP2 temperature record (Alley, 2000). I. GISP2 accumulation record (Alley, 2000).
Fig. A1.7  Donard Lake summer temperature record compared to the last 1.3 ka of Cumberland Peninsula moss age distribution.  **A.** Summer temperatures inferred from varve thickness at Donard Lake (66° 40' N, 61° 21' W; Moore et al., 2001);  **B.** Cumberland Peninsula summed probability distributions for the last 1.3 ka (red, excluding seven youngest samples and one caribou sample; blue, excluding only one caribou sample).
A1.5 REFERENCES FOR A1


## A2.1 TCN CHEMISTRY DATA AND ADDITIONAL FIELD PICTURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Mass of quartz dissolved (mg)</th>
<th>Mass of Be carrier (mg)</th>
<th>$^{10}Be/^{9}Be$ AMS (10$^{-10}$)</th>
<th>Lithology</th>
<th>Quill content</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001R-ET02A-G1</td>
<td>35.900</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.98E-13</td>
<td>medium-grained granodiorite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>boulders on Pangirointments Ice recession moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001R-ET02A-G2</td>
<td>35.900</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.98E-13</td>
<td>medium-grained granodiorite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>boulders on Pangirointments Ice recession moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001R-ET02A-G3</td>
<td>35.900</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.98E-13</td>
<td>medium-grained granodiorite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>boulders on Pangirointments Ice recession moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001R-ET02A-G4</td>
<td>35.900</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.98E-13</td>
<td>medium-grained granodiorite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>boulders on Pangirointments Ice recession moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001R-ET02A-G5</td>
<td>35.900</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.98E-13</td>
<td>medium-grained granodiorite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>boulders on Pangirointments Ice recession moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001R-ET02A-G6</td>
<td>35.900</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.98E-13</td>
<td>medium-grained granodiorite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>boulders on Pangirointments Ice recession moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001R-ET02A-G7</td>
<td>35.900</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.98E-13</td>
<td>medium-grained granodiorite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>boulders on Pangirointments Ice recession moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001R-ET02A-G8</td>
<td>35.900</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.98E-13</td>
<td>medium-grained granodiorite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>boulders on Pangirointments Ice recession moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001R-ET02A-G9</td>
<td>35.900</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.98E-13</td>
<td>medium-grained granodiorite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>boulders on Pangirointments Ice recession moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001R-ET02A-G10</td>
<td>35.900</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.98E-13</td>
<td>medium-grained granodiorite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>boulders on Pangirointments Ice recession moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001R-ET02A-G11</td>
<td>35.900</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.98E-13</td>
<td>medium-grained granodiorite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>boulders on Pangirointments Ice recession moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001R-ET02A-G12</td>
<td>35.900</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.98E-13</td>
<td>medium-grained granodiorite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>boulders on Pangirointments Ice recession moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001R-ET02A-G13</td>
<td>35.900</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.98E-13</td>
<td>medium-grained granodiorite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>boulders on Pangirointments Ice recession moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001R-ET02A-G14</td>
<td>35.900</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.98E-13</td>
<td>medium-grained granodiorite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>boulders on Pangirointments Ice recession moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001R-ET02A-G15</td>
<td>35.900</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.98E-13</td>
<td>medium-grained granodiorite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>boulders on Pangirointments Ice recession moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001R-ET02A-G16</td>
<td>35.900</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.98E-13</td>
<td>medium-grained granodiorite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>boulders on Pangirointments Ice recession moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001R-ET02A-G17</td>
<td>35.900</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.98E-13</td>
<td>medium-grained granodiorite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>boulders on Pangirointments Ice recession moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001R-ET02A-G18</td>
<td>35.900</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.98E-13</td>
<td>medium-grained granodiorite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>boulders on Pangirointments Ice recession moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001R-ET02A-G19</td>
<td>35.900</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.98E-13</td>
<td>medium-grained granodiorite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>boulders on Pangirointments Ice recession moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001R-ET02A-G20</td>
<td>35.900</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.98E-13</td>
<td>medium-grained granodiorite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>boulders on Pangirointments Ice recession moraine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A2.1 TCN chemistry data for boulders and depth profiles including detailed sample description.

![Fig. A2.1 Variation of exposure age with boulder height.](image-url)
Fig. A2.2 Additional field pictures.  A - B. Samples E027 (A) and E026 (B) on double-crested lateral moraine at the mouth of Ujuktuk Fiord (Fig. 3.3a).  C - D. Samples E060 (C) and E052 (D) near meltwater channels and moraines in the broadest part of ‘central valley’ (Fig. 3.3a).  E. Sample A283, boulder on glaciofluvial delta in Moon Valley (Fig. 3.3b).  F. Glaciofluvial delta cross-cutting alpine moraine descending from northern slope of Moon Valley (Fig. 3.3b).  G. Sample A167A-01 deposited on till veneer in the intervening area between Pangnirtung and Kingnait Fiords.  H. Raised marine deposit at American Harbour on the coast to Cumberland Sound containing *Mytilus edulis* shells.
A2.2 DEPTH PROFILE CALCULATIONS

A2.2.1 Input and Output Files for Depth Profile Calculator

Table A2.2 Input variables for depth profile calculator (Hidy et al., 2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th>Moon Valley</th>
<th>Uncertainty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site production rate spallation ( * ) (atoms g(^{-1}) a(^{-1}))</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muon production (depth 5 m) ( b ) (atoms g(^{-1}) a(^{-1}))</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-life (Ma)</td>
<td>1.387</td>
<td>1.387</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attenuation length spallation (g cm(^{-2}))</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>±5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shielding factor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density range (const. with depth) (g cm(^{-3}))</td>
<td>1.9 - 2.1</td>
<td>1.9 - 2.1</td>
<td>uniform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range (ka)</td>
<td>8 - 20</td>
<td>10 - 20</td>
<td>uniform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion rate range (cm ka(^{-1}))</td>
<td>2 - 8</td>
<td>0 - 2</td>
<td>uniform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net erosion range (cm)</td>
<td>30 - 100</td>
<td>0 - 20</td>
<td>uniform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inheritance ( (10^5 \text{ atoms g}^{-1}) )</td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>7 - 10</td>
<td>uniform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of runs</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( * \) obtained from CRONUS KU calculator, version 1.0, accessed 19.11.2014
\( b \) half values of Heisinger et al. (2002a-b) scaling scheme used

Table A2.3 Model output values for depth profiles.
Fig. A2.3 ‘Central valley’ depth profile. A. Modelled concentration depth profile using four upper samples. Deepest sample, collected 5 cm above a shell-bearing zone, has a higher concentration than the next deepest sample. B. Probability density functions (left) and cumulative distribution functions (right) of modelled parameters.
Fig. A2.4  Additional field pictures from depth profile in ‘central valley’. A. Composite delta at the head of Ujuktuk Fiord (Fig. 3.3a). Location of depth profile is indicated by red arrow. B. The vertical distance between the boulder lag deposit in the background and the location of the depth profile is approximately 30 – 100 cm, which is used as an estimate for net surface erosion (Table A2.2). C. Shell in frozen layer at the bottom of the depth profile. D. Completely weathered clast at 120 cm depth. E. Sandy gravel layer (5 – 10 cm thick) within layered silty sand in lower part of the delta. F. Dropstone within layered sand sand with coarser grained lenses.
A2.2.3 Moon Valley Depth Profile

Fig. A2.5 Stratigraphic description and modelled TCN concentrations of depth profile in Moon Valley.

Fig. A2.6 Probability density and cumulative distribution functions of calculated values.
A2.3 CALIBRATION OF PREVIOUS RADIOCARBON DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab ID</th>
<th>Latitude (d.d)</th>
<th>Longitude (d.d)</th>
<th>Elevation (m)</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>$^{14}C$ age $^a$ (BP)</th>
<th>Calibrated age $^b$ (ka)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gak-3713</td>
<td>67.78</td>
<td>-66.45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mytilus trunculus</td>
<td>5600 ± 100</td>
<td>5.8 ± 0.1</td>
<td>Nunatsiaq Fiord, head east arm, in situ shells in fine sand and silt in river bank</td>
<td>Miller, 1973; Dyke et al., 1982; pers. comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-1816</td>
<td>67.05</td>
<td>-65.77</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mytilus trunculus</td>
<td>8760 ± 350</td>
<td>9.2 ± 0.5</td>
<td>Okoa Bay, outer east side, local marine limit 27 m asl, ice-contact sediments</td>
<td>Miller, 1973; Dyke et al., 1982; Frechette et al., 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGR-10139</td>
<td>66.78</td>
<td>-66.93</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Macropads</td>
<td>8560 ± 100</td>
<td>9.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td>Icefjord, head of western branch of Paddle Fiord</td>
<td>Miller, 1973; Dyke et al., 1982; pers. comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gak-5479</td>
<td>67.62</td>
<td>-66.17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mytilus trunculus</td>
<td>9380 ± 180</td>
<td>10.0 ± 0.2</td>
<td>Quaqqor Fiord head, easternmost valley, marine limit 34 m asl an distal side of moraine</td>
<td>Miller, 1973; Dyke et al., 1982; pers. comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gak-2674</td>
<td>67.79</td>
<td>-66.62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mytilus trunculus</td>
<td>10400 ± 1000</td>
<td>11.4 ± 1.3</td>
<td>Middle Nalping Fiord, bottomset silts over lain by debris foresets, terrace at 26 m asl</td>
<td>Miller, 1973; Dyke et al., 1982; pers. comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMS-23554</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>-61.78</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>Aquatic moss</td>
<td>12600 ± 60</td>
<td>15.0 ± 0.2</td>
<td>basal sediment in Doned Lake, Cape Dyer</td>
<td>Moore et al., 2001; Miller, 1973; Locke, 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QL-979</td>
<td>66.73</td>
<td>-61.45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Marine shells</td>
<td>37200 ± 800</td>
<td>41.1 ± 0.8</td>
<td>raised marine delta at Ups, NW Cape Dyer</td>
<td>Miller, 1973; Dyke et al., 1982; pers. comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMS-11337</td>
<td>66.49</td>
<td>-61.59</td>
<td>57000</td>
<td>Marine shells</td>
<td>57000</td>
<td></td>
<td>raised marine delta at Sunshine Fiord, Cape Dyer</td>
<td>Miller, 1973; Dyke et al., 1982; pers. comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIC-324</td>
<td>66.03</td>
<td>-67.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marine shells</td>
<td>6110 ± 80</td>
<td>6.4 ± 0.1</td>
<td>Head of Clearwater Fiord</td>
<td>Dyke, 1979; pers. comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIC-324</td>
<td>66.26</td>
<td>-66.55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Haliotis arctica</td>
<td>8010 ± 65</td>
<td>8.3 ± 0.1</td>
<td>American Harbour</td>
<td>Dyke, 1979; pers. comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gak-4817</td>
<td>66.35</td>
<td>-64.35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mytilus trunculus</td>
<td>8390 ± 170</td>
<td>8.8 ± 0.2</td>
<td>Head of Kingait Fiord, shells from silt forming prominent terrace at 16 m asl</td>
<td>Dyke, 1979; McNeely and Brennan, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSC-2083</td>
<td>66.36</td>
<td>-64.35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mytilus trunculus</td>
<td>8800 ± 270</td>
<td>9.4 ± 0.4</td>
<td>Head of Kingait Fiord, shells in bottomset clay-silt below foresets terminating at 16 m asl</td>
<td>Dyke, 1979; McNeely and Brennan, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMS-85913</td>
<td>66.34</td>
<td>-65.73</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Mytilus trunculus</td>
<td>9110 ± 90</td>
<td>9.7 ± 0.1</td>
<td>Pangnirtung, borehole S09408 north of airstrip at depth 2.37 - 2.47 m</td>
<td>LeBlanc et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSC-2181</td>
<td>66.36</td>
<td>-66.27</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Portiondox antarctic</td>
<td>9060 ± 110</td>
<td>9.8 ± 0.1</td>
<td>Pangnirtung, bulldozer cut near airstrip, 50 m marine limit</td>
<td>LeBlanc et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA-7405</td>
<td>66.42</td>
<td>-62.43</td>
<td>13823</td>
<td>Benthic macrofossae</td>
<td>1700 ± 22</td>
<td>15.9 ± 2.2</td>
<td>Core B2034-041 on continental shelf off</td>
<td>Jennings, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA-7405 orig.</td>
<td>66.42</td>
<td>-62.43</td>
<td>20189</td>
<td>Bulk organic matter</td>
<td>295 ± 2.2</td>
<td>23.6 ± 2.2</td>
<td>Core B2037-031 in deepest section of Cumberland Sound at depth 200-250 cm</td>
<td>Jennings, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL-993</td>
<td>66.39</td>
<td>-65.43</td>
<td>10939</td>
<td>Bulk organic matter</td>
<td>250 ± 12</td>
<td>11.1 ± 0.4</td>
<td>Core B2037-031 in deepest section of Cumberland Sound at depth 200-250 cm</td>
<td>Jennings, 1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Conventionally normalized dates, previously reported data were normalized to $^{14}C$ = -25 ppm and were often corrected for reservoir ages.

$^b$ Calculated with Calib 7.0.2 (Stuiver and Reimer, 1993) using marine 13 calibration curve (Reimer et al., 2013) for marine samples and the Northern Hemisphere IntCal09 calibration curve (Reimer et al., 2009) for terrestrial samples. + Uncertainty stated.

Table A2.4 Calibration of previous radiocarbon data. Calibration is completed using the Calib 7.0.2 program (Stuiver and Reimer, 1993) with the marine calibration curve (Reimer et al., 2013) and an additional ΔR correction of 140 a for a total ΔR correction 540 a. For samples measured at the Geological Survey of Canada (GSC) radiocarbon laboratory ‘normalized corrected’ radiocarbon ages were used for calibration (McNeely and Brennan, 2005). References for radiocarbon data is listed in the last column (Miller, 1973; Dyke, 1979; Miller, 1979; Dyke et al., 1982; Frechette and de Vernal, 2009; Locke, 1987; Jennings, 1993; Moore et al., 2001; LeBlanc et al., 2011).
Contours of paleo-ELA are constructed from measured maximum elevations of lateral moraines assigned to a specific time interval during deglaciation. The distribution of lateral moraines at each time interval is not equal throughout Cumberland Peninsula introducing significant uncertainty into the reconstruction of paleo-ELA contours. For instance, no lateral moraines for the Heinrich Event 1 (H-1, 14.6 ka) time interval are available along the lower southeastern coast or between Cape Dyer and the Merchants Bay area (Fig. A2.7). For the Younger Dryas (YD, 11.7 ka) time interval no moraines are available north of the Merchants Bay area (Fig. A2.8). Finally, for the Cockburn-equivalent (9.5 ka) time interval lateral moraines are only available for the alpine glacier system leading to an elliptical shape of paleo-ELA contours (Fig. A2.9).

At each time interval, contours of relative sea level (rsl) are interpolated from previously published data of raised (Dyke, 1979; Kaplan and Miller, 2003) and submerged (Cowan, 2015; Hughes Clarke et al., 2015) marine deltas (lighter coloured lines in Fig. A2.7 – A2.9). In addition to rsl, an estimate of the eustatic sea level stand is required at each time interval (Miller et al., 2011) to correct for isostatic rebound since deposition of the lateral moraines. The gradients of isostatic rebound and paleo-ELA are constructed for two different profiles that are nearly perpendicular to each other (Fig. A2.10). These profiles were chosen to assess the change in paleo-ELA through time at different coastal sections of Cumberland Peninsula. The paleo-ELA gradients based on the measured maximum elevations of lateral moraines (dashed dark lines in Fig. A2.10) are corrected by subtracting the amount of isostatic rebound (bright lines in Fig. A2.10)
to receive the elevation of lateral moraines at the time of deposition (solid dark lines in Fig. A2.10).

Fig. A2.7 Paleo-ELA (dark blue) and rsl contours (light blue) for H-1 time interval. Dashed paleo-ELA contours indicate measured maximum elevations of lateral moraines and solid paleo-ELA show contours corrected for isostatic rebound since deposition of the lateral moraines. Eustatic sea level was at approximately 80 m below present sea level at this time interval (Miller et al., 2011). MB: Merchants Bay area, CD: Cape Dyer.
Fig. A2.8 Paleo-ELA (red) and rsl contours (orange) for YD time interval. Dashed paleo-ELA contours indicate measured maximum elevations of lateral moraines and solid paleo-ELA show contours corrected for isostatic rebound since deposition of the lateral moraines. Eustatic sea level was at approximately 40 m below present sea level at this time interval (Miller et al., 2011). MB: Merchants Bay.
Fig. A2.9 Paleo-ELA (dark green) and rsl contours (light green) for Cockburn-equivalent time interval. Dashed paleo-ELA contours indicate measured maximum elevations of lateral moraines and solid paleo-ELA show contours corrected for isostatic rebound since deposition of the lateral moraines. Eustatic sea level was at approximately 15 m below present sea level at this time interval (Miller et al., 2011).
Fig. A2.10 Profiles shown in Fig. A2.7 – A2.9 displaying uncorrected paleo-ELA gradients (dashed dark lines, axis to the right), corrected paleo-ELA gradients (solid dark lines, axis to the right), and gradients of isostatic rebound (solid bright lines, axis to the left). For correction of isostatic rebound the amount of relative sea level plus eustatic sea level stand at each time interval is subtracted from the measured maximum elevation of lateral moraines.
Fig. A2.11 Modern ELA distribution on Cumberland Peninsula inferred from the lowest corrie glacier elevations (adapted from Andrews and Miller, 1972).
A2.5 REFERENCES FOR A2


APPENDIX A3 - Supplementary File for New Approach for Quantification of Subaerial and Subglacial Erosion Rates on High Latitude Upland Plateaus: Cumberland Peninsula, Baffin Island, Canada

A3.1 SAMPLE PREPARATION AND TCN CHEMISTRY DATA

Samples were cleaned of lichen and other organic material using a wire brush before crushing in a jaw crusher and grinding with a plate pulverizer. The grain size fraction of 355-500 \( \mu \text{m} \), separated by dry sieving, was used for quartz purification, which included a combination of physical (magnetic separation, sand abrasion, isostatic) and chemical (aqua regia, HF etching, and multiple cycles of dilute HF ultrasonication) procedures (Kohl and Nishiizumi, 1992). The absence of feldspar was verified with a simple test for Al concentration in 1 g of dissolved quartz. Approximately 35 g of purified (generally Al concentration <100 ug g\(^{-1}\)) quartz were spiked with ~0.2 g of \(^{10}\text{Be}\) carrier (Table A3.1) and dissolved in a mixture of HF and HClO\(_4\). Aliquots for determining native \(^{27}\text{Al}\) concentration in quartz were separated before and after addition of varying amounts of standard Al carrier. Native \(^{27}\text{Al}\) concentration were measured with ICP-MS (~5% 1\(\sigma\) precision, MAXXXAM Inc., Halifax) and, for a few samples, ICP-OES (<2% 1\(\sigma\) precision, Dalhousie Geochronology Centre (DGC)). Be- and Al-cations were extracted by a combination of ion chromatography and pH-controlled precipitations of Be- and Al- hydroxides, followed by evaporation and ignition using a Bunsen burner. For AMS analysis, the Be- and Al-oxides were mixed with niobium and silver (1:1 by volume), respectively, and loaded into target holders. At the Center for Accelerator Mass Spectrometry at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (CAMS-LLNL), the process blanks and targets were measured against standards 07KNSTD3110 with a \(^{10}\text{Be}/^{9}\text{Be}\) ratio...
of 2.85 x 10^{-12} (Nishiizumi et al., 2007) and KNSTD10650 with a 26Al/27Al ratio of 1.065 x 10^{-11} (Nishiizumi, 2004). Process blanks for 10Be and 26Al were analysed with each batch of seven to twelve samples, and their measured ratios was used for background correction of the measured sample ratios (generally <1%, few low concentration samples <4%). Process blank 10Be/9Be and 26Al/27Al ranged between 7.6 x 10^{-15} to 3.6 x 10^{-14} and 1.6 x 10^{-15} to 6.1 x 10^{-15} respectively. The elevated ratios for the 10Be/9Be have been positively correlated with high isobaric boron levels in the BeO targets, owing to contamination of 10B in the DGC cosmogenic nuclide lab during building renovations (e.g., installation of pink fibreglass insulation, poor HVAC filtration, and other issues that have been resolved since). Stated total analytical errors of calculated concentrations at 1σ confidence include AMS ratio measurement uncertainty (Poisson counting precision), blank correction error, an additional 2% uncertainty for sample chemistry and uncertainty in the Be concentration of the carrier, and, for 26Al only, native Al concentration measurement error (from ICP.MS or ICP-OES, Table A3.1).

Three samples with initially high native Al concentrations yielded relatively large Al-AMS measurements errors (Table A3.1). We re-submitted these samples for renewed Al-AMS analysis following further quartz purification. However, the calculated 26Al and 10Be concentrations are lower compared to other surfaces of similar weathering degree sampled at the same site (6 & 12, Table 4.2, Fig. 4.5). We suspect that the initial Be-AMS analysis could also be affected by the high concentration of impurities in the quartz (evident from the high native Al concentration), and we have therefore purified quartz of the 250-355 μm size fraction for renewed Be- and Al-extraction and AMS analysis.
Table A3.1  Sample chemistry and AMS data: Apparent $^{10}$Be and $^{26}$Al exposure ages are calculated using the online CRONUS KU calculator Version 1.0 July, 26-27, 2014. Erosion rates are calculated following Lal (1991) assuming samples have reached saturation. For samples with low concentrations, these erosion rates should be interpreted as maxima. Minimum durations of exposure and burial are determined for a simple burial history of an initial continuous exposure interval followed by a single continuous burial interval (Granger and Smith, 2000).
A3.2 ADDITIONAL TCN RESULTS AND FIELD PICTURES

Apparent exposure ages are calculated using the new CRONUS KU online calculator version 1.0 (http://web1.ittc.ku.edu:8888/). For all sampled tor sites, topographic shielding is negligible, and shielding by snow is assumed to be insignificant as the majority of surfaces are on tor tops, metres above the surrounding ground, on wind-swept summits. Rock density is set to 2.65 g cm\(^{-3}\) and a subaerial erosion rate of 1 mm ka\(^{-1}\) is assumed. Low subaerial erosion rates are supported by three samples that had been continuously exposed (no or insignificant complex exposure histories, see section 4.7.1, main text) and whose nuclide concentrations can be interpreted as steady state subaerial erosion rates ranging between 0.8 – 1.6 mm ka\(^{-1}\) (Table A3.1, sites 1 and 4). These low rates are corroborated by the MC method that generally limits subaerial erosion rates at <2 mm ka\(^{-1}\) (Table 4.3, Fig. 4.8). For most samples, measured \(^{26}\text{Al}/^{10}\text{Be}\) ratios are below the surface production ratio of 6.75, indicating a complex exposure history and/or plucking. Minimum estimates for exposure and burial durations are obtained assuming a continuous initial exposure interval followed by a single continuous burial episode (Granger and Smith, 2000; Granger and Muzikar, 2001; Granger, 2006). Uncertainties of these estimates are determined from probability density functions that are based on weighted \(\chi^2\) statistics (Table A3.1, Taylor, 1997). Compared with the cyclic ice cover model outlined in section 4.6.1, the calculated minimum estimates of total exposure plus burial age are only about half the value determined with the new approach (section 4.7.1, Table 4.3, Fig. A3.1).

For these calculations, a sea-level, high-latitude reference production rate of 4.0 atoms g\(^{-1}\) a\(^{-1}\) was used for \(^{10}\text{Be}\) (Borcher et al., subm.) with a spallogenic \(^{26}\text{Al}/^{10}\text{Be}\)...
production ratio of 6.75 (Nishiizumi et al., 1989; Balco et al., 2008). Scaling factors for spallogenic production are calculated with the time-dependent scaling scheme by Lifton et al. (2014), which is based on modelled analytical fits to measured cosmic-ray spectra (Sato 2006 and 2008). Muon production parameters are also calculated according to Lifton et al. (2014) following Heisinger et al. (2002a-b). Compared to the previously used $^{10}$Be spallogenic production rate at SLHL of 4.48 atoms g$^{-1}$ a$^{-1}$ (Stone, 2000, recalibrated according to Nishiizumi et al., 2007) and scaled to the sample site with a time-invariant scaling scheme (Stone, 2000, after Lal, 1991), the calculated apparent exposure ages increase by approximately 11-12%.

![Graph](image)

**Fig. A3.1** Comparison of estimates of total complex history derived using a simplified period ice cover history (section 4.6.1) and the sum of minimum duration of a single exposure interval followed by single burial interval.
Supplementary field photos:  

**A & B:** Site 11 – stage 2-3 tor: samples A188 (top of one of the blocks shown in A), A187 (on top of ridge in B), and A186 (from the extensive slab in front of the ridge shown in B). Large tor blocks in A withstood plucking, while smaller blocks in B at the same location had been plucked more frequently and more recently.  

**C:** Site 9 – stage 2 tor: Preservation of mushroom tors at a summit top.  

**D:** Aerial view of site 10 – stage 3-4 tor: Located at the edge of a plateau, sample A355 (weathered surface) was collected at the highest and centre part of the tor; sample A356 (fresher surface) was collected a few metres upslope from the high tor, on the plinth-like surface to the left.  

**E & F:** Site 7 – stage 3-4 tor: Sample E346 (weathered surface) collected on block 3 m to the left of person shown in E. Sample E348 (fresher bedrock surface) shown in F.  

**G:** Site 4: White erratic cobble.  

**H & I:** Site 5: Erratic blocks: Sub-rounded block with distinctive phenocrysts (train of white blobs on front side) shown in H (sample E222A-02), fresh large block shown in I (sample E222A-06).
Fig. A3.3 Two ways to interpret the measured TCN concentrations of the erratic blocks on site 5 (Table 4.2, Fig. A3.2 h-i). Burial plot is shown for site-specific latitude, longitude and altitude. Production ratio of $^{26}\text{Al}$ to $^{10}\text{Be}$ is normalised by dividing the ratio by the surface production ratio of 6.75, and the burial plot is shown for an average ice thickness of 50 m occupying the site for 74.2% of the time (based on average ice-free time of 25.8% derived from three bedrock samples collected at the site). Exposure isolines are sub-vertical black dashed lines (longer dashes), burial isolines are sub-horizontal black dashed lines (smaller dashes), and constant erosion island is shown in green. 

**A. Continuous exposure at depth:** Additional to the red line for a continuously exposed surfaces (Fig. 4.3), lines for surfaces continuously shielded by rock of density 2.65 g cm$^{-3}$ are shown in 0.5 m increments up to 5 m (assuming no erosion) and for the depth of continuous burial beneath the equivalent of 13 m of rock (for calculation of depth of continuous burial see caption of Fig. 4.3).

**B. Complex exposure trajectories** are shown for a cyclic ice cover history with 1 ka long glacial-interglacial cycles, 25.8% ice-free time and no subaerial constant erosion at depth from 0 - 5 m in 0.5 m intervals.
For both, the simple cyclic ice cover history as well as the Monte Carlo method based on the global benthic oxygen isotope record (Lisiecki and Raymo, 2005), we assume that deglaciation of the weathered plateaus occurred sometime after the last glacial maximum. Timing of deglaciation (15 ka) is inferred from exposure ages of boulders collected on moraines in adjacent valleys (Chapter 3) and previous TCN data from the region (Marsella et al., 2000; Kaplan et al., 2001). To test this assumption, we have calculated the TCN concentrations that would have been measured in the sampled bedrock surfaces prior to an ice-free interval since the start of oxygen isotope stage 3 (OIS-3, 60 ka, black ellipses with points coloured according to ellipses of measured TCN concentrations, Fig. A3.4). Some of the sampled surfaces would have required long periods (>1 Ma) of burial (by 35 m of ice or 13 m of rock). This scenario is unlikely considering the periodic swings between colder and warmer climate during the Quaternary. Therefore, our assumption of ice cover during OIS-2 is justified, which is also supported by the LR04 record used in the MC method.
A3.3 THREE APPROACHES TO DETERMINE LAST GLACIAL PLUCKING

On Cumberland Peninsula, we have observed that stacks of weathered bedrock blocks (tor tops), whose surfaces are affected by granular disintegration, are juxtaposed with less intensely weathered solid bedrock surfaces (tor plinths). Because these surfaces experienced the same complex exposure history, sampling both a fresher and more weathered surface allows us to constrain the timing of last glacial plucking of an overlying bedrock block from the fresher surface. The measurement of two radionuclides
and their ratios in two differentially weathered surfaces reduces the degrees of freedom to constrain the complex exposure history including occasional plucking of weathered bedrock blocks.

We have derived three different approaches to constrain the timing of last glacial plucking. Two approaches (A3.3.1 and A3.3.2) are based on the differences in TCN concentration measured in the two differentially weathered surfaces. The third approach (A3.3.3) outlines how the time of last glacial plucking can be estimated for any sampled surface once the complex exposure history is constrained by multiple paired samples in the region.

**A3.3.1 Pairs of Differentially Weathered Tor Surfaces – Approach 1**

The strong attenuation of cosmic ray flux through mass (section 4.6.1) and the higher production ratio of $^{26}$Al/$^{10}$Be from deeply penetrating muons than from fast neutrons, causes a recently plucked (less weathered) surface to have a lower TCN concentration but a higher $^{26}$Al/$^{10}$Be than a non-plucked (more weathered) surface. The differences in measured concentrations and ratios are related to the timing of last plucking of the fresher surface. The close proximity of the twins or triplets of samples precludes differences in their ice cover histories, simplifying the modeling to solve for the timing of last plucking event.

In the case of continuous exposure without intermittent burial intervals, the TCN concentration measured in both surfaces can be expressed as an inherited concentration at the time of plucking and nuclide production since plucking:
\[ N_{\text{wth}} = \ln h_{\text{wth}} \ast e^{-\lambda \ast t_{sp}} + \frac{P_i}{\lambda} \ast \left(1 - e^{-\lambda \ast t_{sp}}\right) \]

\[ eq(A3.1) \]

\[ N_{\text{frh}} = \ln h_{\text{frh}} \ast e^{-\lambda \ast t_{sp}} + \frac{P_i}{\lambda} \ast \left(1 - e^{-\lambda \ast t_{sp}}\right) \]

\[ eq(A3.2) \]

\[ \lambda' = \lambda + \frac{\varepsilon \ast \rho_r}{\Lambda} \]

\[ eq(A3.3) \]

with \( N_{\text{wth}} \) and \( N_{\text{frh}} \) (atoms g\(^{-1}\)) the measured TCN concentrations of the weathered and fresher surface, \( \ln h_{\text{wth}} \) and \( \ln h_{\text{frh}} \) (atoms g\(^{-1}\)) the inherited concentration from prior to the plucking event, and \( t_{sp} \) the time since plucking. \( P_i \) (atoms g\(^{-1}\) a\(^{-1}\)) is the surface production rate and \( \Lambda \) (g cm\(^{-2}\)) is the attenuation length for fast neutrons, or fast or negative muons, \( \lambda \) (a\(^{-1}\)) is the decay constant, \( \varepsilon \) (cm a\(^{-1}\)) is a constant subaerial erosion rate, and \( \rho_r \) (g cm\(^{-3}\)) is the bulk rock density.

At the time of plucking, the inherited concentration of the fresh surface is the same as the inherited concentration of the weathered surface at a depth equal to the thickness of removed bedrock block:

\[ \ln h_{\text{frh}} = \ln h_{\text{wth}} \ast e^{-z_r \ast \rho_r \Lambda} \]

\[ eq(A3.4) \]

where \( z_r \) is the thickness of removed bedrock block.

The inherited concentration of the fresh surface strongly depends on the thickness of the plucked bedrock block. Production since plucking is strongly diminished if the site has occasionally been buried by ice. For recurring cold-based (weakly erosive) ice cover, ‘time-integrated’ nuclide production over multiple burial intervals can be calculated using the cyclic ice cover history outlined in section 4.6.1 with glacial-interglacial cycles reduced to 1 ka durations (eqs(1-3) with \( t_c = 1 \) ka, Fig. 4.3a). The time-integrated...
increase in concentrations and decrease in ratios can be calculated for any depth below surface using \( \text{eqs(4-5)} \), so that concentration and ratio depth profiles can be obtained for different times of complex history (Fig. A3.5).

![Graph showing concentration and ratio depth profiles](image)

**Fig. A3.5**  A. Time-integrated increase in concentrations and decrease in ratio over multiple glacial-interglacial cycles (for ice-free time \( f = 20\% \), zero subaerial erosion, and 1 Ma duration) is calculated at various depths (25 cm intervals up to 4 m depth). TCN concentrations and ratios measured in a weathered surface (sample A355, Table 4.2, Fig. 4.2a, dark blue) and a fresher surface (sample A356, Table 4.2, Fig. 4.2b, light blue) are shown as horizontal lines. B. Same data as in A, but shown as depth profiles at 100 ka time intervals of complex history (10 time slices shown).

In a first approximation, we use the depth profile with a surface concentration and ratio \( z_r = 0 \) cm equivalent to the measured values of the weathered surface (assuming plucking occurred very recently) to derive the inherited concentration of the fresher surface at the time of plucking (Fig. A3.6). To obtain the depth profile below the weathered surface, we first have to determine the values of average ice-free time \( f \) (for an
assumed subaerial erosion rate $\varepsilon$) and total duration of complex history $t_{tot}$ of the weathered surface (section 4.6.1, Fig. 4.3d, Table 4.3). **Second,** we calculate the depth profile at time $t_{tot}$ using $eqs(1-5)$ with $t_c = 1$ ka (going through as many glacial-interglacial cycles required to reach $t_{tot}$) and, **third,** for different block thicknesses $z_r$, we determine the time since plucking $t_{sp}$, which is the time required to reach the measured concentration of the fresher surface using $eqs(1-3)$ with the same values of $I$ and $\varepsilon$ (Fig. A3.6). With this value of $t_{sp}$, we obtain a new depth profile at time $t_{tot} - t_{sp}$ to derive an improved estimate of $t_{sp}$ repeating the procedure until the value of $t_{sp}$ converges.

**Fig. A3.6** Approaches 1a - c: TCN concentration and ratio depth profiles at time $t_{tot}$ determined for the weathered surface using the appropriate value of $I$ for an assumed subaerial erosion rate $\varepsilon$ (section 4.6.1, Fig. 4.3d, Table 4.3). At any depth $z_r$, the time since plucking $t_{sp}$ is equivalent to the time required to reach the measured TCN concentration or ratio of the fresher surface through a cyclic ice cover history ($eqs(1-3)$). Measured TCN concentrations and ratios for the weathered and fresher surfaces are indicated by dark and light blue lines, respectively.

This approach can be applied to both measured concentrations of $^{10}$Be and $^{26}$Al (Approaches 1a & b) as well as the $^{26}$Al/$^{10}$Be (Approach 1c) to provide an average of three estimates of $t_{sp}$ for a pair of tor surfaces. If the plucked block thickness $z_r$ is...
known (i.e., difference in height between weathered and fresher surface), \( t_{sp} \) can be solved uniquely. A range of \( t_{sp} \) can be computed for different thicknesses, when fracture density varies with depth.

### A3.3.2 Pairs of Differentially Weathered Tor Surfaces – Approach 2

TCN production following the plucking event is the same for both surfaces, since they share the same ice cover history. Therefore, the inherited concentration of the fresher surface at the time of plucking (of a block with thickness \( z_r \)) is a function of the difference between the TCN concentrations measured in both surfaces.

\[
\ln h_{frh} = \frac{N_{wth} - N_{frh}}{e^{-\lambda L_{tsp}} \left(1 - e^{-\lambda L_{tsp}}\right)}
\]

\[
R_{inh} = \frac{\ln h_{Al}}{\ln h_{Be}} = \frac{([A]_{wth} - [A]_{frh}) \cdot e^{-\lambda_{Be} t_{sp}}}{([Be]_{wth} - [Be]_{frh}) \cdot e^{-\lambda_{Al} t_{sp}}}
\]

This equation is then solved for \( t_{sp} \):

\[
t_{sp} = \frac{1}{\lambda_{Al} - \lambda_{Be}} \ln \frac{R_{inh} \cdot ([Be]_{wth} - [Be]_{frh})}{([Al]_{wth} - [Al]_{frh})}
\]

This equation allows the calculation of the time since plucking for a particular block thickness \( z_r \), if the inherited ratio at the time of plucking can be estimated. As with Approach 1 (section A3.3.1), the first estimate of inherited ratio is derived from the ratio depth profile below the weathered surface (right profile in Fig. A3.6). Once \( t_{sp} \) has been estimated, a new depth profile is obtained at time \( t_{tot} - t_{sp} \) to calculate an improved estimate of \( t_{sp} \) until the solution for \( t_{sp} \) converges (generally after four iterations).
A3.3.3 Any Sampled Surface – Approach 3

When the average glacial conditions (estimates of $f$ for an assumed $\varepsilon$, section 4.6.1, Table 4.3) of a region can be constrained from several samples collected at different locations (including pairs of differentially weathered surfaces at the same site), it is possible to determine a minimum estimate of time since plucking for any sampled surface. Without evidence for common glacial conditions, only the method using twin samples from a tor can constrain the time since plucking. If the assumption is justified that subaerial erosion rates and duration of ice cover are consistent for the same lithology within the same geographical territory (considering elevation and surface area of plateaus to support a glacier), then samples collected from different locations are expected to plot along the same complex exposure trajectory in a burial plot (section 4.6.1, Fig. 4.5, Table 4.3). If a sampled surface had been plucked very recently, then the measured TCN concentrations would plot on a complex exposure trajectory further to the left (i.e., corresponding to shielding by $z_r$ rock overburden, Fig. 4.3c). However, subsequent to the plucking event, the TCN concentrations of the freshly exposed surface quickly follow a sub-horizontal trajectory that reaches towards the trajectory of an exposed surface (dark blue trajectory, Fig. 4.3c). Therefore, the value of average ice-free time $f$ obtained by fitting a trajectory through the sample point represents a minimum estimate. Agreement of estimated values of $f$ between different samples of the same region thus suggests that plucking on any sampled surface had occurred long enough ago, so that the measured TCN concentrations approximate glacial conditions for an exposed surface (i.e., the sample has reached the trajectory of an exposed surface following plucking).
Assuming that the sampled surface has reached the trajectory of an exposed surface, a minimum estimate of the time since plucking can be calculated for different plucked block thicknesses $z_r$ (Fig. A3.7). **First**, a trajectory is fitted through the sample point (providing an estimate $f$ for an assumed $e$ for that sample) and additional trajectories at various depth are calculated (Fig. A3.7, trajectory for $z_r = 50$ cm is shown). **Second**, for each block thickness, trajectories for plucking occurring at different times are calculated (dark blue, sub-horizontal convex lines in Fig. A3.7) each merging asymptotically with the trajectory fitted through the sample point. **Third**, the plucking trajectory requiring the shortest time to intersect with the measured concentration (crossing the error ellipse) gives a minimum estimate for $t_{sp}$ for that particular block thickness (note: plucking could have occurred much earlier). This procedure thus renders a function of minimum time since plucking vs. block thicknesses.
Approach 3: Estimation of time since plucking for any surface. For an assumed subaerial erosion rate $\varepsilon$ (here 0 mm ka$^{-1}$), a complex exposure trajectory is fitted through the sample point (measured nuclide concentrations) determining the percent ice-free time $\hat{\tau}$ at the site (section 4.6.1, Fig. 4.3d). For a particular block thickness ($z_r = 50$ cm is shown), plucking is assumed to occur at different times and complex exposure trajectories for the exhumed surface are calculated (dark blue, sub-horizontal convex curves), which asymptotically reach the trajectory fitted through the sample point. The trajectory requiring the shortest time to intersect the error ellipse of the sample point yields the minimum estimate for time since plucking $t_{sp}$ (i.e., the lowest sub-horizontal trajectory intersecting the error ellipse, orange arrow).
A3.4 TIME SINCE LAST GLACIAL PLUCKING DETERMINED FROM THE THREE APPROACHES

A3.4.1 Approach 1 – Pairs of Differentially Weathered Tor Surfaces

For all four pairs of samples (two of the pairs constitute a set of three samples collected at the same site (11, Table 4.2)), the timing of last plucking determined by approach 1a-c agree closely, so that an average estimate can be calculated (red lines in Fig. A3.8). This estimate depends on the chosen values of subaerial erosion rate $\varepsilon$ and ice-free time $\hat{f}$. Increasing $\varepsilon$ leads to earlier last plucking for the same block thickness, while increasing $\hat{f}$ results in more recent last plucking.

A3.4.2 Approach 2 – Pairs of Differentially Weathered Tor Surfaces

Approach 2 yields a differently shaped curve for timing of plucking with depth (green lines in Fig. A3.8) mimicking the ratio depth profile (turned by 90° counter-clockwise). As for approach 1, the time since last plucking depends on values of $\varepsilon$ and $\hat{f}$ but in different ways. Increasing both $\varepsilon$ and $\hat{f}$ results in earlier last plucking. Additionally, for one sample pair (A346 & A348) only three iterations could be successfully completed. A reason for this behaviour could be the relatively small difference in TCN concentrations and ratios between the weathered (A346) and fresher surface (A348).

For three of the four sample pairs, the estimate of time since last plucking derived with approach 2 is always larger than the estimate determined by approaches 1a-c (Fig. A3.8). The discrepancy between the estimates from both approaches is likely related to the values of $\varepsilon$ and $\hat{f}$ used in the calculations. Increasing the subaerial erosion rate $\varepsilon$ and decreasing ice-free time $\hat{f}$ would draw the estimates of timing of last glacial plucking.
towards each other for three of the sample pairs. Opposite shifts in values of $\varepsilon$ and $f$ would be required for the fourth sample pair (A188-186).

Comparison of the timing of last plucking based on sample pairs (approaches 1a-c and 2, red and green lines in Fig. A3.8) with the estimate derived based on the fresher surface only (approach 3, using the same values of $\varepsilon$ and $f$ than in approaches 1 & 2, blue lines in Fig. A3.8) indicates closer similarities between approaches 3 and 1 than 2. Although the different approaches do not completely agree, approach 3 seems to yield tentatively similar results (i.e., more recent plucking for sample A356 than for sample A186). This conformity suggest that approach 3 can provide reliable estimates of timing since last plucking for any sampled surfaces, if the sampled tor sites experienced similar ice cover histories (roughly agreeing estimates of $\varepsilon$ and $f$).

**A3.4.3 Approach 3 – Any Sampled Surface**

The timing of last plucking (Fig. A3.9) determined for all samples plotting closely to the complex exposure trajectory for a cyclic ice cover history (Fig. 4.5, section 4.6.1) varies systematically according to the weathering degree of the sampled surfaces and classification of glacial modification of the tor sites (Table 4.2, section 4.6.1). Sites with only slight glacial modification (stage 2 tors, and weathered surface on the stage 2-3 tor; green curves in Fig. A3.9) have been last plucked much earlier than sites that have been modified more strongly (stage 3 tors, weathered surface on stage 3-4 tors, and fresher surfaces on the stage 2-3 tor; blue lines in Fig. A3.9). Most recently, plucking (red lines in Fig. A3.9) occurred on the most intensely modified tors (stage 4-5) or on the fresher surface of intermediately modified sites (stage 3-4 tors). This agreement between timing of last glacial plucking determined from measured TCN concentrations and geomorphic
observations (weathering degree and degree of glacial modification) suggests that our approaches yield reasonable results, despite the multitude of assumptions and simplification required.

**Fig A3.8** Different estimates of time since last glacial plucking determined for the fresher surface of a pair of samples collected from differentially weathered bedrock surfaces at four tor sites (Approaches 1a-c red lines, Approach 2 green curves, and Approach 3 dark blue lines).  

A. Sample pair A355-356 (weathered surface) and A356 (fresher surface) collected at site 10 (Table 4.2, Fig. 4.2 a-b).  

B. Sample pair A346 (weathered surface) and A348 (fresher surface) from site 6 (Fig. A3.2 e-f).  

C. Sample pair A188-187 (weathered surface) and A187 (fresher surface) from site 11 (Fig. A3.2a sample A188, Fig. A3.2b sample A187 is taken from top of tor ridge).  

D. Sample pair A188 (weathered surface) and A186 (fresher surface) from same site as in C (A186 collected from extensive slab in foreground of Fig. A3.2b).
Fig. A3.9  Time since plucking calculated for any surface. Solid lines: no erosion, dashed lines 1mm ka\(^{-1}\) subaerial erosion. Green: stage 2 tors and most weathered surface (wth surf.) on the stage 2-3 tor, blue: stage 3 tors, weathered surfaces on stage 3-4 tors, and fresher surfaces on the stage 2-3 tor; and red: stage 4-5 tors and fresher surfaces of stage 3-4 tors.

A3.5 DETAILS OF MONTE CARLO METHOD

The Monte Carlo approach is based on the stacked benthic oxygen isotope record (LR04, Lisiecki and Raymo, 2005) that represents global ice volume changes. Comparing the representation of the last 1.2 Ma of LR04 in the burial plot (light blue irregular saw-tooth line in Fig. A3.10) with the trajectory of a simple cyclic ice cover history (light blue smooth line in Fig. A3.10) indicates that exposure intervals derived from LR04 are too long during the early Pleistocene, but that LR04 concurs closely with the cyclic ice cover history for the last 800 ka (inset, Fig. A3.10). The most recent complex exposure history has the largest effect on the measured TCN concentrations suggesting that the cyclic ice cover history is a valuable approximation for LR04 for the middle to late Pleistocene.
Fig. A3.10  A. Comparison of LR04 record ($\delta^{18}O = 3.8$ permil dividing the record into ice-free and ice-cover intervals for the last 1250 ka (20 burial intervals; light blue, irregular saw-tooth trajectory) and cyclic ice cover history (1 ka glacial-interglacial cycles for 1.6 Ma; light blue lines shown for 0 cm, 50 cm, and 100 cm rock thicknesses). Inset displays both ice cover models for an exposed surface. Dark blue trajectory shows the same LR04 history but with two plucking events occurring during the 8th and 15th burial interval each removing 50 cm of rock (marked by dark blue stars).  

B. Increase in concentrations and decrease of ratio based on the last 1250 ka of the LR04 record (as in A) for 0, 50, and 100 cm rock thicknesses (light blue lines) and including two plucking events (dark blue line, plucking marked by blue stars).
The MC method results can be further evaluated by plotting different input parameters and calculated variables of all accepted solutions against each other (solutions are accepted if the calculated TCN concentrations are within the 1σ uncertainty ranges of the measured concentrations, Fig. A3.11 – A3.12). In these scatter plots, the size of the circles represents the $\chi^2$ values obtained for a particular pair of variables (larger circles indicating lower $\chi^2$ values). Plotting subaerial erosion rate against the values of $\delta^{18}$O used to divide the LR04 record in ice-free and ice-cover intervals reveals that longer ice-free time (i.e., higher $\delta^{18}$O values) is required for higher subaerial erosion rates (Fig. A3.11). The same relationship between subaerial erosion rates and ice-free time has already been observed for the simplified cyclic ice cover history (section 4.6.1, Fig. 4.3).

\[ \text{Fig. A3.11} \quad \text{Relationship between subaerial erosion rate and value of } \delta^{18}\text{O that divides LR04 into ice-free and ice-cover intervals (shown for sample pair A355-356 (site 10, Table 4.2, Fig. 4.2 a-b) and 10,000 accepted solutions): Scatterplot is shown for all accepted solutions (calculated TCN concentrations are within 1σ of the measured concentrations) where the size of the circle is inversely proportional to the $\chi^2$ value obtained for a specific set of erosion rate and $\delta^{18}$O. Likewise the cyclic ice cover model, larger $\delta^{18}$O values (i.e., longer exposure intervals) are required for larger subaerial erosion rates that reach a maximum value of $\sim$2.5 mm ka$^{-1}$ (input range is 0 – 4 mm ka$^{-1}$).} \]
Although the MC method yields more recent timing of last plucking for fresher surfaces than more weathered surfaces, the range of timing increases considerably for more weathered surfaces (Fig. 4.7). Plotting various variables against the timing of last plucking for one sample pair from site 10 (A355 weathered surface, Fig. 4.2a; A356 fresher surface, Fig. 4.2b), reveals that more recent plucking is favoured by longer ice-fee intervals (higher $\delta^{18}$O value, Fig. A3.12a), lower erosion rates (Fig. A3.12b), and smaller block thicknesses removed during the plucking event (Fig. A3.12c). Interestingly, the range of episodic erosion rate is largest for the most probable timing of last plucking (Table 4.3, Fig. 4.8), decreases for more recent plucking events, and is smallest for the earliest plucking events (Fig. A3.12d).

The probability density distribution and hence values of the episodic erosion rate determined with the MC method is mainly a function of the measured TCN concentration. Low TCN concentrations yield a higher episodic erosion rate than higher concentrations. This dependency is similar to the variation of basin-wide denudation rates, which yield higher estimates for lower TCN concentrations (i.e., following deep-seated mass wasting events) and lower values for higher concentrations (i.e. steady background denudation, Niemi et al., 2005; Antinao Rojas, 2009). To check this relationship between estimates of episodic erosion rate and measured TCN concentrations, we adjusted the TCN concentration of the fresher surface of a sample pair to a value that would have been measured prior to plucking of a 50 cm thick bedrock block at the end of the last glaciation (i.e., the timing of deglaciation 15 ka, Fig. A3.13). The episodic erosion rate calculated for the adjusted (higher) TCN concentration has a mode of 3.25 mm ka$^{-1}$ ($^{+5.8}_{-1.1}$ mm ka$^{-1}$, 1σ error range), which is considerably lower than
calculated for the measured (lower) TCN concentration (mode 7.25 mm ka\(^{-1}\), 1σ error range \(-3.0/_{+8.3}\) mm ka\(^{-1}\)). In addition, the timing of last plucking event (prior to removal of 50 cm of rock at 15 ka) is earlier (300 \(-92/_{+243}\) ka) than for the measured TCN concentrations (200 \(-162/_{+22}\) ka), indicating that our calculations are reasonable.
Fig. A3.12  Variation of timing of last plucking event (plotted on horizontal axis) with A. \( \delta^{18} \)O value, B. Subaerial erosion rate, C. Thickness of removed bedrock block, and D. Episodic erosion rate. In each panel, the left figure shows the timing of last plucking for the weathered surface (here sample A255, site 10, Table 4.2, Fig. 4.2a) and the right figure displays the timing of last plucking of the fresher surface (sample A356, Fig. 4.2b).
Fig. A3.13 Comparison of normalised probability distributions determined with the Monte Carlo approach for sample A356 (fresh surface site 10, Table 4.2, Fig. 4.2b) using the A. measured TCN concentration, and B. a hypothetical TCN concentration prior to plucking of a 50 cm thick bedrock block at the end of the last glaciation (i.e., timing of deglaciation 15 ka). Red lines are calculated probabilities, blue lines are smoothed probabilities, black solid line is the mode, and dashed lines the 1σ error ranges.
A3.6 REFERENCES FOR A3


APPENDIX A4 – MATLAB® Codes

A4.1 INTRODUCTION

This appendix contains all Matlab codes required for the calculations used in this thesis, with the exception of the codes for scaling production rates to site-specific locations (LSD code adapted from Lifton et al., 2014) and for plotting error ellipses (Balco et al., 2008). In order to use the LSC-scaling scheme, the ‘consts’ matrix has first to be loaded into the workspace. For plotting error ellipses in the burialplot, the code ‘ellipse’ from Balco et al. (2008) is used with slight modifications.

All calculations are completed with the measured TCN concentrations and by scaling production rates to site-specific locations (Table A4.1). For the burialplot, TCN concentrations had to be normalized to a common location, which I have chosen to be an average location at sea level on Cumberland Peninsula (66.50°N, 65.20°W, 0 m, Table A4.2). For displaying the LR04 record in the burialplot and modelling of complex exposure histories with the Monte Carlo method, two tables containing the duration of individual exposure and burial intervals over the last 3 Ma for different δ¹⁸O values (from 3.5 to 4.5 ppm, in 0.5 ppm steps) are loaded within the functions (Table A4.3 - A4.4, Lisiecki and Raymo, 2005).

Additional Matlab functions not included in this appendix:

Tor_ellipse.m Balco et al. (2008)

LSD scaling code Lifton et al. (2014)
A4.2 MATLAB INPUT FILES

### A4.2.1 Tor Data

#### Table A4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%Latitude</th>
<th>%Longitude</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>%Be conc</th>
<th>%Be conc error</th>
<th>%Al conc</th>
<th>%Al conc error</th>
<th>%Field ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% (dd, dd)</td>
<td>% (dd, dd)</td>
<td>% (m)</td>
<td>% (atoms)</td>
<td></td>
<td>% (atoms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.60</td>
<td>-65.54</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>70273.23%</td>
<td>0.0000000000</td>
<td>0.0000000000</td>
<td>0.0000000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.60</td>
<td>-65.54</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>126106.50%</td>
<td>0.0000000000</td>
<td>0.0000000000</td>
<td>0.0000000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.60</td>
<td>-65.54</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>96057.15%</td>
<td>0.0000000000</td>
<td>0.0000000000</td>
<td>0.0000000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.60</td>
<td>-65.54</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>140630.27%</td>
<td>0.0000000000</td>
<td>0.0000000000</td>
<td>0.0000000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.60</td>
<td>-65.54</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>133988.95%</td>
<td>0.0000000000</td>
<td>0.0000000000</td>
<td>0.0000000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A4.1** Input data for all tor sites (measured values).
## A4.2.2 LR04 Exposure and Burial Intervals

Table A4.3 Durations of exposure intervals (in ka) for different $\delta^{18}$O (indicated in first row) for the last 3 Ma derived from LR04. The most recent exposure duration is listed at the top going further back in time downwards in the table. The values for the last ice-free period are overwritten with the timing of deglaciation determined for the region (see Chapter 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$%^{18}$O</th>
<th>$%^{18}$O</th>
<th>$%^{18}$O</th>
<th>$%^{18}$O</th>
<th>$%^{18}$O</th>
<th>$%^{18}$O</th>
<th>$%^{18}$O</th>
<th>$%^{18}$O</th>
<th>$%^{18}$O</th>
<th>$%^{18}$O</th>
<th>$%^{18}$O</th>
<th>$%^{18}$O</th>
<th>$%^{18}$O</th>
<th>$%^{18}$O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ka)</td>
<td>(ka)</td>
<td>(ka)</td>
<td>(ka)</td>
<td>(ka)</td>
<td>(ka)</td>
<td>(ka)</td>
<td>(ka)</td>
<td>(ka)</td>
<td>(ka)</td>
<td>(ka)</td>
<td>(ka)</td>
<td>(ka)</td>
<td>(ka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A4.3

Durations of exposure intervals (in ka) for different $\delta^{18}$O (indicated in first row) for the last 3 Ma derived from LR04. The most recent exposure duration is listed at the top going further back in time downwards in the table. The values for the last ice-free period are overwritten with the timing of deglaciation determined for the region (see Chapter 4).
Table A4.3 Durations of burial intervals (in ka) for different $\delta^{18}O$ (indicated in first row) for the last 3 Ma derived from LR04. The third row restates the values of $\delta^{18}O$, which are read by the Matlab code to choose the right column number to retrieve burial and exposure durations, respectively. The most recent burial duration is listed at the top of the table going further back in time downwards in the table.
A4.3 MONTE CARLO METHOD FOR EPISODIC EROSION RATES

function out = CP_MCsim_LR04 (tordata, expdata, burdata, sample, minbur, maxbur, expdur, averate, deglac, icethick, acc_sigma, acc_res, maxnoresults, usewaitbar, consts)
%example:> CP MCsim LR04('CP_alltor.txt', 'exp LR04.txt', 'bur LR04.txt', [7 8], 11, 16, 0, [0 4], 15, 5000, 1, 100000, 500, true, consts)

%INPUTS:
%tordata = name of ascii file with columns of data (e.g. 'data.txt'):
% column 1 is the decimal latitude of each sample;
% column 2 is the decimal longitude of each sample;
% column 3 is the elevation of each sample; (m)
% column 4 is measured [10Be]; (atoms/g)
% column 5 is the measured 1 sigma error in [10Be]; (atoms/g)
% column 6 is the measured [26Al]; (atoms/g)
% column 7 is the measured 1 sigma error in [26Al]; (atoms/g)

%expdata = name of ascii file with coloumns of exposure intervals for different cutoff values
%burdata = name of ascii file with columns of burial intervals for different cutoff values

%sample = the row numbers of the samples you wish to model

%minbur = min number of ice ages required to model complex exposure history

%maxbur = max number of ice ages required to model complex exposure history

%expdur = best guess for average duration of ice-free intervals in percentage of the total glacial cycle (i.e. 0.185 for 18.5ka of 100ka glacial cycle); if 0 use LR04

%averate = best guess for average steady state erosion rate during interglacials; (mm/ka = m/Ma = le-1 cm/ka = le-4 cm/a)

%deglac = estimated time of last deglaciation of tor sites (ideally based on data); (ka)

%icethick = average ice thickness covering sample site during each burial episode; (cm)

%acc_sigma = range for calculated concentrations to be accepted as valuable simulations (not directly chi2)

%acc_res = min number of successful iterations (for both surfaces)

%maxnoresults = max number of attempts to find solution for one sample %before moving to a different set of expdur and burnumb
%usewaitbar = optional, if 'true' will display the progress of the simulation

%consts = a matlab structure containing constants used in the LSD scaling model. This structure is loaded in the startup.m file

%A.Margreth, 2012 - 2014.
%Based on burialplot code of Alan Hidy, support from Paul Mattern and discussion with Lawrence Plug. LSD scaling scheme adapted from A.Hidy.
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%

%load data
burial_data = load(tordata);
lats = burial_data(:,1);
longs = burial_data(:,2);
elevs = burial_data(:,3);
Be_concs = burial_data(:,4);
Be_errs = burial_data(:,5);
Al_concs = burial_data(:,6);
Al_errs = burial_data(:,7);

if expdur == 0
    exp_data = load(expdata);
    bur_data = load(burdata);
    bur_int = size(bur_data);
    maxbur = bur_int(1); %set total lengths of bur_data as maxbur
    cutoff = bur_data(1,:); %3.5:0.05:4.5;
    [r_cutoff, c_cutoff] = size(cutoff);
end

%set stepsize for normally distributed parameters and values for lognormal-distribution
% stdexpdur = 0.03;
% stderate = 0.25;
% avthick = 60;
% stdthick = 10;
% a_beta = 6;
% b_beta = 6;
mu_plkth = 2; %mean of normal distribution of log(plkthick)
sigma_plkth = 0.25; %std of normal distribution of log(plkthick)
% min_plkth = 10;
% max_plkth = 200;
%densities used for buildup (g/cc)
r_density = 2.65;
ice_density = 0.9;

%Because muonproduction function requires massdepth as input -> transform any depth to rock-equivalent depth, which can then be multiplied by rock density
depth_ice = icethick*ice_density/r_density;
%recalculate ice thickness to a rock-equivalent thickness

%decay constants (1/s)
Be10_lambda = log(2)/1378000;
%Chmeleff et al. (2010), Korschinek et al. (2010)
Al26_lambda = log(2)/720000; %Nishiizumi (2004)
% neutron attenuation length (g/cm^2)
eutron_atten = 150;

% Follows Balco et al. (2008); see Gosse and Phillips (2001)

% Reference spallogenic production (atoms/g/a)
refspalprod = 4.0; % New prod rate, Brocher et al. (subm.);

ratio_init = 6.75; % Nishiizumi et al. (1989); Balco et al. (2008);
6.1/1.106 to reflect recalibration of Nishiizumi et al. (2007)

% Scaling production to site of interest (spallogenic and muogenic)
% Pre-calculation of muonic production for ice-free intervals and for
% average ice-thickness covering site during burial intervals (requires
% initially a bit of time to calculate)
muon_depth = 0:1:round(maxbur*100);
fmuon_prod = nan(4,numel(muon_depth));
nmuon_prod = nan(4,numel(muon_depth));

% Get LSD scaling factors for last ice free interval since deglaciation
maxage_dgl = deglac * 1000;
% age over which to integrate production rates
LSD10 = LSD(lats(sample(1)),longs(sample(1)),elevs(sample(1)),1,maxage_dgl,1,10);
LSD26 = LSD(lats(sample(1)),longs(sample(1)),elevs(sample(1)),1,maxage_dgl,1,26);
agegrid = 0:1:maxage_dgl;
% Average cutoff rigidity (RC) and solar modulation (SPhi) over age range
meanRC = mean(interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.Rc,aagegrid));
meanSPhi = mean(interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.SPhi,aagegrid));
% Average spallogenic surface production rate over age range
Be10_spprod = mean(refspalprod.*interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.Be,aagegrid));
Al26_spprod = mean(refspalprod.*ratio_init.*interpolate(LSD26.tv,LSD26.Al,aagegrid));
[Be10_fmuprod, Be10_nmuprod] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD(0 * r_density, LSD10.pressure, meanRC, meanSPhi,consts,10,'no');
[Al26_fmuprod, Al26_nmuprod] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD(0 * r_density, LSD10.pressure, meanRC, meanSPhi,consts,26,'no');

% Get LSD scaling factors for previous exp and bur intervals (integrated
% over 100ka)
maxage = 100000; % age over which to integrate production rates
LSD10 = LSD(lats(sample(1)),longs(sample(1)),elevs(sample(1)),1,maxage,-1,10);
LSD26 = LSD(lats(sample(1)),longs(sample(1)),elevs(sample(1)),1,maxage,-1,26);
agegrid = 0:1:maxage;
% Average cutoff rigidity (RC) and solar modulation (SPhi) over age range
meanRC = mean(interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.Rc,aagegrid));
meanSPhi = mean(interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.SPhi,aagegrid));
% Average spallogenic surface production rate over age range
Be10_spalprodrate = mean(refspalprod.*interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.Be,aagegrid));
Al26_spalprodrate =
mean(refspalprod.*ratio_init.*interpolate(LSD26.tv,LSD26.Al,agegrid));
%average total muogenic surface production rate over age range
for i_muon = 1:numel(muon_depth)
    [fmuon_prod(1,i_muon), nmuon_prod(1,i_muon)] =
    CP_P_mu_totalLSD(muon_depth(i_muon) *
    r_density,LSD10.pressure,meanRC,meanSPhi,consts,10,'no');
    [fmuon_prod(2,i_muon), nmuon_prod(2,i_muon)] =
    CP_P_mu_totalLSD(muon_depth(i_muon) *
    r_density,LSD10.pressure,meanRC,meanSPhi,consts,26,'no');
    [fmuon_prod(3,i_muon), nmuon_prod(3,i_muon)] =
    CP_P_mu_totalLSD((muon_depth(i_muon)+depth_ice) *
    r_density,LSD10.pressure,meanRC,meanSPhi,consts,10,'no');
    [fmuon_prod(4,i_muon), nmuon_prod(4,i_muon)] =
    CP_P_mu_totalLSD((muon_depth(i_muon)+depth_ice) *
    r_density,LSD10.pressure,meanRC,meanSPhi,consts,26,'no');
end

%**********************************************************************
%**********************************************************************
%Model of complex exposure histories to fit measured nuclide
concentrations to determine timing of last plucking event and derive
probability density functions of episodic erosion rate and other
variables

%Define vectors and matrices for saving results of individual runs and
for successful runs for all samples
nsample = numel(sample);
res_sumchi2 = nan(acc_res, 2+2*nsample); %coloums: sum_chi2,
counter_exp, chi2(nsample), numb_runs(nsample), (indexing over i_acc)
res_exp = nan(1000000, 3); %coloums: exp_part, burnumb, erate
for i_sample = 1:nsample
    res_acc.(sprintf('sample%d', i_sample)) = struct('values',
    nan(acc_res, 10), 'lowering', nan(acc_res, 7), 'events', nan(acc_res,
    maxbur), 'thickn', nan(acc_res, maxbur+1));
    %res.(sprintf('sample%d', i_sample)) = struct('acc', false(1000000,1),
    'values', nan(1000000, 7), 'events', nan(1000000, maxbur), 'thickn',
    nan(1000000, maxbur+1));
end

if expdur == 0
    frac = cutoff;
else
    frac = expdur(1):0.01:expdur(2);
end
esa = averate(1):0.1:averate(2);
ttot = 0:0.1:3; %make vector starting at 0Ma to 3Ma with spacing 100ka
chi2exp_sum = zeros(numel(frac), numel(esa), numel(ttot));
chi2exp_num = zeros(numel(frac), numel(esa), numel(ttot));
chi2exp_max = zeros(numel(frac), numel(esa), numel(ttot));
tsp = 0:50:3000; %make vector starting at 0 to 3000ka with spacing 50ka
eep = 0:0.25:30;
freq = 0:1:30;
for i_sample = 1:nsample
    chi2_res.(sprintf('sample%d', i_sample)) = struct('sum', zeros(numel(tsp), numel(eep), numel(freq)), 'num', zeros(numel(tsp), numel(eep), numel(freq)));
end

%======================================================================
%outer loop with calculation of environmental variables, which have to be valid for all samples, and an inner loop where additional variations, which are individual for each sample, are performed
rand('state', sum(100*clock));
%rng('shuffle');
min_chi2(1:nsample) = 0;
numb_runs(1:nsample) = 0;
counter_exp = 0;
% numb_res(1:nsample) = 0;
numb_exp = 0;
save_res(1:nsample) = 0;
save_exp = 0;
if usewaitbar
    fprintf('
 starting simulation')
    fprintf('%7d/%7d', 0, acc_res)
end

%----------------------------------------------------------------------
%start outer loop which runs until n = acc_res solutions are found
for i_acc = 1:acc_res
    new_att = true;
    while new_att % outer loop with environmental factors
        counter_exp = counter_exp + 1;
        save_exp = save_exp + 1;
        min_chi2(:) = nan;

        %Define total duration of complex exposure history and duration of exposure interval compared to burial interval in one glacial cycle
        if expdur == 0
            rand_cutoff = randperm(c_cutoff);
            exp_part = cutoff(rand_cutoff(1));
            exp_dur = exp_data(:,rand_cutoff(1));
            bur_dur = bur_data(2:end,rand_cutoff(1));
            extimes = exp_dur(~isnan(exp_dur));
            burtimes = bur_dur(~isnan(bur_dur));
            exp_times = flipud(exptimes)' * 1000;
            bur_times = flipud(burtimes)' * 1000;
            [r_burtimes, c_burtimes] = size(bur_times);
            maxbur = c_burtimes; %set total lengths of bur_times as maxbur (bur_times for each cutoff value different)
        else
            %exp_part = ceil(1000*(expdur + stdexpdur*randn))/1000; %%%normal distribution of exp_part with average expdur and stdev stdexpdur
            %exp_part = expdur(1) + (floor(rand(1,1) * (expdur(2)*100 - expdur(1)*100 +1)))/100;
            if exp_part <= 0; exp_part = 0; end
            exp_dur = nan(maxbur+1, 1);
        end
    end

end

279
bur_dur = nan(maxbur, 1);
for i_exp = 1:maxbur+1-9
    exp_dur(i_exp) = exp_part * 41;
end
for i_exp = maxbur+1-8:maxbur+1
    exp_dur(i_exp) = exp_part * 100;
end
for i_bur = 1:maxbur-9
    bur_dur(i_bur) = (1 - exp_part) * 41;
end
for i_bur = maxbur-8:maxbur
    bur_dur(i_bur) = (1 - exp_part) * 100;
end
exp_times = exp_dur' * 1000;
bur_times = bur_dur' * 1000;
end
exp_times(1,end) = deglac * 1000; %%%comment if no different
last deglaciation should be used
burnumb = minbur + floor(rand(1,1) * (maxbur - minbur+1));
burn_index = maxbur+1 - burnumb;
burev = burn_index:maxbur;

%random variation of erosion rate
erate = averate(1) + (floor(rand(1,1) * 10*(averate(2) -
averate(1))))/10;
eros = erate/10000; %convert to cm/a from m/Ma
% eros = ceil(10*(averate + stderate*randn)) / 10000;
% if eros < 0; eros = 0; end

%define new lambda term for accounting for erosion during exposure
intervals
elambda = nan(1,6);
elambda(1) = Be10_lambda + eros*r_density/neutron_atten;
%spallogenic 10Be
elambda(2) = Al26_lambda + eros*r_density/neutron_atten;
%spallogenic 26Al
elambda(3) = Be10_lambda + eros*r_density/1500;
%negative muogenic 10Be
elambda(4) = Al26_lambda + eros*r_density/1500;
%negative muogenic 26Al
elambda(5) = Be10_lambda + eros*r_density/4320;
%fast muogenic 10Be
elambda(6) = Al26_lambda + eros*r_density/4320;
%fast muogenic 26Al

%save environmental data (indexing over counter_exp)
res_exp(save_exp,1:3) = [exp_part burnumb eros*10000];

if mod(counter_exp,1000000) == 0
    numb_exp = numb_exp + 1;
    file_exp = sprintf('res_exp_%i.mat', numb_exp);
    save(file_exp, 'res_exp');
    save_exp = 0;
    res_exp(:, :) = nan;
end
%Random variation of plucking thickness, number of plucking events and
plucking events for each individual sample
for i_sample = 1:nsample
    strname = sprintf('sample%i', i_sample);
    noresult = true;
    resultmaxnoresult = false;
    counter_att = 0;
    if usewaitbar
        fprintf(' 
    end
    while noresult && counter_att < maxnoresults
        counter_att = counter_att + 1;
        numb_runs(i_sample) = numb_runs(i_sample) + 1;
        save_res(i_sample) = save_res(i_sample) + 1;
        rand_numbplkev = randperm(burnumb);
        numb_plkev = rand_numbplkev(1);
        rand_burev = burev(randperm(numel(burev)));
        plk_events = sort(rand_burev(1:numb_plkev));
        %plk_thick = ceil(avthick + stdthick*randn(1,numb_plkev));
        %plk_thick = ceil(betarnd(a_beta,b_beta,1,numb_plkev)*100);
        plk_thick =
            ceil(10*(lognrnd(mu_plkth,sigma_plkth,1,numb_plkev)));
        %plk_thick = min_plkth + floor(rand(1,numb_plkev) * (max_plkth+1 -
            min_plkth));
        cum_plk = [0, cumsum(plk_thick)];
        depth_index = find(cum_plk(end) == muon_depth);
    end
    burbe = 0;
    bural = 0;
end
%calculate alternating exposure and burial intervals, incl. decay of
previous accumulated isotopes (corrected for erosion during exposure
intervals)
for k = bur_index:1:maxbur
%muon_depth(depth_index)
%Be10_totprod = Be10_spalprodrate*exp(-
    muon_depth(depth_index)*r_density/neutron_atten) +
    fmuon_prod(1,depth_index) + nmuo
    %muon_depth(depth_index)) + nmuo
    %Be10_elambda = (Be10_spalprodrate*exp(-
        muon_depth(depth_index)*r_density/neutron_atten)) /Be10_totprod*elambda(1) +
        fmuon_prod(1,depth_index)/Be10_totprod*elambda(5) +
        nmuo
        %Be10_elambda = (Al26_spalprodrate*exp(-
            muon_depth(depth_index)*r_density/neutron_atten)) /Al26_totprod*elambda(2);
2) + fmuon_prod(2,depth_index)/Al26_totpord*elambda(6) +
nmuon_prod(2,depth_index)/Al26_totpord*elambda(4);

   Be10_elambda = elambda(1);
   Al26_elambda = elambda(2);
   expbe = burbe*exp(-Be10_elambda*exp_times(k)) +
   (Be10_spalprodrate/elambda(1))*(1-exp(-elambda(1)*exp_times(k))) +
   (fmuon_prod(1,depth_index)/elambda(5))*(1-exp(-
   elambda(5)*exp_times(k))) + (nmuon_prod(1,depth_index)/elambda(3))*(1-
   exp(-elambda(3)*exp_times(k)));

   expal = bural*exp(-Al26_elambda*exp_times(k)) +
   (Al26_spalprodrate/elambda(2))*(1-exp(-elambda(2)*exp_times(k))) +
   (fmuon_prod(2,depth_index)/elambda(6))*(1-exp(-
   elambda(6)*exp_times(k))) + (nmuon_prod(2,depth_index)/elambda(4))*(1-
   exp(-elambda(4)*exp_times(k)));

   burbe = expbe*exp(Be10_lambda*bur_times(k)) +
   (Be10_spalprodrate/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-
   Be10_lambda*bur_times(k)))*exp(-
   (muon_depth(depth_index)+depth_ice)*r_density/neutron_atten) +
   (fmuon_prod(3,depth_index)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-
   Be10_lambda*bur_times(k))) +
   (nmuon_prod(3,depth_index)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-
   Be10_lambda*bur_times(k)));

   bural = expal*exp(Al26_lambda*bur_times(k)) +
   (Al26_spalprodrate/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-
   Al26_lambda*bur_times(k)))*exp(-
   (muon_depth(depth_index)+depth_ice)*r_density/neutron_atten) +
   (fmuon_prod(4,depth_index)/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-
   Al26_lambda*bur_times(k))) +
   (nmuon_prod(4,depth_index)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-
   Be10_lambda*bur_times(k)));

%check if plucking occurs during this burial event
for i_plk = 1:numb_plkev
   if k == plk_events(i_plk)
      depth_index = find(cum_plk(end-i_plk) ==
      muon_depth);
   end
end

%calculate last exposure interval since deglaciation of site
%Be10_totprod = Be10_spprod*exp(-
   muon_depth(depth_index)*r_density/neutron_atten) +
   fmuon_prod(1,depth_index) + nmuon_prod(1,depth_index);
%Al26_totpord = Al26_spprod*exp(-
   muon_depth(depth_index)*r_density/neutron_atten) +
   fmuon_prod(2,depth_index) + nmuon_prod(2,depth_index);
%Be10_elambda = (Be10_spprod*exp(-
   muon_depth(depth_index)*r_density/neutron_atten))/Be10_totprod*elambda(1) +
   fmuon_prod(1,depth_index)/Be10_totprod*elambda(5) +
   nmuon_prod(1,depth_index)/Be10_totprod*elambda(3);
%Al26_elambda = (Al26_spprod*exp(-muon_depth(depth_index)*r_density/neutron_atten))/Al26_totpord*elambda(2) + fmuon_prod(2,depth_index)/Al26_totpord*elambda(6) + nmuon_prod(2,depth_index)/Al26_totpord*elambda(4);
    Be10_elambda = elambda(1);
    Al26_elambda = elambda(2);
    expbe = burbe*exp(-Be10_elambda*exp_times(maxbur+1)) + (Be10_spprod/elambda(1))*(1-exp(-elambda(1)*exp_times(maxbur+1)))*exp(-muon_depth(depth_index)*r_density/neutron_atten) + (Be10_fmuprod/elambda(5))*(1-exp(-elambda(5)*exp_times(maxbur+1))) + (Be10_nmuprod/elambda(3))*(1-exp(-elambda(3)*exp_times(maxbur+1)));
    expal = bural*exp(-Al26_elambda*exp_times(maxbur+1)) + (Al26_spprod/elambda(2))*(1-exp(-elambda(2)*exp_times(maxbur+1)))*exp(-muon_depth(depth_index)*r_density/neutron_atten) + (Al26_fmuprod/elambda(6))*(1-exp(-elambda(6)*exp_times(maxbur+1))) + (Al26_nmuprod/elambda(4))*(1-exp(-elambda(4)*exp_times(maxbur+1)));

%saving all simulated results:
    chi2 = ((expbe - Be_concs(sample(i_sample))) / Be_errs(sample(i_sample)))^2 + ((expal - Al_concs(sample(i_sample))) / Al_errs(sample(i_sample)))^2;
    min_chi2(i_sample) = min(min(min_chi2(i_sample)), chi2);
    %res.(strname).values(save_res(i_sample), 1) = chi2;
    %res.(strname).values(save_res(i_sample), 2:3) = [expbe expal];
    %res.(strname).values(save_res(i_sample), 4:7) = [numb_plkev, plk_events(end), cum_plk(2), counter_exp];
    %res.(strname).events(save_res(i_sample), 1:numb_plkev) = plk_events(end:-1:1);
    %res.(strname).thickn(save_res(i_sample), 1:numb_plkev+1) = cum_plk;
    %from sim ann (1:numb_plkev+1);

%weight results by chi-squared value
    if expdur == 0
        tot_hist = (sum(exp_times(bur_index:end)) + sum(bur_times(bur_index:end)))/10^6; %Ma
        last_plkev = (sum(bur_times(plk_events(end):end)) + sum(exp_times(plk_events(end)+1:end)))/10^3; %in ka, starting from following exposure interval, but not including burial interval of plucking event
        av_exp = (sum(exp_times(bur_index:end)))*10^-6)/tot_hist; %calculates %exp for this run
    else
        tot_hist = (burnumb-9)*0.041 + 0.9; %in Ma
        last_plkev = (sum(bur_times(plk_events(end):end)) + sum(exp_times(plk_events(end)+1:end)))/10^3; %in ka, starting from following exposure interval, but not including burial interval of plucking event
        av_exp = exp_part;
    end
    w_chi2 = exp(-chi2./2);
    [dump, xind] = min(abs(tsp-last_plkev));
[dump, yind] = min(abs(eep-
(sum(plk_thick)/100)/tot_hist);
[dump, zind] = min(abs(freq-numb_plkev/tot_hist));
chi2_res.(strname).sum(xind,yind,zind) =
max(chi2_res.(strname).sum(xind,yind,zind),w_ch2);
chi2_res.(strname).num(xind,yind,zind) =
chi2_res.(strname).num(xind,yind,zind) + 1;

%check if final nuclide concentration is within acceptable range of
uncertainty from measured concentration, then save accepted results
if (Be_concs(sample(i_sample)) -
acc_sigma*Be_errs(sample(i_sample)) <= expbe) && (expbe <=
Be_concs(sample(i_sample)) + acc_sigma*Be_errs(sample(i_sample)))
if (Al_concs(sample(i_sample)) -
acc_sigma*Al_errs(sample(i_sample)) <= expal) && (expal <=
Al_concs(sample(i_sample)) + acc_sigma*Al_errs(sample(i_sample)))
noresult = false;
res_acc.(strname).values(i_acc, 1:10) = [chi2,
counter_exp, exp_part, burnumb, maxburn, eros*10000,
numb_runs(i_sample), numb_plkev, plk_events(end), cum_plk(2)];
res_acc.(strname).events(i_acc, 1:numb_plkev) =
plk_events(end:-1:1);
res_acc.(strname).thickn(i_acc, 1:nomb_plkev) =
plk_thick; %res_acc.(strname).thickn(i_acc, 1:nomb_plkev+1) = cum_plk;
res_acc.(strname).lowering(i_acc, 1) =
numb_plkev/tot_hist;
res_acc.(strname).lowering(i_acc, 2) =
(sum(plk_thick)/100)/tot_hist; %lowering rate in m Ma-1
res_acc.(strname).lowering(i_acc, 3:7) =
[(sum(plk_thick)/100)/numb_plkev, sum(plk_thick)/100, tot_hist,
av_exp*100, last_plkev];
res.(strname).acc(save_res(i_sample),1) = true;
if counter_att == maxnoresults
resultmaxnoresult = true;
end
end

%save structure for sample if full and empty
if mod(numb_runs(i_sample),1000000) == 0
%numb_res(i_sample) = numb_res(i_sample) + 1;
%file_res = sprintf('res_sample%i_%i.mat', i_sample,
numb_res(i_sample));
%save(file_res, '-struct', 'res', strname);
%save_res(i_sample) = 0;
%res.(strname).acc(:) = false;
%res.(strname).values(:) = nan;
%res.(strname).events(:) = nan;
%res.(strname).thickn(:) = nan;
%end

end %while noresult

if ~resultmaxnoresult
if counter_att == maxnoresults
min_chi2(isnan(min_chi2)) = 0;
sumchi2 = sum(min_chi2(:));
wexp_ch2 = exp(-sumchi2./2);
[dump, xind] = min(abs(frac-exp_part));
[dump, yind] = min(abs(esa-eros*10000));
[dump, zind] = min(abs(ttot-tot_hist));
chi2exp_sum(xind,yind,zind) =

chi2exp_sum(xind,yind,zind) + wexp_ch2;
chi2exp_num(xind,yind,zind) =
chi2exp_num(xind,yind,zind) + 1;
chi2exp_max (xind,yind,zind) =
max(chi2exp_max(xind,yind,zind),wexp_ch2);

break %exit for i_sample = 1:nsample loop
end

if i_sample == nsample
    new_att = false;
end

end %for i_sample = 1:nsamle
end %while new_att

res_sumchi2(i_acc,1:2) = [sum(min_chi2(:)), counter_exp];
res_sumchi2(i_acc,3:1:2+nsample) = min_chi2(:);
res_sumchi2(i_acc,3+nsample:1:end) = numb_runs(:);

wexp_ch2 = exp(-res_sumchi2(i_acc,1)./2);
[dump, xind] = min(abs(frac-exp_part));
[dump, yind] = min(abs(esa-eros*10000));
[dump, zind] = min(abs(ttot-tot_hist));
chi2exp_sum(xind,yind,zind) = chi2exp_sum(xind,yind,zind) +
wexp_ch2;
chi2exp_num(xind,yind,zind) = chi2exp_num(xind,yind,zind) + 1;
chi2exp_max (xind,yind,zind) =
max(chi2exp_max(xind,yind,zind),wexp_ch2);

end %for i_runs

%generate probability density functions for environmental and sample
%specific parameters
valid = chi2exp_num > 0;
chi2exp_sum(valid) = chi2exp_sum(valid)./chi2exp_num(valid);
probs_exp = cell(2,3);
maxs_exp = cell(2,3);
cums_exp = cell(2,3);
probmax_exp = nan(2,3);
sigma1minus_exp = zeros(2,3);
sigma1plus_exp = zeros(2,3);
sigma2minus_exp = zeros(2,3);
sigma2plus_exp = zeros(2,3);
probs_exp{1,1} = sum(sum(chi2exp_sum,2),3);
probs_exp{1,1} = probs_exp{1,1}. / sum(probs_exp{1,1});
maxs_exp{1,1} = max(max(chi2exp_sum,[],[],2),[],[],3);
cums_exp{1,1} = cumsum(probs_exp{1,1}) / sum(probs_exp{1,1});
[b_1,i_1] = unique(cums_exp{1,1});
probmax_exp{1,1} = max(probs_exp{1,1}) == probs_exp{1,1});
sigma1minus_exp{1,1} = interp1(b_1,fractional(i_1), 0.15865);
sigma1plus_exp{1,1} = interp1(b_1,fractional(i_1), 0.84135);
sigma2minus_exp{1,1} = interp1(b_1,fractional(i_1), 0.023);
sigma2plus_exp{1,1} = interp1(b_1,fractional(i_1), 0.977);

probs_exp{1,2} = sum(sum(chi2exp_sum,2),3);
probs_exp{1,2} = probs_exp{1,2}. / sum(probs_exp{1,2});
maxs_exp{1,2} = max(max(chi2exp_sum,[],[],2),[],[],3);
cums_exp{1,2} = cumsum(probs_exp{1,2}) / sum(probs_exp{1,2});
[b_2,i_2] = unique(cums_exp{1,2});
probmax_exp{1,2} = max(probs_exp{1,2}) == probs_exp{1,2});
sigma1minus_exp{1,2} = interp1(b_2,fractional(i_2), 0.15865);
sigma1plus_exp{1,2} = interp1(b_2,fractional(i_2), 0.84135);
sigma2minus_exp{1,2} = interp1(b_2,fractional(i_2), 0.023);
sigma2plus_exp{1,2} = interp1(b_2,fractional(i_2), 0.977);

ph = nan(1,3);
ph(:) = sum(sum(chi2exp_sum,1),2);
probs_exp{1,3} = ph;
maxs_exp{1,3} = max(max(chi2exp_sum,[],[],2),[],[],3);
cums_exp{1,3} = cumsum(probs_exp{1,3}) / sum(probs_exp{1,3});
[b_3,i_3] = unique(cums_exp{1,3});
probmax_exp{1,3} = max(probs_exp{1,3}) == probs_exp{1,3});
sigma1minus_exp{1,3} = interp1(b_3,ttot(i_3), 0.15865);
sigma1plus_exp{1,3} = interp1(b_3,ttot(i_3), 0.84135);
sigma2minus_exp{1,3} = interp1(b_3,ttot(i_3), 0.023);
sigma2plus_exp{1,3} = interp1(b_3,ttot(i_3), 0.977);
sigma2plus_exp(2,2) = interp1(b_2,esa(i_2),0.977);

ph(:) = sum(sum(chi2exp_max,1),2);
probs_exp(2,3) = ph;
maxs_exp(2,3) = max(max(chi2exp_sum,[],1),[],2);
cums_exp(2,3) = cumsum(probs_exp(2,3))/sum(probs_exp(2,3));
{b_3, i_3} = unique(cums_exp(2,3));
probmax_exp(2,3) = ttot(max(max(probs_exp(2,3))) == probs_exp(2,3));
sigma1minus_exp(2,3) = interp1(b_3,ttot(i_3),0.15865);
sigma1plus_exp(2,3) = interp1(b_3,ttot(i_3),0.84135);
sigma2minus_exp(2,3) = interp1(b_3,ttot(i_3),0.023);
sigma2plus_exp(2,3) = interp1(b_3,ttot(i_3),0.977);

probs = cell(nsample,3);
maxs = cell(nsample,3);
cums = cell(nsample,3);
probmax = nan(nsample,3);
sigma1minus = zeros(nsample,3);
sigma1plus = zeros(nsample,3);
sigma2minus = zeros(nsample,3);
sigma2plus = zeros(nsample,3);

for i_sample = 1:nsample
    strname = sprintf('sample%i', i_sample);
    %valid = chi2_res.(strname).num > 0;
    %chi2_res.(strname).sum(valid) =
    chi2_res.(strname).sum(valid).*chi2_res.(strname).sum;
    probs{i_sample,1} = sum(sum(chi2_res.(strname).sum,2),3);
    probs{i_sample,1} = probs{i_sample,1}/sum(probs{i_sample,1});
    maxs{i_sample,1} = max(max(chi2_res.(strname).sum,[],2),[],3);
    cums{i_sample,1} =
    cumsum(probs{i_sample,1})/sum(probs{i_sample,1});
    [b_1, i_1] = unique(cums{i_sample,1});
    probmax(i_sample,1) = tsp(max(probs{i_sample,1}) ==
    probs{i_sample,1});
    sigma1minus(i_sample,1) = interp1(b_1,tsp(i_1),0.15865);
    sigma1plus(i_sample,1) = interp1(b_1,tsp(i_1),0.84135);
    sigma2minus(i_sample,1) = interp1(b_1,tsp(i_1),0.023);
    sigma2plus(i_sample,1) = interp1(b_1,tsp(i_1),0.977);
    
    probs{i_sample,2} = sum(sum(chi2_res.(strname).sum,1),3);
    probs{i_sample,2} = probs{i_sample,2}/sum(probs{i_sample,2});
    maxs{i_sample,2} = max(max(chi2_res.(strname).sum,[],1),[],3);
    cums{i_sample,2} =
    cumsum(probs{i_sample,2})/sum(probs{i_sample,2});
    [b_2, i_2] = unique(cums{i_sample,2});
    probmax(i_sample,2) = eep(max(probs{i_sample,2}) ==
    probs{i_sample,2});
    sigma1minus(i_sample,2) = interp1(b_2,eep(i_2),0.15865);
    sigma1plus(i_sample,2) = interp1(b_2,eep(i_2),0.84135);
    sigma2minus(i_sample,2) = interp1(b_2,eep(i_2),0.023);
    sigma2plus(i_sample,2) = interp1(b_2,eep(i_2),0.977);

    ph(:) = sum(sum(chi2_res.(strname).sum,1),2);
    probs{i_sample,3} = ph;
probs\{i\_sample,3\} = probs\{i\_sample,3\}./sum(probs\{i\_sample,3\});
maxs\{i\_sample,3\} = max(max(chi2\_res.(strname).sum,[],1),[],2);
cums\{i\_sample,3\} = cumsum(probs\{i\_sample,3\})/sum(probs\{i\_sample,3\});
[b_3,i_3] = unique(cums\{i\_sample,3\});
probmax\{i\_sample,3\} = freq(max(probs\{i\_sample,3\}) == probs\{i\_sample,3\});
sigma1minus\{i\_sample,3\} = interp1(b_3,freq(i_3),0.15865);
sigma1plus\{i\_sample,3\} = interp1(b_3,freq(i_3),0.84135);
sigma2minus\{i\_sample,3\} = interp1(b_3,freq(i_3),0.023);
sigma2plus\{i\_sample,3\} = interp1(b_3,freq(i_3),0.977);
end

%======================================================================
%Export all data and display results
res\_exp = res\_exp(1:counter\_exp-numb\_exp*1000000,:);
file = sprintf('res\_exp\_%i.mat', numb\_exp+1);
save(file, 'res\_exp');
save res\_sumchi2.mat res\_sumchi2
save res\_chi2\_exp.mat probmax\_exp sigma1minus\_exp sigma1plus\_exp
sigma2minus\_exp sigma2plus\_exp probs\_exp maxs\_exp cums\_exp
chi2\_exp\_sum ch2\_exp\_num ch2\_exp\_max
save res\_chi2\_samples.mat probmax sigma1minus sigma1plus sigma2minus
sigma2plus probs maxs cums
for i\_sample = 1:nsample
%res.(sprintf('sample\_d', i\_sample)).acc = res.(sprintf('sample\_d', i\_sample)).acc(i:1 numa runs(i\_sample)-numb\_res\_sample\_d*1000000,); %coloums: chi2, conc\_be, conc\_al, numb\_kev, last\_kev\_control, last\_plk\_control, counter\_exp, att\_inner, numb\_runs(i)
%res.(sprintf('sample\_d', i\_sample)).values = res.(sprintf('sample\_d', i\_sample)).values(i:1 numa runs(i\_sample)-numb\_res\_sample\_d*1000000,);
%res.(sprintf('sample\_d', i\_sample)).events = res.(sprintf('sample\_d', i\_sample)).events(i:1 numa runs(i\_sample)-numb\_res\_sample\_d*1000000,);
%res.(sprintf('sample\_d', i\_sample)).thickn = res.(sprintf('sample\_d', i\_sample)).thickn(i:1 numa runs(i\_sample)-numb\_res\_sample\_d*1000000,);
%file\_res = sprintf('res\_sample\_d\_%d.mat', i\_sample, numb\_res(i\_sample)+1);
%save(file\_res, '-struct', 'res', sprintf('sample\_d', i\_sample));
%file\_res\_acc = sprintf('res\_acc\_sample\_d\_%d.mat', i\_sample);
%save(file\_res\_acc, '-struct', 'res\_acc', sprintf('sample\_d', i\_sample));
%file\_chi2\_res = sprintf('res\_chi2\_sample\_d', i\_sample);
%save(file\_chi2\_res, '-struct', 'chi2\_res', sprintf('sample\_d', i\_sample));
end

out = [numb\_runs acc\_res counter\_exp];
run\_input = [sample min\_bur max\_bur exp\_dur aver\_ate deglac ice\_thick
depth\_ice acc\_sigma acc\_res max\_no\_results];
save res\_run\_settings.mat out run\_input
sprod = [Be\_10\_spal\_prodrate Al\_26\_spal\_prodrate
Al\_26\_spal\_prodrate/Be\_10\_spal\_prodrate]
save prod\_int.mat sprod fmuon\_prod nmuon\_prod muon\_depth exp\_dur
bur\_dur
if usewaitbar
    fprintf('\n all solutions found')
    fprintf('%7d/%7d', i_acc, acc_res)
    sumchi2 = min(res_sumchi2(:,1));
    index = find(res_sumchi2(:,1) == sumchi2);
    i_environ = res_sumchi2(index,2);
    if i_environ <= 100000
        environ = res_exp(i_environ,1:3);
    else
        environ = nan(1:3);
    end
    fprintf('\n optimal solution')
    fprintf('\n sumchi2: %e', sumchi2)
    fprintf('\n')
    disp([' exp_part: ' num2str(environ(1))]);
    disp([' burnumb: ' num2str(environ(2))]);
    disp([' erate: ' num2str(environ(3))]);
    sample_chi2 = res_sumchi2(index,3:1:2+nsample)
    sample_numbrun = res_sumchi2(index,3+nsample:1:end)
end

save res_output.mat sumchi2 sample_chi2 sample_numbrun environ

%---------------------------------------------
% generate pdf's for weighted chi2 values
maxp_frac = max(probs_exp{1,1}./sum(probs_exp{1,1}));
maxp_esp = max(probs_exp{1,2}./sum(probs_exp{1,2}));
maxp_ttot = max(probs_exp{1,3}./sum(probs_exp{1,3}));
maxp_frac1 = max(probs_exp{2,1}./sum(probs_exp{2,1}));
maxp_esp1 = max(probs_exp{2,2}./sum(probs_exp{2,2}));
maxp_ttot1 = max(probs_exp{2,3}./sum(probs_exp{2,3}));

figure
subplot(2,3,1)
hold on
axis([3.5 4.5 0 1.1*maxp_frac])
plot(frac, probs_exp{1,1}./sum(probs_exp{1,1}), 'r-');
plot(frac,
    smooth(frac,probs_exp{1,1})./(sum(smooth(frac,probs_exp{1,1}))), 'b-','
    'linewidth', 2);
line([probmax_exp(1,1), probmax_exp(1,1)], [0 0.5], 'linestyle', '-',
    'color', 'k')
line([signalminus_exp(1,1), signalminus_exp(1,1)], [0 0.5],
    'linestyle', '-', 'color', 'k')
line([signalplus_exp(1,1), signalplus_exp(1,1)], [0 0.5], 'linestyle',
    '-', 'color', 'k')
xlabel('d18O value (ppm)')
ylabel('normalised probability')
subplot(2,3,2)
hold on
axis([0 4 0 1.1*maxp_esp])
plot(esa, probs_exp{1,2}./sum(probs_exp{1,2}), 'r-');
plot(esa,
    smooth(esa,probs_exp{1,2})./(sum(smooth(esa,probs_exp{1,2})))), 'b-',
    'linewidth', 2);
% plot(ttot, probs_exp{2,3}./sum(probs_exp{2,3}), 'r-');
plot(ttot,
    smooth(ttot,probs_exp{2,3})./(sum(smooth(ttot,probs_exp{2,3}))), 'b-',
    'linewidth', 2);
line([probmax_exp(2,3), probmax_exp(2,3)], [0 0.5], 'linestyle', '-',
    'color', 'k')
line([signalminus_exp(2,3), signalminus_exp(2,3)], [0 0.5],
    'linestyle', '-', 'color', 'k')
line([signalplus_exp(2,3), signalplus_exp(2,3)], [0 0.5], 'linestyle',
    '-', 'color', 'k')
xlabel('tot history (Ma)')
ylabel('normalised probability')

for i_sample = 1:nsample
    max_tsp = max(probs{i_sample,1}./sum(probs{i_sample,1}));
    max_eep = max(probs{i_sample,2}./sum(probs{i_sample,2}));
    max_frec = max(probs{i_sample,3}./sum(probs{i_sample,3}));

    figure
    subplot(1,3,1)
    hold on
    axis([0 3000 0 1.1*max_tsp])
    plot(tsp, probs{i_sample,1}./sum(probs{i_sample,1}), 'r-');
    plot(tsp,
        smooth(tsp,probs{i_sample,1})./(sum(smooth(tsp,probs{i_sample,1}))), 'b-',
        'linewidth', 2);
    line([probmax(i_sample,1), probmax(i_sample,1)], [0 0.1],
        'linestyle', '-', 'color', 'k')
    line([sigma1minus(i_sample,1), sigma1minus(i_sample,1)], [0 0.1],
        'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'k')
    line([sigma1plus(i_sample,1), sigma1plus(i_sample,1)], [0 0.1],
        'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'k')
    xlabel('time since last plucking (ka)')
    ylabel('normalised probability')
    subplot(1,3,2)
    hold on
    axis([0 15 0 1.1*max_eep])
    plot(eep, probs{i_sample,2}./sum(probs{i_sample,2}), 'r-');
    plot(eep,
        smooth(eep,probs{i_sample,2})./(sum(smooth(eep,probs{i_sample,2}))), 'b-',
        'linewidth', 2);
    line([probmax(i_sample,2), probmax(i_sample,2)], [0 0.05],
        'linestyle', '-', 'color', 'k')
    line([signalminus(i_sample,2), signalminus(i_sample,2)], [0 0.05],
        'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'k')
    line([signalplus(i_sample,2), signalplus(i_sample,2)], [0 0.05],
        'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'k')
    xlabel('episodic rate (mm ka-1)')
    ylabel('normalised probability')
    subplot(1,3,3)
    hold on
    axis([0 15 0 1.1*max_frec])
    % plot(freq, probs{i_sample,3}./sum(probs{i_sample,3}), 'r-');
    plot(freq,
        smooth(freq,probs{i_sample,3})./(sum(smooth(freq,probs{i_sample,3}))), 'b-',
        'linewidth', 2);
\begin{verbatim}
    line([probmax(i_sample,3), probmax(i_sample,3)], [0 0.18],
        'linestyle', '-', 'color', 'k')
    line([sigma1minus(i_sample,3), sigma1minus(i_sample,3)], [0 0.18],
        'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'k')
    line([sigma1plus(i_sample,3), sigma1plus(i_sample,3)], [0 0.18],
        'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'k')
    xlabel('frequency plucking (Ma-1)')
    ylabel('normalised probability')
end

%-----------------------------------------------
%Display results: histogramms of weighted chi-square values for the
%distribution of burial events for each plucking event
%plot histograms for all results and compare to acc. reuslts of
%occurrence of last plucking event
for i_sample = 1:nsample
    strname = sprintf('sample%i', i_sample);
    min_lplkev = min(res_acc.(strname).values(:,5)-
        res_acc.(strname).values(:,9));
    max_lplkev = max(res_acc.(strname).values(:,5)-
        res_acc.(strname).values(:,9));
    min_nplkev = min(res_acc.(strname).values(:,8));
    max_nplkev = max(res_acc.(strname).values(:,8));
    min_lplkth = floor(min(res_acc.(strname).values(:,10))/10)*10;
    max_lplkth = ceil(max(res_acc.(strname).values(:,10))/10)*10;
    r_lplkev = min_lplkev:1:max_lplkev;
    b_lplkev = numel(r_lplkev);
    r_nplkev = min_nplkev:1:max_nplkev;
    b_nplkev = numel(r_nplkev);
    r_lplkth = min_lplkth:10:max_lplkth;
    b_lplkth = numel(r_lplkth);

    figure
    subplot(3,3,1)
    hold on
    box on
    axis([0.9*min_lplkev 1.1*max_lplkev 0 acc_res]);
    hist(res_acc.(strname).values(:,5)-
        res_acc.(strname).values(:,9), b_lplkev)
    title('last plucking event')
    xlabel('burial episode')
    ylabel('frequency')
    legend(sprintf('sample %d', i_sample))
    subplot(3,3,2)
    hold on
    box on
    axis([0.9*min_nplkev 1.1*max_nplkev 0 acc_res]);
    hist(res_acc.(strname).values(:,8), b_nplkev)
    title('number plucking event')
    xlabel('number')
    ylabel('frequency')
    legend(sprintf('sample %d', i_sample))
    subplot(3,3,3)
    hold on
\end{verbatim}
box on
axis([0.9*min_lplkth 1.1*max_lplkth 0 acc_res]);
hist(res_acc.(strname).values(:,10), b_lplkth)
title('last plucking thickness')
xlabel('block thickness')
ylabel('frequency')
legend(sprintf('sample %d', i_sample))
subplot(3,3,4)
hold on
box on
plot(res_acc.(strname).values(:,1), res_acc.(strname).values(:,5) - res_acc.(strname).values(:,9), 'b.')
title('last plucking event')
xlabel('chi2')
ylabel('burial episode')
legend(sprintf('sample %d', i_sample))
subplot(3,3,5)
hold on
box on
plot(res_acc.(strname).values(:,1), res_acc.(strname).values(:,8), 'b.')
title('number plucking event')
xlabel('chi2')
ylabel('number')
legend(sprintf('sample %d', i_sample))
subplot(3,3,6)
hold on
box on
plot(res_acc.(strname).values(:,1), res_acc.(strname).values(:,10), 'b.')
title('last plucking thickness')
xlabel('chi2')
ylabel('block thickness')
legend(sprintf('sample %d', i_sample))
subplot(3,3,7)
hold on
box on
plot(res_sumchi2(:,1), res_acc.(strname).values(:,5) - res_acc.(strname).values(:,9), 'r.')
title('last plucking event')
xlabel('sum chi2')
ylabel('burial episode')
legend(sprintf('sample %d', i_sample))
subplot(3,3,8)
hold on
box on
plot(res_sumchi2(:,1), res_acc.(strname).values(:,8), 'r.')
title('number plucking event')
xlabel('sum chi2')
ylabel('number')
legend(sprintf('sample %d', i_sample))
subplot(3,3,9)
hold on
box on
plot(res_sumchi2(:,1), res_acc.(strname).values(:,10), 'r.')
title('last plucking thickness')
xlabel('sum chi2')
ylabel('block thickness')
legend(sprintf('sample %d', i_sample))
end

for i_sample = 1:nsample
    strname = sprintf('sample%i', i_sample);
    min_lastev = floor(min(res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,7))/100)*100;
    max_lastev = ceil(max(res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,7))/100)*100;
    min_rate = floor(min(res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,2)));
    max_rate = ceil(max(res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,2)));
    min_events = floor(min(res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,1)));
    max_events = ceil(max(res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,1)));

    range_lastev = min_lastev:50:max_lastev;
    rate_range = min_rate:0.25:max_rate;
    event_range = min_events:1:max_events;

    figure
    subplot(3,3,1)
    hold on
    box on
    axis([min_lastev max_lastev 0 acc_res]);
    hist(res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,7), range_lastev)
    title('last plucking event')
    xlabel('ka')
    ylabel('frequency')
    legend(sprintf('sample %d', sample(i_sample)))
    subplot(3,3,2)
    hold on
    box on
    axis([min_rate max_rate 0 acc_res]);
    hist(res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,2), rate_range)
    title('episodic erosion rate')
    xlabel('erosion rate (m Ma-1)')
    ylabel('frequency')
    legend(sprintf('sample %d', sample(i_sample)))
    subplot(3,3,3)
    hold on
    box on
    axis([min_events max_events 0 acc_res]);
    hist(res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,1), event_range)
    title('frequency of events')
    xlabel('number of events (Ma-1)')
    ylabel('frequency')
    legend(sprintf('sample %d', sample(i_sample)))
    subplot(3,3,4)
    hold on
    box on
    plot(res_acc.(strname).values(:,1),
         res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,7), 'b.'
    title('last plucking event')
    xlabel('chi2')
    ylabel('ka')
    legend(sprintf('sample %d', i_sample))
    subplot(3,3,5)
    hold on
box on
plot(res_acc.(strname).values(:,1),
    res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,2), 'b.'
    title('episodic erosion rate')
    xlabel('chi2')
    ylabel('erosion rate (m Ma-1)')
    legend(sprintf('sample %d', i_sample))
subplot(3,3,6)
hold on
box on
plot(res_acc.(strname).values(:,1),
    res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,1), 'b.'
    title('frequency of events')
    xlabel('chi2')
    ylabel('number of events (Ma-1)')
    legend(sprintf('sample %d', i_sample))
subplot(3,3,7)
hold on
box on
plot(res_sumchi2(:,1), res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,7), 'r.'
    title('last plucking event')
    xlabel('chi2')
    ylabel('ka')
    legend(sprintf('sample %d', i_sample))
subplot(3,3,8)
hold on
box on
plot(res_sumchi2(:,1), res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,2), 'r.'
    title('episodic erosion rate')
    xlabel('chi2')
    ylabel('erosion rate (m Ma-1)')
    legend(sprintf('sample %d', i_sample))
subplot(3,3,9)
hold on
box on
plot(res_sumchi2(:,1), res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,1), 'r.'
    title('frequency of events')
    xlabel('chi2')
    ylabel('number of events (Ma-1)')
    legend(sprintf('sample %d', i_sample))
end

strname = sprintf('sample%i', 1);
min_frac = floor(min(res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,6))/10)*10; %in ka
max_frac = ceil(max(res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,6))/10)*10; %in ka
min_hist = floor(min(res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,5)));
max_hist = ceil(max(res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,5)));
min_suberate = floor(min(res_acc.(strname).values(:,6)));
max_suberate = ceil(max(res_acc.(strname).values(:,6)));

range_frac = min_frac:1:max_frac;
range_hist = min_hist:0.1:max_hist;
range_suberate = min_suberate:0.25:max_suberate;

figure
subplot(3,3,1)
hold on
box on
axis([min_frac max_frac 0 acc_res]);
hist(res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,6), range_frac)
title('ice free time')
xlabel('percent')
ylabel('frequency')
subplot(3,3,2)
hold on
box on
axis([min_hist max_hist 0 acc_res]);
hist(res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,5), range_hist)
title('total exposure history')
xlabel('Ma')
ylabel('frequency')
subplot(3,3,3)
hold on
box on
axis([min_suberate max_suberate 0 acc_res]);
hist(res_acc.(strname).values(:,6), range_suberate)
title('subaerial erosion rate')
xlabel('m Ma-1')
ylabel('frequency')
subplot(3,3,4)
hold on
box on
plot(res_acc.(strname).values(:,1), res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,6), 'b.')
title('ice free time')
xlabel('chi2')
ylabel('percent')
subplot(3,3,5)
hold on
box on
plot(res_acc.(strname).values(:,1), res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,5), 'b.')</title='total exposure history')
xlabel('chi2')
ylabel('Ma')
subplot(3,3,6)
hold on
box on
plot(res_acc.(strname).values(:,1), res_acc.(strname).values(:,6), 'b.')</title='subaerial erosion rate')
xlabel('chi2')
ylabel('m Ma-1')
subplot(3,3,7)
hold on
box on
plot(res_sumchi2(:,1), res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,6), 'r.')
title('ice free time')
xlabel('chi2')
ylabel('percent')
subplot(3,3,8)
hold on
box on
plot(res_sumchi2(:,1), res_acc.(strname).lowering(:,5), 'r.')
title('total exposure history')
xlabel('chi2')
ylabel('Ma')
subplot(3,3,9)
hold on
box on
plot(res_sumchi2(:,1), res_acc.(strname).values(:,6), 'r.')
title('subaerial erosion rate')
xlabel('chi2')
ylabel('m Ma-1')

end %end of function

A4.4 BURIAL PLOT INCLUDING COMPLEX EXPOSURE HISTORIES

function CP_burialplot_cmplxexp(tordata, samples, durglac, avexpdur,
averate, glerate, icethick, consts, sigma, plotbanana)
%example:> CP_burialplot_cmplxexp('CP_alltor.txt', 10, 100, 0.2, 1.0,
5.0, 5000, consts, 1, true)

%This function creates a muon inclusive burial plot for either SLHL normalized samples or a sample-specific location assuming ice of constant thickness covering the site for a pre-defined fraction of time. In addition, it plots plausible complex exposure histories for tors with alternate exposure intervals (glacial-interglacial cycles). Scaling based on Lifton et al. (2014) using individual production rates for fast and negative muons and their respective attenuation lengths.

%INPUTS:
%tordata = name of ascii file with 7 columns of data (e.g. 'data.txt'):
% column 1 is the decimal latitude of each sample;
% column 2 is the decimal longitude of each sample;
% column 3 is the elevation of each sample; (m)
% column 4 is measured [10Be]; (atoms/g)
% column 5 is the measured 1 sigma error in [10Be]; (atoms/g)
% column 6 is the measured [26Al]; (atoms/g)
% column 7 is the measured 1 sigma error in [26Al]; (atoms/g)

%sample = the row number of the sample you wish to model;

%durglac = average duration of one glacial cycle; (ka)

%avexpdur = best guess for average duration of ice-free intervals in percentage of the total glacial cycle; (i.e. 0.185 for 18.5ka of 100ka glacial cycle)

%averate = best guess for average constant erosion rate during interglacials in mm ka-1; (mm/ka = m/Ma = 1e-1 cm/ka = 1e-4 cm/a)

%glerate = best guess for average constant erosion rate during glacials in mm ka-1; (mm/ka = m/Ma = 1e-1 cm/ka = 1e-4 cm/a)
%icethick = average ice thickness covering sample site during each
burial episode; (cm)

%consts = a matlab structure containing constants used in the LSD
scaling %model. This structure is loaded in the startup.m file.

%sigma = specifies the sigma confidence for the error ellipse

%plotbanananna = if true, will also plot the banana window

%A.Margreth - March 2014, adapted from A. Hidy's burialplot (incl. LSD)
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%

%load data
burial_data = load(tordata);
lats = burial_data(:,1);
longs = burial_data(:,2);
elevs = burial_data(:,3);
Be_concs = burial_data(:,4);
Be_errs = burial_data(:,5);
Al_concs = burial_data(:,6);
Al_errs = burial_data(:,7);

sample = samples(1);

norm = 6.75;  %1 or 6.75; for normalization of burialplot

%densities used for buildup (g/cc)
r_density = 2.65;
ice_density = 0.9;

%re-calculate ice thickness to rock-equivalent thickness for burial
events
surf_depth = 0;
%used in buildup functions to draw isoexp and -bur lines
depth_ice = icethick*ice_density/r_density;
t_glac = durglac * 1000;
frac = avexpdur;  %redundent assignment
eros = averate / 10000;  %convert to cm a-1
gl_eros = glerate / 10000;  %convert to cm a-1
bur_depth = (depth_ice * (1-frac) * t_glac) / t_glac;
%calculate average burial depth

%decay constants (1/s)
Be10_lambda = log(2)/1378000;
%Chmeleff et al. (2010), Korschinek et al. (2010)
Al26_lambda = log(2)/720000;  %Nishiizumi (2004)

%neutron attenuation length (g/cm^2)
neutron_atten = 150;  %Follows Balco et al. (2008); see Gosse and
Phillips (2001)
%spallogenic production (atoms/g/a)
refspalprod = 4; %New prod rate, Brocher et al. (subm.);
ratio_init = 6.75; %Nishiizumi et al. (1989); Balco et al. (2008);
6.1/1.106 to reflect recalibration of Nishiizumi et al. (2007)

%Get surface production rates
%Get LSD scaling factors
maxage = 100000; %age over which to integrate production rates
LSD10 = LSD(lats(sample),longs(sample),elevs(sample),1,maxage,-1,10);
LSD26 = LSD(lats(sample),longs(sample),elevs(sample),1,maxage,-1,26);
agegrid = 0:1:maxage;
%average cutoff rigidity (RC) and solar modulation (SPhi) over age range
meanRC = mean(interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.Rc,agegrid));
meanSPhi = mean(interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.SPhi,agegrid));
%average spallogenic surface production rate over age range
Be10_spalprodrate = mean(refspalprod.*interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.Be,agegrid));
Al26_spalprodrate = mean(refspalprod.*ratio_init.*interpolate(LSD26.tv,LSD26.Al,agegrid));
%average total muogenic surface production rate over age range
[Be10_fmusurf, Be10_nmusurf] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD(surf_depth * r_density,LSD10.pressure,meanRC,meanSPhi,consts,10,'no');
[Al26_fmusurf, Al26_nmusurf] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD(surf_depth * r_density,LSD10.pressure,meanRC,meanSPhi,consts,26,'no');
[Be10_fmudepth, Be10_nmudepth] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD(bur_depth * r_density,LSD10.pressure,meanRC,meanSPhi,consts,10,'no');
[Al26_fmudepth, Al26_nmudepth] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD(bur_depth * r_density,LSD10.pressure,meanRC,meanSPhi,consts,26,'no');
Be10_musurf = Be10_fmusurf + Be10_nmusurf;
Al26_musurf = Al26_fmusurf + Al26_nmusurf;
Be10_mudepth = Be10_fmudepth + Be10_nmudepth;
Al26_mudepth = Al26_fmudepth + Al26_nmudepth;

%======================================================================
%definition of functions to calculate production of isotopes
%simple buildup model with no erosion
%buildup due to exposure at surface; assumes no inheritance
function Be10_conc_buildup_surf = Be10_buildup_surf(t_exposure)
    Be10spall_buildup = (Be10_spalprodrate/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*t_exposure));
    Be10muon_buildup = (Be10_musurf/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*t_exposure));
    Be10_conc_buildup_surf = Be10spall_buildup + Be10muon_buildup;
end

function Al26_conc_buildup_surf = Al26_buildup_surf(t_exposure)
    Al26spall_buildup = (Al26_spalprodrate/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*t_exposure));
    Al26muon_buildup = (Al26_musurf/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*t_exposure));
    Al26_conc_buildup_surf = Al26spall_buildup + Al26muon_buildup;
end
%burial production; assume buildup is inheritance
function Be10_conc_burial_surf = Be10_burial_surf(t_exposure, t_burial)
    Be10spall_burial = (Be10_spalprodrate/Be10_lambda)*exp(-bur_depth*r_density/neutron_atten)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*t_burial));
    Be10muon_burial = (Be10_mudepth/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*t_burial));
    Be10inheritance = Be10_buildup_surf(t_exposure)*exp(-Be10_lambda*t_burial);
    Be10_conc_burial_surf = Be10spall_burial + Be10muon_burial + Be10inheritance;
end

function Al26_conc_burial_surf = Al26_burial_surf(t_exposure, t_burial)
    Al26spall_burial = (Al26_spalprodrate/Al26_lambda)*exp(-bur_depth*r_density/neutron_atten)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*t_burial));
    Al26muon_burial = (Al26_mudepth/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*t_burial));
    Al26inheritance = Al26_buildup_surf(t_exposure)*exp(-Al26_lambda*t_burial);
    Al26_conc_burial_surf = Al26spall_burial + Al26muon_burial + Al26inheritance;
end

function Be10_conc_buildup_depth = Be10_buildup_depth(t_exposure)
    Be10spall_buildup = (Be10_spalprodrate/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*t_exposure))*exp(-bur_depth*r_density/neutron_atten);
    Be10muon_buildup = (Be10_mudepth/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*t_exposure));
    Be10_conc_buildup_depth = Be10spall_buildup + Be10muon_buildup;
end

function Al26_conc_buildup_depth = Al26_buildup_depth(t_exposure)
    Al26spall_buildup = (Al26_spalprodrate/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*t_exposure))*exp(-bur_depth*r_density/neutron_atten);
    Al26muon_buildup = (Al26_mudepth/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*t_exposure));
    Al26_conc_buildup_depth = Al26spall_buildup + Al26muon_buildup;
end

%simple buildup model with erosion
%new lambda term spallation
function Be10lambda = Be10_elambda(erate)
    Be10lambda = Be10_lambda + erate*r_density/neutron_atten;
end

function Al26lambda = Al26_elambda(erate)
    Al26lambda = Al26_lambda + erate*r_density/neutron_atten;
end

function Be10lambdamun = Be10n_elambdamu(erate)
    Be10lambdamun = Be10_lambda + erate*r_density/1500;
end

function Al26lambdamun = Al26n_elambdamu(erate)
\[ Al_{26} \text{lambdamun} = Al_{26} \lambda + erate * r\_density/1500; \]

function Be10lambdamuf = Be10f_elambdamu(erate)
    Be10lambdamuf = Be10 \lambda + erate * r\_density/4320;
end

function Al26lambdamuf = Al26f_elambdamu(erate)
    Al26lambdamuf = Al26 \lambda + erate * r\_density/4320;
end

% buildup due to exposure at surface; assumes no inheritance
function eBe10_conc_buildup = eBe10_buildup(t\_exposure, erate)
    Be10spall\_buildup = (Be10\_spalprodrate./Be10 \_elambda(erate)).*(1-exp(-
        Be10\_elambda(erate).*t\_exposure));
    Be10muon\_buildup = Be10\_fmusurf./Be10f\_elambdamu(erate).*(1-
        exp(-Be10f\_elambdamu(erate).*t\_exposure)) +
        Be10\_nmusurf./Be10n\_elambdamu(erate).*1-exp(-
        Be10n\_elambdamu(erate).*t\_exposure));
    eBe10\_con\_buildup = Be10\_spall\_buildup + Be10\_muon\_buildup;
end

function eAl26_conc_buildup = eAl26_buildup(t\_exposure, erate)
    Al26spall\_buildup = (Al26\_spalprodrate./Al26 \_elambda(erate)).*(1-exp(-
        Al26\_elambda(erate).*t\_exposure));
    Al26muon\_buildup = Al26\_fmusurf./Al26f\_elambdamu(erate).*(1-
        exp(-Al26f\_elambdamu(erate).*t\_exposure)) +
        Al26\_nmusurf./Al26n\_elambdamu(erate).*1-exp(-
        Al26n\_elambdamu(erate).*t\_exposure));
    eAl26\_con\_buildup = Al26\_spall\_buildup + Al26\_muon\_buildup;
end

% ------------------------------------------------------------------
% Build burial plot with additional complex exposure pathways
% define axis for plot
plot\_axis = [4 7.5 0 8/norm];

% Define locations of contours on burial plot, unit years
n1 = [250000 500000 1000000 2000000]; % burial contours
n2 = [3000 10000 30000 100000 300000 1000000]; % exposure contours
n3 = [100 50 20 10 5 2 1 0.5 0.2 0.1 0.05 0.01]/1000;
% erosion rate contours, cm/a (inside [ ] erosion rate in cm/ka)

% Create grids for plot contours
texp = 1:1000:20000000; % max 20 Ma
tbur = 1:1000:20000000; % max 10 Ma
eeros = 0:0.001/1000:500/1000; % erosion endpoints ranging from 0-500
cm/ka

figure % burial plot
hold on
axis(plot\_axis);
xlabel('\text{log}[^{10}\text{Be}] (\text{atoms g}^{-1})');
ylabel('^{26}\text{Al}/[^{10}\text{Be}]');
title('Burial Plot');

%plot samples points and ellipses
for i_sample = 1:numel(samples)
Tor_ellipse(Be_concs(samples(i_sample)),Be_errs(samples(i_sample)),Al_concs(samples(i_sample))./norm,Al_errs(samples(i_sample))./norm,sigma);
plot(log10(Be_concs(samples(i_sample))),(Al_concs(samples(i_sample))./Be_concs(samples(i_sample)))./norm,'k.');
end

%plot burial contours and exposure contours
for k = 1:numel(n1)
plot(log10(Be10_burial_surf(texp,n1(k))),(Al26_burial_surf(texp,n1(k))./Be10_burial_surf(texp,n1(k)))./norm,'b-');
end

for k = 1:numel(n2)
plot(log10(Be10_burial_surf(n2(k),tbur)),(Al26_burial_surf(n2(k),tbur)./Be10_burial_surf(n2(k),tbur))./norm,'k--');
end

%plot continuous exposure line
plot(log10(Be10_burial_surf(texp,0)),(Al26_burial_surf(texp,0)./Be10_burial_surf(texp,0))./norm,'r-','linewidth',2);

%plot continuous exposure curve for bur_depth, which is the left boundary of allowable ratio vs. concentration pairs
plot(log10(Be10_buildup_depth(texp)),(Al26_buildup_depth(texp)./Be10_buildup_depth(texp))./norm,'r-','linewidth',2);
plot(log10(Be10_burial_surf(100000000,tbur)),(Al26_burial_surf(100000000,tbur)./Be10_burial_surf(100000000,tbur))./norm,'k-','linewidth',2);

%======================================================================
%-----------comment if not required to calculate inherited concentration
%%% use for calculation of concentration produced during last ice-free interval
% no_ice = 15000; %ice free interval in years
% elambda = nan(1,6);
% elambda(1) = Be10_lambda + eros*r_density/neutron_atten;
% spallogenic 10Be
% elambda(2) = Al26_lambda + eros*r_density/neutron_atten;
% spallogenic 26Al
% elambda(3) = Be10_lambda + eros*r_density/1500; %muogenic 10Be
% elambda(4) = Al26_lambda + eros*r_density/1500; %muogenic 26Al
% elambda(5) = Be10_lambda + eros*r_density/4320; %muogenic 10Be
% elambda(6) = Al26_lambda + eros*r_density/4320; %muogenic 26Al
% inh = nan(numel(samples),6);
% prod_inh = nan(numel(samples),6);
% for i_sample = 1:numel(samples)
% %Get LSD scaling factors
% maxage = no_ice; %age over which to integrate production rates
% LSD10 = LSD(lats(sample),longs(sample),elevs(sample),1,maxage,-1,10);
LSD26 = LSD(lats(sample), longs(sample), elevs(sample), 1, maxage, -1, 26);
agegrid = 0:1:maxage;
% average cutoff rigidity (RC) and solar modulation (SPhi) over age range
meanRC = mean(interpolate(LSD10.tv, LSD10.Rc, agegrid));
meanSPhi = mean(interpolate(LSD10.tv, LSD10.SPhi, agegrid));
% average spallogenic surface production rate over age range
Be10_spprd_noice = mean(refspalprod.*interpolate(LSD10.tv, LSD10.Be, agegrid));
Al26_spprd_noice = mean(refspalprod.*ratio_init.*interpolate(LSD26.tv, LSD26.Al, agegrid));
[Be10_fmuprod_noice, Be10_nmuprod_noice] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD(surf_depth * r_density, LSD10.pressure, meanRC, meanSPhi, consts, 10, 'no');
[Al26_fmuprod_noice, Al26_nmuprod_noice] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD(surf_depth * r_density, LSD10.pressure, meanRC, meanSPhi, consts, 26, 'no');

% prod_inh(samples(i_sample), 1) = Be_concs_noice;
% prod_inh(samples(i_sample), 2) = Al_concs_noice;
% prod_inh(samples(i_sample), 3) = e_Be_concs_noice;
% prod_inh(samples(i_sample), 4) = e_Al_concs_noice;
% prod_inh(samples(i_sample), 5) = Be10_spalprodrate + Be10_musurf;
% prod_inh(samples(i_sample), 6) = Al26_spalprodrate + Al26_musurf;
%
% prod_inh = (Be_concs(samples(i_sample)) - Be_concs_noice) / exp(-Be10_lambda*no_ice);
Al_inh = (Al_concs(samples(i_sample)) - Al_concs_noice)/exp(-Al26_lambda*no_ice);
% e_Be_inh = (Be_concs(samples(i_sample)) - e_Be_concs_noice)/exp(-
% eBe_lambda*no_ice);
% e_Al_inh = (Al_concs(samples(i_sample)) - e_Al_concs_noice)/exp(-
% eAl_lambda*no_ice);

inh(samples(i_sample),1) = Be_inh;
inh(samples(i_sample),2) = Al_inh;
inh(samples(i_sample),3) = Al_inh./Be_inh;
% inh(samples(i_sample),4) = e_Be_inh;
% inh(samples(i_sample),5) = e_Al_inh;
% inh(samples(i_sample),6) = e_Al_inh./e_Be_inh;
end

% save inh.txt inh -ascii
% save prod_inh.txt prod_inh -ascii
%
% %%%plot all sample points (inherited with/without erosion)
% for i_sample = 1:numel(samples)
% Tor_ellipse(inh(samples(i_sample),1),
inh(samples(i_sample),1)*(Be_errs(samples(i_sample))/Be_concs(samples(i_
_sample)))/norm,
(inh(samples(i_sample),2)*Al_errs(samples(i_sample))/Al_concs(samples( i_sample)))/norm,sigma);
% Tor_ellipse(inh(samples(i_sample),4),
inh(samples(i_sample),4)*(Be_errs(samples(i_sample))/Be_concs(samples(i_
_sample)))/norm,
(inh(samples(i_sample),5)*Al_errs(samples(i_sample))/Al_concs(samples( i_sample)))/norm,sigma);
% plot(log10(inh(samples(i_sample),1)),
inh(samples(i_sample),3)/norm, 'm.', log10(inh(samples(i_sample),4)),
in(samples(i_sample),6)/norm, 'g.'
% end
%
% %%%plot last longer ice-free trajectory with/without erosion
% expose_noice = 0:no_ice;
% for i_sample = 1:numel(samples)
% Be_noice = inh(samples(i_sample),1).* exp(-
Be10_lambda.*expose_noice) + (Be10_spprd_noice/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-
Be10_lambda.*expose_noice)) + (Be10_fmuprod_noice/Be10_lambda)*exp(-
Be10_lambda.*expose_noice) + (Be10_nmprod_noice/Be10_lambda)*exp(-
Be10_lambda.*expose_noice);
% Al_noice = inh(samples(i_sample),2).* exp(-
Al26_lambda.*expose_noice) + (Al26_spprd_noice/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-
Al26_lambda.*expose_noice)) + (Al26_fmuprod_noice/Al26_lambda)*exp(-
Al26_lambda.*expose_noice) + (Al26_nmprod_noice/Al26_lambda)*exp(-
Al26_lambda.*expose_noice);
% Be_e_noice = inh(samples(i_sample),4).* exp(-
eBe_lambda.*expose_noice) + (Be10_spprd_noice/elambda(1))*(1-exp(-
elambda(1).*expose_noice)) + (Be10_fmuprod_noice/elambda(5))*(1-exp(-
elambda(5).*expose_noice)) + (Be10_nmprod_noice/elambda(3))*(1-exp(-
elambda(3).*expose_noice));
% Al_e_noice = inh(samples(i_sample),5).* exp(-
eAl_lambda.*expose_noice) + (Al26_spprd_noice/elambda(2))*(1-exp(-
elambda(2).*expose_noice)) + (Al26_fmuprod_noice/elambda(6))*(1-exp(-
elambda(6).*expose_noice)) + (Al26_nuprod_noice/elambda(4))*(1-exp(-
elambda(4).*expose_noice));
%     plot(log10(Be_noice),(Al_noice./Be_noice)./norm, 'm-',
log10(Be_e_noice),(Al_e_noice./Be_e_noice)./norm, 'g-')
% end
%-----------------------------------------------------------end of comments

%construct complex exposure trajectories at depth
thickn = 0:50:100; %choose numbers and depth of add. lines

k_max = 20*10^6/t_glac;
%define maximum duration of cyclic ice cover history (in a)
exposet = 0:100:frac*t_glac;
burialt = 0:100:(1-frac)*t_glac;

elambda = nan(1,6);
elambda(1) = Be10_lambda + eros*r_density/neutron_atten;
%spallogenic 10Be
elambda(2) = Al26_lambda + eros*r_density/neutron_atten;
%spallogenic 26Al
elambda(3) = Be10_lambda + eros*r_density/1500; %muogenic 10Be
elambda(4) = Al26_lambda + eros*r_density/1500; %muogenic 26Al
elambda(5) = Be10_lambda + eros*r_density/4320; %muogenic 10Be
elambda(6) = Al26_lambda + eros*r_density/4320; %muogenic 26Al

gl_elambda = nan(1,6);
gl_elambda(1) = Be10_lambda + gl_eros*r_density/neutron_atten;
%spallogenic 10Be
gl_elambda(2) = Al26_lambda + gl_eros*r_density/neutron_atten;
%spallogenic 26Al

gl_elambda(3) = Be10_lambda + gl_eros*r_density/1500; %muogenic 10Be
gl_elambda(4) = Al26_lambda + gl_eros*r_density/1500; %muogenic 26Al

gl_elambda(5) = Be10_lambda + gl_eros*r_density/4320; %muogenic 10Be

gl_elambda(6) = Al26_lambda + gl_eros*r_density/4320; %muogenic 26Al

%no erosion during decay intervals
decbeexp = exp(-Be10_lambda.*exposet);
decbebur = exp(-Be10_lambda.*burialt);
decalexp = exp(-Al26_lambda.*exposet);
decalbur = exp(-Al26_lambda.*burialt);

fmuon = nan(4,numel(thickn));
nmuon = nan(4,numel(thickn));
tot_prod = nan(4,numel(thickn));
spalprod = nan(4,numel(thickn));
dec_elambda = nan(4,numel(thickn));

for t = 1:numel(thickn)
%  %------------------------------------------------------------can be commented if no inheritance calculated
%  %Get LSD scaling factors
%  maxage = 100000; %age over which to integrate production rates
%  LSD10 = LSD(lats(sample),longs(sample),elevs(sample),1,maxage,-
%  1,10);
%  LSD26 = LSD(lats(sample),longs(sample),elevs(sample),1,maxage,-
%  1,26);
%  agegrid = 0:1:maxage;

305
% average cutoff rigidity (RC) and solar modulation (SPhi) over age range
% meanRC = mean(interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.Rc,agegrid));
% meanSPhi = mean(interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.SPhi,agegrid));
%----------------------------------------------------end commenting

[fmuon(1,t), nmuon(1,t)] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD((surf_depth + thickn(t)) * r_density, LSD10.pressure, meanRC, meanSPhi, consts, 10, 'no');
[fmuon(2,t), nmuon(2,t)] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD((surf_depth + thickn(t)) * r_density, LSD10.pressure, meanRC, meanSPhi, consts, 26, 'no');
[fmuon(3,t), nmuon(3,t)] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD((depth_ice + thickn(t)) * r_density, LSD10.pressure, meanRC, meanSPhi, consts, 10, 'no');
[fmuon(4,t), nmuon(4,t)] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD((depth_ice + thickn(t)) * r_density, LSD10.pressure, meanRC, meanSPhi, consts, 26, 'no');

spalprod(1,t) = Be10_spalprodrate*exp(-(surf_depth + thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten);
spalprod(2,t) = Al26_spalprodrate*exp(-(surf_depth + thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten);
spalprod(3,t) = Be10_spalprodrate*exp(-(depth_ice + thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten);
spalprod(4,t) = Al26_spalprodrate*exp(-(depth_ice + thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten);

%%%new decay terms including individual terms for neg. & fast muons
	tot_prod(1,t) = Be10_spalprodrate*exp(-(surf_depth + thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten) + fmuon(1,t) + nmuon(1,t);

tot_prod(2,t) = Al26_spalprodrate*exp(-(surf_depth + thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten) + fmuon(2,t) + nmuon(2,t);

tot_prod(3,t) = Be10_spalprodrate*exp(-(surf_depth + thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten) + fmuon(3,t) + nmuon(3,t);

tot_prod(4,t) = Al26_spalprodrate*exp(-(surf_depth + thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten) + fmuon(4,t) + nmuon(4,t);

dec_elambda(1,t) = (Be10_spalprodrate*exp(-(surf_depth + thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten))/tot_prod(1,t) * elambda(1) +
fmuon(1,t)/tot_prod(1,t)*elambda(5) +

nmuon(1,t)/tot_prod(1,t)*elambda(3);

dec_elambda(2,t) = (Al26_spalprodrate*exp(-(surf_depth + thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten))/tot_prod(2,t) * elambda(2) +
fmuon(2,t)/tot_prod(2,t)*elambda(6) +
nmuon(2,t)/tot_prod(2,t)*elambda(4);

dec_elambda(4,t) = (Al26_spalprodrate*exp(-(depth_ice + thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten))/tot_prod(4,t) * gl_elambda(1) +
fmuon(4,t)/tot_prod(4,t)*gl_elambda(6) +
nmuon(4,t)/tot_prod(4,t)*gl_elambda(4);

dec_elambda(3,t) = (Be10_spalprodrate*exp(-(surf_depth + thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten))/tot_prod(1,t) * gl_elambda(1) +
fmuon(1,t)/tot_prod(1,t)*gl_elambda(5) +
nmuon(1,t)/tot_prod(1,t)*gl_elambda(3);

dec_elambda(4,t) = (Al26_spalprodrate*exp(-(surf_depth + thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten))/tot_prod(2,t) * gl_elambda(2) +
fmuon(2,t)/tot_prod(2,t)*gl_elambda(6) +
nmuon(2,t)/tot_prod(2,t)*gl_elambda(4);
%% subaerial erosion during exp intervals
sa_decbeexp = exp(-dec_elambda(1,t).*exposet);
sa_decalexp = exp(-dec_elambda(2,t).*exposet);

%% glacial erosion during bur intervals
gl_decbebur = exp(-dec_elambda(3,t).*burialt);
gl_decalbur = exp(-dec_elambda(4,t).*burialt);

% %%% to plot continuous exposure lines for any depth---------------------
% expbe_anydepth = (Be10_spalprodrate/Be10_lambda)*exp(-(surf_depth +
    thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*texp)) +
    (fmuon(1,t)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*texp)) +
    (nmuon(1,t)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*texp));
% expal_anydepth = (Al26_spalprodrate/Al26_lambda)*exp(-(surf_depth +
    thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*texp)) +
    (fmuon(2,t)/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*texp)) +
    (nmuon(2,t)/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*texp));

% %%% end comment--------------------------------------------------
expbe = (Be10_spalprodrate/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-
    Be10_lambda*exposet))*exp(-(surf_depth +
    thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten) + (fmuon(1,t)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-
    Be10_lambda*exposet)) + (nmuon(1,t)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-
    Be10_lambda*exposet));
expal = (Al26_spalprodrate/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-
    Al26_lambda*exposet))*exp(-(surf_depth +
    thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten) + (fmuon(2,t)/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-
    Al26_lambda*exposet)) + (nmuon(2,t)/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-
    Al26_lambda*exposet));
tmp1 = max(expbe);
tmp2 = max(expal);

e_expbe = (Be10_spalprodrate/elambda(1))*(1-exp(-
    elambda(1)*exposet))*exp(-(surf_depth +
    thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten) + (fmuon(1,t)/elambda(5))*(1-exp(-
    elambda(5)*exposet)) + (nmuon(1,t)/elambda(3))*(1-exp(-
    elambda(3)*exposet));
e_expal = (Al26_spalprodrate/elambda(2))*(1-exp(-
    elambda(2)*exposet))*exp(-(surf_depth +
    thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten) + (fmuon(2,t)/elambda(6))*(1-exp(-
    elambda(6)*exposet)) + (nmuon(2,t)/elambda(4))*(1-exp(-
    elambda(4)*exposet));
etmp1 = max(e_expbe);
etmp2 = max(e_expal);
gle_tmp1 = e_tmp1;
gle_tmp2 = e_tmp2;

burbe = (Be10_spalprodrate/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-
Be10_lambda*burialt)) * exp(-(depth_ice +
thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten) + (fmuon(3,t)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-
Be10_lambda*burialt)) + (nmuon(3,t)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-
Be10_lambda*burialt));

bural = (Al26_spalprodrate/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-
Al26_lambda*burialt)) * exp(-(depth_ice +
thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten) + (fmuon(4,t)/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-
Al26_lambda*burialt)) + (nmuon(4,t)/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-
Al26_lambda*burialt));

e_burbe = (Be10_spalprodrate/gl_elambda(1))*(1-exp(-
gl_elambda(1)*burialt)) * exp(-(depth_ice +
thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten) + (fmuon(3,t)/gl_elambda(5))*(1-exp(-
gl_elambda(5)*burialt)) + (nmuon(3,t)/gl_elambda(3))*(1-exp(-
gl_elambda(3)*burialt));

e_bural = (Al26_spalprodrate/gl_elambda(2))*(1-exp(-
gl_elambda(2)*burialt)) * exp(-(depth_ice +
thickn(t))*r_density/neutron_atten) + (fmuon(4,t)/gl_elambda(6))*(1-exp(-
gl_elambda(6)*burialt)) + (nmuon(4,t)/gl_elambda(4))*(1-exp(-
gl_elambda(4)*burialt));

colormat = [0.2 0.6 0.2];
plot(log10(expbe), expal./expbe./norm,'Color',colormat,'linewidth',
0.5);
plot(log10(e_expbe), e_expal./e_expbe./norm,'c-','linewidth', 0.5);
plot(log10(e_expbe), e_expal./e_expbe./norm,'m-','linewidth', 0.5);

texp_cmplx = nan(1,k_max+1);
tbur_cmplx = nan(1,k_max);
Rexpbe = nan(numel(thickn),k_max+1);
Rexpal = nan(numel(thickn),k_max+1);
Rburbe = nan(numel(thickn),k_max);
Rbural = nan(numel(thickn),k_max);

Rexpbe_e = nan(numel(thickn),k_max+1);
Rexpal_e = nan(numel(thickn),k_max+1);
Rburbe_e = nan(numel(thickn),k_max);
Rbural_e = nan(numel(thickn),k_max);

Rexpbe_gle = nan(numel(thickn),k_max+1);
Rexpal_gle = nan(numel(thickn),k_max+1);
Rburbe_gle = nan(numel(thickn),k_max);
Rbural_gle = nan(numel(thickn),k_max);

for k = 1:k_max
    Rexpbe(t,k) = tmp1;
    Rexpal(t,k) = tmp2;
    Rexpbe_e(t,k) = e_tmp1;
    Rexpal_e(t,k) = e_tmp2;
    Rexpbe_gle(t,k) = gle_tmp1;

Rexpal_gle(t, k) = gle_tmp2;
texp_cmplx(k) = exposet(end) + (k-1)*t_glac;

% no erosion at all!
tburbe = tmp1.*decbebur + burbe;
tmp3 = tburbe(end);
tbare = tmp2.*decalbur + bural;
tmp4 = tbare(end);
treexpbe = tmp3.*decbbeexp + expbe;
tmp1 = treexpbe(end);
treexpal = tmp4.*decalexp + expal;
tmp2 = treexpal(end);

% subaerial erosion during exp intervals
e_tburbe = e_tmp1.*decbebur + burbe;
e_tmp3 = e_tburbe(end);
e_tbare = e_tmp2.*decalbur + bural;
e_tmp4 = e_tbare(end);
e_treexpbe = e_tmp3.*decbeexp + e_expbe;
e_tmp1 = e_treexpbe(end);
e_treexpal = e_tmp4.*decalexp + e_expal;
e_tmp2 = e_treexpal(end);

% glacial erosion during bur intervals and subaerial erosion during exp intervals
gle_tburbe = gle_tmp1.*gl_decbebur + e_burbe;
gle_tmp3 = gle_tburbe(end);
gle_tbare = gle_tmp2.*gl_decalbur + e_bural;
gle_tmp4 = gle_tbare(end);
gle_treexpbe = gle_tmp3.*gl_decbbeexp + e_expbe;
gle_tmp1 = gle_treexpbe(end);
gle_treexpal = gle_tmp4.*gl_decalexp + e_expal;
gle_tmp2 = gle_treexpal(end);

Rburbe(t, k) = tmp3;
Rbural(t, k) = tmp4;
Rburbe_e(t, k) = e_tmp3;
Rbural_e(t, k) = e_tmp4;
Rburbe_gle(t, k) = gle_tmp3;
Rbural_gle(t, k) = gle_tmp4;
tbur_cmplx(k) = k*t_glac;

plot(log10(tburbe), (tbural./tburbe)./norm, 'Color', colormat, 'linewidth', 0.5);
plot(log10(treexpbe), (treexpal./treexpbe)./norm, 'Color', colormat, 'linewidth', 0.5);
plot(log10(e_tburbe), (e_tbural./e_tburbe)./norm, 'c-', 'linewidth', 0.5);
plot(log10(e_treexpbe), (e_treexpal./e_treexpbe)./norm, 'c-', 'linewidth', 0.5);
plot(log10(gle_tburbe), (gle_tbural./gle_tburbe)./norm, 'm-', 'linewidth', 0.5);
plot(log10(gle_treexpbe), (gle_treexpal./gle_treexpbe)./norm, 'm-', 'linewidth', 0.5);
end
Rexpbe(t,k_max+1) = tmp1;
Rexpal(t,k_max+1) = tmp2;
Rexpbe_e(t,k_max+1) = e_tmp1;
Rexpal_e(t,k_max+1) = e_tmp2;
Rexpbe_gle(t,k_max+1) = gle_tmp1;
Rexpal_gle(t,k_max+1) = gle_tmp2;
texp_cmplx(k) = exposet(end) + (k-1)*t_glac;

%%%plot lines through interglacial endpoints
plot(log10(Rexpbe'), (Rexpal./Rexpbe)'./norm, 'Color',
colormat,'linewidth', 0.5)
plot(log10(Rexpbe_e'), (Rexpal_e./Rexpbe_e)'./norm, 'c-',
'linewidth', 0.5)
plot(log10(Rexpbe_gle'), (Rexpal_gle./Rexpbe_gle)'./norm, 'm-',
'linewidth', 0.5)

%%%plot glacial/interglacial endpoints
plot(log10(Rexpbe'), (Rexpal./Rexpbe)'./norm, 'k.'
plot(log10(Rexpbe_e'), (Rexpal_e./Rexpbe_e)'./norm, 'k.'
plot(log10(Rexpbe_gle'), (Rexpal_gle./Rexpbe_gle)'./norm, 'k.'
plot(log10(Rburbe'), (Rbural./Rburbe)'./norm, 'k.'
plot(log10(Rexpbe_e'), (Rexpal_e./Rexpbe_e)'./norm, 'k.'
plot(log10(Rexpbe_gle'), (Rexpal_gle./Rexpbe_gle)'./norm, 'k.'
end

%%%--------------------------------------------------------------------
%%%complex exposure trajectory including plucking
numb_plkev = numel(thickn)-1;
depth_index = numel(thickn);
plkev = [2 5]

%%%subaerial erosion during exp intervals
sa_decbeexp = exp(-dec_elambda(1,depth_index).*exposet);
sa_decalexp = exp(-dec_elambda(2,depth_index).*exposet);

%%%glacial erosion during bur intervals
gl_decbebur = exp(-dec_elambda(3,depth_index).*burialt);
gl_decalbur = exp(-dec_elambda(4,depth_index).*burialt);

expbe = (Be10_spalprodrate/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-
Be10_lambda*exposet))*exp(-surf_depth +
thickn(depth_index))*r_density/neutron_atten) +
(fmuon(1,depth_index)/Be10_lambda)*(-Be10_lambda*exposet)) +
(nmuon(1,depth_index)/Be10_lambda)*(-Be10_lambda*exposet));
tmp1 = max(expbe);
expal = (Al26_spalprodrate/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-
Al26_lambda*exposet))*exp(-surf_depth +
thickn(depth_index))*r_density/neutron_atten) +
(fmuon(2,depth_index)/Al26_lambda)*(-Al26_lambda*exposet)) +
(nmuon(2,depth_index)/Al26_lambda)*(-Al26_lambda*exposet));
tmp2 = max(expal);
e_expbe = (Be10_spalprodrate/elambda(1))*(1-exp(-
elambda(1)*exposet))*exp(-surf_depth +
thickn(depth_index))*r_density/neutron_atten) +
(fmuon(1, depth_index)/elambda(5))*(1-exp(-elambda(5)*exposet)) +
(nmuon(1, depth_index)/elambda(3))*(1-exp(-elambda(3)*exposet));
e_expal = (Al26_spalprodrate/elambda(2))*(1-exp(-
elambda(2)*exposet))*exp(-(surf_depth +
thickn(depth_index))*r_density/neutron_atten) +
(fmuon(2, depth_index)/elambda(6))*(1-exp(-elambda(6)*exposet)) +
(nmuon(2, depth_index)/elambda(4))*(1-exp(-elambda(4)*exposet));
e_tmp1 = max(e_expbe);
e_tmp2 = max(e_expal);

gle_tmp1 = e_tmp1;
gle_tmp2 = e_tmp2;

burbe = (Be10_spalprodrate/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-
Be10_lambda*burialt))*(1-exp(-(depth_ice +
thickn(depth_index)))*r_density/neutron_atten) +
(fmuon(3, depth_index)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*burialt)) +
(nmuon(3, depth_index)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*burialt));
bural = (Al26_spalprodrate/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-
Al26_lambda*burialt))*(1-exp(-(depth_ice +
thickn(depth_index)))*r_density/neutron_atten) +
(fmuon(4, depth_index)/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*burialt)) +
(nmuon(4, depth_index)/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*burialt));

e_burbe = (Be10_spalprodrate/gl_elambda(1))*(1-exp(-
gl_elambda(1)*burialt))*(1-exp(-(depth_ice +
thickn(depth_index)))*r_density/neutron_atten) +
(fmuon(3, depth_index)/gl_elambda(5))*(1-exp(-gl_elambda(5)*burialt)) +
(nmuon(3, depth_index)/gl_elambda(3))*(1-exp(-gl_elambda(3)*burialt));
e_bural = (Al26_spalprodrate/gl_elambda(2))*(1-exp(-
gl_elambda(2)*burialt))*(1-exp(-(depth_ice +
thickn(depth_index)))*r_density/neutron_atten) +
(fmuon(4, depth_index)/gl_elambda(6))*(1-exp(-gl_elambda(6)*burialt)) +
(nmuon(4, depth_index)/gl_elambda(4))*(1-exp(-gl_elambda(4)*burialt));

colormat = [0.2 0.6 0.2];
plot(log10(expbe), expal./expbe./norm, 'Color', colormat, 'linewidth',
0.5);
plot(log10(e_expbe), e_expal./e_expbe./norm, 'c-','linewidth', 0.5);
plot(log10(e_expbe), e_expal./e_expbe./norm, 'm-','linewidth', 0.5);

Rexpbe_plk = nan(1,k_max+1);
Rexpal_plk = nan(1,k_max+1);
Rburbe_plk = nan(1,k_max);
Rbural_plk = nan(1,k_max);

Rexpbe_plk_e = nan(1,k_max+1);
Rexpal_plk_e = nan(1,k_max+1);
Rburbe_plk_e = nan(1,k_max);
Rbural_plk_e = nan(1,k_max);

Rexpbe_plk_gle = nan(1,k_max+1);
Rexpal_plk_gle = nan(1,k_max+1);
Rburbe_plk_gle = nan(1,k_max);
Rbural_plk_gle = nan(1,k_max);
for k = 1:k_max
    Rexpbe_plk(k) = tmp1;
    Rexpal_plk(k) = tmp2;
    Rexpbe_plk_e(k) = e_tmp1;
    Rexpal_plk_e(k) = e_tmp2;
    Rexpbe_plk_gle(k) = gle_tmp1;
    Rexpal_plk_gle(k) = gle_tmp2;
%no erosion at all!
    tburbe = tmp1.*decbebur + burbe;
    tmp3 = tburbe(end);
    tbural = tmp2.*decalbur + bural;
    tmp4 = tbural(end);
%subaerial erosion during exp intervals
    e_tburbe = e_tmp1.*decbebur + burbe;
    e_tmp3 = e_tburbe(end);
    e_tbural = e_tmp2.*decalbur + bural;
    e_tmp4 = e_tbural(end);
%glacial erosion during bur intervals and subaerial erosion during exp intervals
    gle_tburbe = gle_tmp1.*gl_decbebur + e_burbe;
    gle_tmp3 = gle_tburbe(end);
    gle_tbural = gle_tmp2.*gl_decalbur + e_bural;
    gle_tmp4 = gle_tbural(end);
    for i_plk = 1:numb_plkev
        if k == plkev(i_plk) %i_plk*0.05*k_max
            depth_index = depth_index - 1;
%subaerial erosion during exp intervals
            sa_decbeexp = exp(-dec_elambda(1,depth_index).*exposet);
            sa_decalexp = exp(-dec_elambda(2,depth_index).*exposet);
%glacial erosion during bur intervals
            gl_decbebur = exp(-dec_elambda(3,depth_index).*burialt);
            gl_decalbur = exp(-dec_elambda(4,depth_index).*burialt);

            expbe = (Be10_spalprodrate/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-
                thickn(depth_index)*r_density/neutron_atten) +
                (fmuon(1,depth_index)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*exposet)) +
                (nmuon(1,depth_index)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*exposet));
            expal = (Al26_spalprodrate/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-
                thickn(depth_index)*r_density/neutron_atten) +
                (fmuon(2,depth_index)/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*exposet)) +
                (nmuon(2,depth_index)/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*exposet));

            e_expbe = (Be10_spalprodrate/elambda(1))*(1-exp(-
                elambda(1)*exposet)) * exp(-(surf_depth +
                thickn(depth_index)) * r_density/neutron_atten) +
                (fmuon(1,depth_index)/elambda(5))*(1-exp(-elambda(5)*exposet)) +
                (nmuon(1,depth_index)/elambda(3))*(1-exp(-elambda(3)*exposet));
            e_expal = (Al26_spalprodrate/elambda(2))*(1-exp(-
                elambda(2)*exposet)) * exp(-(surf_depth +
                thickn(depth_index)) * r_density/neutron_atten) +
                (fmuon(1,depth_index)/elambda(5))*(1-exp(-elambda(5)*exposet)) +
                (nmuon(1,depth_index)/elambda(3))*(1-exp(-elambda(3)*exposet));

thickn(depth_index) * r_density / neutron_atten) +
(fmuon(2, depth_index) / elambda(6)) * (1 - exp(-elambda(6) * exposer)) +
(nmuon(2, depth_index) / elambda(4)) * (1 - exp(-elambda(4) * exposer));

burbe = (Be10_spalprodrate / Be10_lambda) * (1 - exp(-
Be10_lambda * burialt)) * exp(-(depth_ice +
thickn(depth_index)) * r_density / neutron_atten) +
(fmuon(3, depth_index) / Be10_lambda) * (1 - exp(-Be10_lambda * burialt)) +
(nmuon(3, depth_index) / Be10_lambda) * (1 - exp(-Be10_lambda * burialt));

bural = (Al26_spalprodrate / Al26_lambda) * (1 - exp(-
Al26_lambda * burialt)) * exp(-(depth_ice +
thickn(depth_index)) * r_density / neutron_atten) +
(fmuon(4, depth_index) / Al26_lambda) * (1 - exp(-Al26_lambda * burialt)) +
(nmuon(4, depth_index) / Al26_lambda) * (1 - exp(-Al26_lambda * burialt));

e_burbe = (Be10_spalprodrate / gl_elambda(1)) * (1 - exp(-
gl_elambda(1) * burialt)) * exp(-(depth_ice +
thickn(depth_index)) * r_density / neutron_atten) +
(fmuon(3, depth_index) / gl_elambda(5)) * (1 - exp(-gl_elambda(5) * burialt)) +
(nmuon(3, depth_index) / gl_elambda(3)) * (1 - exp(-gl_elambda(3) * burialt));
e_bural = (Al26_spalprodrate / gl_elambda(2)) * (1 - exp(-
gl_elambda(2) * burialt)) * exp(-(depth_ice +
thickn(depth_index)) * r_density / neutron_atten) +
(fmuon(4, depth_index) / gl_elambda(6)) * (1 - exp(-gl_elambda(6) * burialt)) +
(nmuon(4, depth_index) / gl_elambda(4)) * (1 - exp(-gl_elambda(4) * burialt));

e_burbe = (Be10_spalprodrate / gl_elambda(1)) * (1 - exp(-
gl_elambda(1) * burialt)) * exp(-(depth_ice +
thickn(depth_index)) * r_density / neutron_atten) +
(fmuon(3, depth_index) / gl_elambda(5)) * (1 - exp(-gl_elambda(5) * burialt)) +
(nmuon(3, depth_index) / gl_elambda(3)) * (1 - exp(-gl_elambda(3) * burialt));
e_bural = (Al26_spalprodrate / gl_elambda(2)) * (1 - exp(-
gl_elambda(2) * burialt)) * exp(-(depth_ice +
thickn(depth_index)) * r_density / neutron_atten) +
(fmuon(4, depth_index) / gl_elambda(6)) * (1 - exp(-gl_elambda(6) * burialt)) +
(nmuon(4, depth_index) / gl_elambda(4)) * (1 - exp(-gl_elambda(4) * burialt));

% no erosion at all!
treexpbe = tmp3 .* decbeexp + expbe;
tmp1 = treexpbe(end);
treexpal = tmp4 .* decalexp + expal;
tmp2 = treexpal(end);

% subaerial erosion during exp intervals
e_treexpbe = e_tmp3 .* sa_decbeexp + e_expbe;
e_tmp1 = e_treexpbe(end);
e_treexpal = e_tmp4 .* sa_decalexp + e_expal;
e_tmp2 = e_treexpal(end);

% glacial erosion during bur intervals and subaerial erosion during exp intervals
gle_treexpbe = gle_tmp3 .* sa_decbeexp + e_expbe;
gle_tmp1 = gle_treexpbe(end);
gle_treexpal = gle_tmp4 .* sa_decalexp + e_expal;
gle_tmp2 = gle_treexpal(end);

Rburbe_plk(k) = tmp3;
Rbural_plk(k) = tmp4;
Rburbe_plk_e(k) = e_tmp3;
Rbural_plk_e(k) = e_tmp4;
Rburbe_plk_gle(k) = gle_tmp3;
Rbural_plk_gle(k) = gle_tmp4;
plot(log10(tburbe), (tbural./tburbe)./norm, 'Color', colormat, 'linewidth', 0.5);
plot(log10(treexpbe), (treexpal./treexpbe)./norm, 'Color', colormat, 'linewidth', 0.5);
plot(log10(e_tburbe), (e_tbural./e_tburbe)./norm, 'c-', 'linewidth', 0.5);
plot(log10(e_treexpbe), (e_treexpal./e_treexpbe)./norm, 'c-', 'linewidth', 0.5);
plot(log10(gle_tburbe), (gle_tbural./gle_tburbe)./norm, 'm-', 'linewidth', 0.5);
plot(log10(gle_treexpbe), (gle_treexpal./gle_treexpbe)./norm, 'm-', 'linewidth', 0.5);
end

Rexpbe_plk(k_max+1) = tmp1;
Rexpal_plk(k_max+1) = tmp2;
Rexpbe_plk_e(k_max+1) = e_tmp1;
Rexpal_plk_e(k_max+1) = e_tmp2;
Rexpbe_plk_gle(k_max+1) = gle_tmp1;
Rexpal_plk_gle(k_max+1) = gle_tmp2;

plot(log10(Rexpbe_plk'), (Rexpal_plk./Rexpbe_plk')./norm, 'Color', colormat, 'linewidth', 1)
plot(log10(Rexpbe_plk_e'), (Rexpal_plk_e./Rexpbe_plk_e')./norm, 'c-', 'linewidth', 1)
plot(log10(Rexpbe_plk_gle'), (Rexpal_plk_gle./Rexpbe_plk_gle')./norm, 'b-', 'linewidth', 1)

%------------------------------------------------------------------------------
%complex exposure trajectory including plucking of blocks (example)
numb_plkev = numel(thickn)-1;
depth_index = numel(thickn);
maxbur = 25;
plk_events = [12 18];

d18O = 3.8;  %for LR04
exp_data = load('expdata_long.txt');
bur_data = load('burdata_long.txt');
cutoff = find(bur_data(1, :) == d18O);
exp_dur = exp_data(:, cutoff);
bur_dur = bur_data(2:end, cutoff);
exptimes = exp_dur(~isnan(exp_dur));
burtimes = bur_dur(~isnan(bur_dur));
exptimes = fliplr(exptimes(1:maxbur+1)) * 1000;
burtimes = fliplr(burtimes(1:maxbur)) * 1000;
exptimes(1,end) = 15 * 1000;

% exp_dur = nan(maxbur+1, 1);
% bur_dur = nan(maxbur, 1);
% for i_exp = 1:maxbur+1-9
%     exp_dur(i_exp) = frac * 41;
% end
% for i_exp = maxbur+1-8:maxbur+1
%     exp_dur(i_exp) = frac * 100;
% end
% for i_bur = 1:maxbur-9

314
\% bur_dur(i_bur) = (1 - frac) * 41;
\% end
\% for i_bur = maxbur-8:maxbur
\% bur_dur(i_bur) = (1 - frac) * 100;
\% end
\% exp_times = exp_dur' * 1000;
\% bur_times = bur_dur' * 1000;
\% exp_times(1,end) = 15 * 1000;

Rexpbe = nan(1,k_max+1);
Rexpal = nan(1,k_max+1);
Rburbe = nan(1,k_max);
Rbural = nan(1,k_max);
Rexpbe_e = nan(1,k_max+1);
Rexpal_e = nan(1,k_max+1);
Rburbe_e = nan(1,k_max);
Rbural_e = nan(1,k_max);
Rexpbe_gle = nan(1,k_max+1);
Rexpal_gle = nan(1,k_max+1);
Rburbe_gle = nan(1,k_max);
Rbural_gle = nan(1,k_max);

tmp3 = 0;
tmp4 = 0;
e_tmp3 = 0;
e_tmp4 = 0;

gle_tmp3 = 0;
gle_tmp4 = 0;

for k = 1:maxbur
    exposet = 0:exp_times(k);
    reexpbe = tmp3 .* exp(-Be10_lambda.*exposet) +
        (Be10_spalprodrate/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*exposet)) * exp(-thickn(depth_index)*r_density/neutron_atten) +
        (fmuon(1,depth_index)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*exposet)) +
        (nmuon(1,depth_index)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*exposet));
    tmp1 = reexpbe(end);
    reexpal = tmp4 .* exp(-Al26_lambda.*exposet) +
        (Al26_spalprodrate/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*exposet)) * exp(-thickn(depth_index)*r_density/neutron_atten) +
        (fmuon(2,depth_index)/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*exposet)) +
        (nmuon(2,depth_index)/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*exposet));
    tmp2 = reexpal(end);
    e_reexpbe = e_tmp3 .* exp(-dec_elambda(1,depth_index).*exposet) +
        (Be10_spalprodrate/elambda(1))*(1-exp(-elambda(1).*exposet)) * exp(-thickn(depth_index)*r_density/neutron_atten) +
        (fmuon(1,depth_index)/elambda(5))*(1-exp(-elambda(5).*exposet)) +
        (nmuon(1,depth_index)/elambda(3))*(1-exp(-elambda(3).*exposet));
    e_reexpal = e_tmp4 .* exp(-dec_elambda(2,depth_index).*exposet) +
        (Al26_spalprodrate/elambda(2))*(1-exp(-elambda(2).*exposet)) * exp(-thickn(depth_index)*r_density/neutron_atten) +
        (fmuon(2,depth_index)/elambda(6))*(1-exp(-elambda(6).*exposet)) +
        (nmuon(2,depth_index)/elambda(4))*(1-exp(-elambda(4).*exposet));
    e_tmp1 = e_reexpbe(end);
    e_tmp2 = e_reexpal(end);
gle_reexpbe = gle_tmp3 .* exp(-dec_elambda(1,depth_index).*exposet) + (Be10_spalprodrate/elambda(1))*(1-exp(-elambda(1).*exposet)) * exp(-thickn(depth_index)*r_density/neutron_atten) + (fmuon(1,depth_index)/elambda(5))*(1-exp(-elambda(5).*exposet)) + (nmuon(1,depth_index)/elambda(3))*(1-exp(-elambda(3).*exposet));
gle_reexpal = gle_tmp4 .* exp(-dec_elambda(2,depth_index).*exposet) + (Al26_spalprodrate/elambda(2))*(1-exp(-elambda(2).*exposet)) * exp(-thickn(depth_index)*r_density/neutron_atten) + (fmuon(2,depth_index)/elambda(6))*(1-exp(-elambda(6).*exposet)) + (nmuon(2,depth_index)/elambda(4))*(1-exp(-elambda(4).*exposet));

gle_tmp1 = gle_reexpbe(end);
gle_tmp2 = gle_reexpal(end);

burialt = 0:bur_times(k);
burbe = tmp1.*exp(-Be10_lambda.*burialt) + (Be10_spalprodrate/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*burialt)) * exp(-thickn(depth_index)+depth_ice)*r_density/neutron_atten) + (fmuon(3,depth_index)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*burialt)) + (nmuon(3,depth_index)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*burialt));
tmp3 = burbe(end);
bural = tmp2.*exp(-Al26_lambda.*burialt) + (Al26_spalprodrate/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*burialt)) * exp(-thickn(depth_index)+depth_ice)*r_density/neutron_atten) + (fmuon(4,depth_index)/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*burialt)) + (nmuon(4,depth_index)/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*burialt));
tmp4 = bural(end);

e_burbe = e_tmp1.*exp(-Be10_lambda.*burialt) + (Be10_spalprodrate/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*burialt)) * exp(-thickn(depth_index)+depth_ice)*r_density/neutron_atten) + (fmuon(3,depth_index)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*burialt)) + (nmuon(3,depth_index)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*burialt));
e_bural = e_tmp2.*exp(-Al26_lambda.*burialt) + (Al26_spalprodrate/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*burialt)) * exp(-thickn(depth_index)+depth_ice)*r_density/neutron_atten) + (fmuon(4,depth_index)/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*burialt)) + (nmuon(4,depth_index)/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*burialt));
e_tmp3 = e_burbe(end);
e_tmp4 = e_bural(end);

gle_burbe = gle_tmp1.*exp(-dec_elambda(3,depth_index).*burialt) + (Be10_spalprodrate/gl_elambda(1))*(1-exp(-gl_elambda(1)*burialt)) * exp(-thickn(depth_index)+depth_ice)*r_density/neutron_atten) + (fmuon(3,depth_index)/gl_elambda(5))*(1-exp(-gl_elambda(5)*burialt)) + (nmuon(3,depth_index)/gl_elambda(3))*(1-exp(-gl_elambda(3)*burialt));
gle_bural = gle_tmp2.*exp(-dec_elambda(4,depth_index).*burialt) + (Al26_spalprodrate/gl_elambda(2))*(1-exp(-gl_elambda(2)*burialt)) * exp(-thickn(depth_index)+depth_ice)*r_density/neutron_atten) + (fmuon(4,depth_index)/gl_elambda(6))*(1-exp(-gl_elambda(6)*burialt)) + (nmuon(4,depth_index)/gl_elambda(4))*(1-exp(-gl_elambda(4)*burialt));
gle_tmp3 = gle_burbe(end);
gle_tmp4 = gle_bural(end);

for i_plk = 1:numb_plkev
  if k == plk_events(i_plk)
\[
\text{depth}_{\text{index}} = \text{depth}_{\text{index}} - 1;
\]
\]
end
end

\[
\text{Rexpbe}(k) = \text{tmp1};
\]
\[
\text{Rexpal}(k) = \text{tmp2};
\]
\[
\text{Rexpb}_{\text{e}}(k) = \text{e}_\text{tmp1};
\]
\[
\text{Rexpal}_{\text{e}}(k) = \text{e}_\text{tmp2};
\]
\[
\text{Rexpb}_{\text{gle}}(k) = \text{gle}_\text{tmp1};
\]
\[
\text{Rexpal}_{\text{gle}}(k) = \text{gle}_\text{tmp2};
\]
\[
\text{Rburbe}(k) = \text{tmp3};
\]
\[
\text{Rbural}(k) = \text{tmp4};
\]
\[
\text{Rburbe}_{\text{e}}(k) = \text{e}_\text{tmp3};
\]
\[
\text{Rbural}_{\text{e}}(k) = \text{e}_\text{tmp4};
\]
\[
\text{Rburbe}_{\text{gle}}(k) = \text{gle}_\text{tmp3};
\]
\[
\text{Rbural}_{\text{gle}}(k) = \text{gle}_\text{tmp4};
\]
\[
\text{colormat} = [0.2 \ 0.6 \ 0.2];
\]
\[
\text{plot}(\log_{10}(\text{reexpbe}),(\text{reexpal}/\text{reexpbe})/\text{norm},'\text{Color}',\text{colormat},'\text{linewi}\text{dth}',0.5);
\]
\[
\text{plot}(\log_{10}(\text{burbe}),(\text{bural}/\text{burbe})/\text{norm},
\text{'Color'},\text{colormat},'\text{linewidth}',0.5);
\]
\[
\text{plot}(\log_{10}(\text{e_reexpbe}),(\text{e_reexpal}/\text{e_reexpbe})/\text{norm},'c-'
\text{'linewidth'},0.5);
\]
\[
\text{plot}(\log_{10}(\text{e_burbe}),(\text{e_bural}/\text{e_burbe})/\text{norm},'c-',
\text{'linewidth'},0.5);
\]
\[
\text{plot}(\log_{10}(\text{gle_reexpbe}),(\text{gle_reexpal}/\text{gle_reexpbe})/\text{norm},'m-
\text{'linewidth'},0.5);
\]
\[
\text{plot}(\log_{10}(\text{gle_burbe}),(\text{gle_bural}/\text{gle_burbe})/\text{norm},'m-
\text{'linewidth'},0.5);
\]
end

\[
\text{exposet} = 0:\text{exp\_times}(k+1);
\]
\[
\text{reexpbe} = \text{tmp3} \cdot \exp(-\text{Be10\_lambda} * \text{exposet}) +
(\text{Be10\_spalprodrate}/\text{Be10\_lambda}) \cdot (1 - \exp(-\text{Be10\_lambda} * \text{exposet})) \cdot \exp(-
\text{thickn(depth\_index)} \cdot \text{r\_density}/\text{neutron\_atten}) +
(\text{fmuon(1,depth\_index)}/\text{Be10\_lambda}) \cdot (1 - \exp(-\text{Be10\_lambda} * \text{exposet})) +
(\text{nmuon(1,depth\_index)}/\text{Be10\_lambda}) \cdot (1 - \exp(-\text{Be10\_lambda} * \text{exposet}));
\]
\[
\text{reexpal} = \text{tmp4} \cdot \exp(-\text{Al26\_lambda} * \text{exposet}) +
(\text{Al26\_spalprodrate}/\text{Al26\_lambda}) \cdot (1 - \exp(-\text{Al26\_lambda} * \text{exposet})) \cdot \exp(-
\text{thickn(depth\_index)} \cdot \text{r\_density}/\text{neutron\_atten}) +
(\text{fmuon(2,depth\_index)}/\text{Al26\_lambda}) \cdot (1 - \exp(-\text{Al26\_lambda} * \text{exposet})) +
(\text{nmuon(2,depth\_index)}/\text{Al26\_lambda}) \cdot (1 - \exp(-\text{Al26\_lambda} * \text{exposet}));
\]
\[
\text{e_reexpbe} = \text{e}\_\text{tmp3} \cdot \exp(-\text{dec\_elambda(1,depth\_index)} \cdot \text{exposet}) +
(\text{Be10\_spalprodrate}/\text{elambda(1)}) \cdot (1 - \exp(-\text{elambda(1)} \cdot \text{exposet})) \cdot \exp(-
\text{thickn(depth\_index)} \cdot \text{r\_density}/\text{neutron\_atten}) +
(\text{fmuon(1,depth\_index)}/\text{elambda(5)}) \cdot (1 - \exp(-\text{elambda(5)} \cdot \text{exposet})) +
(\text{nmuon(1,depth\_index)}/\text{elambda(3)}) \cdot (1 - \exp(-\text{elambda(3)} \cdot \text{exposet}));
\]
\[
\text{e_reexpal} = \text{e}\_\text{tmp4} \cdot \exp(-\text{dec\_elambda(2,depth\_index)} \cdot \text{exposet}) +
(\text{Al26\_spalprodrate}/\text{elambda(2)}) \cdot (1 - \exp(-\text{elambda(2)} \cdot \text{exposet})) \cdot \exp(-
\text{thickn(depth\_index)} \cdot \text{r\_density}/\text{neutron\_atten}) +
(\text{fmuon(2,depth\_index)}/\text{elambda(6)}) \cdot (1 - \exp(-\text{elambda(6)} \cdot \text{exposet})) +
(\text{nmuon(2,depth\_index)}/\text{elambda(4)}) \cdot (1 - \exp(-\text{elambda(4)} \cdot \text{exposet}));
\]
gle_reexpbe = gle_tmp3 .* exp(-dec_elambda(1,depth_index).*exposet) + 
(Be10_spalprodrate/elambda(1))*(1-exp(-elambda(1)*exposet))*exp(-
thickn(depth_index)*r_density/neutron_atten) + 
(fmuon(1,depth_index)/elambda(5))*(1-exp(-elambda(5)*exposet)) + 
(nmuon(1,depth_index)/elambda(3))*(1-exp(-elambda(3)*exposet));
gele_reexpal = gle_tmp4 .* exp(-dec_elambda(2,depth_index).*exposet) + 
(Al26_spalprodrate/elambda(2))*(1-exp(-elambda(2)*exposet))*exp(-
thickn(depth_index)*r_density/neutron_atten) + 
(fmuon(2,depth_index)/elambda(6))*(1-exp(-elambda(6)*exposet)) + 
(nmuon(2,depth_index)/elambda(4))*(1-exp(-elambda(4)*exposet));

plot(log10(reexpbe),(reexpal./reexpbe)./norm,'Color',colormat,'linewidth', 0.5);
plot(log10(e_reexpbe),(e_reexpal./e_reexpbe)./norm,'c-','linewidth', 0.5);
plot(log10(gle_reexpbe),(gle_reexpal./gle_reexpbe)./norm,'m-','linewidth', 0.5);
Rexpbe(k_max+1) = tmp1;
Rexpal(k_max+1) = tmp2;
Rexpbe_e(k_max+1) = e_tmp1;
Rexpal_e(k_max+1) = e_tmp2;
Rexpbe_gle(k_max+1) = gle_tmp1;
Rexpal_gle(k_max+1) = gle_tmp2;

plot(log10(Rexpbe'),
(Rexpal./Rexpbe')./norm,'Color',colormat,'linewidth', 0.5)
plot(log10(Rexpbe_e'), (Rexpal_e./Rexpbe_e')./norm,'c-','linewidth', 0.5)
plot(log10(Rexpbe_gle'), (Rexpal_gle./Rexpbe_gle')./norm,'m-','linewidth', 0.5)

%plot erosion banana if requested
if plotbanana  %nargin > 6
    for k = 1:numel(n3)
        plot(log10(eBe10_buildup(texp,n3(k))),(eAl26_buildup(texp,n3(k))./eBe10_buildup(texp,n3(k)))./norm,'g');
    end

    plot(log10(eBe10_buildup(10000000,eeros)),(eAl26_buildup(10000000,eeros )./eBe10_buildup(10000000,eeros))./norm, 'g', 'linewidth', 2);
end

plot(log10(Be10_burial_surf(texp,0)),(Al26_burial_surf(texp,0)/Be10_bu
rial_surf(texp,0))./norm,'r-','linewidth',2);

end %end of function
function out = CP_exphist_values(tordata, samples, durglac, expdur, averate, icethick, consts)
%example:> CP_exphist_values('CP_alltor.txt', 10, 1, 0.001:0.001:1, 1, 5000, consts)
%This function derives estimates of fraction of ice-free time (f) and total complex history (ttot) from fitting a trajectory for a simple periodic ice cover model. Scaling based on Lifton et al. (2014) using individual production rates for fast and negative muons and their respective attenuation lengths.

%INPUTS:
%tordata = name of ascii file with 12 columns of data (e.g. 'data.txt'):
% column 1 is the decimal latitude of each sample;
% column 2 is the decimal longitude of each sample;
% column 3 is the elevation of each sample; (m)
% column 4 is measured [10Be]; (atoms/g)
% column 5 is the measured 1 sigma error in [10Be]; (atoms/g)
% column 6 is the measured [26Al]; (atoms/g)
% column 7 is the measured 1 sigma error in [26Al]; (atoms/g)
%samples = the row number of the sample you wish to model;
%durglac = average duration of one glacial cycle; (ka)
%expdur = range of values for average duration of ice-free intervals in percentage of the total glacial cycle (i.e. 0.185 for 18.5ka of 100ka glacial cycle)
%averate = best guess for average steady state erosion rate during interglacials; (m Ma-1) (m/Ma = mm/ka = 1e-1 cm/ka = 1e-4 cm/a)
%icethick = average ice thickness covering sample site during each burial episode; (cm)
%consts = a matlab structure containing constants used in the LSD scaling model. This structure is loaded in the startup.m file.

%A.Margreth - April 2014, LSD scaling scheme adapted from A.Hidy
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%

%load data
burial_data = load(tordata);
lats = burial_data(:,1);
longs = burial_data(:,2);
elevs = burial_data(:,3);
Be_concs = burial_data(:,4);
Be_errs = burial_data(:,5);
Al_concs = burial_data(:,6);
Al_errs = burial_data(:,7);

sample = samples(1);

%densities used for buildup (g/cc)
r_density = 2.65;
ice_density = 0.9;

%recalculate ice thickness to rock-equivalent thickness for burial events
depth_ice = icethick * ice_density / r_density;
t_glac = durglac * 1000; %convert to a
eros = averate / 10000; %convert to cm a-1

%decay constants (1/s)
Be10_lambda = log(2)/1378000;
%Chmeleff et al. (2010), Korschinek et al. (2010)
Al26_lambda = log(2)/720000; %Nishiizumi (2004)

%neutron attenuation length (g/cm^2)
neutron_atten = 150;
%Follows Balco et al. (2008); see Gosse and Phillips (2001)

%define new lambda terms to account for surface erosion
elambda = nan(1,6);
elambda(1) = Be10_lambda + eros*r_density/neutron_atten;
%spallogenic 10Be
elambda(2) = Al26_lambda + eros*r_density/neutron_atten;
%spallogenic 26Al
elambda(3) = Be10_lambda + eros*r_density/1500; %muogenic 10Be
elambda(4) = Al26_lambda + eros*r_density/1500; %muogenic 26Al
elambda(5) = Be10_lambda + eros*r_density/4320; %muogenic 10Be
elambda(6) = Al26_lambda + eros*r_density/4320; %muogenic 26Al

%reference spallogenic production (atoms/g/a)
refspalprod = 4.0; %New prod rate, Brocher et al. (subm.);
ratio_init = 6.75; %Nishiizumi et al. (1989); Balco et al. (2008);
6.1/1.106 to reflect recalibration of Nishiizumi et al. (2007)

%scaling production to site of interest (spallogenic and muogenic)
%Get LSD scaling factors
maxage = 100000; %age over which to integrate production rates
LSD10 = LSD(lats(sample),longs(sample),elevs(sample),1,maxage,-1,10);
LSD26 = LSD(lats(sample),longs(sample),elevs(sample),1,maxage,-1,26);
agegrid = 0:1:maxage;
%average cutoff rigidity (RC) and solar modulation (SPhi) over age range
meanRC = mean(interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.Rc,agegrid));
meanSPhi = mean(interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.SPhi,agegrid));

%average spallogenic surface production rate over age range
Be10_spalprodrate =
mean(refspalprod.*interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.Be,agegrid));
Al26_spalprodrate =
mean(refspalprod.*ratio_init.*interpolate(LSD26.tv,LSD26.Al,agegrid));
%average total muogenic surface production rate over age range
[mBe_fexp, mBe_nexp] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD(0 *
r_density, LSD10.pressure, meanRC, meanSPhi, consts, 10, 'no');
[mAl_fexp, mAl_nexp] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD(0 *
r_density, LSD10.pressure, meanRC, meanSPhi, consts, 26, 'no');
[mBe_fbur, mBe_nbur] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD(depth_ice *
r_density, LSD10.pressure, meanRC, meanSPhi, consts, 10, 'no');
[mAl_fbur, mAl_nbur] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD(depth_ice *
r_density, LSD10.pressure, meanRC, meanSPhi, consts, 26, 'no');

%======================================================================
%%% calculation of time-integrated production rate of complex exposure
%%% trajectory and comparison with trajectory including erosion
k_max = round(50*10^6/t_glac);
% max amount of glacial cycles till saturation (in a)

% P_expbe = nan(k_max+1,numel(expdur));
% P_expal = nan(k_max+1,numel(expdur));
% P_burbe = nan(k_max,numel(expdur));
% P_bural = nan(k_max,numel(expdur));
Pe_expbe = nan(k_max+1,numel(expdur));
Pe_expal = nan(k_max+1,numel(expdur));
Pe_burbe = nan(k_max,numel(expdur));
Pe_bural = nan(k_max,numel(expdur));
texp = nan(k_max+1,1);
tbur = nan(k_max,1);
% chi2_tot = nan(k_max,numel(expdur));
chi2_etot = nan(k_max,numel(expdur));
prob_values = nan(1,12); %Coloumns: median_frac, mode_frac, min1s_frac,
max1s_frac, min2s_frac, max2s_frac, median_ttot, mode_ttot, min1s_ttot
max1s_ttot, min2s_ttot
% prob_values = nan(2,12); %rows: no erosion/erosion. Coloumns:
median_frac, mode_frac, min1s_frac, max1s_frac, min2s_frac, max2s_frac,
median_ttot, mode_ttot, min1s_ttot max1s_ttot

for f = 1:numel(expdur)
    exposet = expdur(f)*t_glac;
    burialt = (1-expdur(f))*t_glac; % no erosion during burial intervals

    Be10_elamba = Be10_spalprodrate/(Be10_spalprodrate + mBe_fexp +
mBe_nexp)*elambda(1) + mBe_fexp/(Be10_spalprodrate + mBe_fexp +
mBe_nexp)*elambda(5) + mBe_nexp/(Be10_spalprodrate + mBe_fexp +
mBe_nexp)*elambda(3);
    _Al26_elamba = Al26_spalprodrate/(Al26_spalprodrate + mAl_fexp +
mAl_nexp)*elambda(2) + mAl_fexp/(Al26_spalprodrate + mAl_fexp +
mAl_nexp)*elambda(6) + mAl_nexp/(Al26_spalprodrate + mAl_fexp +
mAl_nexp)*elambda(4);
    _e_decbeexp = exp(-Be10_elamba.*exposet);
    _e_decbebur = exp(-Be10_lambda.*burialt);
% could be used in case of subglacial constant erosion rate
    _e_decayexp = exp(-Al26_elamba.*exposet);
    _e_decaybur = exp(-Al26_lambda.*burialt);
% could be used in case of subglacial constant erosion rate
% expbe = (Be10_spalprodrate/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*exposet)) + (mBe_fexp/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*exposet)) + (mBe_nexp/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*exposet));
% expal = (Al26_spalprodrate/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*exposet)) + (mAl_fexp/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*exposet)) + (mAl_nexp/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*exposet));

e_expbe = (Be10_spalprodrate/elambda(1))*(1-exp(-elambda(1)*exposet)) + (mBe_fexp/elambda(5))*(1-exp(-elambda(5)*exposet)) + (mBe_nexp/elambda(3))*(1-exp(-elambda(3)*exposet));
e_expal = (Al26_spalprodrate/elambda(2))*(1-exp(-elambda(2)*exposet)) + (mAl_fexp/elambda(6))*(1-exp(-elambda(6)*exposet)) + (mAl_nexp/elambda(4))*(1-exp(-elambda(4)*exposet));

% burbe = (Be10_spalprodrate/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*burialt))*exp(-depth_ice*r_density/neutron_atten) + (mBe_fbur/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*burialt)) + (mBe_nbur/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*burialt));
% bural = (Al26_spalprodrate/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*burialt))*exp(-depth_ice*r_density/neutron_atten) + (mAl_fbur/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*burialt)) + (mAl_nbur/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*burialt));

% treexpbe = expbe;
% treexpal = expal;
e_treexpbe = e_expbe;
e_treexpal = e_expal;

for k = 1:k_max
% P_expbe(k,f) = treexpbe;
P_expal(k,f) = treexpal;
Pe_expbe(k,f) = e_treexpbe;
Pe_expal(k,f) = e_treexpal;
texp(k,1) = exposet + (k-1)*t_glac;
% chi2_tot(k,f) = ((treexpbe - Be_concs(sample)) ./ Be_errs(sample))^2 + ((treexpal - Al_concs(sample)) ./ Al_errs(sample))^2;
chi2_etot(k,f) = ((e_treexpbe - Be_concs(sample)) ./ Be_errs(sample))^2 + ((e_treexpal - Al_concs(sample)) ./ Al_errs(sample))^2;

% tburbe = treexpbe.*dechebur + burbe;
tbural = treexpal.*decalbur + bural;
e_tburbe = e_treexpbe.*e_dechebur + burbe;
e_tburral = e_treexpal.*e_decalbur + bural;
% treexpbe = tburbe.*decbeexp + expbe;
% treexpal = tbural.*decalexp + expal;
% e_treexpbe = e_tburbe.*e_decbeexp + e_expbe;
% e_treexpal = e_tbural.*e_decalexp + e_expal;

% P_burbe(k,f) = tburbe;
% P_bural(k,f) = tbural;
P_burbe(k,f) = e_tburbe;
P_bural(k,f) = e_tbural;
tbur(k,1) = k*t_glac;
end

% P_expbe(k_max+1,f) = treexpbe;
% P_expal(k_max+1,f) = treexpal;
P_expbe(k_max+1,f) = e_treexpbe;
P_expal(k_max+1,f) = e_treexpal;
texp(k_max+1,1) = exposet + (k_max)*t_glac;
end

%%% save results_expdur.mat P_expbe P_expal P_burbe P_bural Pe_expbe
%Pe_expal P_burbe Pe_bural texp tbur

%------------------------------------------------------------------
%%%chi2-statistics & continuous probability density function
% convert chi2 value (calculated for each expdur and texp) to
% probability using likelihood function;
%%%for each possible value of expdur and texp find highest probability
% value (one-dimensional vectors)
%%%normalize these probability values to generate probability density
% funtion for expdur (=f) and texp (=ttot)

% prob = exp(-chi2_tot./2);
% frac_maxprob = max(prob);
% maximum value of probability for each expdur (coloums)
% pdf_frac = frac_maxprob./sum(frac_maxprob);
% norm probability for each expdur
% cdf_frac = cumsum(pdf_frac);
% [b_frac,i_frac] = unique(cdf_frac);
% ttot_maxprob = max(prob, [], 2);
% maximum value of probability for each texp (rows)
% pdf_ttot = ttot_maxprob./sum(ttot_maxprob);
% norm probability for each texp
% cdf_ttot = cumsum(pdf_ttot);
% [b_ttot,i_ttot] = unique(cdf_ttot);

e_prob = exp(-chi2_etot./2);
frac_emaxprob = max(e_prob);
% maximum value of probability for each expdur (coloums)
pdf_efrac = frac_emaxprob./sum(frac_emaxprob);
%norm probability for each expdur
  cdf_efrac = csum(pdf_efrac);
  [b_efrac,i_efrac] = unique(cdf_efrac);
  ttot_emaxprob = max(e_prob, [], 2);
%maximum value of probability for each texp (rows)
  pdf_ettot = ttot_emaxprob./sum(ttot_emaxprob);
%norm probability for each texp
  cdf_ettot = csum(pdf_ettot);
  [b_ettot,i_ettot] = unique(cdf_ettot);

%%%find mode and 1- & 2-sigma error ranges for each expdur (=f) and
texp (=ttot)
% best_frac = expdur(pdf_frac == max(pdf_frac));
%find value of expdur for max value of pdf
% med_frac = interp1(b_frac,expdur(i_frac),0.5);
% min_1s_frac = interp1(b_frac,expdur(i_frac),0.15865);
% max_1s_frac = interp1(b_frac,expdur(i_frac),0.84135);
% min_2s_frac = interp1(b_frac,expdur(i_frac),0.023);
% max_2s_frac = interp1(b_frac,expdur(i_frac),0.977);
% prob_values(1,1:6) = [med_frac*100, best_frac*100, min_1s_frac*100,
% max_1s_frac*100, min_2s_frac*100, max_2s_frac*100]; %convert to %exp

% best_ttot = texp(pdf_ttot == max(pdf_ttot));
%find value of expdur for max value of pdf
% med_ttot = interp1(b_ttot,texp(i_ttot),0.5);
% min_1s_ttot = interp1(b_ttot,texp(i_ttot),0.15865);
% max_1s_ttot = interp1(b_ttot,texp(i_ttot),0.84135);
% min_2s_ttot = interp1(b_ttot,texp(i_ttot),0.023);
% max_2s_ttot = interp1(b_ttot,texp(i_ttot),0.977);
% prob_values(1,7:12) = [med_ttot./10^3, best_ttot./10^3,
% min_1s_ttot./10^3, max_1s_ttot./10^3, min_2s_ttot./10^3,
% max_2s_ttot./10^3];

best_efrac = expdur(pdf_efrac == max(pdf_efrac));
%find value of expdur for max value of pdf
  med_efrac = interp1(b_efrac,expdur(i_efrac),0.5);
  min_1s_efrac = interp1(b_efrac,expdur(i_efrac),0.15865);
  max_1s_efrac = interp1(b_efrac,expdur(i_efrac),0.84135);
  min_2s_efrac = interp1(b_efrac,expdur(i_efrac),0.023);
  max_2s_efrac = interp1(b_efrac,expdur(i_efrac),0.977);
  best_ettot = texp(pdf_ettot == max(pdf_ettot));
%find value of expdur for max value of pdf
  med_ettot = interp1(b_ettot,texp(i_ettot),0.5);
  min_1s_ettot = interp1(b_ettot,texp(i_ettot),0.15865);
  max_1s_ettot = interp1(b_ettot,texp(i_ettot),0.84135);
  min_2s_ettot = interp1(b_ettot,texp(i_ettot),0.023);
  max_2s_ettot = interp1(b_ettot,texp(i_ettot),0.977);
  prob_values(1,1:6) = [med_efrac*100, best_efrac*100, min_1s_efrac*100,
    max_1s_efrac*100, min_2s_efrac*100, max_2s_efrac*100];
  prob_values(1,7:12) = [med_ettot./10^3, best_ettot./10^3,
    min_1s_ettot./10^3, max_1s_ettot./10^3, min_2s_ettot./10^3,
    max_2s_ettot./10^3];
prob_values(2,7:12) = [med_ettot./10^3, best_ettot(1)./10^3, min_1s_ettot./10^3, max_1s_ettot./10^3, min_2s_ettot./10^3, max_2s_ettot./10^3];

format long
out = prob_values;
save frac_ttot.mat prob_values
save pdf_frac_ttot.mat pdf_efrac pdf_ettot cdf_efrac cdf_ettot

%%%plot probability density function with error margins
figure
subplot(2,1,1)
hold on
box on
axis([0 1.5*best_efrac+max_2s_efrac 0 1.2*max(pdf_efrac)])
plot(expdur, pdf_efrac, 'b-', 'linewidth', 1)
% line([min_1s_frac, min_1s_frac], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'k')
% line([max_1s_frac, max_1s_frac], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'k')
% line([min_2s_frac, min_2s_frac], [0 1], 'linestyle', '--', 'color', 'k')
% line([max_2s_frac, max_2s_frac], [0 1], 'linestyle', '--', 'color', 'k')
% line([min_1s_frac, min_1s_frac], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'r')
% line([max_1s_frac, max_1s_frac], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'r')
% line([min_2s_frac, min_2s_frac], [0 1], 'linestyle', '--', 'color', 'r')
% line([max_2s_frac, max_2s_frac], [0 1], 'linestyle', '--', 'color', 'r')
xlabel('fraction exposure')
ylabel('normaliyed probability');
subplot(2,1,2)
hold on
box on
axis([0 (1.5*best_ettot+max_2s_ettot)./10^3 0 1.2*max(pdf_ettot)])
plot(texp./10^3, pdf_ettot, 'b-', 'linewidth', 1)
% line([min_1s_ttot./10^3, min_1s_ttot./10^3], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'k')
% line([max_1s_ttot./10^3, max_1s_ttot./10^3], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'k')
% line([min_2s_ttot./10^3, min_2s_ttot./10^3], [0 1], 'linestyle', '--', 'color', 'k')
% line([max_2s_ttot./10^3, max_2s_ttot./10^3], [0 1], 'linestyle', '--', 'color', 'k')
plot(texp./10^3, pdf_ettot, 'g-', 'linewidth', 1)
line([min_1s_ettot./10^3 , min_1s_ettot./10^6 ], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'r')
line([max_1s_ettot./10^3 , max_1s_ettot./10^6 ], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'r')
line([min_2s_ettot./10^3 , min_2s_ettot./10^6 ], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'r')
325
line([max_2s_ettot./10^3 , max_2s_ettot./10^6 ], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-','color', 'r')
xlabel('exposure duration (Ma)')
ylabel('normaliyed probability');

%% plot concentration increase and ratio decrease over time for
best_frac
figure
subplot(1,2,1)
hold on
% plot(tbur, P_burbe(:,expdur==best_frac), 'g:', tbur,
P_bural(:,expdur==best_frac), 'm:')
% plot(texp, P_expbe(:,expdur==best_frac), 'g-', texp,
P_expal(:,expdur==best_efrac), 'm-')
plot(tbur, Pe_burbe(:,expdur==best_efrac), 'y:', tbur,
Pe_bural(:,expdur==best_efrac), 'c:')
plot(texp, Pe_expbe(:,expdur==best_efrac), 'y-', texp,
Pe_expal(:,expdur==best_efrac), 'c-')
plot(texp, ones(size(texp))*Be_concs(sample), 'k-')
plot(texp, ones(size(texp))*(Be_concs(sample)-Be_errs(sample)), 'k:')
plot(texp, ones(size(texp))*(Be_concs(sample)+Be_errs(sample)), 'k:')
xlabel('time (years)');
ylabel('concentration (atmos)');
subplot(1,2,2)
hold on
% plot(tbur,
P_bural(:,expdur==best_frac)./P_burbe(:,expdur==best_frac), 'r:')
% plot(texp,
P_expal(:,expdur==best_efrac)./P_expbe(:,expdur==best_efrac), 'r-')
plot(texp, ones(size(texp))*Al_concs(sample)/Be_concs(sample), 'k-')
plot(texp, ones(size(texp))*(Al_concs(sample)/Be_concs(sample) -
(Al_errs(sample)/Al_concs(sample))^2 + (Be_errs(sample)/Be_concs(sample))^2)^(0.5), 'k:')
plot(texp,
ones(size(texp))*(Al_concs(sample)/Be_concs(sample)+Al_concs(sample)/Be_concs(sample)*((Al_errs(sample)/Al_concs(sample))^2 +
(Be_errs(sample)/Be_concs(sample))^2)^(0.5), 'k:')
xlabel('time (years)');
ylabel('nuclide ratio');

end %end of function
A4.6 CALCULATION OF TIME SINCE PLUCKING FOR PAIRED SAMPLES

A4.6.1 Common Code for All Approaches

function out = CP_exphist_tplk(tordata, samples, durglac, avexpdur, averate, icethick, consts)
%example:> CP_exphist_tplk('CP_alltor.txt', [10 11], 1, 0.27, 1, 5000, consts)

%INPUTS:
%tordata = name of ascii file with 12 columns of data (e.g. 'data.txt'):
%   column 1 is the decimal latitude of each sample;
%   column 2 is the decimal longitude of each sample;
%   column 3 is the elevation of each sample; (m)
%   column 4 is measured [10Be]; (atoms/g)
%   column 5 is the measured 1 sigma error in [10Be]; (atoms/g)
%   column 6 is the measured [26Al]; (atoms/g)
%   column 7 is the measured 1 sigma error in [26Al]; (atoms/g)

%sample = the row number of the sample you wish to model;

%durglac = average duration of one glacial cycle; (ka)

%avexpdur = best value for average exposure at the specific site
determined with previous code

%averate = best guess for average steady state erosion rate during
interglacials; (m/Ma = mm/ka = 1e-1 cm/ka = 1e-4 cm/a)

%icethick = average ice thickness covering sample site during each
burial episode; (cm)

%consts = a matlab structure containing constants used in the LSD
scaling model. This structure is loaded in the startup.m file.

%A.Margreth - April 2014, LSD scaling scheme adapted from A.Hidy
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%

%load data
burial_data = load(tordata);
lats = burial_data(:,1);
longs = burial_data(:,2);
elevs = burial_data(:,3);
Be_concs = burial_data(:,4);
Be_errs = burial_data(:,5);
Al_concs = burial_data(:,6);
Al_errs = burial_data(:,7);

sample = samples(1);

%densities used for buildup (g/cc)
r_density = 2.65;
ice_density = 0.9;
%recalculate ice thickness to rock-equivalent thickness for burial events
depth_ice = icethick * ice_density / r_density;
t_glac = durglac * 1000; %convert to a
frac = avexpdur;
eros = averate / 10000; %convert to cm a-1

%decay constants (1/s)
Be10_lambda = log(2)/1378000;
%Chmeleff et al. (2010), Korschinek et al. (2010)
Al26_lambda = log(2)/720000; %Nishiizumi (2004)

%neutron attenuation length (g/cm^2)
neutron_atten = 150;
%Follows Balco et al. (2008); see Gosse and Phillips (2001)

define new lambda terms to account for surface erosion
elambda = nan(1,6);
elambda(1) = Be10_lambda + eros*r_density/neutron_atten;
%spallogenic 10Be
elambda(2) = Al26_lambda + eros*r_density/neutron_atten;
%spallogenic 26Al
elambda(3) = Be10_lambda + eros*r_density/1500; %muogenic 10Be
elambda(4) = Al26_lambda + eros*r_density/1500; %muogenic 26Al
elambda(5) = Be10_lambda + eros*r_density/4320; %muogenic 10Be
elambda(6) = Al26_lambda + eros*r_density/4320; %muogenic 26Al

%reference spallogenic production (atoms/g/a)
refspalprod = 4.0; %New prod rate, Brocher et al. (subm.);
ratio_init = 6.75; %Nishiizumi et al. (1989); Balco et al. (2008);
6.1/1.106 to reflect recalibration of Nishiizumi et al. (2007)

%scaling production to site of interest and at depth (spallogenic and muogenic)
muon_depth = 0:5:400; %cm, max 10m
fmuon_prod = nan(4,numel(muon_depth));
nmuon_prod = nan(4,numel(muon_depth));
spall_prod = nan(4,numel(muon_depth));
dec_elambda = nan(2,numel(muon_depth));

%Get LSD scaling factors
maxage = 100000; %age over which to integrate production rates
LSD10 = LSD(lats(sample),longs(sample),elevs(sample),1,maxage,-1,10);
LSD26 = LSD(lats(sample),longs(sample),elevs(sample),1,maxage,-1,26);
agegrid = 0:1:maxage;
%average cutoff rigidity (RC) and solar modulation (SPhi) over age range
meanRC = mean(interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.Rc,agegrid));
meanSPhi = mean(interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.SPhi,agegrid));

%average spallogenic surface production rate over age range
Be10_spalprodrate =
mean(refspalprod.*interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.Be,agegrid));
Al26_spalprodrate =
mean(refspalprod.*ratio_init.*interpolate(LSD26.tv,LSD26.Al,agegrid));
spall_prod(1,:) = Be10_spalprodrate .* exp(- muon_depth .* r_density ./ neutron_atten);
spall_prod(2,:) = Al26_spalprodrate .* exp(- muon_depth .* r_density ./ neutron_atten);
spall_prod(3,:) = Be10_spalprodrate .* exp(- (muon_depth + depth_ice) .* r_density ./ neutron_atten);
spall_prod(4,:) = Al26_spalprodrate .* exp(- (muon_depth + depth_ice) .* r_density ./ neutron_atten);

%average total muogenic surface production rate over age range
for i_muon = 1:numel(muon_depth)
    [fmuon_prod(1,i_muon), nmuon_prod(1,i_muon)] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD(muon_depth(i_muon) * r_density, LSD10.pressure, meanRC, meanSPhi, consts, 10, 'no');
    [fmuon_prod(2,i_muon), nmuon_prod(2,i_muon)] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD(muon_depth(i_muon) * r_density, LSD10.pressure, meanRC, meanSPhi, consts, 26, 'no');
    [fmuon_prod(3,i_muon), nmuon_prod(3,i_muon)] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD((muon_depth(i_muon)+depth_ice) * r_density, LSD10.pressure, meanRC, meanSPhi, consts, 10, 'no');
    [fmuon_prod(4,i_muon), nmuon_prod(4,i_muon)] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD((muon_depth(i_muon)+depth_ice) * r_density, LSD10.pressure, meanRC, meanSPhi, consts, 26, 'no');
end

tot_prod = nmuon_prod + fmuon_prod + spall_prod;
dec_elambda(1,:) = spall_prod(1,:)/tot_prod(1,:) * elambda(1) + fmuon_prod(1,:)/tot_prod(1,:) * elambda(5) + nmuon_prod(1,:)/tot_prod(1,:) * elambda(3);
dec_elambda(2,:) = spall_prod(2,:)/tot_prod(2,:) * elambda(2) + fmuon_prod(2,:)/tot_prod(2,:) * elambda(6) + nmuon_prod(2,:)/tot_prod(2,:) * elambda(4);

%%%---------------------------------------------comment if not required
%%% use for calculation of concentration produced during last ice-free
%%% interval
no_ice = 15000; %ice free interval in a, or use durglac*100*1000
(conversion to ka in 100ka glacial cycles then to a)

%Get LSD scaling factors
maxage = no_ice; %age over which to integrate production rates
LSD10 = LSD(lats(sample),longs(sample),elevs(sample),1,maxage,-1,10);
LSD26 = LSD(lats(sample),longs(sample),elevs(sample),1,maxage,-1,26);
agegrid = 0:1:maxage;
%average cutoff rigidity (RC) and solar modulation (SPhi)over age range
meanRC = mean(interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.Rc,aegrid));
meanSPhi = mean(interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.SPhi,aegrid));

%average spallogenic surface production rate over age range
Be10_spprd_noice = mean(refspalprod.*interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.Be,aegrid));
Al26_spprd_noice = mean(refspalprod.*ratio_init.*interpolate(LSD26.tv,LSD26.Al,aegrid));

%average total muogenic surface production rate over age range
Be10_elambda = Be10_spdroid_noice/(Be10_spdroid_noice + Be10_fmuprod_noice + Be10_nmuprod_noice)*elambda(1) + Be10_fmuprod_noice/(Be10_spdroid_noice + Be10_fmuprod_noice + Be10_nmuprod_noice)*elambda(5) + Be10_nmuprod_noice/(Be10_spdroid_noice + Be10_fmuprod_noice + Be10_nmuprod_noice)*elambda(3);

Al26_elambda = Al26_spdroid_noice/(Al26_spdroid_noice + Al26_fmuprod_noice + Al26_nmuprod_noice)*elambda(2) + Al26_fmuprod_noice/(Al26_spdroid_noice + Al26_fmuprod_noice + Al26_nmuprod_noice)*elambda(6) + Al26_nmuprod_noice/(Al26_spdroid_noice + Al26_fmuprod_noice + Al26_nmuprod_noice)*elambda(4);

e_Be_concs_noice = (Be10_spdroid_noice/elambda(1))*(1-exp(-elambda(1)*no_ice)) + (Be10_nmuprod_noice/elambda(3))*(1-exp(-elambda(3)*no_ice)) + (Be10_fmuprod_noice/elambda(5))*(1-exp(-elambda(5)*no_ice));

e_Al_concs_noice = (Al26_spdroid_noice/elambda(2))*(1-exp(-elambda(2)*no_ice)) + (Al26_nmuprod_noice/elambda(4))*(1-exp(-elambda(4)*no_ice)) + (Al26_fmuprod_noice/elambda(6))*(1-exp(-elambda(6)*no_ice));

for i_sample = 1:numel(samples)
    e_Be_inh(i_sample) = (Be_concs(samples(i_sample)) - e_Be_concs_noice)/exp(-Be10_elambda*no_ice);
    e_Al_inh(i_sample) = (Al_concs(samples(i_sample)) - e_Al_concs_noice)/exp(-Al26_elambda*no_ice);
    Be_concs(samples(i_sample)) = e_Be_inh(i_sample);
    Al_concs(samples(i_sample)) = e_Al_inh(i_sample);
end

% Complex exposure trajectories for different depth below surface - use muonproduction terms from above

k_max = round(20*10^6/t_glac);

P_expbe_z = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
P_expal_z = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
P_burbe_z = nan(k_max,numel(muon_depth));
P_bural_z = nan(k_max,numel(muon_depth));
chi2_exp_wth = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
chi2_bur_wth = nan(k_max,numel(muon_depth));
chi2_exp_frh = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
chi2_bur_frh = nan(k_max,numel(muon_depth));
texp = nan(k_max+1,1);
tbur = nan(k_max,1);

exposet = frac*t_glac;
buriat = (1-frac)*t_glac;
decbebur = exp(-Be10_\lambda.*buriat);
decalbur = exp(-Al26_\lambda.*buriat);
for z = 1:numel(muon_depth)
    e_decbexp = exp(-dec_elambda(1,z).*exposet);
    e_decalexp = exp(-dec_elambda(2,z).*exposet);

    expbe = (spall_prod(1,z)/elambda(1))*(1-exp(-elambda(1)*exposet)) +
     (fmuo0n_prod(1,z)/elambda(5))*(1-exp(-elambda(5)*exposet)) +
     (nmuo0n_prod(1,z)/elambda(3))*(1-exp(-elambda(3)*exposet));
    expal = (spall_prod(2,z)/elambda(2))*(1-exp(-elambda(2)*exposet)) +
     (fmuo0n_prod(2,z)/elambda(6))*(1-exp(-elambda(6)*exposet)) +
     (nmuo0n_prod(2,z)/elambda(4))*(1-exp(-elambda(4)*exposet));
    burbe = (spall_prod(3,z)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*burialt)) +
     (fmuo0n_prod(3,z)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*burialt)) +
     (nmuo0n_prod(3,z)/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*burialt));
    bural = (spall_prod(4,z)/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*burialt)) +
     (fmuo0n_prod(4,z)/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*burialt)) +
     (nmuo0n_prod(4,z)/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*burialt));

    treexpbe = expbe;
    treexpal = expal;

    for k = 1:k_max
        P_expbe_z(k,z) = treexpbe;
        P_expal_z(k,z) = treexpal;
        chi2_exp_whth(k,z) = ((treexpbe -
            Be_concs(samples(1)))./Be_errs(samples(1)))^2 + ((treexpal -
            Al_concs(samples(1)))./Al_errs(samples(1)))^2;
        chi2_exp_frh(k,z) = ((treexpbe -
            Be_concs(samples(2)))./Be_errs(samples(2)))^2 + ((treexpal -
            Al_concs(samples(2)))./Al_errs(samples(2)))^2;
    end

    tburbe = treexpbe.*decbebur + burbe;
    tbural = treexpal.*decalbur + bural;

    treexpbe = tburbe.*e_decbexp + expbe;
    treexpal = tbural.*e_decalexp + expal;

    P_burbe_z(k,z) = tburbe;
    P_bural_z(k,z) = tbural;
    chi2_bur_whth(k,z) = ((treexpbe -
        Be_concs(samples(1)))./Be_errs(samples(1)))^2 + ((treexpal -
        Al_concs(samples(1)))./Al_errs(samples(1)))^2;
    chi2_bur_frh(k,z) = ((treexpbe -
        Be_concs(samples(2)))./Be_errs(samples(2)))^2 + ((treexpal -
        Al_concs(samples(2)))./Al_errs(samples(2)))^2;
    texp(k,1) = exposet + (k-1)*t_glac;
    tbur(k,1) = k*t_glac;
end

P_expbe_z(k_max+1,z) = treexpbe;
P_expal_z(k_max+1,z) = treexpal;
chi2_exp_whth(k_max+1,z) = ((treexpbe -
        Be_concs(samples(1)))./Be_errs(samples(1)))^2 + ((treexpal -
        Al_concs(samples(1)))./Al_errs(samples(1)))^2;
chi2_exp_frh(k_max+1,z) = ((treexpbe -
        Be_concs(samples(2)))./Be_errs(samples(2)))^2 + ((treexpal -
        Al_concs(samples(2)))./Al_errs(samples(2)))^2;
\[ texp(k_{\text{max}}+1,1) = \text{exposet} + (k_{\text{max}})*t_{\text{glac}}; \]

end

%re-define surface exposure accumulation terms
\[
\text{expbe}_{\text{surf}} = (\text{spall}_{\text{prod}}(1,1)/\text{elambda}(1))*\left(1-\exp(-\text{elambda}(1)\times\text{exposet})\right) + (\text{fmuon}_{\text{prod}}(1,1)/\text{elambda}(5))*\left(1-\exp(-\text{elambda}(5)\times\text{exposet})\right) + (n_{\mu}\text{muon}_{\text{prod}}(1,1)/\text{elambda}(3))*\left(1-\exp(-\text{elambda}(3)\times\text{exposet})\right);
\]
\[
\text{expal}_{\text{surf}} = (\text{spall}_{\text{prod}}(2,1)/\text{elambda}(2))*\left(1-\exp(-\text{elambda}(2)\times\text{exposet})\right) + (\text{fmuon}_{\text{prod}}(2,1)/\text{elambda}(6))*\left(1-\exp(-\text{elambda}(6)\times\text{exposet})\right) + (n_{\mu}\text{muon}_{\text{prod}}(2,1)/\text{elambda}(4))*\left(1-\exp(-\text{elambda}(4)\times\text{exposet})\right);
\]
\[
\text{burbe}_{\text{surf}} = (\text{spall}_{\text{prod}}(3,1)/\text{Be10}_{\lambda}\text{ambda})*(1-\exp(-\text{Be10}_{\lambda}\text{ambda}\times\text{burialt})) + (\text{fmuon}_{\text{prod}}(3,1)/\text{Be10}_{\lambda}\text{ambda})*(1-\exp(-\text{Be10}_{\lambda}\text{ambda}\times\text{burialt})) + (f_{\mu}\text{muon}_{\text{prod}}(3,1)/\text{Be10}_{\lambda}\text{ambda})*(1-\exp(-\text{Be10}_{\lambda}\text{ambda}\times\text{burialt}));
\]
\[
\text{bural}_{\text{surf}} = (\text{spall}_{\text{prod}}(4,1)/\text{Al26}_{\lambda}\text{ambda})*(1-\exp(-\text{Al26}_{\lambda}\text{ambda}\times\text{burialt})) + (\text{fmuon}_{\text{prod}}(4,1)/\text{Al26}_{\lambda}\text{ambda})*(1-\exp(-\text{Al26}_{\lambda}\text{ambda}\times\text{burialt})) + (f_{\mu}\text{muon}_{\text{prod}}(4,1)/\text{Al26}_{\lambda}\text{ambda})*(1-\exp(-\text{Al26}_{\lambda}\text{ambda}\times\text{burialt}));
\]
\[
e_{\text{decbeexp}} = \exp(-\text{dec}_{\text{elambda}}(1,1)\times\text{exposet});
\]
\[
e_{\text{decalexp}} = \exp(-\text{dec}_{\text{elambda}}(2,1)\times\text{exposet});
\]
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A4.6.2 Specific Code for Approach 1

Concentration depth profiles ($^{10}$Be and $^{26}$Al)

```matlab
%**********************************************************************
%%% find time since plucking according Method 1a & b using only
concentrations separately starting with concentration beneath weathered
surface as inheritance for fresher surface since plucking
P_expbe_plk = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
P_expal_plk = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
P_burbe_plk = nan(k_max,numel(muon_depth));
P_bural_plk = nan(k_max,numel(muon_depth));
delta_Be_plk_frh = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
delta_Al_plk_frh = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
Be_tsp_frh = nan(1,numel(muon_depth));
Al_tsp_frh = nan(1,numel(muon_depth));

for z_plk = 1:numel(muon_depth) %for each possible plucking thickness
    be_inh = Be_prof_ttot_wth(z_plk);
    al_inh = Al_prof_ttot_wth(z_plk);
    be_inh = Beprob_prof_ttot_wth(z_plk);
    al_inh = Alprob_prof_ttot_wth(z_plk);

    treexpbe_plk = be_inh.*e_decbeexp + expbe_surf;
    treexpal_plk = al_inh.*e_decalexp + expal_surf;

    for k = 1:k_max
        P_expbe_plk(k,z_plk) = treexpbe_plk;
        P_expal_plk(k,z_plk) = treexpal_plk;

        tburbe_plk = treexpbe_plk.*decbebur + burbe_surf;
        tbural_plk = treexpal_plk.*decalbur + bural_surf;

        treexpbe_plk = tburbe_plk.*e_decbeexp + expbe_surf;
        treexpal_plk = tbural_plk.*e_decalexp + expal_surf;

        P_burbe_plk(k,z_plk) = tburbe_plk;
        P_bural_plk(k,z_plk) = tbural_plk;
    end

    P_expbe_plk(k_max+1,z_plk) = treexpbe_plk;
    P_expal_plk(k_max+1,z_plk) = treexpal_plk;

    delta_Be_plk_frh(:,z_plk) = abs(P_expbe_plk(:,z_plk) -
        Be_concs(samples(2)));
    delta_Al_plk_frh(:,z_plk) = abs(P_expal_plk(:,z_plk) -
        Al_concs(samples(2)));

    Be_tsp_frh(1,z_plk) = texp(delta_Be_plk_frh(:,z_plk) ==
        min(delta_Be_plk_frh(:,z_plk)));
    Al_tsp_frh(1,z_plk) = texp(delta_Al_plk_frh(:,z_plk) ==
        min(delta_Al_plk_frh(:,z_plk)));
end
```
%% second iteration

```matlab
P_expbe_plk_1 = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
P_expal_plk_1 = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
P_burbe_plk_1 = nan(k_max,numel(muon_depth));
P_bural_plk_1 = nan(k_max,numel(muon_depth));

delta_Be_plk_frh_1 = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
delta_Al_plk_frh_1 = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
Be_tsp_frh_1 = nan(1,numel(muon_depth));
Al_tsp_frh_1 = nan(1,numel(muon_depth));

for z_plk = 1:numel(muon_depth) %for each possible plucking thickness
    % new_ttot_wth_plk_exact_Be = R_ttot_wth - Be_tsp_frh(z_plk);
    % new_ttot_wth_plk_exact_Al = R_ttot_wth - Al_tsp_frh(z_plk);
    new_ttot_wth_plk_exact_Be = ttot_wth - Be_tsp_frh(z_plk);
    new_ttot_wth_plk_exact_Al = ttot_wth - Al_tsp_frh(z_plk);
    new_ttot_wth_plk_est_Be = t_glac*round(new_ttot_wth_plk_exact_Be/t_glac) + frac*t_glac;
    new_ttot_wth_plk_est_Al = t_glac*round(new_ttot_wth_plk_exact_Al/t_glac) + frac*t_glac;

    Be_prof_ttot_wth_1 = P_expbe_z(texp == new_ttot_wth_plk_est_Be,:);
    Al_prof_ttot_wth_1 = P_expal_z(texp == new_ttot_wth_plk_est_Al,:);
    be_inh_1 = Be_prof_ttot_wth_1(z_plk);
    al_inh_1 = Al_prof_ttot_wth_1(z_plk);
    treexpbe_plk_1 = be_inh_1.*e_decbeexp + expbe_surf;
    treexpal_plk_1 = al_inh_1.*e_decalexp + expal_surf;

    for k = 1:k_max
        P_expbe_plk_1(k,z_plk) = treexpbe_plk_1;
        P_expal_plk_1(k,z_plk) = treexpal_plk_1;

        tburbe_plk_1 = treexpbe_plk_1.*decbebur + burbe_surf;
        tbural_plk_1 = treexpal_plk_1.*decalbur + bural_surf;

        treexpbe_plk_1 = tburbe_plk_1.*e_decbeexp + expbe_surf;
        treexpal_plk_1 = tbural_plk_1.*e_decalexp + expal_surf;

        P_burbe_plk_1(k,z_plk) = tburbe_plk_1;
        P_bural_plk_1(k,z_plk) = tbural_plk_1;
    end
end

delta_Be_plk_frh_1(:,z_plk) = abs(P_expbe_plk_1(:,z_plk) - Be_concs(samples(2)));
Be_tsp_frh_1(1,z_plk) = texp(delta_Be_plk_frh_1(:,z_plk) == min(delta_Be_plk_frh_1(:,z_plk)));
```
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delta_Al_plk_frh_1(:,z_plk) = abs(P_expal_plk_1(:,z_plk) - Al_concs(samples(2)));
Al_tsp_frh_1(1,z_plk) = texp(delta_Al_plk_frh_1(:,z_plk) == min(delta_Al_plk_frh_1(:,z_plk)));

%% third iteration
P_expbe_plk_2 = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
P_expal_plk_2 = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
P_burbe_plk_2 = nan(k_max,numel(muon_depth));
P_bural_plk_2 = nan(k_max,numel(muon_depth));
delta_Be_plk_frh_2 = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
delta_Al_plk_frh_2 = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
Be_tsp_frh_2 = nan(1,numel(muon_depth));
Al_tsp_frh_2 = nan(1,numel(muon_depth));
for z_plk = 1:numel(muon_depth) %for each possible plucking thickness
% new_ttot_wth_plk_exact_Be = R_ttot_wth  - Be_tsp_frh_1(z_plk);
% new_ttot_wth_plk_exact_Al  = R_ttot_wth  - Al_tsp_frh_1(z_plk);
new_ttot_wth_plk_exact_Be = ttot_wth  - Be_tsp_frh_1(z_plk);
new_ttot_wth_plk_est_Be = t_glac*round(new_ttot_wth_plk_exact_Be/t_glac) + frac*t_glac;
new_ttot_wth_plk_exact_Al  = ttot_wth  - Al_tsp_frh_1(z_plk);
new_ttot_wth_plk_est_Al   = t_glac*round(new_ttot_wth_plk_exact_Al/t_glac) + frac*t_glac;

Be_prof_ttot_wth_2 = P_expbe_z(texp == new_ttot_wth_plk_est_Be,:);
Al_prof_ttot_wth_2 = P_expal_z(texp == new_ttot_wth_plk_est_Al,:);

be_inh_2 = Be_prof_ttot_wth_2(z_plk);
al_inh_2 = Al_prof_ttot_wth_2(z_plk);

treexpbe_plk_2 = be_inh_2.*e_decbeexp  + expbe_surf;
treexpal_plk_2 = al_inh_2.*e_decalexp  + expal_surf;
for k = 1:k_max
P_expbe_plk_2(k,z_plk) = treexpbe_plk_2;
P_expal_plk_2(k,z_plk) = treexpal_plk_2;

tburbe_plk_2 = treexpbe_plk_2.*decbebur + burbe_surf;
tbural_plk_2 = treexpal_plk_2.*decalbur + bural_surf;

treexpbe_plk_2 = tburbe_plk_2.*e_decbeexp  + expbe_surf;
treexpal_plk_2 = tbural_plk_2.*e_decalexp  + expal_surf;
P_burbe_plk_2(k,z_plk) = tburbe_plk_2;
P_bural_plk_2(k,z_plk) = tbural_plk_2;
end
P_expbe_plk_2(k_max+1,z_plk) = treexpbe_plk_2;
P_expal_plk_2(k_max+1,z_plk) = treexpal_plk_2;
delta_Be_plk_frh_2(:,z_plk) = abs(P_expbe_plk_2(:,z_plk) - Be_concs(samples(2)));  
Be_tsp_frh_2(1,z_plk) = texp(delta_Be_plk_frh_2(:,z_plk) == min(delta_Be_plk_frh_2(:,z_plk)));  
delta_A1_plk_frh_2(:,z_plk) = abs(P_expal_plk_2(:,z_plk) - Al_concs(samples(2)));  
Al_tsp_frh_2(1,z_plk) = texp(delta_Be_plk_frh_2(:,z_plk) == min(delta_Be_plk_frh_2(:,z_plk)));  
end

%---------------------------------------------------------------------
%%% fourth iteration
P_expbe_plk_3 = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));  
P_expal_plk_3 = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));  
P_burbe_plk_3 = nan(k_max,numel(muon_depth));  
P_bural_plk_3 = nan(k_max,numel(muon_depth));  
delta_Be_plk_frh_3 = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));  
delta_A1_plk_frh_3 = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));  
Be_tsp_frh_3 = nan(1,numel(muon_depth));  
Al_tsp_frh_3 = nan(1,numel(muon_depth));
for z_plk = 1:numel(muon_depth) %for each possible plucking thickness
  new_ttot_wth_plk_exact_Be = R_ttot_wth  - Be_tsp_frh_2(z_plk);  
  new_ttot_wth_plk_est_Be = t_glac*round(new_ttot_wth_plk_exact_Be/t_glac) + frac*t_glac;  
  new_ttot_wth_plk_exact_Al = ttot_wth  - Al_tsp_frh_2(z_plk);  
  new_ttot_wth_plk_est_Al = t_glac*round(new_ttot_wth_plk_exact_Al/t_glac) + frac*t_glac;  
  Be_prof_ttot_wth_3 = P_expbe_z(texp == new_ttot_wth_plk_est_Be,:);  
  Al_prof_ttot_wth_3 = P_expal_z(texp == new_ttot_wth_plk_est_Al,:);  
  be_inh_3 = Be_prof_ttot_wth_3(z_plk);  
  al_inh_3 = Al_prof_ttot_wth_3(z_plk);  
  treexpbe_plk_3 = be_inh_3.*e_decebexp + expbe_surf;  
  treexpal_plk_3 = al_inh_3.*e_decalexp + expal_surf;
  for k = 1:k_max
    P_expbe_plk_3(k,z_plk) = treexpbe_plk_3;  
    P_expal_plk_3(k,z_plk) = treexpal_plk_3;
    tburbe_plk_3 = treexpbe_plk_3.*decbebur + burbe_surf;  
    tbural_plk_3 = treexpal_plk_3.*decalbur + bural_surf;  
    treexpbe_plk_3 = tburbe_plk_3.*e_decebexp + expbe_surf;  
    treexpal_plk_3 = tbural_plk_3.*e_decalexp + expal_surf;
  end
end
P\text{\_expbe\_plk\_3}(k\_\text{max}+1,z\text{\_plk}) = \text{treexpbe\_plk\_3};
\text{P\_expal\_plk\_3}(k\_\text{max}+1,z\text{\_plk}) = \text{treexpal\_plk\_3};

\text{delta\_Be\_plk\_frh\_3}(:,z\text{\_plk}) = \text{abs}(\text{P\_expbe\_plk\_3}(\cdot,z\text{\_plk}) - \text{Be\_concs}(\text{samples}(2)))
\text{Be\_tsp\_frh\_3}(1,z\text{\_plk}) = \exp(\text{delta\_Be\_plk\_frh\_3}(\cdot,z\text{\_plk}) == \text{min}(\text{delta\_Be\_plk\_frh\_3}(\cdot,z\text{\_plk})))
\text{delta\_Al\_plk\_frh\_3}(:,z\text{\_plk}) = \text{abs}(\text{P\_expal\_plk\_3}(\cdot,z\text{\_plk}) - \text{Al\_concs}(\text{samples}(2)))
\text{Al\_tsp\_frh\_3}(1,z\text{\_plk}) = \exp(\text{delta\_Al\_plk\_frh\_3}(\cdot,z\text{\_plk}) == \text{min}(\text{delta\_Al\_plk\_frh\_3}(\cdot,z\text{\_plk})))

\text{save tsp\_Mth1\_conc Be\_tsp\_frh Al\_tsp\_frh Be\_tsp\_frh\_1 Al\_tsp\_frh\_1 Be\_tsp\_frh\_2 Al\_tsp\_frh\_2 Be\_tsp\_frh\_3 Al\_tsp\_frh\_3}

%%%display results of concentration depth profiles and time since plucking for all iterations
figure
subplot(1,2,1)
hold on
figure
subplot(1,2,1)
hold on
plot(muon\_depth, \text{Be\_prof\_ttot\_wth\_3}, 'g--', muon\_depth, \text{Al\_prof\_ttot\_wth\_3}, 'm--')
plot(muon\_depth, \text{Be\_prof\_ttot\_wth\_2}, 'g-.', muon\_depth, \text{Al\_prof\_ttot\_wth\_2}, 'm-.')
plot(muon\_depth, \text{Be\_prof\_ttot\_wth\_1}, 'g:', muon\_depth, \text{Al\_prof\_ttot\_wth\_1}, 'm:')
plot(muon\_depth, \text{Be\_prof\_ttot\_wth}, 'g-', muon\_depth, \text{Al\_prof\_ttot\_wth}, 'm-')
plot(muon\_depth, \text{Beprob\_prof\_ttot\_wth}, 'y:', muon\_depth, \text{Al\_prof\_ttot\_wth}, 'y:')
plot(muon\_depth, \text{ones(size(muon\_depth)})*\text{Al\_concs}(\text{samples}(1)), 'k:', muon\_depth, \text{ones(size(muon\_depth)})*\text{Be\_concs}(\text{samples}(1)), 'k-')
plot(muon\_depth, \text{ones(size(muon\_depth)})*\text{Al\_concs}(\text{samples}(2)), 'b:', muon\_depth, \text{ones(size(muon\_depth)})*\text{Be\_concs}(\text{samples}(2)), 'b-')
xlabel('depth (cm)')
ylabel('Concentration')
subplot(1,2,2)
hold on
plot(muon\_depth, \text{Be\_tsp\_frh}, 'g-', muon\_depth, \text{Al\_tsp\_frh}, 'm-')
plot(muon\_depth, \text{Be\_tsp\_frh\_1}, 'g:', muon\_depth, \text{Al\_tsp\_frh\_1}, 'm:')
plot(muon\_depth, \text{Be\_tsp\_frh\_2}, 'g-.', muon\_depth, \text{Al\_tsp\_frh\_2}, 'm-.')
plot(muon\_depth, \text{Be\_tsp\_frh\_3}, 'g--', muon\_depth, \text{Al\_tsp\_frh\_3}, 'm--')
xlabel('depth (cm)')
ylabel('time since plucking (a)')
Ratio depth profile \(^{26}\text{Al}/^{10}\text{Be}\)

```matlab
% find tsp using Approach 1c starting with nuclide concentration at a certain depth below the weathered surface, do the time integrated complex exposure trajectory and find tsp for which \(R_{\text{calc}} = R_{\text{meas frh}}

\[
P_{\text{exp be plk}} = \text{nan}(\text{k max}+1, \text{numel(muon_depth)});
P_{\text{exp al plk}} = \text{nan}(\text{k max}+1, \text{numel(muon_depth)});
P_{\text{bur be plk}} = \text{nan}(\text{k max}, \text{numel(muon_depth)});
P_{\text{bur al plk}} = \text{nan}(\text{k max}, \text{numel(muon_depth)});
R_{\text{tsp frh}} = \text{zeros}(1, \text{numel(muon_depth)});

for \(z\_\text{plk} = 1:\text{numel(muon_depth)}\) %for each plucking thickness
    \(t_{\text{sp z}} = \text{nan}(1, 100);\)
    \(\text{counter} = 0;\)
    \%
    \(\text{be inh} = \text{Be prof ttot wth}(z\_\text{plk});\)
    \(\text{al inh} = \text{Al prof ttot wth}(z\_\text{plk});\)
    \(\text{be inh} = \text{Beprob prof ttot wth}(z\_\text{plk});\)
    \(\text{al inh} = \text{Alprob prof ttot wth}(z\_\text{plk});\)

    \(\text{tre exp be plk} = \text{be inh}.*\text{dec be exp} + \text{exp be surf} ;\)
    \(\text{tre exp al plk} = \text{al inh}.*\text{deca exp} + \text{exp al surf} ;\)

    for \(k = 1: \text{k max}\)
        \(P_{\text{exp be plk}}(k, z\_\text{plk}) = \text{tre exp be plk} ;\)
        \(P_{\text{exp al plk}}(k, z\_\text{plk}) = \text{tre exp al plk} ;\)
        \(\text{t bur be plk} = \text{tre exp be plk}.*\text{dec be bur} + \text{bur be surf} ;\)
        \(\text{t bur al plk} = \text{tre exp al plk}.*\text{deca bur} + \text{bural surf} ;\)

        \(\text{tre exp be plk} = \text{t bur be plk}.*\text{dec be exp} + \text{exp be surf} ;\)
        \(\text{tre exp al plk} = \text{t bur al plk}.*\text{deca exp} + \text{exp al surf} ;\)

        \(P_{\text{bur be plk}}(k, z\_\text{plk}) = \text{t bur be plk} ;\)
        \(P_{\text{bur al plk}}(k, z\_\text{plk}) = \text{t bur al plk} ;\)

        \(\text{if} \left(\text{tre exp be plk} \geq (\text{Be concs(samples(2))} - 1*\text{Be errs(samples(2)))} \&\& (\text{tre exp be plk} \leq (\text{Be concs(samples(2))} + 1*\text{Be errs(samples(2)))})\right)\)
        \(\text{if} \left(\text{tre exp al plk} \geq (\text{Al concs(samples(2))} - 1*\text{Al errs(samples(2)))} \&\& (\text{tre exp al plk} \leq (\text{Al concs(samples(2))} + 1*\text{Al errs(samples(2)))})\right)\)
            \(\text{counter} = \text{counter} + 1;\)
            \(t_{\text{sp z}}(1, \text{counter}) = \text{t exp}(k);\)
    end
end

\(P_{\text{exp be plk}}(\text{k max}+1, z\_\text{plk}) = \text{tre exp be plk} ;\)
\(P_{\text{exp al plk}}(\text{k max}+1, z\_\text{plk}) = \text{tre exp al plk} ;\)
\(R_{\text{tsp frh}}(1, z\_\text{plk}) = \text{min}(\text{min}(t_{\text{sp z}}));\)
end
```
bnrdr = 15;

%% second iteration
P_expbe_plk_1 = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
P_expal_plk_1 = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
P_burbe_plk_1 = nan(k_max,numel(muon_depth));
P_bural_plk_1 = nan(k_max,numel(muon_depth));
R_tsp_frh_1 = zeros(1,numel(muon_depth));

for z_plk = bnrdr:numel(muon_depth) %for each plucking thickness
    new_ttot_wth_plk_exact = R_ttot_wth - R_tsp_frh(z_plk);
    new_ttot_wth_plk_est = t_glac*round(new_ttot_wth_plk_exact/t_glac) + frac*t_glac;
    ind_R_ttot_wth_1 = find(texp == new_ttot_wth_plk_est);
    Be_prof_ttot_wth_1 = P_expbe_z(ind_R_ttot_wth_1,:);
    Al_prof_ttot_wth_1 = P_expal_z(ind_R_ttot_wth_1,:);
    be_inh_1 = Be_prof_ttot_wth_1(z_plk);
    al_inh_1 = Al_prof_ttot_wth_1(z_plk);
    t_sp_z = nan(1, 100);
    counter = 0;
    
    treexpbe_plk_1 = be_inh_1.*decbeexp + expbe_surf;
    treexpal_plk_1 = al_inh_1.*decalexp + expal_surf;

    for k = 1:k_max
        P_expbe_plk_1(k,z_plk) = treexpbe_plk_1;
        P_expal_plk_1(k,z_plk) = treexpal_plk_1;
        
        tburbe_plk_1 = treexpbe_plk_1.*decbebur + burbe_surf;
        tbural_plk_1 = treexpal_plk_1.*decalbur + bural_surf;
        treexpbe_plk_1 = tburbe_plk_1.*decbeexp + expbe_surf;
        treexpal_plk_1 = tbural_plk_1.*decalexp + expal_surf;
        
        P_burbe_plk_1(k,z_plk) = tburbe_plk_1;
        P_bural_plk_1(k,z_plk) = tbural_plk_1;

        if (treexpbe_plk_1 >= (Be_concs(samples(2)) - 1*Be_errs(samples(2)))) &
            (treexpbe_plk_1 <= (Be_concs(samples(2)) + 1*Be_errs(samples(2))))
            if (treexpal_plk_1 >= (Al_concs(samples(2)) - 1*Al_errs(samples(2)))) &
                (treexpal_plk_1 <= (Al_concs(samples(2)) + 1*Al_errs(samples(2))))
                    counter = counter + 1;
                    t_sp_z(1,counter) = texp(k);
                end
            end
        end
    end
end

P_expbe_plk_1(k_max+1,z_plk) = treexpbe_plk_1;
P_expal_plk_1(k_max+1,z_plk) = treexpal_plk_1;
R_tsp_frh_1(1,z_plk) = min(min(t_sp_z));
% third iteration
P_expbe_plk_2 = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
P_expal_plk_2 = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
P_burbe_plk_2 = nan(k_max,numel(muon_depth));
P_bural_plk_2 = nan(k_max,numel(muon_depth));
R_tsp_frh_2 = zeros(1,numel(muon_depth));

for z_plk = bndr:numel(muon_depth) % for each plucking thickness
    new_ttot_wth_plk_exact = R_ttot_wth  - R_tsp_frh_1(z_plk);
    new_ttot_wth_plk_est = t_glac*round(new_ttot_wth_plk_exact/t_glac) + frac*t_glac;
    ind_R_ttot_wth_2 = find(texp == new_ttot_wth_plk_est);
    Be_prof_ttot_wth_2 = P_expbe_z(ind_R_ttot_wth_2,:);
    Al_prof_ttot_wth_2 = P_expal_z(ind_R_ttot_wth_2,:);
    be_inh_2 = Be_prof_ttot_wth_2(z_plk);
    al_inh_2 = Al_prof_ttot_wth_2(z_plk);
    t_sp_z = nan(1, 100);
    counter = 0;
    treexpbe_plk_2 = be_inh_2.*decbeexp + expbe_surf;
    treexpal_plk_2 = al_inh_2.*decalexp + expal_surf;

    for k = 1:k_max
        P_expbe_plk_2(k,z_plk) = treexpbe_plk_2;
        P_expal_plk_2(k,z_plk) = treexpal_plk_2;
        tburbe_plk_2 = treexpbe_plk_2.*decbebur + burbe_surf;
        tbural_plk_2 = treexpal_plk_2.*decalbur + bural_surf;
        treexpbe_plk_2 = tburbe_plk_2.*decbeexp + expbe_surf;
        treexpal_plk_2 = tbural_plk_2.*decalexp + expal_surf;
        P_burbe_plk_2(k,z_plk) = tburbe_plk_2;
        P_bural_plk_2(k,z_plk) = tbural_plk_2;

        if (treexpbe_plk_2 >= (Be_concs(samples(2)) -
            1*Be_errs(samples(2))) && (treexpbe_plk_2 <= (Be_concs(samples(2)) +
            1*Be_errs(samples(2))))
            if (treexpal_plk_2 >= (Al_concs(samples(2)) -
                1*Al_errs(samples(2))) && (treexpal_plk_2 <= (Al_concs(samples(2)) +
                1*Al_errs(samples(2))))
                counter = counter + 1;
                t_sp_z(1,counter) = texp(k);
            end
        end
    end
end

P_expbe_plk_2(k_max+1,z_plk) = treexpbe_plk_2;
P_expal_plk_2(k_max+1,z_plk) = treexpal_plk_2;
R_tsp_frh_2(1,z_plk) = min(min(t_sp_z));
end
%% fourth iteration
P_expbe_plk_3 = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
P_expal_plk_3 = nan(k_max+1,numel(muon_depth));
P_burbe_plk_3 = nan(k_max,numel(muon_depth));
P_bural_plk_3 = nan(k_max,numel(muon_depth));
R_tsp_frh_3 = zeros(1,numel(muon_depth));

for z_plk = bndr:numel(muon_depth) %for each plucking thickness
    new_ttot_wth_plk_exact = R_ttot_wth - R_tsp_frh_2(z_plk);
    new_ttot_wth_plk_est = t_glac*round(new_ttot_wth_plk_exact/t_glac) + frac*t_glac;
    ind_R_ttot_wth_3 = find(texp == new_ttot_wth_plk_est);
    Be_prof_ttot_wth_3 = P_expbe_z(ind_R_ttot_wth_3,:);
    Al_prof_ttot_wth_3 = P_expal_z(ind_R_ttot_wth_3,:);
    be_inh_3 = Be_prof_ttot_wth_3(z_plk);
    al_inh_3 = Al_prof_ttot_wth_3(z_plk);
    t_sp_z = nan(1, 100);
    counter = 0;

    treexpbe_plk_3 = be_inh_3.*decbeexp + expbe_surf;
    treexpal_plk_3 = al_inh_3.*decalexp + expal_surf;

    for k = 1:k_max
        P_expbe_plk_3(k,z_plk) = treexpbe_plk_3;
        P_expal_plk_3(k,z_plk) = treexpal_plk_3;

        tburbe_plk_3 = treexpbe_plk_3.*decbebur + burbe_surf;
        tbural_plk_3 = treexpal_plk_3.*decalbur + bural_surf;

        treexpbe_plk_3 = tburbe_plk_3.*decbeexp + expbe_surf;
        treexpal_plk_3 = tbural_plk_3.*decalexp + expal_surf;

        P_burbe_plk_3(k,z_plk) = tburbe_plk_3;
        P_bural_plk_3(k,z_plk) = tbural_plk_3;

        if (treexpbe_plk_3 >= (Be_concs(samples(2)) - 1*Be_errs(samples(2))) && (treexpbe_plk_3 <= (Be_concs(samples(2)) + 1*Be_errs(samples(2))))
            if (treexpal_plk_3 >= (Al_concs(samples(2)) - 1*Al_errs(samples(2))) && (treexpal_plk_3 <= (Al_concs(samples(2)) + 1*Al_errs(samples(2))))
                counter = counter + 1;
                t_sp_z(1,counter) = texp(k);
            end
        end
    end

    P_expbe_plk_3(k_max+1,z_plk) = treexpbe_plk_3;
    P_expal_plk_3(k_max+1,z_plk) = treexpal_plk_3;
    R_tsp_frh_3(1,z_plk) = min(min(t_sp_z));
end
save tsp_Mth1_R R_tsp_frh R_tsp_frh_1 R_tsp_frh_2 R_tsp_frh_3

figure
subplot(1,3,1)
hold on
plot(muon_depth, Be_prof_ttot_wth_3, 'b-', muon_depth, Be_prof_ttot_wth_2, 'g-')
plot(muon_depth, Be_prof_ttot_wth_1, 'y-', muon_depth, Be_prof_ttot_wth, 'm-')
plot(muon_depth, ones(size(muon_depth))*Be_concs(samples(1)), 'k-')
plot(muon_depth, ones(size(muon_depth))*(Be_concs(samples(1))-Be_errs(samples(1))), 'k:')
plot(muon_depth, ones(size(muon_depth))*(Be_concs(samples(1))+Be_errs(samples(1))), 'k:')
plot(muon_depth, ones(size(muon_depth))*Be_concs(samples(2)), 'b-')
plot(muon_depth, ones(size(muon_depth))*(Be_concs(samples(2))-Be_errs(samples(2))), 'b:')
plot(muon_depth, ones(size(muon_depth))*(Be_concs(samples(2))+Be_errs(samples(2))), 'b:')
xlabel('depth (cm)')
ylabel('Be concentration')

subplot(1,3,2)
hold on
plot(muon_depth, Al_prof_ttot_wth_3, 'b-', muon_depth, Al_prof_ttot_wth_2, 'g-')
plot(muon_depth, Al_prof_ttot_wth_1, 'y-', muon_depth, Al_prof_ttot_wth, 'm-')
plot(muon_depth, ones(size(muon_depth))*Al_concs(samples(1)), 'k-')
plot(muon_depth, ones(size(muon_depth))*(Al_concs(samples(1))-Al_errs(samples(1))), 'k:')
plot(muon_depth, ones(size(muon_depth))*(Al_concs(samples(1))+Al_errs(samples(1))), 'k:')
plot(muon_depth, ones(size(muon_depth))*Al_concs(samples(2)), 'b-')
plot(muon_depth, ones(size(muon_depth))*(Al_concs(samples(2))-Al_errs(samples(2))), 'b:')
plot(muon_depth, ones(size(muon_depth))*(Al_concs(samples(2))+Al_errs(samples(2))), 'b:')
xlabel('depth (cm)')
ylabel('Al concentration')

subplot(1,3,3)
hold on
plot(muon_depth, R_tsp_frh, 'm-')
plot(muon_depth, R_tsp_frh_1, 'y-')
plot(muon_depth, R_tsp_frh_2, 'g-')
plot(muon_depth, R_tsp_frh_3, 'b-')
xlabel('depth (cm)')
ylabel('time since plucking (a)')
A4.6.3 Specific Code for Approach 2

```matlab
% find time since plucking using equation
new_Be10_lambda = (1-frac)*Be10_lambda + frac*dec_elambda(1,1);
new_Al26_lambda = (1-frac)*Al26_lambda + frac*dec_elambda(2,1);

tsp_eq = 1/(new_Al26_lambda - new_Be10_lambda) *
log(Rprob_prof_ttot_wth*(Be_concs(samples(1))-
Be_concs(samples(2)))/(Al_concs(samples(1))-Al_concs(samples(2))));

% new_ttot_wth_exact = R_ttot_wth - tsp_z_eq1(1);
new_ttot_wth_exact = ttot_wth - tsp_eq(1);
new_ttot_wth_est = t_glac*round(new_ttot_wth_exact/t_glac) +
frac*t_glac;
ind_R_wth_1 = find(texp == new_ttot_wth_est);
R_prof_ttot_wth_1 =
P_expal_z(ind_R_wth_1,:)/P_expbe_z(ind_R_wth_1,:);
tsp_eq_1 = 1/(new_Al26_lambda - new_Be10_lambda) * log(
R_prof_ttot_wth_1 *(Be_concs(samples(1))-
Be_concs(samples(2)))/(Al_concs(samples(1))-Al_concs(samples(2))));

% new_ttot_wth_exact_1 = R_ttot_wth - tsp_z_eq_1_1(1);
new_ttot_wth_exact_1 = ttot_wth - tsp_eq_1(1);
new_ttot_wth_est_1 = t_glac*round(new_ttot_wth_exact_1/t_glac) +
frac*t_glac;
ind_R_wth_2 = find(texp == new_ttot_wth_est_1);
R_prof_ttot_wth_2 =
P_expal_z(ind_R_wth_2,:)/P_expbe_z(ind_R_wth_2,:);
tsp_eq_2 = 1/(new_Al26_lambda - new_Be10_lambda) * log(
R_prof_ttot_wth_2 *(Be_concs(samples(1))-
Be_concs(samples(2)))/(Al_concs(samples(1))-Al_concs(samples(2))));

% new_ttot_wth_exact_2 = R_ttot_wth - tsp_z_eq2(1);
new_ttot_wth_exact_2 = ttot_wth - tsp_eq_2(1);
new_ttot_wth_est_2 = t_glac*round(new_ttot_wth_exact_2/t_glac) +
frac*t_glac;
ind_R_wth_3 = find(texp == new_ttot_wth_est_2);
R_prof_ttot_wth_3 =
P_expal_z(ind_R_wth_3,:)/P_expbe_z(ind_R_wth_3,:);
tsp_eq_3 = 1/(new_Al26_lambda - new_Be10_lambda) * log(
R_prof_ttot_wth_3 *(Be_concs(samples(1))-
Be_concs(samples(2)))/(Al_concs(samples(1))-Al_concs(samples(2))));

save tsp_eq tsp_eq tsp_eq_1 tsp_eq_2 tsp_eq_3

figure
subplot(2,1,1)
hold on
plot(muon_depth, R_prof_ttot_wth', 'm-')
plot(muon_depth, R_prof_ttot_wth_1', 'y-')
plot(muon_depth, R_prof_ttot_wth_2', 'g-', 'linewidth', 2)
plot(muon_depth, R_prof_ttot_wth_3', 'b-')
```

% Specific Code for Approach 3

% find min time since plucking for any depth below surface
% define range of texp for starting points of reexposure after plucking
ind_inh = 1:10:k_max/10; %maybe need to refine this interval 1:k_max

pdf_inh = nan(numel(muon_depth),numel(ind_inh));
tsp_prob = nan(numel(muon_depth), 3);
t_sp = nan(numel(muon_depth), 2);

for z = 1:numel(muon_depth)
    P_reexpbe = nan(k_max+1,numel(ind_inh));
    P_reexpal = nan(k_max+1,numel(ind_inh));
    P_reburbe = nan(k_max,numel(ind_inh));
    P_rebural = nan(k_max,numel(ind_inh));
    t_sp_z = nan(numel(ind_inh),1000);
    chi2_plk = nan(k_max+1, numel(ind_inh));
end
for i_inh = 1:numel(ind_inh)
  counter = 0;
  e_counter = 0;
  P_reexpbe(1:ind_inh(i_inh), i_inh) = P_expbe_z(1:ind_inh(i_inh), i_inh);
  P_reexpal(1:ind_inh(i_inh), i_inh) = P_expal_z(1:ind_inh(i_inh), i_inh);
  P_reburbe(1:ind_inh(i_inh), i_inh) = P_burbe_z(1:ind_inh(i_inh), i_inh);
  P_rebural(1:ind_inh(i_inh), i_inh) = P_bural_z(1:ind_inh(i_inh), i_inh);
  be_inh = P_burbe_z(ind_inh(i_inh), z);
  al_inh = P_bural_z(ind_inh(i_inh), z);
  treexpbe = be_inh.*decbeexp + expbe;
  treexpal = al_inh.*decalexp + expal;
  for k = ind_inh(i_inh)+1:k_max
    P_reexpbe(k,i_inh) = treexpbe;
    P_reexpal(k,i_inh) = treexpal;
    chi2_plk(k,i_inh) = ((treexpbe - Be_concs(sample)) ./ Be_errs(sample))^2 + ((treexpal - Al_concs(sample)) ./ Al_errs(sample))^2;
  end
  treburbe = treexpbe.*decbebur + burbe;
  trebural = treexpal.*decalbur + bural;
  treexpbe = treburbe.*decbeexp + expbe;
  treexpal = trebural.*decalexp + expal;
  if (treexpbe >= (Be_concs(sample) - Be_errs(sample))) &&
     (treexpbe <= (Be_concs(sample) + Be_errs(sample)))
    if (treexpal >= (Al_concs(sample) - Al_errs(sample)))
      && (treexpal <= (Al_concs(sample) + Al_errs(sample)))
      counter = counter + 1;
      k_tsp = k - ind_inh(i_inh);
      t_sp_z(i_inh,counter) = k_tsp*t_glac + exposet;
    end
  end
  P_reburbe(k,i_inh) = treburbe;
  P_rebural(k,i_inh) = trebural;
end
P_reexpbe(k_max+1,i_inh) = treexpbe;
P_reexpal(k_max+1,i_inh) = treexpal;
chi2_plk(k_max+1,i_inh) = ((treexpbe - Be_concs(sample)) ./ Be_errs(sample))^2 + ((treexpal - Al_concs(sample)) ./ Al_errs(sample))^2;
end %i_inh
prob_plk = exp(-chi2_plk./2);
[inh_maxprob, index_inhmaxprob] = max(prob_plk);
ind_tspinh = index_inhmaxprob - ind_inh;
min_tspinh = min(ind_tspinh)*t_glac + exposet;
max_tspinh = max(ind_tspinh)*t_glac + exposet;
[tsp_inhmaxprob, ind_inhbesttsp] = max(inh_maxprob);
best_tspinh = ind_tspinh(1,ind_inhbesttsp)*t_glac + exposet;
tsp_prob(z,:) = [best_tspinh min_tspinh max_tspinh];
pdf_inh(z,:) = inh_maxprob./sum(inh_maxprob);

t_sp(z,1) = min(min(t_sp_z));
t_sp(z,2) = max(max(t_sp_z));
end %z

out = [t_sp te_sp];
save t_sp.mat t_sp te_sp

figure
hold on
plot(muon_depth, tsp_prob(:,1), 'r*', muon_depth, tsp_prob, 'r-')
plot(muon_depth, t_sp, 'c*', muon_depth, t_sp, 'b-')
xlabel('plucking thickness (cm)')
ylabel('min time since plucking (a)')

A4.7 BURIAL AGE CALCULATION

A4.7.1 Primary code to calculate multiple burial and exposure ages

function output = CP_burial_ages(tordata, muontype, samples, avexpdur, averate, icethick, sigma, binres, consts, makeplot, plotbanana)
%example:> output = CP_burial_ages('CP_alltor.txt', 1, [1:26], 0.222, 1, 5000, 1, 2000, consts, false, false)

%This function runs the CP_burialage script for each sample included in %samples vector. See that script for details for the inputs and output file.

%obtain ages for each sample
output = nan(numel(samples),7);
allexpages = nan(numel(samples),11);
allburages = nan(numel(samples),11);
for k = 1:numel(samples)
    [X, Y, e_X, e_Y] = CP_burialage(tordata, muontype, samples(k), avexpdur, averate, icethick, sigma, binres, consts, makeplot, plotbanana);
allexpages(k,1) = samples(k);
allburages(k,1) = samples(k);
allexpages(k,2:6) = X;
allburages(k,2:6) = Y;
allexpages(k,7:11) = e_X;
allburages(k,7:11) = e_Y;
end
output(:,1:4) = allexpages(:,1:4);
output(:,5:7) = allburages(:,2:4);

%output concatenated pdfs (pre-convolution) with age bin (x-axis) to
file for later use
save expages.txt allexpages -ascii
save burages.txt allburages -ascii
save expburages.txt output -ascii

end

A4.7.2  Secondary code for individual burial and exposure ages

function [expages, burages, e_expages, e_burages] =
CP_burialage(tordata, muontype, sample, avexpdur, averate, icethick,
sigma, binres,consts, makeplot, plotbanana)
%example:> out = CP_burialage('CP_alltor.txt', 1, 10, 0.222, 1, 5000,
1, 2000, consts, true, true)

%This function determines the burial age that best fits concentrations
of Be-10 and Al-26 given a simple surface buildup and burial history.
Muon production based on Lifton et al. 2014 (LSD scaling scheme) is
included both during the buildup period and the burial period.

%Burial age and error is determined using a systematic parameter search
and chi-squared statistic to create a continuous probability density
function.

%Note: inputing a multi-line data file will plot all data on one burial
plot, but only the 'sample' you select will be analyzed numerically.
See 'CP_burial_ages.m' (above) to analyze multiple burial ages at once.

%INPUTS:
%tordata = name of ascii file with columns of data (e.g. 'data.txt'):
% column 1 is the decimal latitude of each sample;
% column 2 is the decimal longitude of each sample;
% column 3 is the elevation of each sample; (m)
% column 4 is measured [10Be]; (atoms/g)
% column 5 is the measured 1 sigma error in [10Be]; (atoms/g)
% column 6 is the measured [26Al]; (atoms/g)
% column 7 is the measured 1 sigma error in [26Al]; (atoms/g)

%muontype = deep muon scheme to use; surface buildup model uses Lifton
et al. (2014), but this parameter refers to the scheme used at depth.
If = 0, there is no deep muon production; if = 1 Lifton (2013) is used
at depth (estimate from J. Stone, pers. comm.); if = 2 Heisinger (2002)
is used at depth.

%sample = the row number of the sample you wish to plot; all samples
will plot regardless, however, because of muons, the plot is
structurally different at different depths and will therefore only be
accurate for the sample specified here unless 1) all sample depths are identical or 2) muon production is not included (muontype = 0)

%avexpdur = best guess for average duration of ice-free intervals in percentage of the total %glacial cycle; (i.e. 0.185 for 18.5ka of 100ka glacial cycle)

%averate = best guess for average constant erosion rate during interglacials in mm ka−1; (mm/ka = m/Ma = 1e−1 cm/ka = 1e−4 cm/a)

%icethick = average ice thickness covering sample site during each burial episode; (cm)

%sigma = specifies the sigma confidence for the error ellipse

%binres = the bin resolution used to calculate pdf (note: increasing this constant geometrically increases calculation time. A value of around 2000 is usually sufficient, which generates a pdf curve using 2000 points over the age range

%consts = a matlab structure containing constants used in the LSD scaling model. This structure is loaded in the startup.m file.

%makeplot = if true, will output individual plots for each sample. It is useful to suppress this if goal is to just creat pdfs for age.

%plotbananna = if true, will also plot the banana window

%OUTPUT:

%Running this program also writes a .mat file to your working directory. The name format is the name of your data input file plus the sample row number. This file contains a data structure called "burialoutput" with the following results of the age calculation:

sample row number, bur/expmaxage (the most probable age as determined from the probability density function), bur/expsignalplus and bur/expsignalminus (the +/- 1sigma errors in bur/expmaxage), bur/expsignal2plus and bur/expsignal2minus (the +/- 2sigma errors in bur/expmaxage), burial_sim, exposure_sim and pdf_bur, pdf_exp (matrices containing vectors for incremental time and probability--basically to allow reconstruction of the pdf.

%A.Margreth, based on A. Hidy's burialage code (25.03.2014) adapted to tor data on Cumberland Peninsula

%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%

%load data
burial_data = load(tordata);
lats = burial_data(:,1);
longs = burial_data(:,2);
elevs = burial_data(:,3);
Be_concs = burial_data(:,4);
Be_errs = burial_data(:,5);
Al_concs = burial_data(:,6);
Al_errs = burial_data(:,7);
ratios = Al_concs./Be_concs;

%densities used for buildup (g/cc)
 r_density = 2.65;
 ice_density = 0.9;

%Because muon production function requires mass depth as input ->
 transform any depth to rock-equivalent depth, which can then be
 multiplied by rock density
 surf_depth = 0;
%used in buildup functions to draw isoexp and -bur lines
 depth_ice = icethick*ice_density/r_density;
%recalculate ice thickness to a rock-equivalent thickness
 frac = avexpdur; %redundent assignment
 bur_depth = (depth_ice * (1-frac) * 100) / 100;
 eros = averate / 10000; %convert to cm a-1

%decay constants (1/s)
 Be10_lambda = log(2)/1387000;
 %Chmeleff et al. (2010), Korschinek et al. (2010)
 Al26_lambda = log(2)/705000; %Nishiizumi (2004)

%neutron attenuation length (g/cm^2)
 neutron_atten = 150;
 %Follows Balco et al. (2008); see Gosse and Phillips (2001)

%spallogenic production (atoms/g/a)
 refspalprod = 4.0; %New prod rate, Brocher et al. (subm.);
 ratio_init = 6.75; %Nishiizumi et al. (1989); Balco et al. (2008);
 6.1/1.106 to reflect recalibration of Nishiizumi et al. (2007)

%Get LSD scaling factors
 maxage = 100000; %age over which to integrate production rates
 LSD10 = LSD(lats(sample),longs(sample),elevs(sample),1,maxage,-1,10);
 LSD26 = LSD(lats(sample),longs(sample),elevs(sample),1,maxage,-1,26);
 agegrid = 0:1:maxage;
%average cutoff rigidity (RC) and solar modulation (SPhi) over age range
 meanRC = mean(interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.Rc,agegrid));
 meanSPhi = mean(interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.SPhi,agegrid));

%average spallogenic surface production rate over age range
 Be10_spalsurf =
 mean(refspalprod.*interpolate(LSD10.tv,LSD10.Be,agegrid));
 Al26_spalsurf =
 mean(refspalprod.*ratio_init.*interpolate(LSD26.tv,LSD26.Al,agegrid));
 [Be10_fmusurf, Be10_mmusurf] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD(0 *
  r_density,LSD10.pressure,meanRC,meanSPhi,consts,10,'no');
 [Al26_fmusurf, Al26_mmusurf] = CP_P_mu_totalLSD(0 *
  r_density,LSD10.pressure,meanRC,meanSPhi,consts,26,'no');

%muonic production at depth
 if muontype == 0 %no muon production
 Be10_mudepth = 0;
 Al26_mudepth = 0;
 else if muontype == 1 %Use LSD rates based on

Be10_mudepth = P_mu_totalLSD(bur_depth * r_density, LSD10.pressure, meanRC, meanSPhi, consts, 10, 'no');
Al26_mudepth = P_mu_totalLSD(bur_depth * r_density, LSD10.pressure, meanRC, meanSPhi, consts, 26, 'no');
else if muontype == 2
    Be10_mudepth = muonproduction_heisinger(bur_depth * r_density, elevs, 1);
    Al26_mudepth = muonproduction_heisinger(bur_depth * r_density, elevs, 0);
end
end
end

%override buildup production rates here (for example, to assume basin-wide production rate for source)
Be10_spalbuildup = Be10_spalsurf;
Al26_spalbuildup = Al26_spalsurf;
Be10_mubuildup = Be10_fmusurf + Be10_nmusurf;
Al26_mubuildup = Al26_fmusurf + Al26_nmusurf;

%simple buildup model with no erosion
%buildup due to exposure at surface; assumes no inheritance
function Be10_conc_buildup = Be10_buildup(t_exposure)
    Be10spall_buildup = (Be10_spalbuildup/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*t_exposure));
    Be10muon_buildup = (Be10_mubuildup/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*t_exposure));
    Be10_conc_buildup = Be10spall_buildup + Be10muon_buildup;
end

function Al26_conc_buildup = Al26_buildup(t_exposure)
    Al26spall_buildup = (Al26_spalbuildup/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*t_exposure));
    Al26muon_buildup = (Al26_mudepth/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*t_exposure));
    Al26_conc_buildup = Al26spall_buildup + Al26muon_buildup;
end

%burial production; assume buildup is inheritance
function Be10_conc_burial = Be10_burial(t_exposure, t_burial)
    Be10spall_burial = (Be10_spalsurf/Be10_lambda)*exp(-bur_depth*r_density/neutron_atten)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*t_burial));
    Be10muon_burial = (Be10_mudepth/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*t_burial));
    Be10inheritance = Be10_buildup(t_exposure)*exp(-Be10_lambda*t_burial);
    Be10_conc_burial = Be10spall_burial + Be10muon_burial + Be10inheritance;
end

function Al26_conc_burial = Al26_burial(t_exposure, t_burial)
    Al26spall_burial = (Al26_spalsurf/Al26_lambda)*exp(-bur_depth*r_density/neutron_atten)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*t_burial));
    Al26muon_burial = (Al26_mudepth/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*t_burial));

Al26inheritance = Al26_buildup(t_exposure)*exp(-Al26_lambda*t_burial);
Al26_conc_burial = Al26spall_burial + Al26muon_burial + Al26inheritance;
end

%simple buildup model with erosion
%new lambda term spallation
function Be10lambda = Be10_elambda(erate)
    Be10lambda = Be10_lambda + erate*r_density/neutron_atten;
end
function Al26lambda = Al26_elambda(erate)
    Al26lambda = Al26_lambda + erate*r_density/neutron_atten;
end
function Be10lambdamun = Be10n_elambdamu(erate)
    Be10lambdamun = Be10_lambda + erate*r_density/1500;
end
function Al26lambdamun = Al26n_elambdamu(erate)
    Al26lambdamun = Al26_lambda + erate*r_density/1500;
end
function Be10lambdamuf = Be10f_elambdamu(erate)
    Be10lambdamuf = Be10_lambda + erate*r_density/4350;
end
function Al26lambdamuf = Al26f_elambdamu(erate)
    Al26lambdamuf = Al26_lambda + erate*r_density/4350;
end

function eBe10_conc_buildup = eBe10_buildup(t_exposure, erate)
    Be10spall_buildup = (Be10_spalsurf./Be10_elambda(erate)).*(1-exp(-Be10_elambda(erate).*t_exposure));
    Be10muon_buildup = Be10_fmusurf./Be10f_elambdamu(erate).*(1-exp(-Be10f_elambdamu(erate).*t_exposure)) + Be10_nmusurf./Be10n_elambdamu(erate).*(1-exp(-Be10n_elambdamu(erate).*t_exposure));
    eBe10_conc_buildup = Be10spall_buildup + Be10muon_buildup;
end

function eAl26_conc_buildup = eAl26_buildup(t_exposure, erate)
    Al26spall_buildup = (Al26_spalsurf./Al26_elambda(erate)).*(1-exp(-Al26_elambda(erate).*t_exposure));
    Al26muon_buildup = Al26_fmusurf./Al26f_elambdamu(erate).*(1-exp(-Al26f_elambdamu(erate).*t_exposure)) + Al26_nmusurf./Al26n_elambdamu(erate).*(1-exp(-Al26n_elambdamu(erate).*t_exposure));
    eAl26_conc_buildup = Al26spall_buildup + Al26muon_buildup;
end

%burial production; assume buildup is inheritance
function eBe10_conc_burial = eBe10_burial(t_exposure, t_burial, erate)
Be10spall_burial = (Be10_spalsurf/Be10_lambda)*exp(-bur_depth*r_density/neutron_atten)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*t_burial));
Be10muon_burial = (Be10_mudepth/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*t_burial));
Be10inheritance = eBe10_buildup(t_exposure, erate)*exp(-Be10_lambda*t_burial);
eBe10_conc_burial = Be10spall_burial + Be10muon_burial + Be10inheritance;
end

function eAl26_conc_burial = eAl26_burial(t_exposure, t_burial, erate)
Al26spall_burial = (Al26_spalsurf/Al26_lambda)*exp(-bur_depth*r_density/neutron_atten)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*t_burial));
Al26muon_burial = (Al26_mudepth/Al26_lambda)*(1-exp(-Al26_lambda*t_burial));
Al26inheritance = eAl26_buildup(t_exposure, erate)*exp(-Al26_lambda*t_burial);
eAl26_conc_burial = Al26spall_burial + Al26muon_burial + Al26inheritance;
end

%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%  
%Generate probability density function
%pdf grid resolution
pdfres = binres;

%create burial and exposure grids
burial_sim = linspace(0,1500000,pdfres);
exposure_sim = linspace(0, 500000, pdfres);

%initialize matrices
Be10_matrix = zeros(numel(exposure_sim),numel(burial_sim));
Al26_matrix = zeros(numel(exposure_sim),numel(burial_sim));
eBe10_matrix = zeros(numel(exposure_sim),numel(burial_sim));
eAl26_matrix = zeros(numel(exposure_sim),numel(burial_sim));
for i = 1:numel(exposure_sim)
    for j = 1:numel(burial_sim)
        Be10_matrix(i,j) = Be10_burial(exposure_sim(i),burial_sim(j));
        Al26_matrix(i,j) = Al26_burial(exposure_sim(i),burial_sim(j));
        eBe10_matrix(i,j) = eBe10_burial(exposure_sim(i),burial_sim(j), eros);
        eAl26_matrix(i,j) = eAl26_burial(exposure_sim(i),burial_sim(j), eros);
    end
end
%use grid values to compute modeled results at each point and compare
with measured concentrations to generate chi-squared grid
chi2be_matrix = abs(((Be10_matrix - Be_concs(sample))./Be_errs(sample))).^2);
chi2al_matrix = abs(((Al26_matrix - Al_concs(sample))./Al_errs(sample)).^2);
chi2total_matrix = chi2be_matrix + chi2al_matrix;

echi2be_matrix = abs(((eBe10_matrix - Be_concs(sample))./Be_errs(sample)).^2);
echi2al_matrix = abs(((eAl26_matrix - Al_concs(sample))./Al_errs(sample)).^2);
echi2total_matrix = echi2be_matrix + echi2al_matrix;

%convert chi-squared to probability using likelihood function
prob2total_matrix = exp(-chi2total_matrix./2);
eprob2total_matrix = exp(-echi2total_matrix./2);

burial_max = max(prob2total_matrix);
burial_emax = max(eprob2total_matrix);
%construct pdf normalized so area under curve=1
pdf_bur = burial_max./sum(burial_max);
cdf_bur = cumsum(pdf_bur);
[b_bur,i_bur] = unique(cdf_bur);

pdf_ebur = burial_emax./sum(burial_emax);
cdf_ebur = cumsum(pdf_ebur);
[b_ebur,i_ebur] = unique(cdf_ebur);

exposure_max = max(prob2total_matrix, [], 2);
pdf_exp = exposure_max./sum(exposure_max);
cdf_exp = cumsum(pdf_exp);
[b_exp,i_exp] = unique(cdf_exp);

exposure_emax = max(eprob2total_matrix, [], 2);
pdf_eexp = exposure_emax./sum(exposure_emax);
cdf_eexp = cumsum(pdf_eexp);
[b_eexp,i_eexp] = unique(cdf_eexp);

burialoutput.sampleID = sample;
burialoutput.burmaxage = burial_sim(pdf_bur == max(pdf_bur))/10^3;
%burial age in ka
burialoutput.bursignalplus = interp1(b_bur,burial_sim(i_bur),0.84135)/10^3; %del burial age in ka
burialoutput.bursignalminus = interp1(b_bur,burial_sim(i_bur),0.15865)/10^3; %del burial age in ka
burialoutput.bursigma2plus = interp1(b_bur,burial_sim(i_bur),0.977)/10^3; %del burial age in ka
burialoutput.bursigma2minus = interp1(b_bur,burial_sim(i_bur),0.023)/10^3; %del burial age in ka
burialoutput.pdf_bur = pdf_bur;
burialoutput.expmaxage = exposure_sim(pdf_exp == max(pdf_exp))/10^3;
%burial age in ka
burialoutput.expulse = interp1(b_exp,exposure_sim(i_exp),0.84135)/10^3; %del burial age in ka
burialoutput.expulse = interp1(b_exp,exposure_sim(i_exp),0.15865)/10^3; %del burial age in ka
burialoutput.expulse = interp1(b_exp,exposure_sim(i_exp),0.977)/10^3; %del burial age in ka
burialoutput.expsigma2minus = 
interp1(b_exp,exposure_sim(i_exp),0.023)/10^3; %del burial age in ka
burialoutput.exposure_sim = exposure_sim;
burialoutput.pdf_exp = pdf_exp;

burages = [burialoutput.burmaxage burialoutput.bursigma1plus burialoutput.bursigma1minus burialoutput.bursigma2plus burialoutput.bursigma2minus];
expages = [burialoutput.expmaxage burialoutput.expsigma1plus burialoutput.expsigma1minus burialoutput.expsigma2plus burialoutput.expsigma2minus];

e_burialoutput.sampleID = sample;
e_burialoutput.burmaxage = burial_sim(pdf_ebur == max(pdf_ebur))/10^3;
%burial age in ka
e_burialoutput.bursigma1plus = 
interp1(b_ebur,burial_sim(i_ebur),0.84135)/10^3; %del burial age in ka
e_burialoutput.bursigma1minus = 
interp1(b_ebur,burial_sim(i_ebur),0.15865)/10^3; %del burial age in ka
e_burialoutput.bursigma2plus = 
interp1(b_ebur,burial_sim(i_ebur),0.977)/10^3; %del burial age in ka
e_burialoutput.bursigma2minus = 
interp1(b_ebur,burial_sim(i_ebur),0.023)/10^3; %del burial age in ka
e_burialoutput.pdf_bur = pdf_ebur;
e_burialoutput.expmaxage = exposure_sim(pdf_eexp == max(pdf_eexp))/10^3; %burial age in ka
e_burialoutput.expsigma1plus = 
interp1(b_eexp,exposure_sim(i_eexp),0.84135)/10^3; %del burial age in ka
e_burialoutput.expsigma1minus = 
interp1(b_eexp,exposure_sim(i_eexp),0.15865)/10^3; %del burial age in ka
e_burialoutput.expsigma2plus = 
interp1(b_eexp,exposure_sim(i_eexp),0.977)/10^3; %del burial age in ka
e_burialoutput.expsigma2minus = 
interp1(b_eexp,exposure_sim(i_eexp),0.023)/10^3; %del burial age in ka
e_burialoutput.pdf_exp = pdf_exp;

e_burages = [e_burialoutput.burmaxage e_burialoutput.bursigma1plus e_burialoutput.bursigma1minus e_burialoutput.bursigma2plus e_burialoutput.bursigma2minus];
e_expages = [e_burialoutput.expmaxage e_burialoutput.expsigma1plus e_burialoutput.expsigma1minus e_burialoutput.expsigma2plus e_burialoutput.expsigma2minus];

burages;
expages;
e_burages;
e_expages;

%write output file to workspace
name = strcat(mat2str(sample));
save(name,'burialoutput', 'e_burialoutput');
% Plotting parameters
if ~makeplot % suppress all burial plots?
    return
end

% pdf plot
pdfbur_axis = [0 1.5*burialoutput.bursigma2plus 0 1.2*max(pdf_bur)];
error2bur_high = (burialoutput.bursigma2plus);
error2bur_low = (burialoutput.bursigma2minus);
error1bur_high = (burialoutput.bursigma1plus);
error1bur_low = (burialoutput.bursigma1minus);
pdfexp_axis = [0 1.5*burialoutput.expsigma2plus 0 1.2*max(pdf_exp)];
error2exp_high = (burialoutput.expsigma2plus);
error2exp_low = (burialoutput.expsigma2minus);
error1exp_high = (burialoutput.expsigma1plus);
error1exp_low = (burialoutput.expsigma1minus);

figure
hold on
box on
subplot(2,2,1)
axis(pdfbur_axis)
xlabel('Burial Age (ka)');
ylabel('normalized probability');
title(strcat({'PDF: sample '},{name}));
plot(burial_sim./10^3,pdf_bur,'b-', 'linewidth', 2)
line([error2bur_high error2bur_high], [0 1], 'linestyle','-.', 'color', 'k')
line([error2bur_low error2bur_low], [0 1], 'linestyle','-.', 'color', 'k')
line([error1bur_high error1bur_high], [0 1], 'linestyle','-.', 'color', 'r')
line([error1bur_low error1bur_low], [0 1], 'linestyle','-.', 'color', 'r')
subplot(2,2,2)
axis(pdfexp_axis)
xlabel('Exposure Age (ka)');
ylabel('normalized probability');
title(strcat({'PDF: sample '},{name}));
plot(exposure_sim./10^3,pdf_exp,'b-', 'linewidth', 2)
line([error2exp_high error2exp_high], [0 1], 'linestyle','-.', 'color', 'k')
line([error2exp_low error2exp_low], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'k')
line([error1exp_high error1exp_high], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-', 'color', 'r')
line([error1exp_low error1exp_low], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'r')
subplot(2,2,3)
axis(pdfbur_eaxis)
xlabel('Burial Age (ka)');
ylabel('normalized probability');
title(strcat({'PDF: sample '},{name}));
plot(burial_sim./10^3,pdf_ebur,'b-', 'linewidth', 2)
line([error2bur_ehigh error2bur_ehigh], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-', 'color', 'k')
line([error2bur_elow error2bur_elow], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'k')
line([error1bur_ehigh error1bur_ehigh], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-', 'color', 'r')
line([error1bur_elow error1bur_elow], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'r')
subplot(2,2,4)
axis(pdfexp_eaxis)
xlabel('Exposure Age (ka)');
ylabel('normalized probability');
title(strcat({'PDF: sample '},{name}));
plot(exposure_sim./10^3,pdf_eexp,'b-', 'linewidth', 2)
line([error2exp_ehigh error2exp_ehigh], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-', 'color', 'k')
line([error2exp_elow error2exp_elow], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'k')
line([error1exp_ehigh error1exp_ehigh], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-', 'color', 'r')
line([error1exp_elow error1exp_elow], [0 1], 'linestyle', '-.', 'color', 'r')

%burial plot
%define axis for plot
plot_axis = [4 7.5 0 8]; %x-axis, y-axis

%Define locations of contours on burial plot, in years
n1 = [250000 500000 1000000 2000000 3000000 4000000 8000000];
%burial contours
n2 = [1000 10000 30000 100000 300000 1000000]; %exposure contours
n3 = [100 50 10 5 2 1 0.5 0.1 0.05 0.01]/1000;
%erosion rate contours for erosion banana, cm/a, [cm/ka]

%Create grids for plot contours
texp = 1:100:20000000;
tbur = 1:100:20000000;
eeros = 0:0.001/1000:500/1000;

figure
hold on
box on
axis(plot_axis);
xlabel('log[^{10}Be] (atoms g^{-1})');
ylabel('^{26}Al/^{10}Be');
title(strcat({'Burial Plot: sample '},{name}));

%Plot error ellipses and mean values for sample concentrations
plot(log10(Be_concs(sample)),ratios(sample),'k.'); Tor ellipse(Be_concs(sample),Be_errs(sample),Al_concs(sample),Al_errs(sample),sigma);

%burial contours
for k = 1:numel(n1)
    plot(log10(Be10_burial(texp,n1(k))),Al26_burial(texp,n1(k))./Be10_burial(texp,n1(k)),'b:'); end

%exposure contours
for k = 1:numel(n2)
    plot(log10(Be10_burial(n2(k),tbur)),Al26_burial(n2(k),tbur)./Be10_burial(n2(k),tbur),'k--'); end

%surface curve for zero erosion
plot(log10(Be10_burial(texp,0)),Al26_burial(texp,0)./Be10_burial(texp,0 ),'r-', 'linewidth',2);

%burial path starting at zero-erosion surface saturation (lower plot %boundary)
plot(log10(Be10_burial(100000000,tbur)),Al26_burial(100000000,tbur)./Be10_burial(100000000,tbur),'k-', 'linewidth',2);

%include erosion banana?
if ~plotbanana
    return
end

for k = 1:numel(n3)
    plot(log10(eBe10_buildup(texp,n3(k))),eAl26_buildup(texp,n3(k))./eBe10_buildup(texp,n3(k)),'g-'); end
plot(log10(eBe10_buildup(100000000,eeros)),eAl26_buildup(100000000,eeros)./eBe10_buildup(100000000,eeros),'g-','linewidth',2);
plot(log10(Be10_burial(texp,0)),Al26_burial(texp,0)./Be10_burial(texp,0 ),'r-', 'linewidth',2);

%depth curve for zero erosion
function Be10_conc_buildupA = Be10_buildupA(t_exposure)
    Be10spall_buildup = (Be10_spalsurf/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*t_exposure)) *exp(-bur_depth*r_density/neutron_atten);
    Be10muon_buildup = (Be10_mudepth/Be10_lambda)*(1-exp(-Be10_lambda*t_exposure));
    Be10_conc_buildupA = Be10spall_buildup + Be10muon_buildup;
end

function Al26_conc_buildupA = Al26_buildupA(t_exposure)
\texttt{A26spall\_buildup = (A26\_spalsurf/A26\_lambda)*(1-exp(-A26\_lambda*t\_exposure))}\texttt{*exp(-bur\_depth*r\_density/neutron\_atten)};}
\texttt{A26muon\_buildup = (A26\_mudepth/A26\_lambda)*(1-exp(-A26\_lambda*t\_exposure));}
\texttt{A26\_conc\_buildupA = A26spall\_buildup + A26muon\_buildup;}
\texttt{end}

\texttt{plot(log10(Be10\_buildupA(texp)),A26\_buildupA(texp)/.Be10\_buildupA(texp),'r-','linewidth',2);}
\texttt{end}

A4.8 REFERENCES FOR A4


APPENDIX A5 – Chemistry Data

This appendix contains all the information necessary to re-calculate exposure ages as production rates, isotope half-lives or other parameters may change over time. In the first section, the input tables are given, which were used to calculate exposure ages with the CRONUS KU online calculator, version 1.0 (http://web1.ittc.ku.edu:8888/), together with the tables used to calculate concentrations of native Al from ICP-MS and –OES analyses. In the second section, the chemistry worksheets are included for all TCN samples (boulders, bedrock, and depth profiles).
A5.1 INPUT TABLES FOR CRONUS KU CALCULATOR AND NATIVE ALUMINUM DATA CALCULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Name</th>
<th>Scaling</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Pressure</th>
<th>Atmospheric Pressure or Elevation</th>
<th>Sample Thickness</th>
<th>Bulk Density</th>
<th>Shielding Factor</th>
<th>180 Concentration</th>
<th>360 Standardization</th>
<th>360 Standardization</th>
<th>Absorption Length</th>
<th>Top to Bottom Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E07-02</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.1887</td>
<td>-64.3370</td>
<td>207.74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>759737</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E09-01</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.6704</td>
<td>-63.5975</td>
<td>290.02</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>319849</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E06-01</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.6974</td>
<td>-63.9691</td>
<td>389.51</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1358039</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E08-01</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.1847</td>
<td>-63.4703</td>
<td>763.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>389860</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E28-01</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.1887</td>
<td>-64.3375</td>
<td>199.44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E08-02</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.6704</td>
<td>-63.5975</td>
<td>206.94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>759671</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E04-01</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.8421</td>
<td>-64.4713</td>
<td>554.61</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>221074</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E06-02</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.1722</td>
<td>-63.8477</td>
<td>551.60</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>754851</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E06-03</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.1722</td>
<td>-63.8477</td>
<td>558.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>72125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E06-04</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.8308</td>
<td>-64.4484</td>
<td>391.51</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>224460</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E06-05</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.7199</td>
<td>-64.4966</td>
<td>297.82</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>60825</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E06-06</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.1708</td>
<td>-63.8514</td>
<td>538.70</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E16-01</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.3929</td>
<td>-65.0995</td>
<td>472.40</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>877432</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E16-02</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.3959</td>
<td>-65.0995</td>
<td>472.40</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>309333</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E16-10</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.3919</td>
<td>-65.0995</td>
<td>472.40</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>148091</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E22-01</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.3454</td>
<td>-63.7391</td>
<td>558.89</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>304543</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E22-03</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.3481</td>
<td>-63.7391</td>
<td>558.89</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>78588</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E22-04</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.3434</td>
<td>-63.7391</td>
<td>558.89</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E22-05</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.3434</td>
<td>-63.7266</td>
<td>536.39</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>149893</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E22-06</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.3434</td>
<td>-63.7266</td>
<td>561.19</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>63998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E22-07</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.3434</td>
<td>-63.7266</td>
<td>561.19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>258996</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E28-01</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.2805</td>
<td>-63.7266</td>
<td>536.19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>30871</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E28-02</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.2877</td>
<td>-63.8245</td>
<td>481.89</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>75451</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E28-03</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.2877</td>
<td>-63.8245</td>
<td>481.89</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E28-04</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.2877</td>
<td>-63.8245</td>
<td>481.89</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E33-01</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.9297</td>
<td>-65.6130</td>
<td>471.19</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>69012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E33-02</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.3951</td>
<td>-65.6137</td>
<td>499.09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>71390</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05BS80-E33-03</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.3130</td>
<td>-65.6132</td>
<td>499.09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>648754</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>KNSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A5.1 Input data for CRONUS KU calculator.
Table A5.1 (continued) Input data for CRONUS KU calculator.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHEF ID</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Qtz Mass</th>
<th>Al Carrier Mass</th>
<th>Al Carrier ID</th>
<th>Al Carrier Conc</th>
<th>Al Carrier Density</th>
<th>ZrAl added</th>
<th>Mass of 100ml glass flask</th>
<th>Mass of glass flask plus remaining volume of solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>(g/ml)</td>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>(g/ml)</td>
<td>(g/ml)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.000</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2812.33</td>
<td>67.7464</td>
<td>168.6474</td>
<td>100.8129</td>
<td>4.7935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2313</td>
<td>Monx</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>2.8464</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1372.77</td>
<td>9.0477</td>
<td>156.8726</td>
<td>100.8129</td>
<td>4.7471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2383</td>
<td>09589-E221A-01</td>
<td>35.2199</td>
<td>1.7299</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>511.88</td>
<td>67.4055</td>
<td>169.3510</td>
<td>100.8129</td>
<td>4.8147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2384</td>
<td>09589-E304A-01</td>
<td>16.8411</td>
<td>0.5170</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1738.42</td>
<td>67.1067</td>
<td>168.3115</td>
<td>100.8129</td>
<td>4.8083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2385</td>
<td>09589-E118A-01</td>
<td>35.3935</td>
<td>1.7356</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3881.61</td>
<td>66.9584</td>
<td>167.8992</td>
<td>100.8129</td>
<td>4.8511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2387</td>
<td>09589-E138A-01</td>
<td>36.1633</td>
<td>2.4791</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2648.61</td>
<td>66.3810</td>
<td>167.7928</td>
<td>100.8129</td>
<td>4.8211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2390</td>
<td>09589-E167A-01</td>
<td>35.2181</td>
<td>2.4827</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2544.85</td>
<td>65.9574</td>
<td>167.5705</td>
<td>100.8129</td>
<td>4.8981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2391</td>
<td>09589-E335A-01</td>
<td>35.2931</td>
<td>2.4794</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2482.08</td>
<td>65.6493</td>
<td>167.4246</td>
<td>100.8129</td>
<td>4.7952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2392</td>
<td>09589-ES5A-01</td>
<td>35.1482</td>
<td>2.4174</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2454.85</td>
<td>65.6374</td>
<td>167.5705</td>
<td>100.8129</td>
<td>4.8891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2393</td>
<td>09589-E348A-01</td>
<td>35.1319</td>
<td>2.4810</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2544.85</td>
<td>65.6080</td>
<td>167.2512</td>
<td>100.8129</td>
<td>4.8537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2394</td>
<td>09589-E344B-01</td>
<td>35.8062</td>
<td>2.8054</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2777.62</td>
<td>65.1017</td>
<td>166.0703</td>
<td>100.8129</td>
<td>4.8618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A5.2** Native aluminum data calculation for bedrock samples – batch 1, part 1.
Table A5.2 (continued) Native aluminum data calculation for bedrock samples – batch 1, part 1.
### Table A5.2 (continued) Native aluminum data calculation for bedrock samples – batch 1, part 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNED ID</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Native aluminum data calculation for bedrock samples – batch 1, part 1.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JG2313</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>6.00E+05 6.16E+05 4.9% 2.4% 2.18E+18 1.54E+18 1.54E+18 5.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2933</td>
<td>059B-E211A-03</td>
<td>1.03E+02 1.07E+02 2.5% 1.3% 1.86E+18 1.76E+18 1.33E+18 1.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2934</td>
<td>059B-E304A-01</td>
<td>1.13E+02 1.13E+02 0.4% 0.2% 3.57E+17 0.31E+17 2.33E+17 0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2935</td>
<td>059B-A183A-01</td>
<td>1.31E+02 1.11E+02 3.3% 1.0% 2.55E+18 2.92E+18 1.84E+18 0.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2936</td>
<td>059B-A183A-01</td>
<td>1.22E+02 1.23E+02 0.6% 0.3% 5.42E+17 0.44E+17 3.83E+17 0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2937</td>
<td>059B-A183A-01</td>
<td>1.20E+02 1.24E+02 4.0% 2.3% 5.91E+18 3.02E+18 2.77E+18 2.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2938</td>
<td>059B-A183A-01</td>
<td>1.18E+02 1.19E+02 2.8% 1.4% 2.48E+18 2.04E+18 1.72E+18 1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2939</td>
<td>059B-A183A-01</td>
<td>1.13E+02 1.14E+02 1.3% 0.6% 1.01E+18 0.85E+17 7.15E+17 0.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2940</td>
<td>059B-A183A-01</td>
<td>1.07E+02 1.09E+02 3.3% 1.7% 1.59E+18 2.30E+18 1.63E+18 1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2941</td>
<td>059B-A183A-01</td>
<td>1.18E+02 1.18E+02 3.4% 1.7% 2.72E+18 2.34E+18 1.92E+18 1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A5.3 Native aluminum data calculation for bedrock samples – batch 1, part 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNF ID</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Meas of glass floss plus initial solution</th>
<th>Mass of glass floss plus initial solution</th>
<th>Difference between calculated and measured mass of glass floss plus initial solution</th>
<th>Meas of total Al2O3 solution</th>
<th>Mass of total Al2O3 solution</th>
<th>Difference between calculated and measured mass of total Al2O3 solution</th>
<th>Ratio of mass between target solution and initial solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3909R E221A-01</td>
<td>96.3394</td>
<td>104.0715</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>104.0715</td>
<td>81.5993</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3909R E221A-02</td>
<td>96.3394</td>
<td>104.0715</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>104.0715</td>
<td>81.5993</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3909R E221A-03</td>
<td>96.3394</td>
<td>104.0715</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>104.0715</td>
<td>81.5993</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A5.3 (continued) Native aluminum data calculation for bedrock samples – batch 1, part 2.
Table A5.4 Native aluminum data calculation for bedrock samples – batch 2.
Table A5.4 (continued) Native aluminum data calculation for bedrock samples – batch 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONIF ID</th>
<th>SAMPLE ID</th>
<th>Mass of aliquot vial B with 2 drops carrier (μL)</th>
<th>Mass of aliquot vial B diluted (μL)</th>
<th>Mass of glass flask plus remaining volume of solution (μL)</th>
<th>Difference between calculated and measured mass of carrier to 95 μL solution</th>
<th>Mass of carrier added to 95 μL solution (μL)</th>
<th>Mass of aliquot vial C</th>
<th>Mass of aliquot vial C diluted (μL)</th>
<th>Mass of glass flask plus remaining volume of solution (with carrier)</th>
<th>Mass of remaining volume of solution (μL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(μL)</td>
<td>(μL)</td>
<td>in 5 μL</td>
<td>in 10 μL</td>
<td>in 15 μL</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(μL)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(μL)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(μL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG1254</td>
<td>0958B-E223A-01</td>
<td>5.0349</td>
<td>10.184</td>
<td>15.367</td>
<td>86.2465</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>2.9683</td>
<td>5.0052</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>151.0182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2526</td>
<td>0958B-E223A-01</td>
<td>5.0436</td>
<td>10.164</td>
<td>15.348</td>
<td>86.3003</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>1.7429</td>
<td>5.0131</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>151.0182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2527</td>
<td>0958B-E223A-01</td>
<td>5.0319</td>
<td>10.149</td>
<td>15.330</td>
<td>86.1899</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>1.7297</td>
<td>5.0119</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>151.0182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2528</td>
<td>0958B-E223A-01</td>
<td>5.0798</td>
<td>10.146</td>
<td>15.347</td>
<td>86.5105</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>1.7482</td>
<td>5.0186</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>151.0182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2529</td>
<td>0958B-E223A-01</td>
<td>5.0555</td>
<td>10.083</td>
<td>15.266</td>
<td>86.5541</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.7402</td>
<td>5.0216</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>151.0182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2532</td>
<td>0958B-E223A-01</td>
<td>5.0499</td>
<td>10.146</td>
<td>15.321</td>
<td>86.1503</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>1.7290</td>
<td>5.0134</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>151.0182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2533</td>
<td>1058B-E04A-01</td>
<td>5.0930</td>
<td>10.183</td>
<td>15.268</td>
<td>86.4791</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.8031</td>
<td>5.0066</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>151.0182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG2534</td>
<td>1058B-E04A-01</td>
<td>5.0523</td>
<td>10.132</td>
<td>15.316</td>
<td>86.4713</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>2.4867</td>
<td>5.0013</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>151.0182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONIF ID</th>
<th>ICP-MS Al calculations</th>
<th>Mass of Al in 85 μL solution before addition of carrier (by mass solution)</th>
<th>Mass of Al in 85 μL solution before addition of carrier (reduced for mass Al lost in aliquots A and B)</th>
<th>Concentration of Al in target solution</th>
<th>Total mass of Al in target solution (by mass solution)</th>
<th>Total mass of Al in target solution (reduced for mass Al lost in aliquot C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(μg Al)</td>
<td>(μg Al)</td>
<td>(μg Al)/μL</td>
<td>(μg Al)</td>
<td>(μg Al)</td>
<td>(μg Al)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2420</td>
<td>2490</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3801</td>
<td>3893</td>
<td>3893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2526</td>
<td>2449</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3801</td>
<td>3893</td>
<td>3893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2527</td>
<td>2451</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3927</td>
<td>3927</td>
<td>3927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2528</td>
<td>2510</td>
<td>2510</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3994</td>
<td>3993</td>
<td>3993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2529</td>
<td>2599</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4079</td>
<td>4079</td>
<td>4079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2532</td>
<td>25602</td>
<td>25602</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25938</td>
<td>25923</td>
<td>25923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2533</td>
<td>11891</td>
<td>11884</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>12894</td>
<td>12894</td>
<td>12894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2534</td>
<td>4776</td>
<td>4776</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6771</td>
<td>6813</td>
<td>6813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONIF ID</th>
<th>ICP-MS Al calculations</th>
<th>2010_Tor1_2, 274Al atoms in target solution</th>
<th>2010_Tor1_2, 274Al Average of 274Al atoms in target solution</th>
<th>Standard deviation for 274Al atoms in target solution</th>
<th>ICP measurement error for estimate of 274Al atoms in target solution</th>
<th>ICP measurement error should be calculated differently: Average of two different measurements (i.e. average of two wavelengths &gt; error)</th>
<th>STDEV / Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(atoms 274Al)</td>
<td>(atoms 274Al)</td>
<td>(atoms 274Al)</td>
<td>(atoms 274Al)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2527</td>
<td>4.48±19</td>
<td>4.48±19</td>
<td>3.57±15</td>
<td>1.52±15</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>10.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2529</td>
<td>5.50±19</td>
<td>5.50±19</td>
<td>6.10±15</td>
<td>4.10±15</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A5.4 (continued) Native aluminum data calculation for bedrock samples – batch 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNIF ID</th>
<th>SAMPLE ID</th>
<th>Difference between calculated and measured mass of remaining volume of solution</th>
<th>Ratio of mass between target solution and initial solution</th>
<th>2010_Tor1_2 ZnAl atoms in target solution</th>
<th>2010_Tor1_2 Average of ZnAl atoms in target solution</th>
<th>2010_Tor1_2 Standard deviation for average of ZnAl atoms in target solution</th>
<th>Standard deviation of the means for ZnAl atoms in target solution</th>
<th>ICP measurement error for estimate of ZnAl atoms in target solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J52254</td>
<td>059R-E222A-01</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>in-80 ml [%]</td>
<td>in-target (atoms ZnAl)</td>
<td>in-target (atoms ZnAl)</td>
<td>in-target (atoms ZnAl)</td>
<td>in-target (atoms ZnAl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J52252</td>
<td>059R-E222A-01</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>6.19E+19</td>
<td>6.19E+19</td>
<td>6.19E+19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J52253</td>
<td>059R-E222A-01</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>6.00E+19</td>
<td>6.00E+19</td>
<td>6.00E+19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J52253</td>
<td>059R-E222A-01</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>6.00E+19</td>
<td>6.00E+19</td>
<td>6.00E+19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J52254</td>
<td>059R-E222A-01</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.51E+20</td>
<td>1.51E+20</td>
<td>1.51E+20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

too low ICP error, but no uncertainty stated by ICP-MS
Table A5.5 Native aluminum data calculation for bedrock samples – batch 3.
Table A5.5 (continued) Native aluminum data calculation for bedrock samples – batch 3.
A5.2 CHEMISTRY WORKSHEETS

A5.2.1 Boulder Data for Chapter 3

Chemistry worksheets of boulders from ‘central valley’

### WS4_QtzDissolution p1

*This worksheet outlines the steps for dissolving quartz and adding Be carrier.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemist: AM/GY</th>
<th>Date: 02/02/2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>300 ml vessel ID</th>
<th>Beryl Carrier ID</th>
<th>Al Carrier ID</th>
<th>Mass 300 ml vessel</th>
<th>Mass 40g quartz</th>
<th>Mass Be carrier</th>
<th>Mass Al Carrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2396</td>
<td>09SRB-E027A-01</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>N/A. No Al data needed</td>
<td>10.4058</td>
<td>35.5406</td>
<td>0.1932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2397</td>
<td>09SRB-E036A-01</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1035</td>
<td>36.0183</td>
<td>0.1932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2398</td>
<td>09SRB-E040A-01</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1965</td>
<td>36.2254</td>
<td>0.2046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>09SRB-E092A-01</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1222</td>
<td>35.3615</td>
<td>0.1975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2402</td>
<td>09SRB-E025A-01</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.4041</td>
<td>35.0693</td>
<td>0.2129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2403</td>
<td>09SRB-E026A-01</td>
<td>B9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.4134</td>
<td>35.8344</td>
<td>0.1939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2404</td>
<td>09SRB-E041A-01</td>
<td>B10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.4240</td>
<td>35.4114</td>
<td>0.1933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Add 20 ml conc. HF and 2 ml HClO4 per 5 g of quartz
2. Add 5 ml Aqua Regia
3. Heat at 100-125°C until quartz dissolves, add HF if needed
4. Raise to 200°C and evaporate to dryness
5. Add 5 ml HClO4 and evaporate to dryness
6. Add 8 to 10 ml conc. HNO3, swirl, and evaporate to dryness
7. Dissolved dried sample in 20 ml of 2% HCl

**Comments**

B17: 45ml HF + 50ml AR + 8ml HClO4; B23: 110ml HF + 50ml AR + 8ml HClO4;
all other plus blank: 140ml HF + 50ml AR + 8 HClO4
Feb 03 9:15 am, all dissolved, open lid, to dry at 200°C, not much residue
Feb 04 8:30 am, 5ml HClO4, rinse with dionized water
3:40 pm, add 8-10ml HNO3, down to 110°C -> to dry
B14 white, large, full bottom of jar; B15 small, brown; B3 small brown; B6 small white/brown;
B5 small brown; B2 small, dark brown; B21 small, light brown; B17 small, light brown;
B9 small, white; B23 small, brown; B31 clean, tiny; B30 small, light brown; B10 small, brown;
B8 large, white, full bottom
WS4_QtzDissolution p2

This worksheet outlines the steps for dissolving quartz and adding Be carrier.

Chemist: AM/GY  Date: 02/02/2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2406</td>
<td>2407</td>
<td>2408</td>
<td>2409</td>
<td>2410</td>
<td>2412</td>
<td>2415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>09SRB-E003A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E004A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E002A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E058A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E060A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E002A-01</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 ml vessel ID</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>B17</td>
<td>B21</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>B30</td>
<td>B31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beryl Carrier ID</td>
<td>Be Carrier bottle 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Carrier ID</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 300 ml vessel</td>
<td>10.6022</td>
<td>10.1103</td>
<td>10.1881</td>
<td>10.2666</td>
<td>10.4052</td>
<td>10.3926</td>
<td>150.1907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 40g quartz</td>
<td>35.7158</td>
<td>35.4866</td>
<td>11.1915</td>
<td>36.1225</td>
<td>27.2192</td>
<td>35.0875</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Be carrier</td>
<td>0.2003</td>
<td>0.1906</td>
<td>0.1821</td>
<td>0.2014</td>
<td>0.1838</td>
<td>0.2023</td>
<td>0.1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Al Carrier</td>
<td>Add Al carrier next step. With aliquot, Nov 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Add 20 ml conc. HF and 2 ml HClO4 per 5 g of quartz
2. Add 5 ml Aqua Regia
3. Heat at 100-1250 C until quartz dissolves, add HF if needed
4. Raise to 200 C and evaporate to dryness
5. Add 5 ml HClO4 and evaporate to dryness
6. Add 8 to 10 ml conc. HNO3, swirl, and evaporate to dryness
7. Dissolved dried sample in 20 ml of 2% HCl

Comments
B17: 45ml HF + 50ml AR + 8ml HClO4; B23: 110ml HF + 50ml AR + 8ml HClO4;
all other plus blank: 140ml HF + 50ml AR + 8 HClO4
Feb 03 9:15 am, all dissolved, open lid, to dry at 200°C, not much residue
Feb 04 8:30 am, 5ml HClO4, rinse with dionized water
  3:40 pm, add 8-10ml HNO3, down to 110°C -> to dry
  B14 white, large, full bottom of jar; B15 small, brown; B3 small brown; B6 small white/brown;
  B5 small brown; B2 small, dark brown; B21 small, light brown; B17 small, light brown;
  B9 small, white; B23 small, brown; B31 clean, tiny; B30 small, light brown, B10 small, brown;
  B8 large, white, full bottom
WS6_Anion Column Chemistry p1

This worksheet outlines the steps for the Anion Column Chemistry (2ml size small column)

Chemist: GY/AM    Date: 02/09/2010

1. Evaporate 20 ml to dryness at 100-120°C (will take at least 3 hrs)
2. Dissolve in 10 ml 9 N HCl (let stand for several hours)
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tubes, rinse digestion vessels with 9 N HCl to bring volume in tube to 10 ml
4. Centrifuge at 1500 rpm or higher for minimum of 10 minutes
5. Allow any 9 N HCl in columns to drain out; discard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td>B9</td>
<td>B10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2396</td>
<td>2397</td>
<td>2398</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2402</td>
<td>2403</td>
<td>2404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. With stopcock closed, pipet sample (avoid residue) onto 2ml size columns.
7. Collect sample in same 300 ml teflon vessel.
8. Elute with 10 ml 9 N HCl, and collect that, close stopcock
9. 5 ml 4.5 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate in labeled 100 ml bottle
10. 10 ml 1 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate
11. 50 ml deionized water. Discard.
12. CONDITION ANION COLUMN
    (bottle A1) 10 ml 1N HCl, discard
    (bottle A2) 10 ml 4.5 N HCl, discard
    (bottle A3) 10 ml 9 N HCl, discard, but retain acid approx. 2 mm above resin

Comments
Feb 09  B5 large redbrown residue; B8 large transparent 'foamy' residue; B9 very small white residue
Feb 09  Run 14 Anion columns. 8 columns have been used once (Alan's) B3-B10; 8 new columns with new resin B2, B14-B31
Feb 10  B14 large white to transparent 'foamy' residue; B15/B17/B21 red-brown residue; B23 red-brown residue, large
WS6_Anion Column Chemistry p2

This worksheet outlines the steps for the Anion Column Chemistry (2ml size small column)

Chemist: GY/AM Date: 02/09/2010

1. Evaporate 20 ml to dryness at 100-120°C (will take at least 3 hrs)
2. Dissolve in 10 ml 9 N HCl (let stand for several hours)
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tubes, rinse digestion vessels with 9 N HCl to bring volume in tube to 10 ml
4. Centrifuge at 1500 rpm or higher for minimum of 10 minutes
5. Allow any 9 N HCl in columns to drain out; discard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>B17</td>
<td>B21</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>B30</td>
<td>B31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2406</td>
<td>2407</td>
<td>2408</td>
<td>2409</td>
<td>2410</td>
<td>2412</td>
<td>2415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>09SRB- E003A-01</td>
<td>09SRB- E004A-01</td>
<td>09SRB- E052A-01</td>
<td>09SRB- E059A-01</td>
<td>09SRB- E060A-01</td>
<td>09SRB- E002A-01</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. With stopcock closed, pipet sample (avoid residue) onto 2ml size columns.
7. Collect sample in same 300 ml teflon vessel.
8. Elute with 10 ml 9 N HCl, and collect that, close stopcock
9. 5 ml 4.5 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate in labeled 100 ml bottle
10. 10 ml 1 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate
11. 50 ml deionized water. Discard.

12. CONDITION ANION COLUMN
   (bottles A1) 10 ml 1 N HCl, discard
   (bottles A2) 10 ml 4.5 N HCl, discard
   (bottles A3) 10 ml 9 N HCl, discard, but retain acid approx. 2 mm above resin

Comments:
Feb 09  B5 large redbrown residue, B8 large transparent 'foamy' residue, B9 very small white residue
Feb 09  Run 14 Anion columns. 6 columns have been used once (Alan’s) B3-B10, 8 new columns with new resin B2, B14-B31
Feb 10  B14 large white to transparent 'foamy' residue; B15/B17/B21 red-brown residue. B23 red-brown residue, large
WS7_Controlled Precipitate p1

This worksheet outlines the steps for the controlled precipitation chemistry

Chemist: GY/AM  Date: 02/10/2010

1. Evaporate "anion" elute to dryness at 125°C
2. Dissolve in 10 ml of a 1:1 solution of 0.5 N HCl and 2% NH₄Cl
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge, centrifuge for 10 minutes
4. Decant into clean test tube, heat in water bath at 60°C
5. Add drops of 1:1 NH₄OH:H₂O to pH=9.2 (5 drops first then single)
6. Centrifuge for 15 minutes
7. Check pH of liquid, if less than pH=7, redo step 5
8. Decant, save with Anion Supernate
9. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
10. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
11. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Approx. vol. Ptte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2396</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>09SRB-E027A-01</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2397</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>09SRB-E030A-01</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2398</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td>09SRB-E040A-01</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>09SRB-E020A-01</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2402</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td>09SRB-E025A-01</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2403</td>
<td>B9</td>
<td>09SRB-E026A-01</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2404</td>
<td>B10</td>
<td>09SRB-E041A-01</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
Residue B8 white; B14 white; B31 blank, brown gel color (new resin, black before dissolving)
All other gels are light brown color (new resin for anion columns)
WS7_Controlled Precipitate p2

This worksheet outlines the steps for the controlled precipitation chemistry

Chemist: GY/AM Date: 02/10/2010

1. Evaporate "anion" elute to dryness at 125°C
2. Dissolve in 10 ml of a 1:1 solution of 0.5 N HCl and 2% NH₄Cl
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge, centrifuge for 10 minutes
4. Decant into clean test tube, heat in water bath at 60°C
5. Add drops of 1:1 NH₄OH·H₂O to pH=9.2 (5 drops first then single)
6. Centrifuge for 15 minutes
7. Check pH of liquid, if less than pH=7, redo step 5
8. Decant, save with Anion Supernate
9. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
10. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
11. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>2406</th>
<th>2407</th>
<th>2408</th>
<th>2409</th>
<th>2410</th>
<th>2412</th>
<th>2415</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>B17</td>
<td>B21</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>B30</td>
<td>B31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>09SRB-E003A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E004A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E005A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E006A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E007A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E008A-01</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. vol. Ptte</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
Residue B6 white; B14 white; B31 blank, brown gel color (new resin, black before dissolving)
All other gels are light brown color (new resin for anion columns)
WS8_Cation Column Chemistry p1

This worksheet outlines the steps for the Cation Column Chemistry

Chemist: GY/AM  Date: 02/11/2010 morning

1. Dissolve in 5 ml conc. HCl and evaporate to dryness at 125°C
2. Redissolve in 2.5 ml 1 N HCl and 2.5 ml 0.5 N HCl
3. Transfer to centrifuge tube, rinse with 1 ml 0.5 N, and centrifuge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td>B9</td>
<td>B10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2396</td>
<td>2397</td>
<td>2398</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2402</td>
<td>2403</td>
<td>2404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Pipette all of the sample into designated conditioned cation column, 17ml
5. Discard the eluant. Add 285 ml 0.5 N HCL (Bottle C6)
6. Drain the column, discard the first 300 ml of eluant
7. Add 60 ml of 0.5 N HCl, (Bottle C7), Collect eluant as Cation Supernate
8. Add 65 ml of 0.5 N HCl, (Bottle C8), Save it as Be-Sample
9. Add 120 ml 1N HCl (bottle C9)
10. Save this as Be-sample as well.
11. Add 80 ml 4.5 N HCl (bottle C10), save the eluant as Al sample.
12. CONDITION CATION COLUMN

(bottle C1) 100 ml 9 N HCl
(bottle C2) 50 ml 4.5 N HCl
(bottle C3) 50 ml 1 N HCl
(bottle C4) 50 ml water
(bottle C5) 100 ml 0.5 N HCl

* 17 ml Column
This worksheet outlines the steps for the Cation Column Chemistry

Chemist: GY/AM  Date: 02/11/2010 afternoon

1. Dissolve in 5 ml conc. HCl and evaporate to dryness at 125°C
2. Redissolve in 2.5 ml 1 N HCl and 2.5 ml 0.5 N HCl
3. Transfer to centrifuge tube, rinse with 1 ml 0.5 N, and centrifuge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID Vessel</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>B17</td>
<td>B21</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>B30</td>
<td>B31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>2406</td>
<td>2407</td>
<td>2408</td>
<td>2409</td>
<td>2410</td>
<td>2412</td>
<td>2415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09SRB-003A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-004A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-005A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-006A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-007A-01</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Pipette all of the sample into designated conditioned cation column, 17ml
5. Discard the eluant. Add 285 ml 0.5 N HCL (Bottle C6)
6. Drain the column, discard the first 300 ml of eluant
7. Add 60 ml of 0.5 N HCl, (Bottle C7), Collect eluant as Cation Supernate
8. Add 65 ml of 0.5 N HCl, (Bottle C8), Save it as Be-Sample
9. Add 120 ml 1N HCl (bottle C9)
10. Save this as Be-sample as well.
11. Add 80 ml 4.5 N HCl (bottle C10), save the eluant as Al sample.

**CONDITION CATION COLUMN**

- **(bottle C1)** 100 ml 9 N HCl
- **(bottle C2)** 50 ml 4.5 N HCl
- **(bottle C3)** 50 ml 1 N HCl
- **(bottle C4)** 50 ml water
- **(bottle C5)** 100 ml 0.5 N HCl

* 17 ml Column
WS9_Be Sample Chemistry p1

This worksheet outlines the steps to prepare the BeO sample

Chemist: GY/AM Date: 02/12/2010

1. Evaporate Be Sample from column in wiped digestion vessels at 125°C
2. Add 2.5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
3. Again, add 2.5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
4. Dissolve sample in 10 ml of 0.5 N HCl (optima grade)
5. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tube
6. Centrifuge and decant into clean centrifuge tube
7. Heat centrifuge tubes in water bath at 60°C
8. Precipitate Be(OH)₂ using Matheson ultimate grade ammonia gas
   Gently bubble NH₃ with clean pipet tip on hose
   for ca.15 bubbles, or ca. 8-12 sec until ptte forms
   Optimum pH=9.2; 1N HCl may be added
9. Centrifuge 15 min., decant (save and redo 8 if pH of liquid is < 8)
10. Wash with water, vortex, centrifuge for 10 min, and decant
11. Record mass quartz vials, label, and place them in furnace holder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Mass Qtz Vial</th>
<th>Mass Vial+Spl</th>
<th>Mass Spl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06SRB- 09SRB-</td>
<td>2.5224</td>
<td>2.5435</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E027A-01</td>
<td>2.6404</td>
<td>2.7102</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06SRB- 09SRB-</td>
<td>2.5224</td>
<td>2.5435</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E027A-01</td>
<td>2.5224</td>
<td>2.5435</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09SRB- 09SRB-</td>
<td>2.5224</td>
<td>2.5435</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E040A-01</td>
<td>2.5224</td>
<td>2.5435</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09SRB- 09SRB-</td>
<td>2.5224</td>
<td>2.5435</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E040A-01</td>
<td>2.5224</td>
<td>2.5435</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09SRB- 09SRB-</td>
<td>2.5224</td>
<td>2.5435</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E040A-01</td>
<td>2.5224</td>
<td>2.5435</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09SRB- 09SRB-</td>
<td>2.5224</td>
<td>2.5435</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E040A-01</td>
<td>2.5224</td>
<td>2.5435</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09SRB- 09SRB-</td>
<td>2.5224</td>
<td>2.5435</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E040A-01</td>
<td>2.5224</td>
<td>2.5435</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09SRB- 09SRB-</td>
<td>2.5224</td>
<td>2.5435</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E040A-01</td>
<td>2.5224</td>
<td>2.5435</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09SRB- 09SRB-</td>
<td>2.5224</td>
<td>2.5435</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E040A-01</td>
<td>2.5224</td>
<td>2.5435</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Add 1 small drop of water with micropipet, slurry precipitate
13. Transfer sample into quartz vial, cover with quartz lid
14. Turn on Bunsen Burner, dry the gel carefully.
15. Burn the Be(OH)₂ gel on bunsen burner at least 2 mins, at blue flame.
16. Convert to BeO
17. Determine mass of vial + sample
WS9_Be Sample Chemistry p2

This worksheet outlines the steps to prepare the BeO sample

Chemist: GY/AM  Date: 02/12/2010

1. Evaporate Be Sample from column in wiped digestion vessels at 125°C
2. Add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
3. Again, add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
4. Dissolve sample in 10 ml of 0.5 N HCl (optima grade)
5. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tube
6. Centrifuge and decant into clean centrifuge tube
7. Heat centrifuge tubes in water bath at 60°C
8. Precipitate Be(OH)₂ using Matheson ultimate grade ammonia gas
   Gently bubble NH₃ with clean pipet tip on hose
   for ca.15 bubbles, or ca. 8-12 sec until ptte forms
   Optimum pH=9.2; 1N HCl may be added
9. Centrifuge 15 min., decant (save and redo 8b if pH of liquid is < 8)
10. Wash with water, vortex, centrifuge for 10 min, and decant
11. Record mass quartz vials, label, and place them in furnace holder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNES ID</th>
<th>2406</th>
<th>2407</th>
<th>2408</th>
<th>2409</th>
<th>2410</th>
<th>2412</th>
<th>2415</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>B17</td>
<td>B21</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>B30</td>
<td>B31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>09SRB-E003A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E004A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E005A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E006A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E007A-01</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Qtz Vial</td>
<td>2.6548</td>
<td>2.6043</td>
<td>2.4906</td>
<td>2.7072</td>
<td>2.6052</td>
<td>2.5822</td>
<td>2.5394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Vial+Spl</td>
<td>2.6559</td>
<td>2.6038</td>
<td>2.4900</td>
<td>2.7064</td>
<td>2.6058</td>
<td>2.5827</td>
<td>2.5390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Spl</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>-0.0005</td>
<td>-0.0006</td>
<td>-0.0006</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>-0.0004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Add 1 small drop of water with micropipet, slurry precipitate
13. Transfer sample into quartz vial, cover with quartz lid
14. Turn on Bunsen Burner, dry the gel carefully.
15. Burn the Be(OH)₂ gel on bunsen burner at least 2 mins, at blue flame.
16. Convert to BeO
17. Determine mass of vial + sample
Chemistry worksheets for boulders from Moon Valley

WS4_QtzDissolution p1

This worksheet outlines the steps for dissolving quartz and adding Be carrier.

Chemist: GY
Date: 01/01/2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2375</td>
<td>2376</td>
<td>2377</td>
<td>2378</td>
<td>2379</td>
<td>2380</td>
<td>2371</td>
<td>2372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>300 ml vessel ID</th>
<th>Beryl Carrier ID</th>
<th>Al Carrier ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06SRB-E223A-01</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Be Carrier Bottle 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06SRB-E223A-03</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06SRB-E223A-02</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06SRB-E224A-01</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06SRB-E224A-02</td>
<td>B11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06SRB-E224A-03</td>
<td>B12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06SRB-E283A-01</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06SRB-E284A-01</td>
<td>B20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No Al data needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mass 40g quartz    | 36.2755 | 37.6230 | 37.0617 | 37.3268 | 37.5235 | 36.5319 | 38.3565 | 36.7188 |
| Mass Al Carrier    | 0.2037  | 0.1994  | 0.2025  | 0.1938  | 0.2005  | 0.2047  | 0.2011  | 0.2055  |

- Add 20 ml conc. HF and 2 ml HClO4 per 5 g of quartz
- Add 5 ml Aqua Regia
- Heat at 100-125°C until quartz dissolves, add HF if needed
- Raise to 200°C and evaporate to dryness
- Add 5 ml HClO4 and evaporate to dryness
- Add 8 to 10 ml conc. HNO3, swirl, and evaporate to dryness
- Dissolved dried sample in 20 ml of 2% HCl

Comments:

Omnit trace HF, HNO3, HCl, HClO4
Jan 04 140ml HF, 50ml AR, 8ml HClO4
Jan 05 All dissolved, 200°C 9:00 am, no crust, clean
Rinse all tubes, pipette with 2% HNO3
Jan 06 2:00 pm, Add ~3-5ml HClO4. Rinse with dionized water, 200°C to dry
B30 large, thin, yellow; B23 small, yellow; B27 small, yellow; B31 large, needleshape: white/yellow;
B32 blank - tiny; B21 large; B14 small yellow; B6 small; B1 small; B20 small; B12 small; B11 small;
Jan 07 8:30 am. Add 8ml conc. HNO3 -> 110°C to dry
Jan 08 2% HCl -> back to jar -> dry
**WS4_QtzDissolution p2**

*This worksheet outlines the steps for dissolving quartz and adding Be carrier.*

Chemist: **GY**  Date: **01/01/2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>300 ml vessel ID</th>
<th>Beryl Carrier ID</th>
<th>Al Carrier ID</th>
<th>Mass 300 ml vessel</th>
<th>Mass 40g quartz</th>
<th>Mass Be carrier</th>
<th>Mass Al Carrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1259</td>
<td>37.1511</td>
<td>0.2015</td>
<td>Add Al carrier next step. With Aliquot, Nov 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1367</td>
<td>36.6987</td>
<td>0.1970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1475</td>
<td>40.5384</td>
<td>0.1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.4267</td>
<td>37.1910</td>
<td>0.1909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Be carrier Bottle 2</td>
<td>10.4212</td>
<td>36.6939</td>
<td>0.1964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>150.2453</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.1928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Add 20 ml conc. HF and 2 ml HClO4 per 5 g of quartz
2. Add 5 ml Aqua Regia
3. Heat at 100-125°C until quartz dissolves, add HF if needed
4. Raise to 200°C and evaporate to dryness
5. Add 5 ml HClO4 and evaporate to dryness
6. Add 8 to 10 ml conc. HNO3, swirl, and evaporate to dryness
7. Dissolved dried sample in 20 ml of 2% HCl

**Comments**

- Omini trace HF, HNO3, HCl, HClO4
- Jan 04 140ml HF, 50ml AR, 8ml HClO4
- Jan 05 All dissolved, 200°C 9:00 am, no crust, clean
- Rinse all tubes, pipete with 2% HNO3
- Jan 06 2:00 pm, Add ~3.5ml HClO4. Rinse with dionized water, 200°C to dry
- B30 large, thin, yellow; B23 small, yellow; B27 small, yellow; B31 large, needleshape: white/yellow; B32 blank - tiny; B21 large; B14 small yellow; B6 small; B1 small; B20 small; B12 small; B11 small;
- Jan 07 8:30 am. Add 8ml conc. HNO3 -> 110°C to dry
- Jan 08 2% HCl -> back to jar -> dry
WS6_Anion Column Chemistry p1

This worksheet outlines the steps for the Anion Column Chemistry (2ml size small column)

Chemist: GYIAM Date: 01/11/2010

1. Evaporate 20 ml to dryness at 100-120°C (will take at least 3 hrs)
2. Dissolve in 10 ml 9 N HCl (let stand for several hours)
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tubes, rinse digestion vessels with 9 N HCl to bring volume in tube to 10 ml
4. Centrifuge at 1500 rpm or higher for minimum of 10 minutes
5. Allow any 9 N HCl in columns to drain out; discard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td>B11</td>
<td>B12</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>B20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2375</td>
<td>2376</td>
<td>2377</td>
<td>2378</td>
<td>2379</td>
<td>2380</td>
<td>2371</td>
<td>2372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. With stopcock closed, pipet sample (avoid residue) onto 2ml size columns.
7. Collect sample in same 300 ml teflon vessel.
8. Elute with 10 ml 9 N HCl, and collect that, close stopcock
9. 5 ml 4.5 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate in labeled 100 ml bottle
10. 10 ml 1 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate
11. 50 ml deionized water. Discard.
12. CONDITION ANION COLUMN
(bottle A1): 10 ml 1 N HCl, discard
(bottle A2): 10 ml 4.5 N HCl, discard
(bottle A3): 10 ml 9 N HCl, discard, but retain acid approx. 2 mm above resin

Comments

Column has been used 2 times before, everything fine.
WS6_Anion Column Chemistry p2

This worksheet outlines the steps for the Anion Column Chemistry (2ml size small column)

Chemist: GY/AM  Date: 01/12/2010

1. Evaporate 20 ml to dryness at 100-120°C (will take at least 3 hrs)
2. Dissolve in 10 ml 9 N HCl (let stand for several hours)
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tubes, rinse digestion vessels with 9 N HCl to bring volume in tube to 10 ml
4. Centrifuge at 1500 rpm or higher for minimum of 10 minutes
5. Allow any 9 N HCl in columns to drain out; discard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B21</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>B27</td>
<td>B30</td>
<td>B31</td>
<td>B32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2373</td>
<td>2374</td>
<td>2385</td>
<td>2388</td>
<td>2389</td>
<td>2312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>09SRB-E284A-02</td>
<td>09SRB-E284A-03</td>
<td>09SRB-A167A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A167A-02</td>
<td>09SRB-A167A-03</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. With stopcock closed, pipet sample (avoid residue) onto 2ml size columns.
7. Collect sample in same 300 ml teflon vessel.
8. Elute with 10 ml 9 N HCl, and collect that, close stopcock
9. 5 ml 4.5 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate in labeled 100 ml bottle
10. 10 ml 1 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate
11. 50 ml deionized water. Discard.
12. **CONDITION ANION COLUMN**
    | (bottle A1) | 10 ml 1 N HCl, discard |
    | (bottle A2) | 10 ml 4.5 N HCl, discard |
    | (bottle A3) | 10 ml 9 N HCl, discard, but retain acid approx. 2 mm above resin |

**Comments**

4th time for anion column, good.
WS7_Controlled Precipitate p1

This worksheet outlines the steps for the controlled precipitation chemistry

Chemist: GY/AM Date: 01/13/2010

1. Evaporate "anion" elute to dryness at 125°C
2. Dissolve in 10 ml of a 1:1 solution of 0.5 N HCl and 2% NH₄Cl
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge, centrifuge for 10 minutes
4. Decant into clean test tube, heat in water bath at 60°C
5. Add drops of 1:1 NH₄OH.H₂O to pH=9.2 (5 drops first then single)
6. Centrifuge for 15 minutes
7. Check pH of liquid, if less than pH=7, redo step 15
8. Decant, save with Anion Supernate
9. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
10. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
11. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Approx. vol. Ptte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2375</td>
<td>09SRB-E223A-01</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2376</td>
<td>09SRB-E223A-03</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2377</td>
<td>09SRB-E223A-02</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2378</td>
<td>09SRB-E224A-01</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2379</td>
<td>09SRB-E224A-02</td>
<td>B11</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2380</td>
<td>09SRB-E224A-03</td>
<td>B12</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2371</td>
<td>09SRB-E283A-01</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2372</td>
<td>09SRB-E284A-01</td>
<td>B20</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
WS7_Controlled Precipitate p2

This worksheet outlines the steps for the controlled precipitation chemistry

Chemist: [GY/AM]  Date: 01/13/2010

1. Evaporate "anion" elute to dryness at 125°C
2. Dissolve in 10 ml of a 1:1 solution of 0.5 N HCl and 2% NH₄Cl
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge, centrifuge for 10 minutes
4. Decant into clean test tube, heat in water bath at 60°C
5. Add drops of 1:1 NH₄OH·H₂O to pH=9.2 (5 drops first then single)
6. Centrifuge for 15 minutes
7. Check pH of liquid, if less than pH=7, redo step 5
8. Decant, save with Anion Supernate
9. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
10. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
11. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>2373</th>
<th>2374</th>
<th>2385</th>
<th>2388</th>
<th>2389</th>
<th>2312</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B21</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>B27</td>
<td>B30</td>
<td>B31</td>
<td>B32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>09SRB-E284A-02</td>
<td>09SRB-E284A-03</td>
<td>09SRB-A167A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A167A-02</td>
<td>09SRB-A167A-03</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. vol. Pte</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
This worksheet outlines the steps for the Cation Column Chemistry

Chemist: GY/AM  Date: 01/14/2010

1. Dissolve in 5 ml conc. HCl and evaporate to dryness at 125°C
2. Redissolve in 2.5 ml 1 N HCl and 2.5 ml 0.5 N HCl
3. Transfer to centrifuge tube, rinse with 1 ml 0.5 N, and centrifuge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td>B11</td>
<td>B12</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>B20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2375</td>
<td>2376</td>
<td>2377</td>
<td>2378</td>
<td>2379</td>
<td>2380</td>
<td>2371</td>
<td>2372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Pipette all of the sample into designated conditioned cation column, 17 ml
5. Discard the eluant. Add 265 ml 0.5 N HCL (Bottle C6)
6. Drain the column, discard the first 300ml of eluant
7. Add 60 ml of 0.5N HCl, (Bottle C7), Collect eluant as Cation Supernate
8. Add 65 ml of 0.5N HCl, (Bottle C8), Save it as Be-Sample
9. Add 120 ml 1N HCl (bottle C9)
10. Save this as Be-sample as well.
11. Add 80 ml 4.5 N HCl (bottle C10), save the eluant as Ai sample.
12. CONDITION CATION COLUMN

(bottle C1) 100 ml 9 N HCl
(bottle C2) 50 ml 4.5 N HCl
(bottle C3) 50 ml 1 N HCl
(bottle C4) 50 ml water
(bottle C5) 100 ml 0.5 N HCl

* 17 ml Column
This worksheet outlines the steps for the Cation Column Chemistry

Chemist: GY/AM
Date: 01/14/2010 afternoon

1. Dissolve in 5 ml conc. HCl and evaporate to dryness at 125°C
2. Redissolve in 2.5 ml 1 N HCl and 2.5 ml 0.5 N HCl
3. Transfer to centrifuge tube, rinse with 1 ml 0.5 N, and centrifuge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cation Column ID</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B21</td>
<td>2373</td>
<td>09SRB-E284A-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>2374</td>
<td>09SRB-E284A-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B27</td>
<td>2385</td>
<td>09SRB-A167A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B30</td>
<td>2388</td>
<td>09SRB-A167A-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B31</td>
<td>2389</td>
<td>09SRB-A167A-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B32</td>
<td>2312</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Pipette all of the sample into designated conditioned cation column, 17ml
5. Drain the column, discard the first 300 ml of eluant
6. Add 60 ml of 0.5 N HCl, (Bottle C7), Collect eluant as Cation Supernate
7. Add 65 ml of 0.5 N HCl, (Bottle C8), Save it as Be-Sample
8. Add 120 ml 1N HCl (bottle C9)
9. Save this as Be-sample as well.
10. Add 80 ml 4.5 N HCl (bottle C10), save the eluant as Al sample.

12. CONDITION CATION COLUMN
   (bottle C1) 100 ml 9 N HCl
   (bottle C2) 50 ml 4.5 N HCl
   (bottle C3) 50 ml 1 N HCl
   (bottle C4) 50 ml water
   (bottle C5) 100 ml 0.5 N HCl

* 17 ml Column
WS9_Be Sample Chemistry p1

This worksheet outlines the steps to prepare the BeO sample

Chemist: GY/AM  Date: 01/15/2010
01/18-19/2010

1. Evaporate Be Sample from column in wiped digestion vessels at 125°C
2. Add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
3. Again, add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
4. Dissolve sample in 10 ml of 0.5 N HCl (optima grade)
5. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tube
6. Centrifuge and decant into clean centrifuge tube
7. Heat centrifuge tubes in water bath at 60°C
8. Precipitate Be(OH)₂ using Matheson ultimate grade ammonia gas
   Gently bubble NH₃ with clean pipet tip on hose
   for ca.15 bubbles, or ca. 8-12 sec until pte forms
   Optimum pH=9.2; 1N HCl may be added
9. Centrifuge 15 min., decant (save and redo □ if pH of liquid is < 8)
10. Wash with water, vortex, centrifuge for 10 min, and decant
11. Record mass quartz vials, label, and place them in furnace holder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>2-Jul-06</th>
<th>2376</th>
<th>2377</th>
<th>2378</th>
<th>2379</th>
<th>2380</th>
<th>2371</th>
<th>2372</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>9SRSB-E223A-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>9SRSB-E223A-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>9SRSB-E224A-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>9SRSB-E224A-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>9SRSB-E224A-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>9SRSB-E263A-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td>9SRSB-E284A-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>09SRSB-E223A-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Qtz Vial</td>
<td>2.2145</td>
<td>2.5144</td>
<td>2.5807</td>
<td>2.5067</td>
<td>2.5405</td>
<td>2.5916</td>
<td>2.5744</td>
<td>2.5672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Vial+Sp</td>
<td>2.2153</td>
<td>2.5157</td>
<td>2.5831</td>
<td>2.5080</td>
<td>2.5419</td>
<td>2.5950</td>
<td>2.5756</td>
<td>2.5705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Sp</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td>0.0034</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td>0.0033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Add 1 small drop of water with micropipet, slurry precipitate
13. Transfer sample into quartz vial, cover with quartz lid
14. Turn on Bunsen Burner, dry the gel carefully.
15. Burn the Be(OH)₂ gel on bunsen burner at least 2 mins, at blue flame.
16. Convert to BeO
17. Determine mass of vial + sample
WS9_Be Sample Chemistry p2

This worksheet outlines the steps to prepare the BeO sample

Chemist: GY/AM  Date: 01/15/2010
01/18-19/2010

1. Evaporate Be Sample from column in wiped digestion vessels at 125°C
2. Add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
3. Again, add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
4. Dissolve sample in 10 ml of 0.5 N HCl (optima grade)
5. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tube
6. Centrifuge and decant into clean centrifuge tube
7. Heat centrifuge tubes in water bath at 60°C
8. Precipitate Be(OH)₂ using Matheson ultimate grade ammonia gas
   Gently bubble NH₃ with clean pipet tip on hose
   for ca 15 bubbles, or ca 8-12 sec until pte forms
   Optimum pH=9.2; 1N HCl may be added
9. Centrifuge 15 min., decant (save and redo □ if pH of liquid is < 8)
10. Wash with water, vortex, centrifuge for 10 min, and decant
11. Record mass quartz vials, label, and place them in furnace holder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Mass Qtz Vial</th>
<th>Mass Vial+Spl</th>
<th>Mass Spl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09SRB-</td>
<td>09SRB-</td>
<td>09SRB-</td>
<td>2.0034</td>
<td>2.6094</td>
<td>0.0030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E284A-</td>
<td>E284A-</td>
<td>E284A-</td>
<td>2.5976</td>
<td>2.6004</td>
<td>0.0028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2.5180</td>
<td>2.5207</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>2.6340</td>
<td>2.6381</td>
<td>0.0041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>2.5830</td>
<td>2.5846</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>2.5920</td>
<td>2.5528</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Add 1 small drop of water with micropipet, slurry precipitate
13. Transfer sample into quartz vial, cover with quartz lid
14. Turn on Bunsen Burner, dry the gel carefully.
15. Burn the Be(OH)₂ gel on bunsen burner at least 2 mins, at blue flame.
16. Convert to BeO
17. Determine mass of vial + sample
### A5.2.2 Depth Profile Data for Chapter 3

Depth profile in ‘central valley’

**WS4_QtzDissolution**

This worksheet outlines the steps for dissolving quartz and adding Be carrier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemist: AM</th>
<th>Date: 03/11/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNENF ID</th>
<th>2547</th>
<th>2548</th>
<th>2549</th>
<th>2550</th>
<th>2551</th>
<th>2424</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 ml vessel ID</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 ml vessel ID</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beryl Carrier ID</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Carrier ID</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>10K6B</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mass 300 ml vessel | 150.0810 | 150.1752 | 150.0270 | 130.8439 | 97.3946 | - |
| Mass 40g quartz | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mass Be carrier | 0.1884 | 0.1998 | 0.1797 | 0.1854 | 0.1941 | 0.1907 |

**Residue**

- Large white grains (med.-large white crystals) (med.-large white crystals) (med.-large white crystals) (med.-large white crystals)
- Small yellow to white (med.-yellow to white) (med.-yellow to white) (med.-yellow to white) (med.-yellow to white)
- Black (med.-black) (med.-black) (med.-black) (med.-black)

1. Add 20 ml conc. HF and 2 ml HClO4 per 5 g of quartz
2. Add 5 ml Aqua Regia
3. Heat at 100-125°C until quartz dissolves, add HF if needed
4. Raise to 200°C and evaporate to dryness
5. Add 5 ml HClO4 and evaporate to dryness
6. Add 8 to 10 ml conc. HNO3, swirl, and evaporate to dryness
7. Dissolved dried sample in 20 ml of 2% HCl

**Comments**

March 11: Add 300 ml HF, 50 ml AR, 10 ml HClO4 to each sample. Add 140 ml HF, 50 ml AR, 10 ml HClO4 to blank. Put on hotplate for dissolution at 170°C at 125°C.

March 17: 9:00 open lid. Increase T = 200°C for partial evaporation. A5 (2548) and A16 (2550) precipitate on lid. Scrape carefully from lid using sterile tools (white “crunchy” crystals). All samples floating precipitate. 17:30 add 160 ml HF to blank to increase total amount of acid added to 300 ml HF.

March 18: 8:30 add 150 ml HF to all samples and blank for further dissolution of sample, less floating precipitation. 14:00 close lid, reduce heat to 125°C for further dissolution (protection from sandblasting).

March 19: 12:30 add 80 ml HF, 20 ml HNO3 to all samples. A5 (2548) lots of precipitation on lid and walls; scrape carefully from lid using sterile tools.

March 20: 11:30 most samples dissolved, only A5 (2547) few grains and A16 (2545) few more grains left. Include blank for evaporation on this hotplate T = 20°C.

March 21: 17:30 transfer A15 to B23, rinse 3 times with deionized water, everything transferred.

March 23: 8:30 transfer A22 to E17 and A5 to B20, rinse 3 times with deionized water, everything transferred in A5 (2549) jar some white sticky grains on bottom, add 20 ml HNO3, scratch floor until everything dissolved. Transfer to B23, rinse with deionized water, blank completely dry, no residue. Add 20 ml HNO3, scratch floor until everything dissolved, transfer to B23, rinse with deionized water, blank completely dry, no residue.

March 24: 14:00 transfer A14 to B22, few Zn-grains left (~1g), transfer everything, rinse several times with deionized water, add 20 ml HNO3, close lid, decrease T = 150°C for final dissolution.

March 25: 19:30 B22 and B23 seem to be clear, no solid particles visible, open lid for final evaporation.

Note: from now on 18 samples on 2 hotplates.

March 26: All samples almost dry, tap carefully, record residue (large for 4 samples!)

March 27: Remove samples from hotplate, close lid, set aside until hotplate available for evaporation of HClO4 to be added.

March 28: 10:30 add 10 ml HClO4, swirl and put back on hotplate at T = 200°C

March 29: 15:00 tap jar and lids, <1 ml HClO4 left, put back on hotplate.

March 30: 7:15 add ~12 ml HNO3, reduce T = 125°C (slightly increased amount of acid due to large amount of residue). 14:00 nearly dry, tap jar and lids.

March 31: 14:00 add ~8-12 ml 2% HCl, talk to John about large volume of residue (pictures) -> change procedure, add again 5 ml HClO4 to each sample and put back on hotplate at first T = 125°C, later T = 200°C in order to evaporate as much as possible (esp. Boron).

March 32: Samples not completely dry, tap twice and put back on hotplate.

March 33: Samples dry, still large white crust (pictures). 15:15 add ~6-10 ml 2% HCl, let stand for complete dissolution -> large residue after centrifuge.

B23 (2547), 20 mg residue (white with black dots); B26 (2548); 1.5 ml + 0.3 ml residue (dense white, layered); B28 (2549), 2 ml + 1 ml residue (white with black dots); B31 (2550), 2 times ~3 mm residue (dense white, layered); B32 (2551) <1 mm residue (white).
WS6_Anion Column Chemistry

This worksheet outlines the steps for the Anion Column Chemistry (2ml size small column)

Chemist: AM  Date: 03/28/11

1. Evaporate 20 ml to dryness at 100-120°C (will take at least 3 hrs)
2. Dissolve in 10 ml 9 N HCl (let stand for several hours)
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tubes, rinse digestion vessels with 9 N HCl to bring volume in tube to 10 ml
4. Centrifuge at 1500 rpm or higher for minimum of 10 minutes
5. Allow any 9 N HCl in columns to drain out; discard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Residue (after 2%)</th>
<th>Residue in tubes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>2547</td>
<td>10SRB-E140A-02</td>
<td>large yellow</td>
<td>0.5 ml white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B26</td>
<td>2548</td>
<td>10SRB-E140A-03</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>0.1 ml white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B28</td>
<td>2549</td>
<td>10SRB-E140A-04</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>0.3 ml white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B31</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td>10SRB-E140A-05</td>
<td>(spread) yellow</td>
<td>&lt;0.05 ml white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B32</td>
<td>2551</td>
<td>10SRB-E140A-06</td>
<td>small yellow</td>
<td>&lt;1 mm white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B99</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. With stopcock closed, pipet sample (avoid residue) onto 2 ml size columns.
7. Collect sample in same 300 ml teflon vessel.
8. Elute with 10 ml 9 N HCl, and collect that, close stopcock
9. 5 ml 4.5 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate in labeled 100 ml bottle
10. 10 ml 1 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate
11. 50 ml deionized water. Discard.
12. CONDITION ANION COLUMN
   (bottle A1) 10 ml 1N HCl, discard
   (bottle A2) 10 ml 4.5 N HCl, discard
   (bottle A3) 10 ml 9 N HCl, discard, but retain acid approx. 2 mm above resin

Comments
March 28: Due to still large residue transfer liquid to clean centrifuge tube, vortex residue with additional 3ml 9N HCl and centrifuge, add liquid to clean tubes
WS7_Controlled Precipitate

This worksheet outlines the steps for the controlled precipitation chemistry

Chemist: AM  Date: 03/29/11

1. Evaporate "anion" elute to dryness at 125°C
2. Dissolve in 10 ml of a 1:1 solution of 0.5 N HCl and 2% NH₄Cl
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge, centrifuge for 10 minutes
4. Decant into clean test tube, heat in water bath at 60°C
5. Add drops of 1:1 NH₄OH:H₂O to pH = 9.2 (5 drops first then single)
6. Centrifuge for 15 minutes
7. Check pH of liquid, if less than pH = 7, redo step 5
8. Decant, save with Anion Supernate
9. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
10. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
11. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Approx. vol. Ptte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10SRB-E140A-02</td>
<td>3.5 ml lowest 0.25ml dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10SRB-E140A-03</td>
<td>3.5 ml ~1.5ml dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10SRB-E140A-04</td>
<td>3.5 ml ~0.5ml dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10SRB-E140A-05</td>
<td>3.5 ml ~0.2ml yellow to white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10SRB-E140A-06</td>
<td>1.5ml gel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>0.1ml brown transparent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
WS8_Cation Column Chemistry - 1

For Samples with high Al, need two runs to get better Be

Chemist: AM Date: 03/30/11

1. Dissolve in 5 ml conc. HCl and evaporate to dryness at 125°C
2. Redissolve in 2.5 ml 1 N HCl and 2.5 ml 0.5 N HCl
3. Transfer to centrifuge tube, rinse with 1 ml 0.5 N, and centrifuge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>B26</td>
<td>B28</td>
<td>B31</td>
<td>B32</td>
<td>B99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2547</td>
<td>2548</td>
<td>2549</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td>2551</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>10SRB-E140A-02</td>
<td>10SRB-E140A-03</td>
<td>10SRB-E140A-04</td>
<td>10SRB-E140A-05</td>
<td>10SRB-E140A-06</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Pipette all of the sample into designated conditioned cation column, 17 ml
5. Discard the eluant.
6. Add 250 ml 0.5 N HCL (Bottle C6)
7. Drain the column, discard the 250ml of eluant
8. Add 250 ml 1.0 HCl, (Bottle 7). Collect eluent as Be-sample
9. Add 100 ml 4.5 N HCl (bottle 10), save the eluant as Al sample.

10. CONDITION CATION COLUMN
   (bottle C1) 100 ml 9 N HCl
   (bottle C2) 50 ml 4.5 N HCl
   (bottle C3) 50 ml 1 N HCl
   (bottle C4) 50 ml water
   (bottle C5) 100 ml 0.5 N HCl

* 17 ml Column
WS8_Cation Column Chemistry - 2

This worksheet outlines the steps for the Cation Column Chemistry

Chemist: [GY/AM]  Date: 04/01/11

1. Dissolve in 5 ml conc. HCl and evaporate to dryness at 125°C
2. Redissolve in 2.5 ml 1 N HCl and 2.5 ml 0.5 N HCl
3. Transfer to centrifuge tube, rinse with 1 ml 0.5 N, and centrifuge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>B26</td>
<td>B28</td>
<td>B31</td>
<td>B32</td>
<td>B99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2547</td>
<td>2548</td>
<td>2549</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td>2551</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>10SRB-E140A-02</td>
<td>10SRB-E140A-03</td>
<td>10SRB-E140A-04</td>
<td>10SRB-E140A-05</td>
<td>10SRB-E140A-06</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residue after first additional cation column

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>large-med. white solid</td>
<td>med. yellow to white solid</td>
<td>large-med. white solid</td>
<td>med. yellow to white transp.</td>
<td>med. yellow transp.</td>
<td>white transp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Pipette all of the sample into designated conditioned cation column, 17ml
5. Discard the eluant. Add 285 ml 0.5 N HCL (Bottle C6)
6. Drain the column, discard the first 300 ml of eluant
7. Add 60 ml of 0.5 N HCl, (Bottle C7), Collect eluant as Cation Supernate
8. Add 65 ml of 0.5 N HCl, (Bottle C8), Save it as Be-Sample
9. Add 120 ml 1N HCl (bottle C9)
10. Save this as Be-sample as well.
11. Add 80 ml 4.5 N HCl (bottle C10), save the eluant as Al sample.
12. CONDITION CATION COLUMN
   (bottle C1) 100 ml 9 N HCl
   (bottle C2) 50 ml 4.5 N HCl
   (bottle C3) 50 ml 1 N HCl
   (bottle C4) 50 ml water
   (bottle C5) 100 ml 0.5 N HCl

* 17 ml Column
WS9_Be Sample Chemistry

This worksheet outlines the steps to prepare the BeO sample

Chemist: AM Date: 04/02/11 - 04/06/11

1. Evaporate Be Sample from column in wiped digestion vessels at 125°C
2. Add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
3. Again, add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
4. Dissolve sample in 10 ml of 0.5 N HCl (optima grade)
5. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tube
6. Centrifuge and decant into clean centrifuge tube
7. Heat centrifuge tubes in water bath at 60°C
8. Precipitate Be(OH)₂ using Matheson ultimate grade ammonia gas
   Gently bubble NH₃ with clean pipet tip on hose
   for ca.15 bubbles, or ca. 8-12 sec until ppt forms
   Optimum pH=9.2; 1N HCl may be added
9. Centrifuge 15 min., decant (save and redo 8 if pH of liquid is < 8)
10. Wash with water, vortex, centrifuge for 10 min, and decant
11. Record mass quartz vials, label, and place them in furnace holder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>2547</th>
<th>2548</th>
<th>2549</th>
<th>2550</th>
<th>2551</th>
<th>2424</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>B26</td>
<td>B28</td>
<td>B31</td>
<td>B32</td>
<td>B99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>105RB-E140A-02</td>
<td>105RB-E140A-03</td>
<td>105RB-E140A-04</td>
<td>105RB-E140A-05</td>
<td>105RB-E140A-06</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Qtz Vial</td>
<td>2.5278</td>
<td>2.4328</td>
<td>2.4254</td>
<td>2.4279</td>
<td>2.1604</td>
<td>2.3295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Vial+Sp</td>
<td>2.5273</td>
<td>2.4333</td>
<td>2.4253</td>
<td>2.4276</td>
<td>2.1609</td>
<td>2.3289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Sp</td>
<td>-0.0005</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>-0.0001</td>
<td>-0.0003</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>-0.0006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Add 1 small drop of water with micropipet, slurry precipitate
13. Transfer sample into quartz vial, cover with quartz lid
14. Turn on Bunsen Burner, dry the gel carefully.
15. Burn the Be(OH)₂ gel on bunsen burner at least 2 mins, at blue flame.
16. Convert to BeO
17. Determine mass of vial + sample
Depth profile in Moon Valley

WS4_QtzDissolution p1

This worksheet outlines the steps for dissolving quartz and adding Be carrier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemist: GY/AM</th>
<th>Date: 10/30/2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2358</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|-----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>300 ml vessel ID</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B11</th>
<th>B21</th>
<th>B31</th>
<th>B32</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B6</th>
<th>B12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Al Carrier ID</th>
<th>no data needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass 300 ml vessel</th>
<th>18.1869</th>
<th>18.1575</th>
<th>18.2272</th>
<th>18.0741</th>
<th>18.0537</th>
<th>150.2614</th>
<th>18.1616</th>
<th>18.0838</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass 40g quartz</th>
<th>130.7309</th>
<th>135.7612</th>
<th>130.1105</th>
<th>130.3569</th>
<th>112.4853</th>
<th>35.3900</th>
<th>35.0260</th>
<th>36.2615</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Be carrier</th>
<th>0.2085</th>
<th>0.2048</th>
<th>0.2030</th>
<th>0.2086</th>
<th>0.2136</th>
<th>0.2087</th>
<th>0.2040</th>
<th>0.2274</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Al Carrier</th>
<th>NO Al data for this group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Add 20 ml conc. HF and 2 ml HClO4 per 5 g of quartz
2. Add 5 ml Aqua Regia
3. Heat at 100-125°C until quartz dissolves, add HF if needed
4. Raise to 200°C and evaporate to dryness
5. Add 5 ml HClO4 and evaporate to dryness
6. Add 8 to 10 ml conc. HNO3, swirl, and evaporate to dryness
7. Dissolved dried sample in 20 ml of 2% HCl

Comments:
If we need Al-26 data, we should add Al carrier at WS58_Add Al Carrier sheet. Try not add Al at beginning because it will cause high blank for Be.

Oct 10
E2-E6: add 450ml HF, 100ml AR, 10ml HClO4
E6: add 400ml HF, 100ml AR, 10ml HClO4
B1, B6, B12: add 140ml HF, 40ml AR, 5ml HClO4

Nov 03
transfer from 1000ml vessels (E) to 300ml vessels (B), rinse with H2O
E2 -> B3, E4 -> B11, E5 -> B21, E6 -> B31, E8 -> B32

Nov 04
still 3 not dry yet, add 15ml HNO2 since they are large samples, reduce heat to 110°C, add 8-10ml HNO3 to each sample
WS4_QtzDissolution p2

This worksheet outlines the steps for dissolving quartz and adding Be carrier.

Chemist: GY/AM  Date: 10/30/2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 ml vessel ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beryl Carrier ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Carrier ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 300 ml vessel</td>
<td>10.1259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 40g quartz</td>
<td>37.1511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Be carrier</td>
<td>0.2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Al Carrier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Add 20 ml conc. HF and 2 ml HClO4 per 5 g of quartz
2. Add 5 ml Aqua Regia
3. Heat at 100-125°C until quartz dissolves, add HF if needed
4. Raise to 200°C and evaporate to dryness
5. Add 5 ml HClO4 and evaporate to dryness
6. Add 8 to 10 ml conc. HNO3, swirl, and evaporate to dryness
7. Dissolved dried sample in 20 ml of 2% HCl

Comments
If we need Al-26 data, we should add Al carrier at WS5B. Add Al Carrier sheet. Try not add Al at beginning because it will cause high blank for Be.

Oct. 10 E2-E6: add 450ml HF, 100ml AR, 10ml HClO4
E8: add 400ml HF, 100ml AR, 10ml HClO4
B1, B6, B12: add 140ml HF, 40ml AR, 5ml HClO4

Nov 03 transfer from 1000ml vessels (E) to 300ml vessels (B), rinse with H2O
E2 -> B3, E4 -> B11, E5 -> B21, E6 -> B31, E8 -> B32
Nov 04 still 3 not dry yet, add 15ml HNO3 since they are large samples, reduce heat to 110°C, add 5-10ml HNO3 to each sample
WS6_Anion Column Chemistry p1

This worksheet outlines the steps for the Anion Column Chemistry (2ml size small column)

Chemist: GYIAM Date: 11/06/2009

1. Evaporate 20 ml to dryness at 100-120°C (will take at least 3 hrs)
2. Dissolve in 10 ml 9 N HCl (let stand for several hours)
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tubes, rinse digestion vessels with 9 N HCl to bring volume in tube to 10 ml
4. Centrifuge at 1500 rpm or higher for minimum of 10 minutes
5. Allow any 9 N HCl in columns to drain out; discard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>B11</td>
<td>B21</td>
<td>B31</td>
<td>B32</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td>B12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2358</td>
<td>2359</td>
<td>2360</td>
<td>2361</td>
<td>2362</td>
<td>2363</td>
<td>2364</td>
<td>2365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. With stopcock closed, pipet sample (avoid residue) onto 2ml size columns.
7. Collect sample in same 300 ml teflon vessel.
8. Elute with 10 ml 9 N HCl, and collect that, close stopcock
9. 5 ml 4.5 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate in labeled 100 ml bottle
10. 10 ml 1 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate
11. 50 ml deionized water. Discard.
12. CONDITION ANION COLUMN
    (bottle A1) 10 ml 1 N HCl, discard
    (bottle A2) 10 ml 4.5 N HCl, discard
    (bottle A3) 10 ml 9 N HCl, discard, but retain acid approx. 2 mm above resin

Comments:
Sample 2358 - 2362 are dark yellow color, but clear.
Sample 2363 - 2365 are light yellow.
Anion column from before work fine.
300 ml vessels are back to hotplate.
This worksheet outlines the steps for the Anion Column Chemistry (2ml size small column)

Chemist: GY/AM  Date: 11/06/2009

1. Evaporate 20 ml to dryness at 100-120°C (will take at least 3 hrs)
2. Dissolve in 10 ml 9 N HCl (let stand for several hours)
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tubes, rinse digestion vessels with 9 N HCl to bring volume in tube to 10 ml
4. Centrifuge at 1500 rpm or higher for minimum of 10 minutes
5. Allow any 9 N HCl in columns to drain out; discard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNDF ID</td>
<td>2311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. With stopcock closed, pipet sample (avoid residue) onto 2ml size columns.
7. Collect sample in same 300 ml teflon vessel.
8. Elute with 10 ml 9 N HCl, and collect that, close stopcock
9. 5 ml 4.5 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate in labeled 100 ml bottle
10. 10 ml 1 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate
11. 50 ml deionized water. Discard.
12. CONDITION ANION COLUMN
   (bottle A1) 10 ml 1 N HCl, discard
   (bottle A2) 10 ml 4.5 N HCl, discard
   (bottle A3) 10 ml 9 N HCl, discard, but retain acid approx. 2 mm above resin

Comments
Sample 2358 - 2352 are dark yellow color, but clear.
Sample 2383 - 2385 are light yellow.
Anion column from before work fine.
300 ml vessels are back to hotplate.
This worksheet outlines the steps for the controlled precipitation chemistry

Chemist: GY/AM Date: 11/09/2009

1. Evaporate "anion" elute to dryness at 125°C
2. Dissolve in 10 ml of a 1:1 solution of 0.5 N HCl and 2% NH₄Cl
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge, centrifuge for 10 minutes
4. Decant into clean test tube, heat in water bath at 60°C
5. Add drops of 1:1 NH₄OH:H₂O to pH=9.2 (5 drops first then single)
6. Centrifuge for 15 minutes
7. Check pH of liquid, if less than pH=7, redo step 5
8. Decant, save with Anion Supernate
9. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
10. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
11. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>2376</th>
<th>2377</th>
<th>2378</th>
<th>2379</th>
<th>2380</th>
<th>2371</th>
<th>2372</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>B11</td>
<td>B21</td>
<td>B31</td>
<td>B32</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. vol. Ptle</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 ml</td>
<td>1.5 ml</td>
<td>2 ml</td>
<td>1.5 ml</td>
<td>1.5 ml</td>
<td>0.6 ml</td>
<td>0.6 ml</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
Sample 2358 - 2365: white color gel, not solid white
Sample 2383 - 2385: light brown coloured gel, not solid
Sample 2311: light brown coloured gel, not solid
WS7_Controlled Precipitate p2

This worksheet outlines the steps for the controlled precipitation chemistry

Chemist: GY/AM Date: 11/09/2009

1. Evaporate "anion" elute to dryness at 125°C
2. Dissolve in 10 ml of a 1:1 solution of 0.5 N HCl and 2% NH₄Cl
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge, centrifuge for 10 minutes
4. Decant into clean test tube, heat in water bath at 60°C
5. Add drops of 1:1 NH₄OH:H₂O to pH=9.2 (5 drops first then single)
6. Centrifuge for 15 minutes
7. Check pH of liquid, if less than pH=7, redo step 5
8. Decant, save with Anion Supernate
9. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
10. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
11. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant

| CNEF ID | 2311 |
| Vessel | B27 |
| Sample ID | blank |
| Approx. vol. Ptte | 0.1 ml |

Comments
Sample 2358 - 2365: white color gel, not solid white
Sample 2363 - 2365: light brown coloured gel, not solid
Sample 2311: light brown coloured gel, not solid
This worksheet outlines the steps for the Cation Column Chemistry

Chemist: GY/AM  Date: 11/10/2009

1. Dissolve in 5 ml conc. HCl and evaporate to dryness at 125°C
2. Redissolve in 2.5 ml 1 N HCl and 2.5 ml 0.5 N HCl
3. Transfer to centrifuge tube, rinse with 1 ml 0.5 N, and centrifuge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>2358</td>
<td>09SRB-E282A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B11</td>
<td>2359</td>
<td>09SRB-E282A-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B21</td>
<td>2360</td>
<td>09SRB-E282A-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B31</td>
<td>2361</td>
<td>09SRB-E282A-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B32</td>
<td>2362</td>
<td>09SRB-E282A-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>2363</td>
<td>09SRB-A351A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>2364</td>
<td>09SRB-A352A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>B12</td>
<td>2365</td>
<td>09SRB-A353A-01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Pipette all of the sample into designated conditioned cation column, 17 ml
5. Discard the eluant. Add 285 ml 0.5 N HCL (Bottle C6)
6. Drain the column, discard the first 300ml of eluant
7. Add 60 ml of 0.5N HCl, (Bottle C7), Collect eluant as Cation Supernate
8. Add 65 ml of 0.5N HCl, (Bottle C8), Save it as Be-Sample
9. Add 120 ml 1N HCl (bottle C9)
10. Save this as Be-sample as well.
11. Add 80 ml 4.5 N HCl (bottle C10), save the eluant as Al sample.
12. CONDITION CATION COLUMN
   (bottle C1) 100 ml 9 N HCl
   (bottle C2) 50 ml 4.5 N HCl
   (bottle C3) 50 ml 1 N HCl
   (bottle C4) 50 ml water
   (bottle C5) 100 ml 0.5 N HCl

* 17 ml Column
WS8_Cation Column Chemistry p2

This worksheet outlines the steps for the Cation Column Chemistry

Chemist: GY/AM Date: 11/10/2009

1. Dissolve in 5 ml conc. HCl and evaporate to dryness at 125°C
2. Redissolve in 2.5 ml 1 N HCl and 2.5 ml 0.5 N HCl
3. Transfer to centrifuge tube, rinse with 1 ml 0.5 N, and centrifuge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Pipette all of the sample into designated conditioned cation column, 17ml
5. Discard the eluant. Add 285 ml 0.5 N HCL (Bottle C6)
6. Drain the column, discard the first 300 ml of eluant
7. Add 60 ml of 0.5 N HCl, (Bottle C7). Collect eluant as Cation Supernate
8. Add 65 ml of 0.5 N HCl, (Bottle C8). Save it as Be-Sample
9. Add 120 ml 1N HCl (bottle C9)
10. Save this as Be-sample as well.
11. Add 80 ml 4.5 N HCl (bottle C10), save the eluant as Al sample.
12. CONDITION CATION COLUMN

(bottle C1) 100 ml 9 N HCl
(bottle C2) 50 ml 4.5 N HCl
(bottle C3) 50 ml 1 N HCl
(bottle C4) 50 ml water
(bottle C5) 100 ml 0.5 N HCl

* 17 ml Column
This worksheet outlines the steps to prepare the BeO sample

Chemist: GY/AM  Date: 11/11/2009

1. Evaporate Be Sample from column in wiped digestion vessels at 125°C
2. Add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
3. Again, add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
4. Dissolve sample in 10 ml of 0.5 N HCl (optima grade)
5. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tube
6. Centrifuge and decant into clean centrifuge tube
7. Heat centrifuge tubes in water bath at 60°C
8. Precipitate Be(OH)₂ using Matheson ultimate grade ammonia gas
   Gently bubble NH₃ with clean pipet tip on hose
   for ca.15 bubbles, or ca. 8-12 sec until ptte forms
   Optimum pH=9.2; 1N HCl may be added
9. Centrifuge 15 min., decant (save and redo □₃ if pH of liquid is < 8)
10. Wash with water, vortex, centrifuge for 10 min, and decant
11. Record mass quartz vials, label, and place them in furnace holder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>2358</th>
<th>2359</th>
<th>2360</th>
<th>2361</th>
<th>2362</th>
<th>2363</th>
<th>2364</th>
<th>2365</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>B11</td>
<td>B21</td>
<td>B31</td>
<td>B32</td>
<td>B32</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>08SRB-E282A-01</td>
<td>08SRB-E282A-02</td>
<td>08SRB-E282A-03</td>
<td>08SRB-E282A-04</td>
<td>08SRB-E282A-05</td>
<td>08SRB-E351A-01</td>
<td>08SRB-E352A-01</td>
<td>08SRB-E353A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Qtz Vial</td>
<td>2.6347</td>
<td>2.5141</td>
<td>2.6313</td>
<td>2.5503</td>
<td>2.5108</td>
<td>2.5304</td>
<td>2.6013</td>
<td>2.5298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Vial+Sp</td>
<td>2.6365</td>
<td>2.5161</td>
<td>2.6337</td>
<td>2.5534</td>
<td>2.5196</td>
<td>2.5332</td>
<td>2.6029</td>
<td>2.5315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Sp</td>
<td>0.0018</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
<td>0.0088</td>
<td>0.0028</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Add 1 small drop of water with micropipet, slurry precipitate
13. Transfer sample into quartz vial, cover with quartz lid
14. Turn on Bunsen Burner, dry the gel carefully.
15. Burn the Be(OH)₂ gel on bunsen burner at least 2 mins, at blue flame.
16. Convert to BeO
17. Determine mass of vial + sample
WS9_Be Sample Chemistry p2

This worksheet outlines the steps to prepare the BeO sample

Chemist: GY/AM Date: 11/11/2009

1. Evaporate Be Sample from column in wiped digestion vessels at 125°C
2. Add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
3. Again, add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
4. Dissolve sample in 10 ml of 0.5 N HCl (optima grade)
5. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tube
6. Centrifuge and decant into clean centrifuge tube
7. Heat centrifuge tubes in water bath at 60°C
8. Precipitate Be(OH)₂ using Matheson ultimate grade ammonia gas
   Gently bubble NH₃ with clean pipet tip on hose
   for ca.15 bubbles, or ca. 8-12 sec until ptte forms
   Optimum pH=9.2; 1N HCl may be added
9. Centrifuge 15 min., decant (save and redo □ if pH of liquid is < 8)
10. Wash with water, vortex, centrifuge for 10 min, and decant
11. Record mass quartz vials, label, and place them in furnace holder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Mass Qtz Vial</th>
<th>Mass Vial+Spl</th>
<th>Mass Spl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2311</td>
<td>B27</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>2.6698</td>
<td>2.6703</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Add 1 small drop of water with micropipet, slurry precipitate
13. Transfer sample into quartz vial, cover with quartz lid
14. Turn on Bunsen Burner, dry the gel carefully.
15. Burn the Be(OH)₂ gel on bunsen burner at least 2 mins, at blue flame.
16. Convert to BeO
17. Determine mass of vial + sample
A5.2.3 Bedrock Data for Chapter 4

Bedrock surfaces – batch 1

WS4_QtzDissolution p1

This worksheet outlines the steps for dissolving quartz and adding Be carrier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemist: AM/GY</th>
<th>Date: 20/01/2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>300 ml vessel ID</th>
<th>Beryl Carrier ID</th>
<th>AI Carrier ID</th>
<th>Mass 300 ml vessel</th>
<th>Mass 40g quartz</th>
<th>Mass Be carrier</th>
<th>Mass AI Carrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2381</td>
<td>08SRB-E221A-01</td>
<td>B99</td>
<td>Be Carrier bottle 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1156</td>
<td>35.4572</td>
<td>0.1921</td>
<td>Add AI carrier next step. With Aliquot, Nov 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2382</td>
<td>08SRB-E221A-02</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.4280</td>
<td>35.6541</td>
<td>0.1946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2383</td>
<td>08SRB-E221A-03</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3508</td>
<td>35.2509</td>
<td>0.1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2384</td>
<td>09SRB-E304A-01</td>
<td>B16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0888</td>
<td>35.1661</td>
<td>0.1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2385</td>
<td>09SRB-A188A-01</td>
<td>B18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.6777</td>
<td>35.3395</td>
<td>0.2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2386</td>
<td>09SRB-A188A-01</td>
<td>B19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5270</td>
<td>36.6153</td>
<td>0.1923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2387</td>
<td>09SRB-A188A-01</td>
<td>B22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3410</td>
<td>35.0101</td>
<td>0.2050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2390</td>
<td>09SRB-A188A-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Add 20 ml conc. HF and 2 ml HClO4 per 5 g of quartz
2. Add 5 ml Aqua Regia
3. Heat at 100-1250 C until quartz dissolves, add HF if needed
4. Raise to 200o C and evaporate to dryness
5. Add 5 ml HClO4 and evaporate to dryness
6. Add 8 to 10 ml conc. HNO3, swirl, and evaporate to dryness
7. Dissolved dried sample in 20 ml of 2% HCl

Comments:

All Acids used here are omniTrace level.
Tor Site, Be+AI data
Jan 20, 2010: 140ml HF+50ml Aqua Regia+8ml HClO4
Jan 21: All dissolved. Open lids, to dry.
Jan 22: 5ml HClO4 and DI water to rinse.
Jan 22: 1:25pm Add 8ml HNO3 to each one. 110° C to dry over night
Jan23: Turn off hotplate
Jan25: 2%HCl: B29 lots of residue ~0.5ml white
WS4_QtzDissolution p2

This worksheet outlines the steps for dissolving quartz and adding Be carrier.

Chemist: AM/GY  Date: 20/01/2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>09SRB- A36A-01</td>
<td>09SRB- A36A-01</td>
<td>09SRB- A36A-01</td>
<td>09SRB- A36A-01</td>
<td>09SRB- A34A-01</td>
<td>09SRB- A34A-01</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 ml vessel ID</td>
<td>B24</td>
<td>B25</td>
<td>B26</td>
<td>B28</td>
<td>B29</td>
<td>B13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beryl Carrier ID</td>
<td>Be Carrier Bottle 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Carrier ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mass 300 ml vessel | 10.0752 | 10.0699 | 10.4864 | 10.0615 | 10.6142 | 154.7955 |
| Mass 40g quartz    | 35.2918 | 35.1482 | 35.1319 | 35.3062 | 38.0854 | 0.0000 |
| Mass Be carrier    | 0.1910  | 0.1933  | 0.2003  | 0.1913  | 0.1946  | 0.1904  |

1. Add 20 ml conc. HF and 2 ml HClO4 per 5 g of quartz
2. Add 5 ml Aqua Regia
3. Heat at 100-125°C until quartz dissolves, add HF if needed
4. Raise to 200°C and evaporate to dryness
5. Add 5 ml HClO4 and evaporate to dryness
6. Add 8 to 10 ml conc. HNO3, swirl, and evaporate to dryness
7. Dissolved dried sample in 20 ml of 2% HCl

Comments

All Acids used here are omniTrace level.
Tor Site, Be+Al data
Jan 20, 2010: 140ml HF+50ml Aqua Regia+8ml HClO4
Jan 21: All dissolved. Open lids, to dry.
Jan 22: 5ml HClO4 and DI water to rinse.
Jan 23: 1:25pm Add 8ml HNO3 to each one. 110oC to dry over night
Jan23: Turn off hotplate
Jan25: 2%HCl : B29 lots of residue ~0.5ml white
WS5B_IWP Aliquot and Al spiking p1

This worksheet outlines the steps for collecting ICP aliquots and adding Al carrier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemist: AM/GY</th>
<th>Date: 01/25/2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Label one 100 ml volumetric flasks per sample
2. Label one ICP vial with CNEF ID per sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel ID</th>
<th>2381</th>
<th>2382</th>
<th>2383</th>
<th>2384</th>
<th>2386</th>
<th>2387</th>
<th>2390</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>09SRB-E212A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E212A-02</td>
<td>09SRB-E212A-03</td>
<td>09SRB-E304A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A185-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A186A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A187A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al carrier ID</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quant-EM est. Al in qtr</td>
<td>87.1840</td>
<td>87.3487</td>
<td>87.0047</td>
<td>87.1405</td>
<td>67.4197</td>
<td>66.0348</td>
<td>66.4917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 100 ml volumetric</td>
<td>168.5842</td>
<td>168.3658</td>
<td>167.8276</td>
<td>168.1019</td>
<td>168.3115</td>
<td>167.8929</td>
<td>167.4246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95ml Solution + Volumetric</td>
<td>163.9315</td>
<td>163.8827</td>
<td>163.0680</td>
<td>163.2742</td>
<td>163.5924</td>
<td>163.0584</td>
<td>162.6525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 5 ml Sample to Vial B</td>
<td>0.6175</td>
<td>0.5139</td>
<td>1.7299</td>
<td>0.5170</td>
<td>1.7356</td>
<td>2.4731</td>
<td>2.4867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A, dried, bring back with HNO3
B, Dried, bring back with HNO3

3. Get digestion vessel and cover ready. Do not wipe now.
4. Transfer the 90 ml sample back into vessel
5. Transfer contents volumetrics to ICP vials with same number
WS5B_I Computer and AI spiking p2

This worksheet outlines the steps for collecting ICP aliquots and adding Al carrier.

Chemist: AM/GY Date: 01/25/2010

1. Label one 100 ml volumetric flasks per sample
2. Label one ICP vial with CNEF ID per sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel ID</th>
<th>B24</th>
<th>B25</th>
<th>B26</th>
<th>B28</th>
<th>B29</th>
<th>B13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2391</td>
<td>2392.00</td>
<td>2393</td>
<td>2394</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td>2313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>09SRB-A355A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A365A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A365A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A365A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A348A-01</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al carrier ID</td>
<td>ICP-013-5 1000ug/ml, Lot: H00551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quant-EM est. Al in qtz</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 100 ml volumetric</td>
<td>65.8741</td>
<td>66.3080</td>
<td>66.5908</td>
<td>65.2036</td>
<td>67.7314</td>
<td>67.7944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100ml volumetric + sample + 2%HCl</td>
<td>169.5705</td>
<td>167.2512</td>
<td>167.3973</td>
<td>166.0705</td>
<td>168.9515</td>
<td>168.6174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 5 ml sample pipetted to vol A</td>
<td>4.8991</td>
<td>4.8577</td>
<td>4.7696</td>
<td>4.8619</td>
<td>5.1245</td>
<td>4.7501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95ml Solution + Volumetric</td>
<td>164.6722</td>
<td>162.5800</td>
<td>162.6152</td>
<td>161.1953</td>
<td>163.8102</td>
<td>163.8578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Al Carrier Added to Solution</td>
<td>167.1169</td>
<td>164.9936</td>
<td>165.0833</td>
<td>163.9858</td>
<td>164.3216</td>
<td>168.6812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al carrier Mass</td>
<td>2.4794</td>
<td>2.4174</td>
<td>2.4810</td>
<td>2.8054</td>
<td>0.5114</td>
<td>2.8454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 5 ml Sample to Vial B</td>
<td>4.8683</td>
<td>4.4109</td>
<td>4.6468</td>
<td>5.0300</td>
<td>4.4436</td>
<td>4.4763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Mass of 100 ml vold and sample</td>
<td>162.2309</td>
<td>160.5721</td>
<td>160.4135</td>
<td>158.9384</td>
<td>159.8679</td>
<td>162.1963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A, dried, bring back with HNO3
B, Dried, bring back with HNO3

3. Get digestion vessel and cover ready. Do not wipe now.
4. Transfer the 90 ml sample back into vessel
5. Transfer contents volumetrics to ICP vials with same number
WS6_Anion Column Chemistry p1

This worksheet outlines the steps for the Anion Column Chemistry (2ml size small column)

Chemist: GY/AM Date: 01/26/2010

1. Evaporate 20 ml to dryness at 100-120°C (will take at least 3 hrs)
2. Dissolve in 10 ml 9 N HCl (let stand for several hours)
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tubes, rinse digestion vessels with 9 N HCl to bring volume in tube to 10 ml
4. Centrifuge at 1500 rpm or higher for minimum of 10 minutes
5. Allow any 9 N HCl in columns to drain out; discard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B99</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>B16</td>
<td>B18</td>
<td>B19</td>
<td>B22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2381</td>
<td>2382</td>
<td>2383</td>
<td>2384</td>
<td>2386</td>
<td>2387</td>
<td>2390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-02</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-03</td>
<td>09SRB-E304A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A186A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A188A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A187A-01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. With stopcock closed, pipet sample (avoid residue) onto 2ml size columns.
7. Collect sample in same 300 ml teflon vessel.
8. Elute with 10 ml 9 N HCl, and collect that, close stopcock
9. 5 ml 4.5 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate in labeled 100 ml bottle
10. 10 ml 1 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate
11. 50 ml deionized water. Discard.
12. CONDITION ANION COLUMN
    - bottle A1) 10 ml 1N HCl, discard
    - bottle A2) 10 ml 4.5 N HCl, discard
    - bottle A3) 10 ml 9 N HCl, discard, but retain acid approx. 2 mm above resin

Comments

411
WS6_Anion Column Chemistry p2

This worksheet outlines the steps for the Anion Column Chemistry (2ml size small column)

Chemist: GY IAM  Date: 01/26/2010

1. Evaporate 20 ml to dryness at 100-120°C (will take at least 3 hrs)
2. Dissolve in 10 ml 9 N HCl (let stand for several hours)
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tubes, rinse digestion vessels
   with 9 N HCl to bring volume in tube to 10 ml
4. Centrifuge at 1500 rpm or higher for minimum of 10 minutes
5. Allow any 9 N HCl in columns to drain out; discard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B24</td>
<td>B25</td>
<td>B26</td>
<td>B28</td>
<td>B29</td>
<td>B13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2391</td>
<td>2392</td>
<td>2393</td>
<td>2394</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td>2313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>09SRB-</td>
<td>09SRB-</td>
<td>09SRB-</td>
<td>09SRB-</td>
<td>09SRB-</td>
<td>09SRB-</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. With stopcock closed, pipet sample (avoid residue) onto 2ml size columns.
7. Collect sample in same 300 ml teflon vessel.
8. Elute with 10 ml 9 N HCl, and collect that, close stopcock
9. 5 ml 4.5 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate in labeled 100 ml bottle
10. 10 ml 1 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate
11. 50 ml deionized water. Discard.
12. CONDITION ANION COLUMN
   (bottle A1) 10 ml 1 N HCl, discard
   (bottle A2) 10 ml 4.5 N HCl, discard
   (bottle A3) 10 ml 9 N HCl, discard, but retain acid approx. 2 mm above resin

Comments
WS7_Controlled Precipitate p1

This worksheet outlines the steps for the controlled precipitation chemistry

Chemist: GY/AM  Date: 01/27/2010

1. Evaporate "anion" elute to dryness at 125°C
2. Dissolve in 10 ml of a 1:1 solution of 0.5 N HCl and 2% NH₄Cl
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge, centrifuge for 10 minutes
4. Decant into clean test tube, heat in water bath at 60°C
5. Add drops of 1:1 NH₄OH:H₂O to pH=9.2 (5 drops first then single)
6. Centrifuge for 15 minutes
7. Check pH of liquid, if less than pH=7, redo step 5
8. Decant, save with Anion Supernate
9. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
10. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
11. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Approx. vol. Ptte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2381</td>
<td>B99</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-01</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2382</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-02</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2383</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-03</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2384</td>
<td>B16</td>
<td>09SRB-E304A-01</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2386</td>
<td>B18</td>
<td>09SRB-A186-01</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2387</td>
<td>B19</td>
<td>09SRB-A186A-01</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2390</td>
<td>B22</td>
<td>09SRB-A187A-01</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
1) 0.75ml solid white
2) 2.75ml -> pH ok

All, but B99 gelish
WS7_Controlled Precipitate p2

This worksheet outlines the steps for the controlled precipitation chemistry

Chemist: GY/AM Date: 01/27/2010

1. Evaporate "anion" elute to dryness at 125°C
2. Dissolve in 10 ml of a 1:1 solution of 0.5 N HCl and 2% NH₄Cl
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge, centrifuge for 10 minutes
4. Decant into clean test tube, heat in water bath at 60°C
5. Add drops of 1:1 NH₄OH:H₂O to pH=9.2 (5 drops first then single)
6. Centrifuge for 15 minutes
7. Check pH of liquid, if less than pH=7, redo step 5
8. Decant, save with Anion Supernate
9. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
10. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
11. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Approx. vol. Ptte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2391</td>
<td>B24</td>
<td>09SRB-A35A-01</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2392</td>
<td>B25</td>
<td>09SRB-A36A-01</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2393</td>
<td>B26</td>
<td>09SRB-A346A-01</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2394</td>
<td>B28</td>
<td>09SRB-A348A-01</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2395</td>
<td>B29</td>
<td>09SRB-A347-01</td>
<td>1.75/2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2313</td>
<td>B13</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
B29: 1) 0.25ml solid white, 2) 1.75ml still white, 3) 2.25ml gelly on top part
WS8_Cation Column Chemistry p1

This worksheet outlines the steps for the Cation Column Chemistry

Chemist: GY/AM  Date: 01/27/2010

1. Dissolve in 5 ml conc. HCl and evaporate to dryness at 125°C
2. Redissolve in 2.5 ml 1 N HCl and 2.5 ml 0.5 N HCl
3. Transfer to centrifuge tube, rinse with 1 ml 0.5 N, and centrifuge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Vessel</td>
<td>B99</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>B16</td>
<td>B18</td>
<td>B19</td>
<td>B22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2381</td>
<td>2382</td>
<td>2383</td>
<td>2384</td>
<td>2386</td>
<td>2387</td>
<td>2390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09SRB-E221A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-02</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-03</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-03</td>
<td>09SRB-E304A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A186-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A188A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A187A-01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Pipette all of the sample into designated conditioned cation column, 17 ml
5. Discard the eluant. Add 285 ml 0.5 N HCL (Bottle C6)
6. Drain the column, discard the first 300ml of eluant.
7. Add 60 ml of 0.5N HCl, (Bottle C7), Collect eluant as Cation Supernate
8. Add 65 ml of 0.5N HCl, (Bottle C8), Save it as Be-Sample
9. Add 120 ml 1N HCl (bottle C9)
10. Save this as Be-sample as well.
11. Add 80 ml 4.5 N HCl (bottle C10), save the eluant as Al sample.
12. CONDITION CATION COLUMN
    (bottle C1) 100 ml 9 N HCl
    (bottle C2) 50 ml 4.5 N HCl
    (bottle C3) 50 ml 1 N HCl
    (bottle C4) 50 ml water
    (bottle C5) 100 ml 0.5 N HCl

* 17 ml Column
WS8_Cation Column Chemistry p2

This worksheet outlines the steps for the Cation Column Chemistry

Chemist: GY/AM Date: 01/28/2010

1. Dissolve in 5 ml conc. HCl and evaporate to dryness at 125°C
2. Redissolve in 2.5 ml 1 N HCl and 2.5 ml 0.5 N HCl
3. Transfer to centrifuge tube, rinse with 1 ml 0.5 N, and centrifuge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2391</td>
<td>2392</td>
<td>2393</td>
<td>2394</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td>2313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>00SRB-A355A-01</td>
<td>00SRB-A356A-01</td>
<td>00SRB-A346A-01</td>
<td>00SRB-A348A-01</td>
<td>00SRB-A347-01</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Pipette all of the sample into designated conditioned cation column, 17 ml
5. Discard the eluant. Add 285 ml 0.5 N HCL (Bottle C6)
6. Drain the column, discard the first 300ml of eluant
7. Add 60 ml of 0.5N HCl, (Bottle C7), Collect eluant as Cation Supernate
8. Add 65 ml of 0.5N HCl, (Bottle C8), Save it as Be-Sample
9. Add 120 ml 1N HCl (bottle C9)
10. Save this as Be-sample as well.
11. Add 80 ml 4.5 N HCl (bottle C10), save the eluant as Al sample.
12. CONDITION CATION COLUMN
   - (bottle C1) 100 ml 9 N HCl
   - (bottle C2) 50 ml 4.5 N HCl
   - (bottle C3) 50 ml 1 N HCl
   - (bottle C4) 50 ml water
   - (bottle C5) 100 ml 0.5 N HCl

* 17 ml Column
WS9_Be Sample Chemistry p1

This worksheet outlines the steps to prepare the BeO sample

Chemist: GY/AM  Date: 02/01/2010

1. Evaporate Be Sample from column in wiped digestion vessels at 125°C
2. Add 2–5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
3. Again, add 2–5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
4. Dissolve sample in 10 ml of 0.5 N HCl (optima grade)
5. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tube
6. Centrifuge and decant into clean centrifuge tube
7. Heat centrifuge tubes in water bath at 60°C
8. Precipitate Be(OH)₂ using Matheson ultimate grade ammonia gas
   Gently bubble NH₃ with clean pipet tip on hose
   for ca. 15 bubbles, or ca. 8–12 sec until ptte forms
   Optimum pH=9.2; 1N HCl may be added
9. Centrifuge 15 min., decant (save and redo if pH of liquid is < 8)
10. Wash with water, vortex, centrifuge for 10 min, and decant
11. Record mass quartz vials, label, and place them in furnace holder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>2381</th>
<th>2382</th>
<th>2383</th>
<th>2384</th>
<th>2385</th>
<th>2387</th>
<th>2390</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B90</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>B16</td>
<td>B18</td>
<td>B19</td>
<td>B22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-02</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-03</td>
<td>09SRB-E304A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A189A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A189A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A189A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Qtz Vial</td>
<td>2.5264</td>
<td>2.5797</td>
<td>2.5749</td>
<td>2.6337</td>
<td>2.5977</td>
<td>2.5788</td>
<td>2.6766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Vial+Spil</td>
<td>2.5308</td>
<td>2.5804</td>
<td>2.5760</td>
<td>2.6372</td>
<td>2.5977</td>
<td>2.5807</td>
<td>2.6784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Spil</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residue ml</td>
<td>0.1000</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>0.7500</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>0.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residue</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>little yellow</td>
<td>white fluffy</td>
<td>white solid</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>white solid</td>
<td>white fluffy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Add 1 small drop of water with micropipet, slurry precipitate
13. Transfer sample into quartz vial, cover with quartz lid
14. Turn on Bunsen Burner, dry the gel carefully.
15. Burn the Be(OH)₂ gel on bunsen burner at least 2 mins, at blue flame.
16. Convert to BeO
17. Determine mass of vial + sample
WS9_Be Sample Chemistry p2

This worksheet outlines the steps to prepare the BeO sample

Chemist: GY/AM  Date: 02/01/2010

1. Evaporate Be Sample from column in wiped digestion vessels at 125°C
2. Add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
3. Again, add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
4. Dissolve sample in 10 ml of 0.5 N HCl (optima grade)
5. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tube
6. Centrifuge and decant into clean centrifuge tube
7. Heat centrifuge tubes in water bath at 60°C
8. Precipitate Be(OH)₂ using Matheson ultimate grade ammonia gas
   Gently bubble NH₃ with clean pipet tip on hose
   for ca.15 bubbles, or ca. 8-12 sec until pte forms
   Optimum pH=9.2; 1N HCl may be added
9. Centrifuge 15 min., decant (save and redo 8 if pH of liquid is < 8)
10. Wash with water, vortex, centrifuge for 10 min, and decant
11. Record mass quartz vials, label, and place them in furnace holder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Mass Vial+Spl</th>
<th>Mass Spl</th>
<th>Residue ml</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06SRB-A355A-01</td>
<td>2.5495</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>0.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09SRB-A356A-01</td>
<td>2.5443</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06SRB-A346A-01</td>
<td>2.4879</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
<td>0.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06SRB-A348A-01</td>
<td>2.6681</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
<td>0.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09SRB-A347-01</td>
<td>2.4957</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>2.5204</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Add 1 small drop of water with micropipet, slurry precipitate
13. Transfer sample into quartz vial, cover with quartz lid
14. Turn on Bunsen Burner, dry the gel carefully.
15. Burn the Be(OH)₂ gel on bunsen burner at least 2 mins, at blue flame.
16. Convert to BeO
17. Determine mass of vial + sample
WS10_A1 Sample Chemistry p1

This worksheet outlines the steps to prepare the Al oxide sample

**Chemist:** AM/GY  **Date:** 01/29/2010

1. Evaporate Al Sample from column in wiped teflon vessel at 125°C
2. Dissolve sample in 10 ml of 0.5 N HCl (optima grade)
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tube
4. Centrifuge and decant into clean centrifuge tube
5. Heat centrifuge tubes in water bath at 60°C
6. Precipitate Al(OH)₃ using 50% NH₃·OH (drops: 5, 3, 2, 1, 0)
   Optimum pH=6.3; 1N HCl may be added
7. Centrifuge 15 min., decant (save and redo if pH of liquid is < 8)
8. Wash with water, vortex, centrifuge for 10 min. and decant
9. Record mass quartz vials, label, and place them in furnace holder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel ID</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>C6</th>
<th>C7</th>
<th>C8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNF ID</td>
<td>2381</td>
<td>2382</td>
<td>2383</td>
<td>2384</td>
<td>2386</td>
<td>2387</td>
<td>2390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-02</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-03</td>
<td>09SRB-E304A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A186-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A188A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-A187A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Qtz Vial</td>
<td>2.5739</td>
<td>2.6192</td>
<td>2.5267</td>
<td>2.6407</td>
<td>2.3677</td>
<td>2.5608</td>
<td>2.5221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Vial+Spl</td>
<td>2.6008</td>
<td>2.6428</td>
<td>2.5339</td>
<td>2.6490</td>
<td>2.3738</td>
<td>2.5687</td>
<td>2.5301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Spl</td>
<td>0.0269</td>
<td>0.0236</td>
<td>0.0072</td>
<td>0.0083</td>
<td>0.0061</td>
<td>0.0079</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residue ml</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residue</td>
<td>white</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Add 1 small drop of water with micropipet, slurry precipitate
11. Transfer sample into quartz vial, cover with alumina vial
12. Heat in oven at 120°C for 2-3 hours
13. Let cool and scrape sample down from walls of quartz tube
14. Convert to Al₂O₃ in furnace at 950°C for minimum of 1 hr
15. Determine mass of vial + sample
WS10_Ai Sample Chemistry p2

This worksheet outlines the steps to prepare the Al oxide sample

Chemist: AM/GY  Date: 01/29/2010

- Evaporate Al Sample from column in wiped teflon vessel at 125°C
- Dissolve sample in 10 ml of 0.5 N HCl (optima grade)
- Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tube
- Centrifuge and decant into clean centrifuge tube
- Heat centrifuge tubes in water bath at 60°C
- Precipitate Al(OH)₃ using 50% NH₃OH (drops: 25, 5, 5, 3, 2…)
  Optimum pH=6.3; 1N HCl may be added
- Centrifuge 15 min., decant (save and redo if pH of liquid is < 8)
- Wash with water, vortex, centrifuge for 10 min, and decant
- Record mass quartz vials, label, and place them in furnace holder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel ID</th>
<th>C9</th>
<th>C10</th>
<th>C11</th>
<th>C14</th>
<th>C17</th>
<th>C18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2391</td>
<td>2392</td>
<td>2393</td>
<td>2394</td>
<td>2395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06SRB-A355A-01</td>
<td>06SRB-A356A-01</td>
<td>06SRB-A346A-01</td>
<td>06SRB-A348A-01</td>
<td>06SRB-A347-01</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Qtz Vial</td>
<td>2.5648</td>
<td>2.5015</td>
<td>2.6198</td>
<td>2.6835</td>
<td>2.6445</td>
<td>2.5160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Vial+Spl</td>
<td>2.5727</td>
<td>2.5090</td>
<td>2.6283</td>
<td>2.6923</td>
<td>2.6819</td>
<td>2.5199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Spl</td>
<td>0.0079</td>
<td>0.0075</td>
<td>0.0085</td>
<td>0.0088</td>
<td>0.0373</td>
<td>0.0039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residue ml</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residue</td>
<td>large amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Add 1 small drop of water with micropipet, slurry precipitate
- Transfer sample into quartz vial, cover with alumina vial
- Heat in oven at 120°C for 2-3 hours
- Let cool and scrape sample down from walls of quartz tube
- Convert to Al₂O₃ in furnace at 950°C for minimum of 1 hr
- Determine mass of vial + sample
Bedrock surfaces – batch 2

This worksheet outlines the steps for dissolving quartz and adding Be carrier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemist: AM</th>
<th>Date: 11/19/2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>300 ml vessel ID</th>
<th>Beryl Carrier ID</th>
<th>AI Carrier ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2526</td>
<td>06SRB</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Be3-Carrier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2527</td>
<td>06SRB</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>1015 ppm Be1.05g/ml, Dec 10 2001, JCG, bottle 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2528</td>
<td>06SRB</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2529</td>
<td>06SRB</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2530</td>
<td>06SRB</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2531</td>
<td>06SRB</td>
<td>B10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2532</td>
<td>06SRB</td>
<td>B12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2533</td>
<td>06SRB</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Add 20 ml conc. HF and 2 ml HClO4 per 5 g of quartz
- Add 5 ml Aqua Regia
- Heat at 100-125°C until quartz dissolves, add HF if needed
- Raise to 200°C and evaporate to dryness
- Add 5 ml HClO4 and evaporate to dryness
- Add 8 to 10 ml conc. HNO3, swirl, and evaporate to dryness
- Dissolved dried sample in 20 ml of 2% HCl

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass 300 ml vessel</th>
<th>Mass 40g quartz</th>
<th>Mass Be carrier</th>
<th>Mass AI Carrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150.2878</td>
<td>35.0118</td>
<td>0.1915</td>
<td>0.1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.2873</td>
<td>35.0440</td>
<td>0.1968</td>
<td>0.1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.2790</td>
<td>35.0160</td>
<td>0.1861</td>
<td>0.1847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.2229</td>
<td>35.1029</td>
<td>0.1861</td>
<td>0.1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.1367</td>
<td>35.2063</td>
<td>0.1861</td>
<td>0.1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.2883</td>
<td>35.4637</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

16.11.2i add 140 ml HF, 50 ml Aqua Regia, 8ml HClO4, put on hotplate @ 15 00
21.11.2i all sample dissolved, except for #26 and #29 some residue, open lid @ 12:00, increase to 200°C
22.11.2i add 5 ml HClO4 @ 14.00; blank small white dot, most samples yellow or brown small precipitation; #12 some white fluffy precipitation; #8 and #10 quite some white fluffy precipitation and some large white needle-shaped crystals; #25 lots of white fluffy precipitation, many large white needle-shaped crystals; #29 some brown and some white fluffy precipitation (no needle shaped crystals); #15 very long to evaporate, add 5ml HClO4 @ 17.45
22.11.2i add 8 / 15 / 20 ml HNO3 @ 23.00, reduce heat to 110°C; almost all samples (add 8ml) yellow or brown small precipitation; #12 (add 8ml) some white solid precipitation (not fluffy anymore); #8 and #10 (add 15ml) quite some white precipitation with large needle-shaped crystals; #25 (add 20 ml) lots of white precipitation with large needle-shaped crystals; #29 (add 15ml) some brown and white fluffy precipitation (no crystals)
23.11.2i all samples but #30 (blank), #1 and #2 dry; fan of fume hood makes strange sound -> shut down fume hood ventilation during repair and samples still drying on hotplate
23.11.2i all samples but #30 (blank), #1 and #2 dry; fan of fume hood makes strange sound -> shut down fume hood ventilation during repair and samples still drying on hotplate
most samples small brown or yellow precipitation, samples #8, 10, 26 a lot of white precipitation with many smaller (0.5cm-long) needle-shaped crystals k26 has most precipitation; #29 some yellow and more white precipitation (no crystals), when dissolved in 2% HNO3 especially yellow precipitation turned into a ‘gel’-like mass
#8 = 25 after ultrasonic (3 rounds) some white chunks left plus some white grains (probably felspar?)
AI-test: medium-sized fluffy precipitation
#10 = 2i same as 2530, but more white grains left after ultrasonic (3 rounds)
AI-test: medium-sized fluffy precipitation
#29 = 2i after ultrasonic (5 rounds) few small white chunks left plus many white grains (probably felspar?)
AI-test: medium-sized fluffy precipitation
one of two true for samples from ridge NW of Broughton channel (other sample 2534 no problems)
#29 = 2i after ultrasonic (5 rounds) some muscovite left plus some few white grains (fine)
AI-test: medium-sized fluffy precipitation, result 100 ppm due to AI in muscovite Moonshine ridge sample (straining tonalite with 20% mica)
23.11.2i samples #8, #10, #26 and #29 not dissolved and a lot of residue after centrifuging for 10 min try to bring back residue of samples #8 and #29 by splitting up sample between 4 test tubes (before and afterwards vortex) and adding 5ml of concentrated HNO3 to each tube (bring it up to 10.5ml in total), heat the test tubes in water bath @ 100°C for up to 1 hour -> still not dissolved take these samples out of process and do sand abrasion with left over sample, include into next batch of for samples (4 more samples need to be crushed and purified)
14.11.2i samples #30, #1 and #2 dry @ 14 30, dissolve in 20ml 2% HNO3
WS4_QtzDissolution p2

This worksheet outlines the steps for dissolving quartz and adding Be carrier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemist: AM</th>
<th>Date: 11/19/2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHEF ID</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>360 ml vessel ID</th>
<th>Beryllium Carrier ID</th>
<th>AI Carrier ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2534</td>
<td>1068B-01</td>
<td>B16</td>
<td>Ba6 Carrier, 1016 ppm Be, 1013 ppm Al, Dec 19, 2001, JCO, Bottle 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2535</td>
<td>1068B-01</td>
<td>B26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2536</td>
<td>1068B-01</td>
<td>B28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2420</td>
<td>1068B-01</td>
<td>B30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass 300 ml vessel</th>
<th>Mass 40g quartz</th>
<th>Mass Be carrier</th>
<th>Mass Al Carrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150.2457</td>
<td>39.5603</td>
<td>0.1923</td>
<td>0.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.8166</td>
<td>39.1844</td>
<td>0.1920</td>
<td>0.1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.1650</td>
<td>39.2873</td>
<td>0.1613</td>
<td>0.1803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.2078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Add 20 ml conc. HF and 2 ml HClO4 per 5 g of quartz
2. Add 5 ml Aqua Regia
3. Heat at 100-125°C until quartz dissolves, add HF if needed
4. Raise to 200°C and evaporate to dryness
5. Add 5 ml HClO4 and evaporate to dryness
6. Add 8 to 10 ml conc. HNO3, swirl, and evaporate to dryness
7. Dissolved dried sample in 20 ml of 2% HCl

Comments:

19.11.2: all sample dissolved, except for #26 and #29 some residue, open lid @ 12:00, increase to 200°C
22.11.2: add 5 ml HClO4 @ 14:00, blank small white dot, most samples yellow or brown small precipitation; #12 some white fluffy precipitation, #26 quoted same white fluffy precipitation and some large white needle-shaped crystals, #26 lots of white fluffy precipitation, many large needle-shaped crystals, #26 some brown and some white fluffy precipitation (no needle shaped crystals), #15 very long to evaporate, add 5 ml HClO4 @ 17:45
22.11.2: add 9 / 15 / 20 ml HNO3 @ 23:00, reduce heat to 110°C, almost all samples (add 8mL) yellow or brown small precipitation, #12 (add 8mL) some white solid precipitation (not fluffy anymore), #26 and #10 (add 15mL) quite some white precipitation with large needle-shaped crystals, #26 (add 20 ml) lots of white precipitation with large needle-shaped crystals, #29 (add 15mL) some brown and white fluffy precipitation (no crystals)
23.11.2: all samples but #30 (blank), #1 and #2 dry, fan of fume hood makes strange sound -> shut down fume hood ventilation during repair and samples still drying on hotplate most samples small brown or yellow precipitation, samples #6, #10, #20 a lot of white precipitation with smaller (0.5cm-long) needle-shaped crystals #26 has most precipitation; #26 some yellow and more while precipitation (no crystals), when dissolved in 2% HNO3 especially yellow precipitation turned into a 'gel-like' mass

#6 = 25 after ultrasonic (3 rounds) some white chunks left plus some white grains (probably felspar?)
AI-test: medium-sized fluffy precipitation
#10 = 2 same as 2530, but more white grains left after ultrasonic (3 rounds)
AI-test: medium-sized fluffy precipitation
#26 = 2 after ultrasonic (5 rounds) few small white chunks left plus many white grains (probably felspar?)
AI-test: medium-sized fluffy precipitation
one of two true for samples from ridge NW of Broughten channel (other sample 2534 no problems)
#29 = 2 after ultrasonic (6 rounds) some muscovite left plus some few white grains (fine)
AI-test: medium-sized fluffy precipitation, result 100 ppm due to AI in muscovite Moonshine ridge sample (strained tonalite with 20% mica)
23.11.2: samples #6, #10, #20 and #29 not dissolved and a lot of residue after centrifuging for 10 min try to bring back residue of samples #6 and #29 by splitting up sample between 4 test tubes (before and afterwards vortex) and adding 5ml of concentrated HNO3 to each tube (bring to 10.5ml in total), heat the test tubes in waterbath @ 100°C for up to 1 hour -> still not dissolved take these samples out of process and do sand abrasion with left over sample, include in next batch of for samples (4 more samples need to be crushed and purified)
24.11.2: samples #30, #1 and #2 dry @ 14:30, dissolve in 20ml 2% HNO3
WS5B_Icp aliquot and Al spiking p1

This worksheet outlines the steps for collecting ICP aliquots and adding Al carrier.

Chemist: [AM] Date: 11/24/2010

1. Label one 100 ml volumetric flasks per sample
2. Label one ICP vial with CNEF ID per sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel ID</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B6</th>
<th>B7</th>
<th>B8</th>
<th>B10</th>
<th>B12</th>
<th>B15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2526</td>
<td>2527</td>
<td>2528</td>
<td>2529</td>
<td>2630</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>2532</td>
<td>2533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al carrier ID</td>
<td>LOT # 94-096873J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 100 ml volumetric</td>
<td>66.3035</td>
<td>66.8753</td>
<td>67.0102</td>
<td>67.7324</td>
<td>66.5889</td>
<td>66.4886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 100 ml volumetric + sample + 2% HNO3</td>
<td>167.6249</td>
<td>170.1347</td>
<td>166.4677</td>
<td>169.2417</td>
<td>168.1836</td>
<td>167.9088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 5 ml to volumetric B</td>
<td>5.0097</td>
<td>5.0080</td>
<td>5.0479</td>
<td>5.0267</td>
<td>5.0483</td>
<td>5.0104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add 2 drops carrier, mass</td>
<td>5.0436</td>
<td>5.0389</td>
<td>5.0798</td>
<td>5.0555</td>
<td>5.0789</td>
<td>5.0390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring B to 10 ml with 2% HNO3</td>
<td>10.1648</td>
<td>10.1040</td>
<td>10.1495</td>
<td>10.0839</td>
<td>10.1486</td>
<td>10.1832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 5 ml sample</td>
<td>152.6938</td>
<td>155.1942</td>
<td>153.5407</td>
<td>154.2865</td>
<td>152.7854</td>
<td>152.9680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add carrier to 85ml sample</td>
<td>1.7429</td>
<td>1.7297</td>
<td>1.7442</td>
<td>1.7420</td>
<td>1.7340</td>
<td>1.8031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 5 ml with carrier to volumetric C</td>
<td>5.0131</td>
<td>5.0139</td>
<td>5.0086</td>
<td>5.0216</td>
<td>5.0134</td>
<td>5.0066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring C to 10 ml</td>
<td>10.1863</td>
<td>10.1150</td>
<td>10.1489</td>
<td>10.1396</td>
<td>10.1172</td>
<td>10.0983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass of 80 ml sample</td>
<td>149.4197</td>
<td>151.9035</td>
<td>150.2085</td>
<td>151.0011</td>
<td>149.8733</td>
<td>149.7551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Samples 2530 and 2531 not further processed -> require more purification

423
This worksheet outlines the steps for collecting ICP aliquots and adding AI carrier.

Chemist: AM  Date: 11/24/2010

- Label one 100 ml volumetric flasks per sample
- Label one ICP vial with CNEF ID per sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel ID</th>
<th>B18</th>
<th>B26</th>
<th>B29</th>
<th>B30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2534</td>
<td>2536</td>
<td>2636</td>
<td>2420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>10SRB-E065A-01</td>
<td>10SRB-E066A-04</td>
<td>10SRB-E074A-01</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI carrier ID</td>
<td>LOT # 94-096673J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Quant-EM est. Al in qtz: 25, 25
- Mass 100 ml volumetric: 66.7040, 66.8429
- Mass 10 ml sample to volumetric A (10 ml tube): 9.9024, 9.9121
- Mass 5 ml to volumetric B: 5.0203, 5.0035
- Add 2 drops carrier, mass: 6.0521, 5.0349
- Bring B to 10 ml with 2% HNO3: 10.1324, 10.1181
- Mass 5 ml Sample: 153.1353, 153.0874
- Add carrier to 85 ml sample: 1.7293, 2.9683
- Mass 5 ml with carrier to volumetric C: 5.0013, 5.0052
- Bring C to 10 ml: 10.1289, 10.1571
- Mass of 80 ml sample: 149.8577, 151.0382

Samples 2535 and 2536 not further processed -> require more purification
This worksheet outlines the steps for the Anion Column Chemistry (2ml size small column)

Chemist: AM Date: 11/25/2010

1. Evaporate 20 ml to dryness at 100-120°C (will take at least 3 hrs)
2. Dissolve in 10 ml 9N HCl (let stand for several hours)
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tubes, rinse digestion vessels with 9N HCl to bring volume in tube to 10 ml
4. Centrifuge at 1500 rpm or higher for minimum of 10 minutes
5. Allow any 9N HCl in columns to drain out; discard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td>B40</td>
<td>B12</td>
<td>B15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2526</td>
<td>2527</td>
<td>2528</td>
<td>2529</td>
<td>2530</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>2532</td>
<td>2533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>09SRB-</td>
<td>09SRB-</td>
<td>09SRB-</td>
<td>09SRB-</td>
<td>09SRB-</td>
<td>09SRB-</td>
<td>10SRB-</td>
<td>10SRB-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. With stopcock closed, pipet sample (avoid residue) onto 2ml size columns.
7. Collect sample in same 300 ml teflon vessel.
8. Elute with 10 ml 9N HCl, and collect that, close stopcock
9. 5 ml 4.5 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate in labeled 100 ml bottle
10. 10 ml 1 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate
11. 50 ml deionized water. Discard.
12. CONDITION ANION COLUMN
   (bottle A1) 10 ml 1N HCl, discard
   (bottle A2) 10 ml 4.5 N HCl, discard
   (bottle A3) 10 ml 9 N HCl, discard, but retain acid approx. 2 mm above resin

Comments
This worksheet outlines the steps for the Anion Column Chemistry (2ml size small column)

Chemist: AM  Date: 11/25/2010

1. Evaporate 20 ml to dryness at 100-120°C (will take at least 3 hrs)
2. Dissolve in 10 ml 9 N HCl (let stand for several hours)
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tubes, rinse digestion vessels with 9 N HCl to bring volume in tube to 10 ml
4. Centrifuge at 1500 rpm or higher for minimum of 10 minutes
5. Allow any 9 N HCl in columns to drain out; discard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B18</td>
<td>B26</td>
<td>B29</td>
<td>B30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2534</td>
<td>2536</td>
<td>2636</td>
<td>2420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>10SRB-E065A-01</td>
<td>10SRB-E066A-01</td>
<td>10SRB-E074A-01</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. With stopcock closed, pipet sample (avoid residue) onto 2ml size columns.
7. Collect sample in same 300 ml teflon vessel.
8. Elute with 10 ml 9 N HCl, and collect that, close stopcock
9. 5 ml 4.5 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate in labeled 100 ml bottle
10. 10 ml 1 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate
11. 50 ml deionized water. Discard.
12. CONDITION ANION COLUMN
   (bottle A): 10 ml 1 N HCl, discard
   (bottle A2): 10 ml 4.5 N HCl, discard
   (bottle A3): 10 ml 9 N HCl, discard, but retain acid approx. 2 mm above resin

Comments
WS7_Controlled Precipitate p1

This worksheet outlines the steps for the controlled precipitation chemistry

Chemist: AM Date: 11/26/2010

- Evaporate "anion" elute to dryness at 125°C
- Dissolve in 10 ml of a 1:1 solution of 0.5 N HCl and 2% NH₄Cl
- Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge, centrifuge for 10 minutes
- Decant into clean test tube, heat in water bath at 60°C
- Add drops of 1:1 NH₄OH·H₂O to pH=9.2 (5 drops first then single)
- Centrifuge for 15 minutes
- Check pH of liquid, if less than pH=7, redo step 5
- Decant, save with Anion Supernate
- Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
- Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
- Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>2526</th>
<th>2527</th>
<th>2528</th>
<th>2529</th>
<th>2530</th>
<th>2531</th>
<th>2532</th>
<th>2533</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>B8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>EZZZA-01</td>
<td>EZZZA-02</td>
<td>EZZZA-03</td>
<td>EZZZA-04</td>
<td>EZZZA-05</td>
<td>EZZZA-06</td>
<td>EZZZA-07</td>
<td>EZZZA-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. vol. Pet</td>
<td>0.8 ml</td>
<td>0.9 ml</td>
<td>0.7 ml</td>
<td>0.6 ml</td>
<td>2 ml</td>
<td>1 ml</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

2526 white to yellowish fluffy precipitate
2527 white fluffy precipitate
2528 white fluffy to solid precipitate
2529 white fluffy to solid precipitate
2532 bottom <0.1 ml white solid above white very fluffy precipitate
2533 white to yellowish fluffy precipitate
2543 white very fluffy precipitate
2420 white very fluffy precipitate
WS7_Controlled Precipitate p2

This worksheet outlines the steps for the controlled precipitation chemistry

Chemist: AM  Date: 11/26/2010

1. Evaporate "anion" elute to dryness at 125°C
2. Dissolve in 10 ml of a 1:1 solution of 0.5 N HCl and 2% NH₄Cl
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge, centrifuge for 10 minutes
4. Decant into clean test tube, heat in water bath at 60°C
5. Add drops of 1:1 NH₄OH:H₂O to pH = 9.2 (6 drops first then single)
6. Centrifuge for 15 minutes
7. Check pH of liquid, if less than pH = 7, redo step 5
8. Decant, save with Anion Supernate
9. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
10. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
11. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>2534</th>
<th>2536</th>
<th>2536</th>
<th>2420</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B18</td>
<td>B26</td>
<td>B29</td>
<td>B30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>103RB-006A-01</td>
<td>468RB-006A-01</td>
<td>468RB-0074A-01</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. vol. Ptte</td>
<td>1.5 ml</td>
<td>0.35 ml</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
2528 white to yellowish fluffy precipitate
2527 white fluffy precipitate
2528 white fluffy to solid precipitate
2529 white fluffy to solid precipitate
2532 bottom <0.1 ml white solid above white very fluffy precipitate
2533 white to yellowish fluffy precipitate
2543 white very fluffy precipitate
2420 white very fluffy precipitate
WS8_Cation Column Chemistry p1

This worksheet outlines the steps for the Cation Column Chemistry

Chemist: AM Date: 11/29/2010

1. Dissolve in 5 ml conc. HCl and evaporate to dryness at 125°C
2. Redissolve in 2.5 ml 1 N HCl and 2.5 ml 0.5 N HCl
3. Transfer to centrifuge tube, rinse with 1 ml 0.5 N, and centrifuge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td>B40</td>
<td>B12</td>
<td>B15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2526</td>
<td>2527</td>
<td>2528</td>
<td>2529</td>
<td>2530</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>2532</td>
<td>2533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>09SRB-02</td>
<td>09SRB-02</td>
<td>09SRB-03</td>
<td>09SRB-04</td>
<td>09SRB-02</td>
<td>09SRB-02</td>
<td>10SRB-01</td>
<td>10SRB-01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Pipette all of the sample into designated conditioned cation column, 17 ml
5. Discard the eluant. Add 285 ml 0.5 N HCL (Bottle C6)
6. Drain the column, discard the first 300ml of eluant
7. Add 60 ml of 0.5N HCl, (Bottle C7), Collect eluant as Cation Supernate
8. Add 65 ml of 0.5N HCl, (Bottle C8), Save it as Be-Sample
9. Add 120 ml 1N HCl (bottle C9)
10. Save this as Be-sample as well.
11. Add 80 ml 4.5 N HCl (bottle C10), save the eluant as Al sample.
12. CONDITION CATION COLUMN
   (bottle C1) 100 ml 9 N HCl
   (bottle C2) 50 ml 4.5 N HCl
   (bottle C3) 50 ml 1 N HCl
   (bottle C4) 50 ml water
   (bottle C5) 100 ml 0.5 N HCl

* 17 ml Column
WS8_Cation Column Chemistry p2

This worksheet outlines the steps for the Cation Column Chemistry

Chemist: AM Date: 11/29/2010

1. Dissolve in 5 ml conc. HCl and evaporate to dryness at 125°C
2. Redissolve in 2.5 ml 1 N HCl and 2.5 ml 0.5 N HCl
3. Transfer to centrifuge tube, rinse with 1 ml 0.5 N, and centrifuge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B18</td>
<td>B26</td>
<td>B29</td>
<td>B30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2534</td>
<td>2535</td>
<td>2536</td>
<td>2420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>10SRB-E065A-01</td>
<td>10SRB-E066A-91</td>
<td>10SRB-E074A-91</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Pipette all of the sample into designated conditioned cation column, 17 ml
5. Discard the eluant. Add 285 ml 0.5 N HCL (Bottle C6)
6. Drain the column, discard the first 300ml of eluant
7. Add 60 ml of 0.5N HCl, (Bottle C7), Collect eluant as Cation Supernate
8. Add 65 ml of 0.5N HCl, (Bottle C8), Save it as Be-Sample
9. Add 120 ml 1N HCl (bottle C9)
10. Save this as Be-sample as well.
11. Add 80 ml 4.5 N HCl (bottle C10), save the eluant as Al sample.
12. CONDITION CATION COLUMN
   - (bottle C1) 100 ml 9 N HCl
   - (bottle C2) 50 ml 4.5 N HCl
   - (bottle C3) 50 ml 1 N HCl
   - (bottle C4) 50 ml water
   - (bottle C5) 100 ml 0.5 N HCl

* 17 ml Column
WS9_Be Sample Chemistry p1

This worksheet outlines the steps to prepare the BeO sample

Chemist: AM  Date: 12/01/2010

1. Evaporate Be Sample from column in wiped digestion vessels at 125°C
2. Add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
3. Again, add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
4. Dissolve sample in 10 ml of 0.5 N HCl (optima grade)
5. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tube
6. Centrifuge and decant into clean centrifuge tube
7. Heat centrifuge tubes in water bath at 60°C
8. Precipitate Be(OH)₂ using Matheson ultimate grade ammonia gas
   Gently bubble NH₃ with clean pipet tip on hose
   for ca.15 bubbles, or ca. 8-12 sec until pte forms
   Optimum pH=9.2; 1N HCl may be added
9. Centrifuge 15 min., decant (save and redo if pH of liquid is < 8)
10. Wash with water, vortex, centrifuge for 10 min, and decant
11. Record mass quartz vials, label, and place them in furnace holder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>2526</th>
<th>2527</th>
<th>2528</th>
<th>2529</th>
<th>2630</th>
<th>2631</th>
<th>2532</th>
<th>2533</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td>B40</td>
<td>B12</td>
<td>B15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Qtz Vial</td>
<td>2.6110</td>
<td>2.5631</td>
<td>2.6565</td>
<td>2.5396</td>
<td>2.6340</td>
<td>2.6555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Vial+Sp</td>
<td>2.6137</td>
<td>2.5650</td>
<td>2.6560</td>
<td>2.5412</td>
<td>2.6264</td>
<td>2.6574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Sp</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Add 1 small drop of water with micropipet, slurry precipitate
13. Transfer sample into quartz vial, cover with quartz lid
14. Turn on Bunsen Burner, dry the gel carefully.
15. Burn the Be(OH)₂ gel on bunsen burner at least 2 mins, at blue flame.
16. Convert to BeO
17. Determine mass of vial + sample
WS9_Be Sample Chemistry p2

This worksheet outlines the steps to prepare the BeO sample

Chemist: AM Date: 12/01/2010

1. Evaporate Be Sample from column in wiped digestion vessels at 125°C
2. Add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
3. Again, add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
4. Dissolve sample in 10 ml of 0.5 N HCl (optima grade)
5. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tube
6. Centrifuge and decant into clean centrifuge tube
7. Heat centrifuge tubes in water bath at 60°C
8. Precipitate Be(OH)₂ using Matheson ultimate grade ammonia gas
   Gently bubble NH₃ with clean pipet tip on hose
   for ca. 15 bubbles, or ca. 8-12 sec until ptte forms
   Optimum pH=9.2; 1N HCl may be added
9. Centrifuge 15 min., decant (save and redo if pH of liquid is < 8)
10. Wash with water, vortex, centrifuge for 10 min, and decant
11. Record mass quartz vials, label, and place them in furnace holder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>2534</th>
<th>2536</th>
<th>2536</th>
<th>2420</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B18</td>
<td>B26</td>
<td>B26</td>
<td>B30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>105RB-008A-01</td>
<td>105RB-006A-01</td>
<td>105RB-004A-01</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Qtz Vial</td>
<td>2.6298</td>
<td>2.6279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Vial+Spi</td>
<td>2.6311</td>
<td>2.6285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Spi</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Add 1 small drop of water with micropipet, slurry precipitate
13. Transfer sample into quartz vial, cover with quartz lid
14. Turn on Bunsen Burner, dry the gel carefully.
15. Burn the Be(OH)₂ gel on Bunsen burner at least 2 mins, at blue flame.
16. Convert to BeO
17. Determine mass of vial + sample
WS10_Al Sample Chemistry p1

This worksheet outlines the steps to prepare the Al oxide sample

Chemist: AM Date: 11/30/2010

1. Evaporate Al Sample from column in wiped teflon vessel at 125°C
2. Dissolve sample in 10 ml of 0.5 N HCl (optima grade)
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tube
4. Centrifuge and decant into clean centrifuge tube
5. Heat centrifuge tubes in water bath at 60°C
6. Precipitate Al(OH)₃ using 50% NH₃OH (drops: 25, 5, 5, 3, 2...)
   Optimum pH=6.3; 1N HCl may be added
7. Centrifuge 15 min., decant (save and redo □b if pH of liquid is < 8)
8. Wash with water, vortex, centrifuge for 10 min, and decant
9. Record mass quartz vials, label, and place them in furnace holder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>2526</th>
<th>2527</th>
<th>2528</th>
<th>2529</th>
<th>2530</th>
<th>2531</th>
<th>2532</th>
<th>2533</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Qtz Vial</td>
<td>2.5879</td>
<td>2.5879</td>
<td>2.5950</td>
<td>2.6506</td>
<td>2.6315</td>
<td>2.6108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Vial+Sp</td>
<td>2.6044</td>
<td>2.5937</td>
<td>2.6022</td>
<td>2.6577</td>
<td>2.6960</td>
<td>2.6193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Sp</td>
<td>0.0065</td>
<td>0.0068</td>
<td>0.0072</td>
<td>0.0071</td>
<td>0.0246</td>
<td>0.0089</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Add 1 small drop of water with micropipet, slurry precipitate
11. Transfer sample into quartz vial, cover with alumina vial
12. Heat in oven at 120°C for 2-3 hours
13. Let cool and scrape sample down from walls of quartz tube
14. Convert to Al₂O₃ in furnace at 950°C for minimum of 1 hr
15. Determine mass of vial + sample
WS10_AI Sample Chemistry p2

This worksheet outlines the steps to prepare the Al oxide sample

Chemist: AM  Date: 11/30/2010

1. Evaporate Al Sample from column in wiped teflon vessel at 125°C
2. Dissolve sample in 10 ml of 0.5 N HCl (optima grade)
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tube
4. Centrifuge and decant into clean centrifuge tube
5. Heat centrifuge tubes in water bath at 60°C
6. Precipitate Al(OH)_3 using 50% NH_3OH (drops: 25, 5, 5, 3, 2...)
   Optimum pH=6.3; 1N HCl may be added
7. Centrifuge 15 min., decant (save and redo □ if pH of liquid is < 8)
8. Wash with water, vortex, centrifuge for 10 min, and decant
9. Record mass quartz vials, label, and place them in furnace holder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>2534</th>
<th>2536</th>
<th>2536</th>
<th>2420</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>10SRB-055A-01</td>
<td>10SRB-066A-01</td>
<td>10SRB-057A-01</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Qtz Vial</td>
<td>2.5346</td>
<td>2.6456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Vial+Sp</td>
<td>2.5451</td>
<td>2.6490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Sp</td>
<td>0.0106</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Add 1 small drop of water with micropipet, slurry precipitate
11. Transfer sample into quartz vial, cover with alumina vial
12. Heat in oven at 120°C for 2-3 hours
13. Let cool and scrape sample down from walls of quartz tube
14. Convert to Al_2O_3 in furnace at 950°C for minimum of 1 hr
15. Determine mass of vial + sample
**WS4_QtzDissolution p1**

This worksheet outlines the steps for dissolving quartz and adding Be carrier.

**Chemist:** AM  
**Date:** 03/11/11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>300 ml vessel ID</th>
<th>Beryl Carrier ID</th>
<th>Al Carrier ID</th>
<th>Mass 300 ml vessel</th>
<th>Mass 40 g quartz</th>
<th>Mass Be carrier</th>
<th>Mass Al Carrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10SRB-E020A-01</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Be3-Carrier, 1015 ppm Be, r = 1.013 g ml-1, Dec 10 2001, JG3, Bottle 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10SRB-E021A-01</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10SRB-E022A-01</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08SRB-E222-05</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10SRB-E074A-01</td>
<td>B10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10SRB-E066A-01</td>
<td>B12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10SRB-E075A-01</td>
<td>B13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residue</th>
<th>Colo 2% HNO3</th>
<th>Residue in tube</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>med. yellow to brown</td>
<td>rust brown</td>
<td>~1 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>med. yellow to brown</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>&lt;1 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>med. yellow to brown</td>
<td>cloudy</td>
<td>&lt;1 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>med. yellow to brown</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>&lt;0.5 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>med. white to yellow with holes</td>
<td>white cloudy</td>
<td>&lt;1 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large-med. white with holes</td>
<td>white cloudy</td>
<td>~0.2 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>med. yellow to brown</td>
<td>normal</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Add 20 ml conc. HF and 2 ml HClO4 per 5 g of quartz
2. Add 5 ml Aqua Regia
3. Heat at 100-1250 C until quartz dissolves, add HF if needed
4. Raise to 2000 C and evaporate to dryness
5. Add 5 ml HClO4 and evaporate to dryness
6. Add 8 to 10 ml conc. HNO3, swirl, and evaporate to dryness
7. Dissolved dried sample in 20 ml of 2% HCl

**Comments:**

March 11: add 140 ml HF, 50 ml AR, 10 ml HClO4 to each sample put on hotplate for dissolution at 17:00 at 125°C
March 15: Samples completed dissolved, open lid, increase T = 200°C, start evaporation at 14:00
March 16: Samples 1/2 - 3/4 evaporated, less efficient on front side -> rotate samples on hotplate
March 17: 8:30 some drops on walls and lid left, but bottom dry -> note colour and amount of residue 13:30 some drops on walls and lid left -> tap jar carefully and put back on hotplate
March 15-17: Samples open at same time as Alan’s Wounded Moose samples (high nuclide concentration)
March 18: 14:00 samples completely dry, remove from hotplate, close lid and set aside to wait for three more samples form last year to be included in this batch of samples
March 19: Set up 3 more samples from last year (poor Al-AMS measurement, likely due to chemistry) for just Al targets. 11:00 add 140 ml HF, 50 ml AR, 10 ml HClO4 for dissolution at 125°C
March 20: 11:30 samples 2381 / 92 / 95 completely dissolved, open lid, increase T = 200°C, start evaporation
March 21: 16:30 add 5 ml HClO4 to first group of samples plus blank, 3 other samples not completely dry 19:00 add 5 ml HClO4 to 3 other samples
March 22: 8:30 / 12:30 samples almost dry, just few drops on walls and lids left -> tap jar carefully 19:00 add 5ml conc. HNO3, swirl and evaporate, add ~3-5ml conc. HNO3 to dissolve all samples samples completely dry, remove from hotplate, add 2% HNO3, soak -> very colourful solutions, transfer to 2 centrifuge tubes, bring up to 9ml, some samples difficult to transfer, because of high surface tension of some material, makes it hard to soak everything up, after centrifuge clear or slightly yellow solutions, colour trapped into residue, pipette solution into two additional centrifuge tubes and centrifuge again -> less cloudy solutions, some small residue; clean residue with additional 2ml 2% HNO3, vortex and centrifuge, transfer clean solution to two additional tubes; little bit of residue of sample B12 lost (plopped while cleaning)

**Note:** All acids used trace metal grade and micro-purified water
This worksheet outlines the steps for dissolving quartz and adding Be carrier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemist: AM</th>
<th>Date: 03/11/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2423</td>
<td>2381</td>
<td>2382</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>06SRB-01</td>
<td>E221A-01</td>
<td>E221A-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 ml vessel ID</td>
<td>B16</td>
<td>B17</td>
<td>B18</td>
<td>B20</td>
<td>Be3-Carrier, 1015 ppm Be, r = 1.013 g ml⁻¹, Dec 10 2001, JCG, Bottle 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beryllium Carrier ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Carrier ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mass 300 ml vessel | 155.8895 | 154.9268 | 150.2344 | 150.2993 |
| Mass 40g quartz | 30.0074 | 30.1861 | 30.0465 |
| Mass Be carrier | 0.1922 |     |     |     |
| Mass Al Carrier |     |     |     |     |

| Residue | small white (little dot) | med. rusty brown | med. brown | med. yellow to white |
| Colo 2% HNO3 | normal yellow clear | light yellow clear | white cloudy |
| Residue in tube | none | ~1mm | <1mm | ~1mm |

1. Add 20 ml conc. HF and 2 ml HClO₄ per 5 g of quartz
2. Add 5 ml Aqua Regia
3. Heat at 100-125°C until quartz dissolves, add HF if needed
4. Raise to 200°C and evaporate to dryness
5. Add 5 ml HClO₄ and evaporate to dryness
6. Add 8 to 10 ml conc. HNO₃, swirl, and evaporate to dryness
7. Dissolved dried sample in 20 ml of 2% HCl

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 11: add 140ml HF, 50ml AR, 10ml HClO₄ to each sample put on hotplate for dissolution at 17:00 at 125°C March 15: Samples completely dissolved, open lid, increase T = 200°C, start evaporation at 14:00 March 16: Samples 1/2 - 3/4 evaporated, less efficient on front side -&gt; rotate samples on hotplate March 17: 8:30 some drops on walls and lid left, but bottom dry -&gt; note colour and amount of residue 13:30 some drops on walls and lid left -&gt; tap jar carefully and put back on hotplate March 15-17: Samples open at same time as Ali's Wounded Moose samples (high nuclide concentration) March 18: 14:00 samples completely dry, remove from hotplate, close lid and set aside to wait for three months samples form last year to be included in this batch of samples March 19: Set up 3 more samples from last year (poor Al-AMS measurement, likely due to chemistry) for just Al targets: 11:00 add 140 ml HF, 50 ml AR, 10 ml HClO₄ for dissolution at 125°C March 20: 11:30 samples 2381 / 82 / 96 completely dissolved, open lid, increase T = 200°C, start evaporation March 21: 16:30 add 5 ml HClO₄ to first group of samples plus blank, 3 other samples not completely dry 19:00 add 5 ml HClO₄ to others samples March 22: 8:30 / 12:30 samples almost dry, just few drops on walls and lids left -&gt; tap jar carefully 19:00 add 5ml conc. HNO₃, swirl and evaporate, add ~3-5ml conc. HNO₃ to dissolve all samples March 23: samples completely dry, remove from hotplate, add 2% HNO₃, soak -&gt; very colourfull sansations, transfer to 2 centrifuge tubes, bring up to 9ml, some samples difficult to transfer, because of high surface tension of some material, makes it hard to soak everything up, after centrifuge clear or slightly yellow solutions, colour trapped into residue, pipette solution into additional centrifuge tubes and centrifuge again -&gt; less cloudy solutions, some small residue; clean residue with additional 2ml 2% HNO₃, vortex and centrifuge, transfer clean solution to two additional tubes; little bit of residue of sample B12 lost (popped while cleaning)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All acids used trace metal grade and micro-purified water
WS5B_I CP Aliquot and Al spiking p1

This worksheet outlines the steps for collecting ICP aliquots and adding Al carrier.

Chemist: AM  Date: 03/23/11

1. Label one 100 ml volumetric flasks per sample
2. Label one ICP vial with CNEF ID per sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel ID</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B6</th>
<th>B7</th>
<th>B10</th>
<th>B12</th>
<th>B13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2588</td>
<td>2589</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>2530</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>2536</td>
<td>2535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>09SRB-E020A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E021A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E022A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E222-05</td>
<td>09SRB-E222-06</td>
<td>09SRB-E074A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E066A-01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Al carrier ID
Aluminium, plasma standard solution, Specpure, A=1000ug/ml, Stock# 38727, Lot#03-16108B, Nov. 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quant-EM est. Al in qts</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass 100 ml volumetric</td>
<td>67.1376</td>
<td>68.8721</td>
<td>67.4181</td>
<td>67.1808</td>
<td>66.3006</td>
<td>67.3498</td>
<td>66.7016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 100 ml volumetric + sample + 2% HNO3</td>
<td>168.2867</td>
<td>169.9443</td>
<td>168.6731</td>
<td>168.3829</td>
<td>167.5321</td>
<td>168.6547</td>
<td>167.8986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 5 ml to volumetric B</td>
<td>5.0225</td>
<td>5.0300</td>
<td>5.0054</td>
<td>5.0143</td>
<td>5.0104</td>
<td>5.0005</td>
<td>5.0068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add 2 drops carrier mass</td>
<td>5.0484</td>
<td>5.0471</td>
<td>5.0332</td>
<td>5.0416</td>
<td>5.0355</td>
<td>5.0256</td>
<td>5.0338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 8 ml Sample</td>
<td>153.2503</td>
<td>154.8824</td>
<td>153.6480</td>
<td>153.3037</td>
<td>152.5151</td>
<td>153.6404</td>
<td>152.6808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add carrier to 85 ml sample</td>
<td>1.2460</td>
<td>0.4842</td>
<td>1.7386</td>
<td>1.7469</td>
<td>0.5117 -</td>
<td>0.5160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 5 ml with carrier to Volumetric C</td>
<td>5.0560</td>
<td>5.0126</td>
<td>5.0518</td>
<td>5.0622</td>
<td>5.0230</td>
<td>5.0255</td>
<td>5.0432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass of 80 ml sample</td>
<td>149.4246</td>
<td>150.3426</td>
<td>150.3217</td>
<td>149.9754</td>
<td>147.9812</td>
<td>148.6095</td>
<td>148.3189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Get digestion vessel and cover ready. Do not wipe now.
4. Transfer the 90 ml sample back into vessel
5. Transfer contents volumetrics to ICP vials with same number

437
WS5B_IQC Aliquot and Al spiking p2

This worksheet outlines the steps for collecting ICP aliquots and adding Al carrier.

Chemist: AM  Date: 03/24/11

1. Label one 100 ml volumetric flasks per sample
2. Label one ICP vial with CNEF ID per sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel ID</th>
<th>B16</th>
<th>B17</th>
<th>B18</th>
<th>B20</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2423</td>
<td>2381</td>
<td>2382</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-02</td>
<td>09SRB-A347A-01</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al carrier ID</td>
<td>Aluminium, plasma standard solution, Specpure, A=1000μg/ml, Stock# 38727, Lot# 03-161088, Nov. 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quant-EM est. Al in qt</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>392</th>
<th>194</th>
<th>119</th>
<th>ICP-measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass 100 ml volumetric</td>
<td>66.6411</td>
<td>66.6890</td>
<td>66.4903</td>
<td>67.7306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 100 ml volumetric + sample + 2% HNO3</td>
<td>167.9061</td>
<td>167.9451</td>
<td>167.7223</td>
<td>168.9780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 10 ml sample to vol A (10 ml tube)</td>
<td>10.0168</td>
<td>9.9958</td>
<td>10.0092</td>
<td>10.0219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 5 ml to volumetric B</td>
<td>5.0026</td>
<td>4.9931</td>
<td>4.9971</td>
<td>5.0105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add 2 drops carrier, mass</td>
<td>5.0292</td>
<td>5.0201</td>
<td>5.0263</td>
<td>5.0367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring B to 10 ml with 2% HNO3</td>
<td>10.0347</td>
<td>10.0188</td>
<td>10.0270</td>
<td>10.0233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 5 ml Sample</td>
<td>152.8754</td>
<td>152.9454</td>
<td>152.7047</td>
<td>153.9375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add carrier to 85 ml sample</td>
<td>2.0705</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass 5 ml with carrier to Volumetric C</td>
<td>5.0003</td>
<td>4.9975</td>
<td>5.0053</td>
<td>5.0069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring C to 10 ml</td>
<td>10.0188</td>
<td>10.0145</td>
<td>10.0194</td>
<td>10.0168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass of 80 ml sample</td>
<td>150.8357</td>
<td>147.9445</td>
<td>147.6973</td>
<td>148.9273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Get digestion vessel and cover ready. Do not wipe now.
4. Transfer the 90 ml sample back into vessel
5. Transfer contents volumetrics to ICP vials with same number

438
This worksheet outlines the steps for the Anion Column Chemistry (2ml size small column)

Chemist: AM  Date: 03/25/11

1. Evaporate 20 ml to dryness at 100-120°C (will take at least 3 hrs)
2. Dissolve in 10 ml 9 N HCl (let stand for several hours)
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tubes, rinse digestion vessels
   with 9 N HCl to bring volume in tube to 10 ml
4. Centrifuge at 1500 rpm or higher for minimum of 10 minutes
5. Allow any 9 N HCl in columns to drain out; discard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>B10</td>
<td>B12</td>
<td>B13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2588</td>
<td>2589</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>2530</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>2536</td>
<td>2535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residue (after 2%)</td>
<td>small brown</td>
<td>small brown</td>
<td>small-med brown</td>
<td>small white</td>
<td>small-med white</td>
<td>small-med white</td>
<td>small yellow to white</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. With stopcock closed, pipet sample (avoid residue) onto 2ml size columns.
7. Collect sample in same 300 ml teflon vessel.
8. Elute with 10 ml 9 N HCl, and collect that, close stopcock
9. 5 ml 4.5 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate in labeled 100 ml bottle
10. 10 ml 1 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate
11. 50 ml deionized water. Discard.
12. CONDITION ANION COLUMN

   (bottle A1) 10 ml 1N HCl, discard
   (bottle A2) 10 ml 4.5 N HCl, discard
   (bottle A3) 10 ml 9 N HCl, discard, but retain acid approx. 2 mm above resin

Comments

March 25: 10:30 put on hotplate T=125°C
WS6_Anion Column Chemistry p2

This worksheet outlines the steps for the Anion Column Chemistry (2ml size small column)

Chemist: AM Date: 03/25/11

1. Evaporate 20 ml to dryness at 100-120°C (will take at least 3 hrs)
2. Dissolve in 10 ml 9 N HCl (let stand for several hours)
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tubes, rinse digestion vessels with 9 N HCl to bring volume in tube to 10 ml
4. Centrifuge at 1500 rpm or higher for minimum of 10 minutes
5. Allow any 9 N HCl in columns to drain out; discard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B16</td>
<td>B17</td>
<td>B18</td>
<td>B20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2423</td>
<td>2381</td>
<td>2382</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residue (after 2%)</td>
<td>small white</td>
<td>med.-large yellow</td>
<td>med. yellow to brown</td>
<td>small white</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residue in tube</td>
<td>0.1 ml white</td>
<td>0.05-0.075 ml white</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. With stopcock closed, pipet sample (avoid residue) onto 2 ml size columns.
7. Collect sample in same 300 ml teflon vessel.
8. Elute with 10 ml 9 N HCl, and collect that, close stopcock
9. 5 ml 4.5 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate in labeled 100 ml bottle
10. 10 ml 1 N HCl, collect Anion Supernate
11. 50 ml deionized water. Discard.
12. CONDITION ANION COLUMN
   (bottle A1) 10 ml 1 N HCl, discard
   (bottle A2) 10 ml 4.5 N HCl, discard
   (bottle A3) 10 ml 9 N HCl, discard, but retain acid approx. 2 mm above resin

Comments
March 28: B17, B18 and B20 sitting in 9N HCl since March 25, lid closed under fumehood (3 days)
B17, B18 and B20 transfer liquid to clean centrifuge tube, vortex residue with additional 3ml 9N HCl

440
WS7_Controlled Precipitate p1

This worksheet outlines the steps for the controlled precipitation chemistry

Chemist: AM Date: 03/26/11

1. Evaporate "anion" elute to dryness at 125°C
2. Dissolve in 10 ml of a 1:1 solution of 0.5 N HCl and 2% NH₄Cl
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge, centrifuge for 10 minutes
4. Decant into clean test tube, heat in water bath at 60°C
5. Add drops of 1:1 NH₄OH·H₂O to pH=9.2 (5 drops first then single)
6. Centrifuge for 15 minutes
7. Check pH of liquid, if less than pH=7, redo step 6
8. Decant, save with Anion Supernate
9. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
10. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Approx. vol. Ptte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2588</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>10SRB-E0220A-01</td>
<td>0.7 ml white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2589</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>10SRB-E0221A-01</td>
<td>0.7 ml white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2590</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>10SRB-E022A-01</td>
<td>1 ml orange to white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2530</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>09SRB-E222-05</td>
<td>0.7 ml white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2531</td>
<td>B10</td>
<td>09SRB-E222-06</td>
<td>1 ml white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2536</td>
<td>B12</td>
<td>10SRB-E344A-01</td>
<td>2.3 ml white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2535</td>
<td>B13</td>
<td>10SRB-E088A-01</td>
<td>0.9 ml white</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
WS7_Controlled Precipitate p2

This worksheet outlines the steps for the controlled precipitation chemistry

Chemist: AM Date: 03/26/11 blank
03/29/11 B17, B18, B20

1. Evaporate "anion" elute to dryness at 125°C
2. Dissolve in 10 ml of a 1:1 solution of 0.5 N HCl and 2% NH₄Cl
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge, centrifuge for 10 minutes
4. Decant into clean test tube, heat in water bath at 60°C
5. Add drops of 1:1 NH₄OH·H₂O to pH=9.2 (5 drops first then single)
6. Centrifuge for 15 minutes
7. Check pH of liquid, if less than pH=7, redo step 5
8. Decant, save with Anion Supernate
9. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
10. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant
11. Wash with deionized water, vortex, centrifuge, decant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Approx. vol. Ptte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>0.3 ml white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2423</td>
<td>B16</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-01</td>
<td>1.5 ml white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2381</td>
<td>B17</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-02</td>
<td>1.5-1.75 ml white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2382</td>
<td>B18</td>
<td>09SRB-A547A-61</td>
<td>0.5-0.6 ml white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2395</td>
<td>B20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
This worksheet outlines the steps for the Cation Column Chemistry

Chemist: AM Date: 03/27/11

1. Dissolve in 5 ml conc. HCl and evaporate to dryness at 125°C
2. Redissolve in 2.5 ml 1 N HCl and 2.5 ml 0.5 N HCl
3. Transfer to centrifuge tube, rinse with 1 ml 0.5 N, and centrifuge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>B10</td>
<td>B12</td>
<td>B13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2588</td>
<td>2589</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>2530</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>2536</td>
<td>2535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Vessel</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>C6</td>
<td>C9</td>
<td>C10</td>
<td>C11</td>
<td>C14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Pipette all of the sample into designated conditioned cation column, 17 ml
5. Discard the eluant. Add 285 ml 0.5 N HCL (Bottle C6)
6. Drain the column, discard the first 300ml of eluant
7. Add 60 ml of 0.5N HCl, (Bottle C7), Collect eluant as Cation Supernate
8. Add 65 ml of 0.5 N HCl, (Bottle C8), Save it as Be-Sample
9. Add 120 ml 1N HCl (bottle C9)
10. Save this as Be-sample as well.
11. Add 80 ml 4.5 N HCl (bottle C10), save the eluant as Al sample.
12. CONDITION CATION COLUMN
   (bottle C1): 100 ml 9 N HCl
   (bottle C2): 50 ml 4.5 N HCl
   (bottle C3): 50 ml 1 N HCl
   (bottle C4): 50 ml water
   (bottle C5): 100 ml 0.5 N HCl

* 17 ml Column
WS8_Cation Column Chemistry p2

This worksheet outlines the steps for the Cation Column Chemistry

Chemist: AM  Date: 03/27/11

04/01/11 B17, B18, B20

1. Dissolve in 5 ml conc. HCl and evaporate to dryness at 125°C
2. Redissolve in 2.5 ml 1 N HCl and 2.5 ml 0.5 N HCl
3. Transfer to centrifuge tube, rinse with 1 ml 0.5 N, and centrifuge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B16</td>
<td>B17</td>
<td>B18</td>
<td>B20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2423</td>
<td>2381</td>
<td>2382</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>09SRB-</td>
<td>09SRB-</td>
<td>09SRB-</td>
<td>E221A-01</td>
<td>E221A-02</td>
<td>A347A-01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Vessel</td>
<td>C20</td>
<td>Only Al-sample, Be-sample not collected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Pipette all of the sample into designated conditioned cation column, 17 ml
5. Discard the eluant. Add 285 ml 0.5 N HCL (Bottle C6)
6. Drain the column, discard the first 300ml of eluant
7. Add 60 ml of 0.5N HCl, (Bottle C7), Collect eluant as Cation Supernate
8. Add 65 ml of 0.5N HCl, (Bottle C8), Save it as Be-Sample
9. Add 120 ml 1N HCl (bottle C9)
10. Save this as Be-sample as well.
11. Add 80 ml 4.5 N HCl (bottle C10) , save the eluant as Al sample.
12. CONDITION CATION COLUMN
   (bottle C1) 100 ml 9 N HCl
   (bottle C2) 50 ml 4.5 N HCl
   (bottle C3) 50 ml 1 N HCl
   (bottle C4) 50 ml water
   (bottle C5) 100 ml 0.5 N HCl

* 17 ml Column
WS9_Be Sample Chemistry p1

This worksheet outlines the steps to prepare the BeO sample

Chemist: AM Date: 03/29/11 - 04/04/11

- Evaporate Be Sample from column in wiped digestion vessels at 125°C
- Add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
- Again, add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
- Dissolve sample in 10 ml of 0.5 N HCl (optima grade)
- Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tube
- Centrifuge and decant into clean centrifuge tube
- Heat centrifuge tubes in water bath at 60°C
- Precipitate Be(OH)₂ using Matheson ultimate grade ammonia gas
  Gently bubble NH₃ with clean pipet tip on hose
  for ca.15 bubbles, or ca. 8-12 sec until pte forms
  Optimum pH=9.2; 1N HCl may be added
- Centrifuge 15 min., decant (save and redo □ if pH of liquid is < 8)
- Wash with water, vortex, centrifuge for 10 min, and decant
- Record mass quartz vials, label, and place them in furnace holder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>2588</th>
<th>2589</th>
<th>2590</th>
<th>2530</th>
<th>2531</th>
<th>2536</th>
<th>2535</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>B10</td>
<td>B12</td>
<td>B13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. Precipitate</td>
<td>0.05 ml</td>
<td>0.05 ml</td>
<td>0.05 ml</td>
<td>0.05 ml</td>
<td>0.075 ml</td>
<td>0.1 ml</td>
<td>0.1 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Qtz Vial</td>
<td>2.5239</td>
<td>2.4475</td>
<td>2.5506</td>
<td>2.5199</td>
<td>2.4731</td>
<td>2.5688</td>
<td>2.4591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Vial+Spill</td>
<td>2.5243</td>
<td>2.4478</td>
<td>2.5513</td>
<td>2.5205</td>
<td>2.4733</td>
<td>2.5705</td>
<td>2.4617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Spill</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>0.0026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Add 1 small drop of water with micropipet, slurry precipitate
- Transfer sample into quartz vial, cover with quartz lid
- Turn on Bunsen Burner, dry the gel carefully
- Burn the Be(OH)₂ gel on bunsen burner at least 2 mins, at blue flame.
- Convert to BeO
- Determine mass of vial + sample
WS9_Be Sample Chemistry p2

This worksheet outlines the steps to prepare the BeO sample

Chemist: AM  Date: 03/29/11

- 04/04/11

1. Evaporate Be Sample from column in wiped digestion vessels at 125°C
2. Add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
3. Again, add 2-5 ml 20% perchloric and evaporate at 200°C
4. Dissolve sample in 10 ml of 0.5 N HCl (optima grade)
5. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tube
6. Centrifuge and decant into clean centrifuge tube
7. Heat centrifuge tubes in water bath at 60°C
8. Precipitate Be(OH)₂ using Matheson ultimate grade ammonia gas
   Gently bubble NH₃ with clean pipet tip on hose
   for ca.15 bubbles, or ca. 8-12 sec until ptte forms
   Optimum pH=9.2; 1N HCl may be added
9. Centrifuge 15 min., decant (save and redo if pH of liquid is < 8)
10. Wash with water, vortex, centrifuge for 10 min, and decant
11. Record mass quartz vials, label, and place them in furnace holder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEF ID</th>
<th>2423</th>
<th>2381</th>
<th>2382</th>
<th>2396</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>B16</td>
<td>B17</td>
<td>B18</td>
<td>B20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-02</td>
<td>09SRB-A347A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. Precipitate</td>
<td>0.05 ml</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Qtz Vial</td>
<td>2.3866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Vial+Spl</td>
<td>2.3651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Spl</td>
<td>-0.0005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Add 1 small drop of water with micropipet, slurry precipitate
13. Transfer sample into quartz vial, cover with quartz lid
14. Turn on Bunsen Burner, dry the gel carefully.
15. Burn the Be(OH)₂ gel on bunsen burner at least 2 mins, at blue flame.
16. Convert to BeO
17. Determine mass of vial + sample
WS10_Ai Sample Chemistry p1

This worksheet outlines the steps to prepare the Al oxide sample

Chemist: AM Date: 03/29/11 - 04/04/11

1. Evaporate Al Sample from column in wiped teflon vessel at 125°C
2. Dissolve sample in 10 ml of 0.5 N HCl (optima grade)
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tube
4. Centrifuge and decant into clean centrifuge tube
5. Heat centrifuge tubes in water bath at 60°C
6. Precipitate Al(OH)₃ using 50% NH₃·OH (drops: 25, 5, 5, 3, 2...)
   Optimum pH=6.3; 1N HCl may be added
7. Centrifuge 15 min., decant (save and redo if pH of liquid is < 8)
8. Wash with water, vortex, centrifuge for 10 min, and decant
9. Record mass quartz vials, label, and place them in furnace holder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Vessel</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>C9</th>
<th>C10</th>
<th>C11</th>
<th>C14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2588</td>
<td>2589</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>2530</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>2536</td>
<td>2535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. Precipitate</td>
<td>0.4 ml</td>
<td>0.2 ml</td>
<td>0.4 ml</td>
<td>0.4 ml</td>
<td>1.5 ml</td>
<td>1 ml</td>
<td>0.9 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Qtz Vial</td>
<td>2.3806</td>
<td>2.5344</td>
<td>2.5730</td>
<td>2.4312</td>
<td>2.3978</td>
<td>2.5173</td>
<td>2.4555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Vial+Sp</td>
<td>2.3947</td>
<td>2.5385</td>
<td>2.5794</td>
<td>2.4376</td>
<td>2.4174</td>
<td>2.5516</td>
<td>2.4691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Sp</td>
<td>0.0051</td>
<td>0.0041</td>
<td>0.0064</td>
<td>0.0064</td>
<td>0.0196</td>
<td>0.0343</td>
<td>0.0136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Add 1 small drop of water with micropipet, slurry precipitate
11. Transfer sample into quartz vial, cover with alumina vial
12. Heat in oven at 120°C for 2-3 hours
13. Let cool and scrape sample down from walls of quartz tube
14. Convert to Al₂O₃ in furnace at 950°C for minimum of 1 hr
15. Determine mass of vial + sample
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This worksheet outlines the steps to prepare the Al oxide sample

Chemist: AM Date: 03/29/11 - 04/04/11

1. Evaporate Al Sample from column in wiped teflon vessel at 125°C
2. Dissolve sample in 10 ml of 0.5 N HCl (optima grade)
3. Transfer to 15 ml centrifuge tube
4. Centrifuge and decant into clean centrifuge tube
5. Heat centrifuge tubes in water bath at 60°C
6. Precipitate Al(OH)₃ using 50% NH₃OH (drops: 25, 5, 3, 2...
   Optimum pH=6.3; 1N HCl may be added
7. Centrifuge 15 min., decant (save and redo □ if pH of liquid is < 8)
8. Wash with water, vortex, centrifuge for 10 min, and decant
9. Record mass quartz vials, label, and place them in furnace holder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Vessel</th>
<th>C20</th>
<th>B17</th>
<th>B18</th>
<th>B20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNEF ID</td>
<td>2423</td>
<td>2381</td>
<td>2382</td>
<td>2395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-01</td>
<td>09SRB-E221A-02</td>
<td>09SRB-A347A-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. Precipitate</td>
<td>0.35 ml</td>
<td>1 ml</td>
<td>0.5 ml</td>
<td>0.2 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Qtz Vial</td>
<td>2.5089</td>
<td>2.3055</td>
<td>2.5570</td>
<td>2.4748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Vial+Spī</td>
<td>2.5127</td>
<td>2.3309</td>
<td>2.5763</td>
<td>2.4784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Spī</td>
<td>0.0038</td>
<td>0.0254</td>
<td>0.0213</td>
<td>0.0036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Add 1 small drop of water with micropipet, slurry precipitate
11. Transfer sample into quartz vial, cover with alumina vial
12. Heat in oven at 120°C for 2-3 hours
13. Let cool and scrape sample down from walls of quartz tube
14. Convert to Al₂O₃ in furnace at 950°C for minimum of 1 hr
15. Determine mass of vial + sample
APPENDIX A6 – Electronic Supplementary Files

Plate 1 – Map of ice recession of alpine glaciers on Cumberland Peninsula

This map displays mapped ice margin positions and contours on a DEM of Cumberland Peninsula at a scale of 1:325,000. New geochronological control in the interior of the peninsula is combined with previous age control to infer ice extent of alpine glaciers during deglaciation from the coast to the interior: The green and light blue hand-colored areas indicate early deglacial ice extent, the purple and pink hand-colored areas indicate ice extent during the Younger Dryas cold interval, and the orange and yellow hand-colored areas indicate Cockburn-equivalent ice extent. Figures 3.7 – 3.9 presented and discussed in Chapter 3 have been derived from this map.

The map is available in the Dalhousie Repository (DalSpace):

http://dalspace.library.dal.ca/handle/10222/10559
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