

**RELATIVE MAGNITUDES OF WATER SOURCES TO THE LUNAR POLES.** P. G. Lucey<sup>1</sup>, E. Costello<sup>1</sup>, D. M. Hurley<sup>2</sup>, P. Prem<sup>2</sup>, W. M. Farrell<sup>3</sup>, N. Petro<sup>3</sup>, and M. Cable<sup>4</sup>, <sup>1</sup>Hawaii Institute of Geophysics and Planetology, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, HI ([lucey@higp.hawaii.edu](mailto:lucey@higp.hawaii.edu)), <sup>2</sup>APL, Johns Hopkins University, Laurel, MD, <sup>3</sup>NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, <sup>4</sup>JPL, Pasadena, CA

**Introduction:** The lunar south pole is enjoying intense scrutiny recently in part because of the many lines of evidence for the presence of water ice that may support human activity. The main recognized sources for polar water are the impacts of comets and water-bearing asteroids [1], the solar wind [2], and the newly recognized importance of volcanism as a water source [3]. Balancing these sources are loss mechanisms including sublimation, sputtering, Lyman alpha radiation, and meteorite impact[4].

We estimate the contributions from impact, solar wind and volcanism over the Copernican, Eratosthenian and Upper Imbrian (post-Orientele) when the polar cold traps may have been in operation, and compare these to the steady loss to micrometeorites.

We begin with the Copernican where more solid estimates are available and summarized in Table 1. Ong et al. 2010 [5] made detailed estimates of the mass of water from comets and asteroids retained after impact over 1 Ga: roughly  $10^{17}$  and  $10^{18}$  g respectively. We assign a transport loss of a factor of 10 [6], leaving  $10^{16}$  and  $10^{17}$  g to be deposited at the poles. These values are consistent with a simple estimate of water mass from large Copernican crater impactors assuming an average density of 2.5 g/cc, an impactor to crater size ratio of 1/10, and an average water fraction of 1/10 and a vapor fraction retained of 1/10 also yielding  $10^{17}$  g, and  $10^{16}$  g deposited at the poles. For smaller impactors we integrate [7] from  $10^{-3}$  to  $10^3$  m and find  $10^{15}$  retained and  $10^{14}$  deposited. Finally, from Grun et al. [8] we find for < 1mm impactors  $10^{16}$  g water retained, and  $10^{15}$  g deposited over the Copernican at the poles.

Contrast this with an estimate of water derived from solar wind. Hurley et al. [9] give about 30 g/s of protons striking the Moon on average for a total mass of protons of  $10^{18}$ g over 1 Ga. If we assume 1 part per thousand eventually is converted to water, and 10% of that reaches a cold trap, a total of  $10^{14}$  g of water is supplied to the poles by the solar wind over the Copernican. To assess the relative contribution of volcanism, we scale the impact sources to earlier epochs. For the Eratosthenian we assume a 5 times higher impact flux, and a somewhat longer duration to apply a factor of 10. For the post-Orientele Imbrian, we scale the Copernican rate by 100x. The most salient comparisons are the thicknesses of ice deposits. We use the estimated mass fluxes and assume a total area of cold trap of  $3 \times 10^4$  km<sup>2</sup> [10]. In the Eratosthenian we estimate 3 m of ice based on the masses given by Needham et al. but

	Re-tained (g)	Deposit-ed at Poles in Coperni-can (g)	Deposit Average Thick-ness		
			Coper-nican	Era-to-sthe-nian	Post-Orien-tale Imbrian
Comets <sup>5</sup>	$10^{17}$	$10^{16}$	2 m	20 m	200 m
Aster-oids <sup>5</sup>	$10^{18}$	$10^{17}$	20 m	200 m	2000 m
Large Coperni-can crater impactors <sup>14</sup>	$10^{17}$	$10^{16}$	2 m	20 m	200 m
Impactors $10^{-3}$ to $10^3$ m <sup>7</sup>	$10^{15}$	$10^{14}$	2 cm	20 cm	2 m
Impactors < 1 mm <sup>8</sup>	$10^{16}$	$10^{15}$	20 cm	2 m	20 m
Solar wind <sup>9</sup>		$10^{14}$	30 cm	30 cm	30 cm
Volcan-ism <sup>3</sup>		-	-	3 m	30 m
Microme-teorite loss <sup>4</sup>		-	30 cm	3 m	30 m

a more generous transport efficiency of 0.1 to be consistent with the impact sources. The Upper Imbrian shows 30 m of potential ice thickness from volcanism.

**References:** [1] Arnold JR. Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth. 1979 Sep 10;84(B10):5659-68. [2] Crider DH, Vondrak RR. Advances in Space Research. 2002 Oct 1;30(8):1869-74. [3] Needham DH, Kring DA. EPSL. 2017 Nov 15;478:175-8. [4] Farrell WM, et GRL. 2019 Aug 16. [5] Ong L, et al. Icarus. 2010 Jun 1;207(2):578-89. [6] Schorghofer N, Lucey P, Williams JP. Icarus. 2017 Dec 1;298:111-6. [7] Brown, P., et al. (2002). Nature, 420(6913), 294. [8] Grün, E., Horanyi, M.; Sternovsky, Z. (2011). Planetary and Space Science, 59(14), 1672-1680. [9] Hurley DM, et al. Icarus. 2017 Feb 1;283:31-7. [10] Mazarico E, et al. Icarus. 2011 Feb 1;211(2):1066-81. [11] Zhu C, et al. PNAS 2019;116(23):11165-70. [12] Prem P, Artemieva NA, Goldstein DB, Varghese PL, Trafton LM. Icarus. 2015 Jul 15;255:148-58. [13] Rubanenko L, Venkatraman J, Paige DA. Nature Geoscience. 2019 Aug;12(8):597-601. [14] Wilhelms, D.E. The geologic history of the Moon.