CONTRIBUTION OF THE LUNAR BASIN EJECTA TO MATERIALS WITHIN THE LUNA-GLOB LANDING ZONE

M.A. Ivanov¹, A.M. Abdrakhimov¹, A.T. Basilevsky¹, N.E. Demidov¹, E.N. Guseva¹, J.W. Head², H. Hiesinger³, A.A. Kohanov⁴, S.S. Krasilnikov¹

¹Vernadsky Institute of Geochemistry and Analytical Chemistry Russian Academy of Sciences, 19, Kosygin st., 119991 Moscow, Russia; mikhail_ivanov@brown.edu;

²Department of Geological Sciences, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912 USA;

³Institut fürPlanetologie, WestfälischeWilhelms-UniversitätMünster, Wilhelm-Klemm-Str. 10, 48149 Münster, Germany;

⁴Moscow State University of Geodesy and Cartography (MiiGAIK), Moscow, Russia;

KEYWORDS:

Moon, Luna-Glob, lunar basins, ejecta emplacement

INTRODUCTION:

The Luna-Glob landing zone is in the southern sub-polar region within the heavily cratered highlands. The main feature of this area is the southern portion of the rim of the South Pole-Aitken (SPA) basin [1, 2]. The major impact structures, basins, are the main sources of materials that form the megaregolith of the Moon [3], [4] and in the landing zone as well. In this region, numerous large craters (up to 100-120 km in diameter and a few kilometers deep) and high-standing massifs (several tens of kilometers across, 3-6 km high) form a very rough surface at tens of kilometers scale. The ancient terrains of pre-Nectarian and Nectarian ages prevail in the landing zone [1]. The units that compose the pre-Nectarian terrains are mostly related to the emplacement of ejecta of impact basins, especially SPA. However, during formation of the post-SPA basins, their ejecta that also were transported to large distances [5], [6], [7], [8] could be deposited within the Luna-Glob landing zone. In order to facilitate interpretation of the results of the Luna-Glob in-situ analyses, it is important to assess the potential contribution of ejecta of the lunar impact basins to the materials that may be encountered in the landing zone.

MODELS OF THE EJECTA THICKNESS RADIAL VARIATIONS:

A range of models of the material transport and ejecta emplacement have been developed [9], [10], [11], [12], [13], [14], [15], [16] (Fig. 1). Among these, only the model by [15] is supported by the observations of topography associated with the best preserved lunar basin, Orientale. The application of this model, however, is limited by the estimated ejecta thickness at the Cordillera rim. For the other basins, this thickness can be different and, thus, the estimates of the ejecta radial thickness can be biased. Because of this limitation, in our study we used the theoretical model by [13], which relates the ejecta thickness, T, and the distance from the impact point, r, by the following formula: T=0.0078⁺R⁺(r/R)-2.61, where R is the radius of the crater transient cavity. It must be emphasized that all models of the ejecta emplacement do not account for the separation of the ejecta curtain into individual rays and consider the emplaced ejecta as a contiguous blanket. This obviously erroneous assumption shifts the model thickness values up and tends to overestimate the thickness of the ejecta.

MODEL THICKNESS OF LUNAR BASIN EJECTA IN THE LU-NA-GLOB LANDING ZONE:

In order to assess the possible amount of materials from different major remote sources within the landing zone, we used the approach developed in [17]. Specifically, we constructed a 1x10 grid for the southern sub-polar region (southward of 60oS) and in each point of the grid we calculated the thickness of materials ejected by each lunar basin [18]. In order to estimate the basin ejecta thickness, we implemented the model developed in [13].



Fig. 1. Comparison of the radial ejecta thickness of the Orientale basin estimated with the help of different models.

An important part of the investigations of the variation of the basin ejecta thickness [17], [19], [20] was an assessment of the mixing ratio [12] of local and remote materials brought by large impacts. This parameter helps to estimate the depth to which the ejecta affect the original material upon their emplacement. Unfortunately, the mixing ratio is poorly constrained and its usage sometimes gives unrealistic results. For example, attempts to estimate the depth of mixing in the case of the SPA basin yield values of the mixing depth as large as ~50 km. Such a depth is about six times larger than the estimated thickness of the basin ejecta. Thus, in our work, we did not employ the mixing ratio to determine the depth of mixing and simply calculate the fraction of the brought materials based on their model thicknesses. We also grouped the basins by their stratigraphic position [4] and estimate fractions of materials delivered to the Luna-Glob landing zone by the SPA basin and by the pre-Nectarian, Nectarian, and Imbrian basins separately.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

The results of our model show the following. As expected, the major contributor of materials to the Luna-Glob landing zone is the SPA basin (Fig. 2). Near the rim of the basin transient cavity, the thickness of the ejecta is estimated to be \sim 8.1 km.

However, because the model thickness follows a power law, it rapidly decreases away from the basin rim. For example, the model thickness of the SPA ejecta at the southeast corner of the Luna-Glob landing zone (the closest to the SPA) is ~5.5 km. For the most distant, northwest, corner of the Luna-Glob landing zone the model thickness is ~1.8 km. The mean model thickness of the SPA ejecta within the Luna-Glob area is ~3.2 km, which is ~96% of the total thickness of ejecta of all lunar basins in this region. We assume that the SPA basin is the oldest lunar basin and, thus, its ejecta form the base of the stratigraphy of the basin ejecta in the study area.

All the pre-Nectarian basins have added a small fraction, ~3.6%, to the total thickness of the basin ejecta within the Luna-Glob landing zone. Among these basins, Australe (Fig. 2) appears as the most important source of materials. The model ejecta blanket of Australe overlays the eastern side of the landing zone where its thickness can be ~130-150 m. Within the landing zone, the mean model thickness of the Australe ejecta is ~70 m. The mean model thickness of the other pre-Nectarian basins in the landing zone is a few meters or less.

Both the Nectarian and Imbrian basins (Fig. 2) have delivered a negligible amount (a few tens of meters) of materials to the Luna-Glob landing region compared with the thickness of the SPA ejecta (several kilometers). Among the Nectarian basins, the most important sources of the remote materials in the 8MS3-PS-26



Fig. 2. The model estimates of the thickness of lunar basin ejecta in the Luna-Glob landing zone (white outline).

Luna-Glob zone are Serenitatis and Nectaris. Despite the fact that the Imbrian Schrödinger basin is the closest to the landing zone, the mean model thickness of its ejecta is estimated to be less than one meter and the main Imbrian source of foreign material in the landing zone is the Imbrium basin itself.

In the framework of the no-mixing model, ejecta of the post-SPA basins form the upper portion of the composite layer of ejecta of the basins in the landing zone. The crater gardening, however, locally would tend to change the regional stratigraphy of the basin ejecta and an analysis of local geology is needed in order to estimate the most probable sources of material at each specific landing site [21].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

The work is supported by the Russian Science Foundation grant № 17-17-01149: «Reconstruction of geologic history of polar areas of the Moon using new high-accuracy data to understand sources, distribution and accumulation of volatiles (water) on the Moon.

REFERENCES:

[1] Wilhelms, D.E., Howard, K.A., Wilshire, H.G. Geologic map of the South Side of the

Moon // US Geological Survey Map I-1192, 1979. [2] Garrick-Bethell, I., Zuber, M.T. Elliptical structure of the lunar South Pole-Aitken basin // Icarus 2009. V. 204, P. 399-408.

[3] Moore, H.J., Hodges, C.A., Scott, D.H. Multiringed basins - illustrated by Orientale and associated features // Proc. Lunar and Planetary Sci. Conf. 1974. V. 5, P. 71-100.

[4] Wilhelms, D.E. The geologic history of the Moon. US Geological Survey Special Paper 1348, 1987. 302 p.
[5] Arvidson, R., Drozd, C.M., Hohenberg, C.M., et al. Horizontal transport of the regolith,

modification of features, and erosion rate on the lunar surface // The Moon 1975, V. 13, P. 67-79.

[6] Head, J.W. Processes of Lunar crater degradation: Changes in style with geologic time // The Moon, 1975. V. 12., P. 299-329.

[7] Haskin, L.A., Korotev, R.L., Rockow, K.M., Jolliff, B.L. The case for an Imbrium origin of the Apollo thorium-rich impact-melt breccias // Meteoritics and Planetary Sci., 1998.

V. 33, p. 959-975.

[8] Wieczorek, M.A., Zuber, M.T. A Serenitatis origin for the Imbrian grooves and South Pole-Aitken thorium anomaly // J. Geophys. Res., 2001. V. 106, P. 27853-27864. [9] McGetchin, T.R., Settle, M., Head, J.W. Radial thickness variation in impact crater

ejecta: Implications for lunar basin deposits // Earth Planet. Sci. Lett., 1973. V. 20, P. 226-236.

[10] Pike, R.J. Ejecta from large craters on the Moon: Comments on the geometric model of McGetchin et al. // Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 1974. V. 23, P. 265-274.
[11] Oberbeck, V.R., Morrison, R.H., Hortz, F., Quaide, W.L., Gault, D.E. Smooth plains

and continuous deposits of craters and basins // Proc. Lunar and Planetary Sci. Conf. 1974. V. 5, P. 111-136.

[12] Oberbeck, V.R. The role of ballistic erosion and sedimentation in lunar stratigraphy
// Review of Geophysics and Space Physics, 1975. V. 13, P. 337-363.
[13] Housen, K.R., Schmidt, R.M., Holsapple, K.A. Crater ejecta scaling laws' fundamen-

tal forms based on dimensional analysis // J. Geophys. Res., 1983. V. 88, P. 2485-2499. [14] Haskin, L.A., Moss, B.E., McKinnon, W.B. On estimating contributions of basin ejecta to regolith deposits at lunar sites // Meteoritics and Planetary Sci., 2003. V. 38, P. 13-33.

[15] Fassett, C.I., Head, J.W., Smith, D.E., Zuber, M.T., Neumann, G.A. Thickness of proximal ejecta from the Orientale Basin from Lunar Orbiter Laser Altimeter (LOLA) data: Implications for multi-ring basin formation // Geophys. Res. Lett., 2011. V. 38, L17201.

[16] Sharpton, V.L. Outcrops on lunar crater rims: Implications for rim construction mechanisms, ejecta volumes and excavation depths // J. Geophys. Res., 2014. V. 119, P. 154-168.

[17] Petro, N. Pieters, C.M. The lunar-wide effects of basin ejecta distribution on the early megaregolith // Meteoritics and Planetary Sci., 2008. V. 43, P. 1517-1529.

[18] Spudis P.D. The Geology of Multi-ring Basins: The Moon and Other Planets. Cambridge University Press, New York and Cambridge, 1993. 263 p. [19] Petro, N.E. Pieters, C.M. Surviving the heavy bombardment: Ancient material at the surface of South Pole-Aitken Basin // J. Geophys. Res., 2004. V. 109, E06004.

[20] Petro, N. Pieters, C.M. Modeling the provenance of the Apollo 16 regolith // J. Geophys. Res., 2006. V. 111, E09005.

[21] Ivanov, M.A., Abdrakhimov, A.M., Basilevsky, A.T., et al. Sources of materials three high-priority landing sites of the Luna-Glob mission // MSSS-8, 2017. (this volume).