New insights into the southern margin of the Archean–Proterozoic boundary in the north-central United States based on U–Pb, Sm–Nd, and Ar–Ar geochronology
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Abstract

New geophysical analysis of the Precambrian basement in Minnesota–Iowa–Wisconsin indicates that an Archean–Proterozoic boundary (Spirit Lake trend) previously recognized in NW Iowa can be continued eastward into central Wisconsin and farther east as the Spirit Lake tectonic zone (SLtz). To test the age of Paleoproterozoic crust south of this structure, several subsurface samples of Precambrian basement from the north-central United States have been analyzed or re-examined using modern techniques of U–Pb, Sm–Nd, and 40Ar/39Ar geochronology. The results fill in a major data gap for the region and show that all U–Pb crystallization ages for samples south of the SLtz are geon 17 (1700–1800 Ma). Bedrock core samples from eastern Nebraska are ca. 1760–1800 Ma, and two samples from SE South Dakota, immediately south of the SLtz, yield ages of 1762 ± 28 Ma (Vermillion) and 1733 ± 2 Ma (Elk Point). Xenoliths from impact breccia in the Manson structure in north-central Iowa yield a similar age of ca. 1705 ± 30 Ma and metagabbro from SE Minnesota yields an age of 1760 ± 9 Ma. Farther to the northeast, zircons from Paleoproterozoic gneiss in the basement of Manitoulin Island, only a few km south of the Superior craton in Ontario, also yield a geon 17 age (1714 ± 10 Ma).

Sm–Nd model ages (TDM) for samples immediately south of the SLtz fall in the range 1.9–2.2 Ga, indicating limited involvement of Archean crust. In contrast, Sm–Nd TDM ages for samples north of the SLtz typically range from 2.5 to 3.0 Ga, for both Paleoproterozoic plutons and Archean gneisses. Ion microprobe analyses of zircons from the Elk Point and Manson samples also show the presence of geon 16 overgrowths, indicating a strong regional thermal overprint during geon 16 accretion. This is supported by mid-geon 16 hornblende 40Ar/39Ar ages for samples from SE South Dakota and SE Minnesota. Although no U–Pb ages are available for juvenile basement beneath the ca. 1760 Ma granite–rhyolite suite of southern Wisconsin, south of the SLtz, Sm–Nd model ages are typically ca. 1.9–2.0 Ga, consistent with basement to the rhyolites being geon 17 in age.

Collectively, the data require that most, if not all, of the Paleoproterozoic crust immediately south of the SLtz formed during geon 17 and probably represents eastward continuation, from Colorado, through Nebraska, of the Yavapai crustal province in the SW United States. Penokean (geon 18) crustal rocks are limited mainly to northern and central Wisconsin, east-central Minnesota, and northern Michigan. These results also show that medium grade (>500 °C) tectonothermal effects of the subsequent geon 16 (≈Mazatzal) orogeny to the south continue into the north-central United States. Both terranes probably also continue eastward into Ontario, Canada and farther east into protolith of the Grenville Province.
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1. Introduction

Over the past three decades substantial advances have been made in understanding the regional geology of mostly buried Precambrian crust in the Midcontinent region of the United States (cf. Sims and Peterman, 1986; Bickford et al., 1986; Van Schmus et al., 1993a,b, 1996; Rohs and Van Schmus, 2006). One of the remaining puzzles regarding the northern Midcontinent region has been defining eastward continuation of geon 17 (≈Yavapai) and geon 16 (≈Mazatzal) terranes of the transcontinental Proterozoic provinces (cf. Van Schmus et al., 1993a,b; CD-ROM Working Group, 2002) in such a way that it agrees with west–southwest continuation of the geon 18 Penokean orogen of the Great Lakes area (cf. Sims et al., 1989) and southward continuation of the coeval Trans-Hudson orogen (cf. Klasner and King, 1986, 1990). In particular, the few dated subsurface samples in Nebraska, Iowa, South Dakota, southeastern Minnesota, and southern Wisconsin have provided very limited information with which to constrain regional correlations of the Paleoproterozoic crust. Recently, however, several new sources of data can provide significant insights into this problem, with the consequence that the geology of the Precambrian basement in the north-central United States is undergoing major re-interpretation (see other papers in this volume).

We present in this paper new geochronologic data from basement core samples in southeastern Minnesota, northern Iowa, southeastern South Dakota, and northern Ontario. In addition, improvements in geochronological techniques over the past two decades allow us to study other samples that previously yielded too few accessory minerals for reliable analysis, to re-examine samples from previous studies which yielded imprecise results, or to re-interpret previous results in the light of new geophysical data. Collectively, our results indicate that most of the Paleoproterozoic crust south of the Archean craton (Superior Province) in Iowa and Minnesota is younger than 1800 Ma and therefore represents a general eastward continuation of geon 17 (≈Yavapai) and geon 16 (≈Mazatzal) terranes of the SW United States rather than eastward continuation of the Penokean orogen as had commonly been shown on maps up to now (cf. Sims, 1990; Sims et al., 1993; Van Schmus et al., 1993a,b, 1996; CD-ROM Working Group, 2002). We also demonstrate that medium-grade thermotectonic events of geon 16 (≈Mazatzal or eastern correlative) orogenic events affected most of the region south of the Archean craton in the upper Midwest.

In order to facilitate discussion of broad correlations to the west in this paper, we will use the terms Yavapai and Mazatzal (cf. CD-ROM Working Group, 2002) to encompass crust formed and rapidly accreted to southern Laurentia between 1.80 and 1.70 Ga (geon 17; ≈Yavapai) and 1.70 and 1.60 Ga (geon 16; ≈Mazatzal), respectively. These timespans are somewhat broader age limits than commonly used for the Yavapai and Mazatzal orogens in Arizona–Colorado–New Mexico. We recognize that this is a major simplification that likely masks details of a rich and complex geologic history in the SW United States during the late Paleoproterozoic (cf. CD-ROM Working Group, 2002; Karlstrom et al., 2005). Given the limited crustal exposure and geochronologic control in the Midcontinent region, however, a more simplified broad-brush approach seems justified when attempting to correlate our results to those in better exposed and better-understood terranes to the west and east.

2. Regional geological relationships

2.1. Regional setting and study area

Fig. 1 shows a modified interpretation of the Precambrian basement geology in the north-central United States. Key modifications from prior renditions of this basement geology (e.g. Van Schmus et al., 1993a,b) include: (a) reduction in the southward extent of preserved Penokean-interval crust (1890–1830 Ma) and (b) eastward extension of geon 17 and geon 16 crust from Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico. A key structural element, which shows clearly on geophysical maps of the Midcontinent region, is a sharp transition that is now referred to as the Spirit Lake tectonic zone (SLtz; NICE Working Group, 2007); the SLtz cuts across NW Iowa and SE Minnesota and continues eastward into Wisconsin. In Iowa and Minnesota, crust north of the SLtz is comprised of Archean granite–gneiss complexes (Sims et al., 1993; Southwick, 1994; Windom et al., 1993); basement south of the SLtz is shown in this paper primarily to consist of geon 17 rocks. In Wisconsin the Marshfield terrane lies immediately north of the SLtz; it is mainly comprised of Archean continental crust that is intruded by several Penokean plutons (Van Schmus and Anderson, 1977; Van Schmus, 1980; Van Wyck, 1995).

The SLtz continues southwestward into SE South Dakota. Magnetic data (Klasner and King, 1986; Finn and Sims, 2005) and geochronological data (this paper) indicate that it turns northwestern, but it is still bounded on the north by Archean crust of the Superior Province (Klasner and King, 1986) and on the south by geon 17 crust. At some point the SW margin of the Superior Province becomes bounded by geon 18 rocks of the
Fig. 1. Map of the northern Midcontinent region of the United States showing locations of samples and U–Pb ages discussed in this paper (sample numbers keyed to Table 1). Major province boundaries modified after Van Schmus et al. (1996) and NICE Working Group (2007). Dashed white line in northern Wisconsin–upper Michigan is northern limit of 1630 Ma resetting of Ar–Ar ages in Proterozoic quartzites (Holm et al., 1998b). Abbreviations: BE = Becker Embayment, CB = Cheyenne Belt, CI = Croker Island complex, EP = Eau Pleine shear zone, G–R = granite–rhyolite province, K = Killarney magmatic complex, MI = Manitoulin Island, MRV = Minnesota River Valley terrane promontory, MT = Marshfield terrane, NF = Niagara Fault, SLtz = Sprit Lake tectonic zone, WC = Wyoming craton.
Trans-Hudson orogen (Klasner and King, 1986, 1990); the westward extension of the SLtz, if any, should be bounded on the north by geon 18 rocks. In south-central and southwestern South Dakota, however, the transition from geon 18 crust of the southern Trans-Hudson orogen to geon 17 crust of northern Nebraska is poorly constrained, with only one well-dated geon 17 basement sample in north-central Nebraska (NBKP-01; Van Schmus et al., 1993a; this paper).

In southern Wyoming and northern Utah the Archean–Paleoproterozoic transition is represented by the Cheyenne Belt (Karlstrom and Houston, 1984; Karlstrom and Humphreys, 1998; Karlstrom et al., 2005), which juxtaposes geon 17 rocks of the NE Mojave Province and northern Yavapai Province against Archean crust of the Wyoming craton to the north. These relationships will be discussed further toward the end of this paper.

There are several drill holes to basement along and on either side of the SLtz in South Dakota, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin that provide key age control (Table 1). New and re-evaluated ages for these samples provide key tests for our proposed chronologic similarity between the Cheyenne Belt and the Spirit Lake tectonic zone (geon 17 rocks juxtaposed with Archean cratonic rocks). These data also indicate, however, significant differences in their tectonic histories, as discussed below.

2.2. Prior geochronologic results

2.2.1. Basement crystallization ages

U–Pb zircon crystallization ages for juvenile crust exposed in central and northern Wisconsin definitively bracket the Penokean orogeny between 1880 and 1830 Ma (Van Schmus, 1976, 1980; Sims et al., 1989). However, a paucity of samples from Midcontinent basement to the south and west has left the age of that crust largely unconstrained. For example, the Precambrian basement of Iowa has commonly been portrayed as Penokean crust which was bounded by Archean crust to the north, similar to the geological relationship in northern Wisconsin along the Niagara Fault zone (a Paleoproterozoic suture), and Van Schmus et al. (1993b) argued that the Niagara Fault continued southwestward to the Spirit Lake trend in NW Iowa (contrary to our interpretation in this paper). In contrast, U–Pb zircon ages from basement drill hole samples in Nebraska are dominantly 1800 Ma or younger and probably represent eastward extension of geon 17 (≈Yavapai) basement of central and northern Colorado (Van Schmus et al., 1987, 1993a).

Previously published Paleoproterozoic zircon ages and Sm–Nd data from Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri (Table 1; Figs. 1 and 2) show that geon 17 and geon 16 crust underlies most of the central Midcontinent region. Although data are sparsely distributed, one geon 17 drill hole in SE Kansas and another in NE Kansas (KSNM-21 at 1780 ± 20 Ma, respectively; Van Schmus et al., 1993a) suggest that the southern limit of geon 17 crust trends diagonally, SW–NE, across the state. This boundary (Figs. 1 and 2) is more or less in-line with the Jemez lineament in the southwest, which delineates a better controlled southern limit of Yavapai crust in Arizona and New Mexico (CD-ROM Working Group, 2002; Karlstrom et al., 2005). There are, however, no U–Pb crystallization ages for geon 17 primary crust in southern Iowa or southern Wisconsin that allow precise projection of this boundary eastward.

Sm–Nd crustal formation ages ($T_{DM}$) for Paleoproterozoic basement in the western Midcontinent region typically range between 1.8 and 2.0 Ga, and ca. 1450 Ma plutons intruded into this basement also commonly yield similar values (Van Schmus et al., 1993a, 1996). Such model ages do not occur south and east of a line trending approximately from southern Michigan–southern Ontario to West Texas and have been used by Van Schmus et al. (1993a, 1996) and Rohs and Van Schmus (2006) to define the S–SE limits of Paleoproterozoic crust in the Midcontinent (Fig. 1).

2.2.2. Metamorphism and deformation

Metamorphism along the southern margin of the Archean Superior Province has been historically attributed to Penokean-interval orogenesis. Indeed, a narrow window of amphibolite-facies rocks north of the Niagara Fault zone in the southern Lake Superior region does record 1.83–1.80 Ga monazite U–Th–Pb crystallization ages (Schneider et al., 2004; Holm et al., 2007). Peak metamorphic conditions with attendant magmatism at ca. 1.83 Ga probably represent the culmination of Penokean arc accretion. The dominant metamorphic and igneous imprint on basement rocks in the Archean–Penokean boundary area, however, is a regional tectonothermal event dated at ca. 1.76 Ga (Holm et al., 1998a; Schneider et al., 2004) and includes the 1775 Ma east-central Minnesota batholith (Holm et al., 2005). This is a style and age of deformation similar to that in the southwestern U.S. (CD-ROM Working Group, 2002), where Yavapai convergence resulted in widespread thermal overprinting and significant magmatism during geon 17. In the Lake Huron region of Ontario, geon 17 magmatism and metamorphism are
Table 1
Summary of sample locations, zircon ages, and Sm/Nd data from the northern Midcontinent region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample number</th>
<th>Sample identity</th>
<th>Rock type</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>W Long</th>
<th>N Lat</th>
<th>Zircon age (Ma)</th>
<th>Sm/Nd</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. IA-M8</td>
<td>Manson drill hole M8</td>
<td>Gneiss, granite</td>
<td>Pocahontas</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>90N</td>
<td>31W</td>
<td>94.51</td>
<td>42.60</td>
<td>1705 ± 30</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. IACK-01</td>
<td>Kans. Univ. #1 Peterson</td>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>Cherokee</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>90N</td>
<td>41W</td>
<td>95.67</td>
<td>42.57</td>
<td>1433 ± 06</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>V4 V4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IALY-07</td>
<td>N I Zinc, Matlock C5.914</td>
<td>Keratophyre</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>98N</td>
<td>44W</td>
<td>96.05</td>
<td>43.28</td>
<td>1782 ± 04</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>W1 W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. IALY-09</td>
<td>N I Zinc, Matlock C10.706</td>
<td>Monzodiorite</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>98N</td>
<td>44W</td>
<td>95.98</td>
<td>43.27</td>
<td>2523 ± 05</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>W1 W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. IAOS-01</td>
<td>Iowa Geol Surv, D-13 Test</td>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>Osceola</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100N</td>
<td>39W</td>
<td>95.48</td>
<td>43.45</td>
<td>1804 ± 19</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>V3 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. MIGT-01</td>
<td>Shell State Blair #24</td>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>Grand Trav.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26N</td>
<td>11W</td>
<td>95.58</td>
<td>43.63</td>
<td>1472 ± 06</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>H1 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MNFI-01</td>
<td>MNGS Drill hole BO-1</td>
<td>Metagabbro</td>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>90N</td>
<td>8W</td>
<td>96.45</td>
<td>43.94</td>
<td>ca. 1850</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>W2 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. MNJK-01</td>
<td>Iowa Geol Surv, D-13 Test</td>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>102N</td>
<td>36W</td>
<td>95.14</td>
<td>43.65</td>
<td>1792 ± 31</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S1 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. MNPS-01</td>
<td>Outcrop, MNGS SX-60PEB</td>
<td>Metarhyolite</td>
<td>Pipestone</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>106N</td>
<td>47W</td>
<td>96.85</td>
<td>43.94</td>
<td>ca. 1850</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>W2 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. MNSH-01</td>
<td>MNGS, D-13 Test</td>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>Peoria</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90N</td>
<td>8W</td>
<td>95.48</td>
<td>43.45</td>
<td>1804 ± 19</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>V3 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ONMI-01a</td>
<td>Union Carbide #1, 1308</td>
<td>Aplite</td>
<td>Naperville</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90N</td>
<td>18W</td>
<td>99.38</td>
<td>40.73</td>
<td>1787 ± 09</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>V3 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ONMI-01b</td>
<td>Union Carbide #1, 1308</td>
<td>Granodiorite</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100N</td>
<td>19W</td>
<td>99.38</td>
<td>40.73</td>
<td>1787 ± 09</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>V3 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. ONMI-02a</td>
<td>Union Carbide #2, 2346</td>
<td>Granodiorite</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10N</td>
<td>19W</td>
<td>99.43</td>
<td>40.87</td>
<td>1802 ± 04</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>V3 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. ONMI-02b</td>
<td>Union Carbide #2, 2391</td>
<td>Migmatite</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10N</td>
<td>19W</td>
<td>99.43</td>
<td>40.87</td>
<td>1802 ± 04</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>V3 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. SDUN-01</td>
<td>SDGS, “Elk Point”</td>
<td>Metarhyolite</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>90N</td>
<td>50W</td>
<td>96.70</td>
<td>42.62</td>
<td>1733 ± 02</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>00 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. VS62-13</td>
<td>N. Benjamin I., Ontario</td>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>Waushara</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17N</td>
<td>13E</td>
<td>88.93</td>
<td>43.97</td>
<td>ca. 1760</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>V6 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. VS70-01</td>
<td>Outcrop, Berlin, WI</td>
<td>Metarhyolite</td>
<td>Waushara</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17N</td>
<td>13E</td>
<td>89.90</td>
<td>43.73</td>
<td>1762 ± 28</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>V3 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. VS70-06</td>
<td>Outcrop, Utley, WI</td>
<td>Metarhyolite</td>
<td>Waushara</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17N</td>
<td>13E</td>
<td>89.90</td>
<td>43.73</td>
<td>1762 ± 28</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>V3 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. VS70-07</td>
<td>Outcrop, Marquette, WI</td>
<td>Metarhyolite</td>
<td>Marquette</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17N</td>
<td>13E</td>
<td>89.90</td>
<td>43.73</td>
<td>1762 ± 28</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>V3 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. VS70-83</td>
<td>Outcrop, Observatory Hill, WI</td>
<td>Metarhyolite</td>
<td>Marquette</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17N</td>
<td>13E</td>
<td>89.90</td>
<td>43.73</td>
<td>1762 ± 28</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>V3 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. VS73-01B</td>
<td>Outcrop, Utley, WI</td>
<td>Metarhyolite</td>
<td>Waushara</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17N</td>
<td>13E</td>
<td>88.93</td>
<td>43.97</td>
<td>ca. 1760</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>V6 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. VS73-08</td>
<td>Outcrop, Amberg, WI</td>
<td>Metarhyolite</td>
<td>Waushara</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17N</td>
<td>13E</td>
<td>88.93</td>
<td>43.97</td>
<td>ca. 1760</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>V6 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. VS76-37A</td>
<td>Outcrop, Linwood Twp., WI</td>
<td>Metarhyolite</td>
<td>Waushara</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17N</td>
<td>13E</td>
<td>88.93</td>
<td>43.97</td>
<td>ca. 1760</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>V6 00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Sample numbers mostly from Van Schmus field notes or University of Kansas Project Upper Crust sample numbers (State–County–Number). Sec–Twp–Rge = section–township–range; W Long = west longitude; N Lat = north latitude; ages ±2σ; TDM ages in Ga; *: sample too altered for whole-rock analysis. n.a. = not applicable. Italicized age estimates based on regional geology (est.) or general zircon ages as referenced. Numbers following ONMI samples refer to dept (in feet) below the surface for core pieces analyzed. References: B1, Barovich et al. (1989); D1, Dewane and Van Schmus (2007); H1, Hoppe et al. (1983); H2, Holm et al. (2005); S1, Southwick (1994); V1-Van Schmus et al. (1975b); V2, Van Schmus and Anderson (1977); V3, Van Schmus et al. (1987); V4, Van Schmus et al. (1989); V5, Van Schmus et al. (1993a); †: detailed U–Pb or Sm–Nd data not published; U–Pb ages quoted here may differ slightly due to additional analyses or to refinement in calculations; V6, Van Schmus (1980); W1, Windom et al. (1993); W2, Wallin and Van Schmus (1988); 00, this study.
the dominant tectonothermal event south of the Archean shield as well (Piercey et al., 2007).

Thermochronometric studies from basement rocks of the north-central Midcontinent have revealed detailed characteristics of its Proterozoic lower temperature history (Holm and Lux, 1996; Schneider et al., 1996; Romano et al., 2000; Holm et al., 2007). Penokean-interval $^{40}$Ar/$^{39}$Ar biotite cooling ages are only preserved in low-grade arc rocks in east-central Minnesota; a few hornblende ages also record Penokean cooling in metasedimentary rocks of the orogen. Elsewhere throughout the Lake Superior and Lake Huron region, hornblende and mica $^{40}$Ar/$^{39}$Ar ages are predominantly 1.76–1.75 Ga or somewhat younger (see summary Fig. 4 of Schneider et al., 2004), reflecting rapid, widespread cooling and orogenic collapse following the afore-mentioned geon 17 amphibolite-facies metamorphism and magmatism.

Across much of the Wisconsin Precambrian bedrock, low-temperature (300°C) reheating coeval with deformation was responsible for resetting whole-rock Rb–Sr ages (Van Schmus et al., 1975a; Van Schmus, 1978; Medaris et al., 2003) and $^{40}$Ar/$^{39}$Ar mica cooling ages (Holm et al., 1998b; Romano et al., 2000). This resetting is inferred to have been broadly related to geon 16 ($\approx$ Mazatzal) accretion to the south in the central Midcontinent region. Deformed Baraboo Interval quartzites (1760 Ma $>$ $t$ $>$ 1630 Ma) accurately delineate the region of geon 16 ($\approx$ Mazatzal) deformation. The northern limit of this deformation and moderate temperature (300–500°C) reheating is approximately located along the Niagara Fault zone in northern Wisconsin and upper Michigan (Fig. 1). In Minnesota the deformational front must trend south of the Minnesota River Valley promontory of Archean basement, since those rocks are not isotopically reset and are overlain by flat-lying Baraboo
Interval quartzites (Sioux quartzite; Holm et al., 1998b; Fig. 1 shows the NW limit of this geon 16 deformaional and metamorphic front. Geon 16 heating is recorded only locally in the Lake Huron region of the orogen (Piercey et al., 2007).

Intrusion of the 1.47 Ga Wolf River batholith and other related geon 14 A-type plutons across the northern Midcontinent only had a limited thermal effect on the surrounding country rock, in part reflecting their rapid emplacement at shallow crustal levels. Hydrothermal alteration along the Paleoproterozoic basement/cover contact did occur, however, at considerable distances from the batholith (Medaris et al., 2003). In contrast, geon 14 magmatism in the southwestern United States was accompanied by pervasive thermal effects, causing a major regional resetting of $^{40}$Ar/$^{39}$Ar ages throughout the Yavapai–Mazatzal basement (Shaw et al., 2005). Geon 14 magmatism was ubiquitous throughout the central Midcontinent (cf. Van Schmus et al., 1993a), but few reliable data exist relevant to the intensity of reheating the older Paleoproterozoic crust in the region during this event.

3. New geochronologic data and re-interpretation of prior results

3.1. U–Pb analyses

TIMS U–Pb data (Table 2) were obtained by Van Schmus and colleagues at the Isotope Geochemistry Laboratory (IGL), University of Kansas over an interval of about 25 years. The older data (1980s) were obtained using relatively large (few mg), multi-grain fractions; zircons were dissolved and Pb and U were separated using procedures modified after Krogh (1973, 1982; see Bowring et al., 1984 for further details). Some ages and accompanying data were published by Van Schmus et al. (1987), whereas only ages were published for additional samples by Van Schmus et al. (1993a). Table 2 includes data for individual zircon fractions from all samples for which the detailed data were not previously published. In those cases where our files no longer include actual measurement errors, uncertainties of ±1% were assigned for U/Pb ratios, $^{207}$Pb*/$^{206}$Pb* ratios were assigned an error of ±0.2%, and correlation coefficients ($\rho$) were assigned a corresponding value of 0.980. Over the past 20 years experience has shown that these values are consistent with values (0.5–1.0%, 0.05–0.2%, and 0.980–0.990%, respectively) typically obtained using PBDAT (Ludwig, 1988) for data reduction.

More recent (2005–2006) data were obtained from single-grain analyses using procedures modified after Krogh (1973) and Parrish (1987). In these single-crystal analyses the entire dissolved sample was loaded on a Re filament using phosphoric acid and silica gel without prior ion-exchange column purification (Bruguiere et al., 1994). The U–Pb isotopic analyses were done in single-collector mode using an ion-counting Daly system on a VG Sector mass spectrometer and measured as Pb$^+$ and UO$_2^+$.

Lead compositions were corrected for mass discrimination (typically 0.10–0.12% per amu) as determined by analysis of NBS SRM-982 (equal-atom) Pb and monitored by analysis of NBS SRM-983 (radiogenic) Pb; uranium fractionation was monitored by analyses of NBS SRM U-500. Radiogenic $^{208}$Pb, $^{207}$Pb, and $^{206}$Pb was obtained by correcting for modern blank Pb and for non-radiogenic original Pb corresponding to Stacey and Kramers (1975) model Pb for the approximate age of the sample. Uncertainties in radiogenic Pb ratios are typically less than ±0.1% at the 2σ level unless the samples had a low $^{206}$Pb/$^{204}$Pb ratio, in which case errors in the common Pb correction could cause greater uncertainties. Decay constants used were 0.155125 × 10$^{-9}$ year$^{-1}$ for $^{238}$U and 0.98485 × 10$^{-9}$ year$^{-1}$ for $^{235}$U (Steiger and Jäger, 1977). Blanks were about 2 ng total Pb in 1982 and about 2–4 pg total Pb in 2005; in all cases they do not contribute significantly to uncertainties in the ages of samples. Data reduction followed PBDAT of Ludwig (1988).

Zircon data were regressed for this paper using the Isoplot/Ex program (Ludwig, 2001). Model 1 regressions were accepted if probabilities of fit were better than 20%. Model 2 regressions were used if probabilities of fit were less than 20%; in the latter case uncertainties in concordia intercept ages were recalculated to the 2σ level using the appropriate Student’s t-multiplier for the number of analyses regressed. Results are summarized in Table 2 and presented in Figs. 1 and 3. For older analyses (Van Schmus et al., 1987, 1993a) ages may differ slightly from previously published values due to use of updated regression methods.

For three drill core samples, SDUN-01 (South Dakota), IA-M8 (Manson structure, Iowa) and ONMI-02 (Manitoulin Island, Ontario), single-spot SIMS U–Pb zircon ages were measured by two of us (Schneider and Dodson) using the Cameca ims1270 ion microprobe at the University of California, Los Angeles. Rock cores were processed for zircon through standard mineral separation techniques, including heavy liquid and magnetic separation. Prior to isotopic analysis, the zircon grains were mounted with an age standard in an epoxy probe mount and imaged with BSE/SEM techniques. Most grains showed some sector zoning that is probably a
Table 2
New and previously unreported data for individual zircon fractions from northern Midcontinent basement samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Fraction</th>
<th>Size (mg)</th>
<th>U (ppm)</th>
<th>Pb (ppm)</th>
<th>206Pb/238U Isoplot data</th>
<th>Calculated Ages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>206Pb (%)</td>
<td>204Pb (%)</td>
<td>235U (%)</td>
<td>Correlation coefficient.</td>
<td>Age (Ma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±2σ (%)</td>
<td>±2σ (%)</td>
<td>±2σ (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAOS-01: Osceola Co.; granite</td>
<td>NM(0) 1.400</td>
<td>372 45 904</td>
<td>3.7230 0.39</td>
<td>0.24611</td>
<td>3.09 0.99</td>
<td>0.10972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M(0) 3.300</td>
<td>253 67 1642</td>
<td>3.4951 0.52</td>
<td>0.23287</td>
<td>0.52 0.92</td>
<td>0.10885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M(1) 1.000</td>
<td>322 75 1250</td>
<td>3.0330 0.36</td>
<td>0.24198</td>
<td>0.55 0.99</td>
<td>0.10891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M(2) 0.800</td>
<td>412 88 744</td>
<td>2.6443 0.60</td>
<td>0.17745</td>
<td>0.59 0.96</td>
<td>0.10807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNFI-01: Fillmore Co. (MNGS BO-1; 1335′ depth); metagabbro</td>
<td>HP-a 1.000</td>
<td>506 163 4486</td>
<td>6.2532 1.11</td>
<td>0.31104</td>
<td>1.10 0.99</td>
<td>0.10785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HP-b 0.003</td>
<td>404 128 5172</td>
<td>1.6373 0.51</td>
<td>0.31278</td>
<td>0.50 0.97</td>
<td>0.10753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HP-c 0.002</td>
<td>81 26 550</td>
<td>3.9013 1.20</td>
<td>0.26181</td>
<td>0.99 0.86</td>
<td>0.10807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBBF-01: Buffalo Co.; tonalitic gneiss</td>
<td>M(0) 4.000</td>
<td>362 100 1658</td>
<td>3.9999 0.64</td>
<td>0.26712</td>
<td>0.63 0.98</td>
<td>0.10860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M(1) 3.300</td>
<td>478 115 1057</td>
<td>3.3820 0.51</td>
<td>0.22677</td>
<td>0.48 0.96</td>
<td>0.10817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M(2) 0.500</td>
<td>405 83 636</td>
<td>2.9740 1.28</td>
<td>0.20093</td>
<td>1.27 0.98</td>
<td>0.10735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBBU-01: Butler Co.; dioritic gneiss</td>
<td>lg pk 1.11</td>
<td>114 31 11628</td>
<td>4.7610 1.00</td>
<td>0.31770</td>
<td>1.00 0.98</td>
<td>0.10876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sm pk 0.307</td>
<td>142 38 2717</td>
<td>4.5780 1.00</td>
<td>0.30800</td>
<td>1.00 0.98</td>
<td>0.10779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sm brn 0.324</td>
<td>410 109 7092</td>
<td>4.0620 1.00</td>
<td>0.30810</td>
<td>1.00 0.98</td>
<td>0.10832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lg brn 0.454</td>
<td>394 44 3876</td>
<td>1.0980 1.00</td>
<td>0.12790</td>
<td>1.00 0.98</td>
<td>0.10820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBCS-02: Chase Co.; granodiorite</td>
<td>NM(0) 6.40</td>
<td>201 47 2646</td>
<td>3.0440 1.00</td>
<td>0.21990</td>
<td>1.00 0.98</td>
<td>0.10037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M(1) 7.80</td>
<td>294 60 2451</td>
<td>2.6310 1.00</td>
<td>0.18990</td>
<td>1.00 0.99</td>
<td>0.10051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M(3) 8.06</td>
<td>397 65 1409</td>
<td>2.0420 1.00</td>
<td>0.14840</td>
<td>1.00 0.98</td>
<td>0.09981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBDA-02: Dawson Co.; granodiorite</td>
<td>M(1) 1.9</td>
<td>470 119 1344</td>
<td>3.7480 1.00</td>
<td>0.24660</td>
<td>1.00 0.98</td>
<td>0.11025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M(2) 1.9</td>
<td>467 112 953</td>
<td>3.4770 1.00</td>
<td>0.22880</td>
<td>1.00 0.98</td>
<td>0.11022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M(3) 1.4</td>
<td>561 131 781</td>
<td>3.3460 1.00</td>
<td>0.22060</td>
<td>1.00 0.98</td>
<td>0.11001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M(4) 1.2</td>
<td>683 116 526</td>
<td>2.3720 1.00</td>
<td>0.15610</td>
<td>1.00 0.98</td>
<td>0.11021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBHK-01C: Hooker Co.; tonalitic gneiss</td>
<td>M(1)AA 2.84</td>
<td>203 63</td>
<td>4762</td>
<td>4.5550 1.00</td>
<td>0.30360</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M(2) 2.43</td>
<td>161 48 2762</td>
<td>4.3240 1.00</td>
<td>0.28770</td>
<td>1.00 0.98</td>
<td>0.10900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M(3) 2.34</td>
<td>193 57 3610</td>
<td>4.2940 1.00</td>
<td>0.28580</td>
<td>1.00 0.98</td>
<td>0.10899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M(0) 3.06</td>
<td>230 66 3636</td>
<td>4.1510 1.00</td>
<td>0.27690</td>
<td>1.00 0.98</td>
<td>0.10872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Fraction</td>
<td>Size (mm)</td>
<td>Pb (ppm)</td>
<td>206Pb Isoplot data</td>
<td>Calculated Ages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207Pb/206Pb</td>
<td>207Pb/235U</td>
<td>Age (Ma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207Pb/206Pb</td>
<td>207Pb/235U</td>
<td>Age (Ma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207Pb/206Pb</td>
<td>207Pb/235U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207Pb/206Pb</td>
<td>207Pb/235U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207Pb/206Pb</td>
<td>207Pb/235U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207Pb/206Pb</td>
<td>207Pb/235U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207Pb/206Pb</td>
<td>207Pb/235U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207Pb/206Pb</td>
<td>207Pb/235U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207Pb/206Pb</td>
<td>207Pb/235U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207Pb/206Pb</td>
<td>207Pb/235U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207Pb/206Pb</td>
<td>207Pb/235U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207Pb/206Pb</td>
<td>207Pb/235U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207Pb/206Pb</td>
<td>207Pb/235U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207Pb/206Pb</td>
<td>207Pb/235U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207Pb/206Pb</td>
<td>207Pb/235U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2 (Continued)**

**Notes:**
- AA = air abraded (Krogh, 1982); M = magnetic; NM = non-magnetic; (n) = side tilt used on magnetic separator track during preparation of magnetic fractions; Letters a, b, c, d refer separate analyses from same magnetic split; HP = hand picked; lg = large; sm = small; brn = brown; pk = pink. Data regressed using Isoplot/Ex (Ludwig, 2001); uncertainties reported at the 2σ level (see text); U.I. = upper intercept on concordia; L.I. = lower intercept on concordia. Raw data reduced using PBDAT (various versions); where errors were not propagated during reduction, estimated values are given in italics (see text). *: Pb data corrected for analytical blank Pb and non-radiogenic Pb using Stacey and Kramers (1975) model Pb. All ages calculated using decay constants recommended by Steiger and Jäger (1977). See text for further details.
Fig. 3. Concordia plots of TIMS U–Pb data for selected samples discussed in this paper. (A) Single-crystal analyses for SDUN-01, metagabbro from Elk Point, Union County, South Dakota. (B) Single-crystal analyses for MNFI-01, metagabbro from MNGS drill hole BO-1 in Fillmore Co., Minnesota. (C) Previously unpublished multi-grain data for sample SDCL-01, a granite from Vermillion, Clay Co., South Dakota (open circles; open triangle omitted from regression) and SDDA-01, a granite from Davison Co., South Dakota (solid circles). (D) Previously unpublished multi-grain data for sample IAOS-01, a granite from Osceola Co., Iowa. (E) Previously unpublished multi-grain data for sample NBKP-01, a metagranite from Keya Paha County, Nebraska. (F) Previously unpublished multi-grain data for samples NBBU-01 (solid circles) and NBDA-02 (solid diamonds) in Nebraska. See text for further details and discussion.
primary igneous texture, with relatively thin, if any, overgrowths. Grains selected for analysis were intact grains with no embayments or other textural anomalies. Fifteen zircons each from SDUN-01 and IA-M8 were analyzed; 30 zircons were analyzed from ONMI-02. Most zircons were small (<80 μm), and were analyzed only once (single spot), so it is difficult to assess core-rim age relationships.

For isotopic analyses, the primary O⁻ ion beam was focused to a 15 μm × 20 μm spot. The standard operating conditions were a primary intensity of 3–4 nA, mass resolving power of ~4500, and a 50 eV energy window. Zircon U–Pb ages were determined relative to the zircon age standard AS3 (1099 ± 1 Ma; Paces and Miller, 1993). The precision of the method is not limited by counting statistics but by the reproducibility of the standard calibration curve, which is typically ±1–2% (Harrison et al., 1995). Uranium and thorium concentrations were estimated semiquantitatively by comparing peak intensities in the unknowns to those in standard AS3, which has a mean concentration of ~400 ppm Th and ~550 ppm U. Isotopic data, ages, and errors (±1σ) reported in Table 3 were obtained by data reduction and age calculations based on the methods of Harrison et al. (1995) and Catlos et al. (2002).

The data for each sample are variably discordant and show significant lateral scatter in 207Pb/206Pb ages. To further resolve the SIMS data, we systematically eliminated some of the dates from the regression procedure. The data that have been included in the upper intercept age calculations (Fig. 4) have small errors (<20 m.y.), are concordant or normally discordant, and have Th/U ratio >0.2. There is a clear relationship between the chemistry of zircon and the processes which operate during accessory mineral genesis, and a general association between zircon of “metamorphic” origin and low Th/U values has previously been documented (Williams and Claesson, 1987; Keay et al., 2001). Thus, in an attempt to resolve the crystallization age of these three samples, we concentrated on spot analyses (and ages) that more likely represent an igneous origin.

3.2. Sm–Nd analyses

Sm–Nd data (Table 4) were obtained by Van Schmus at the University of Kansas (KU) or by Nelson at the University of Washington (UW) using similar methods. Rock powders for Sm–Nd analysis at KU were dissolved and REE were extracted using the general methods of Patchett and Ruiz (1987). Isotopic compositions for Nd were measured with a VG Sector multicollector mass spectrometer: samarium was loaded with H₃PO₄ on a single Ta filament and typically analyzed as Sm⁺ in static-multicollector mode or single-collector mode; neodymium was loaded with phosphoric acid on a single Re filament having a thin layer of AGW-50 resin beads and analyzed as Nd⁺ using dynamic-multicollector mode. External precision based on repeated analyses of our internal standard is ±0.5%, based on analytical uncertainties; εNd(0) values were calculated using the U–Pb ages defined from zircons where avail-
### Table 3
Ion microprobe U–Pb isotopic data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>U (ppm)</th>
<th>Th (ppm)</th>
<th>U/Pb (‰)</th>
<th>Correlation of concordia ellipses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L5gr2p2a</td>
<td>238U: 0.2481 ± 0.0080, 235U: 3.6100 ± 0.1162, Th/U: 0.1055 ± 0.0008</td>
<td>1428.7 ± 41.1, 1551.8 ± 25.6, 1723.7 ± 13.7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5gr4p1a</td>
<td>238U: 0.3276 ± 0.0131, 235U: 4.8020 ± 0.0160, Th/U: 0.0960 ± 0.0008</td>
<td>1826.2 ± 64.3, 1753.8 ± 35.8, 1737.3 ± 13.4</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5gr10p1a</td>
<td>238U: 0.2493 ± 0.0111, 235U: 4.2630 ± 0.0151, Th/U: 0.1085 ± 0.0008</td>
<td>1480.2 ± 39.2, 1554.6 ± 23.8, 1657.1 ± 10.2</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5gr20p2a</td>
<td>238U: 0.3124 ± 0.0079, 235U: 4.5640 ± 0.0141, Th/U: 0.1000 ± 0.0009</td>
<td>1678.1 ± 55.2, 1681.0 ± 31.2, 1684.5 ± 8.1</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5gr24p1a</td>
<td>238U: 0.2940 ± 0.0141, 235U: 4.2820 ± 0.0105, Th/U: 0.1075 ± 0.0009</td>
<td>1658.1 ± 52.1, 1681.0 ± 31.2, 1684.5 ± 8.1</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5gr16p1a</td>
<td>238U: 0.3240 ± 0.0126, 235U: 4.7540 ± 0.0142, Th/U: 0.1000 ± 0.0009</td>
<td>1658.1 ± 52.1, 1681.0 ± 31.2, 1684.5 ± 8.1</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ygr3p1a</td>
<td>238U: 0.1837 ± 0.0067, 235U: 2.6650 ± 0.0098, Th/U: 0.1052 ± 0.0007</td>
<td>1480.2 ± 39.2, 1554.6 ± 23.8, 1657.1 ± 10.2</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ygr11p1a</td>
<td>238U: 0.2195 ± 0.0111, 235U: 3.3735 ± 0.0185, Th/U: 0.1075 ± 0.0009</td>
<td>1678.1 ± 55.2, 1681.0 ± 31.2, 1684.5 ± 8.1</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ygr24p1a</td>
<td>238U: 0.2940 ± 0.0141, 235U: 4.2820 ± 0.0105, Th/U: 0.1075 ± 0.0009</td>
<td>1658.1 ± 52.1, 1681.0 ± 31.2, 1684.5 ± 8.1</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ygr2sp1a</td>
<td>238U: 0.2758 ± 0.0087, 235U: 3.6100 ± 0.0112, Th/U: 0.1125 ± 0.0009</td>
<td>1480.2 ± 39.2, 1554.6 ± 23.8, 1657.1 ± 10.2</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ygr1sp1a</td>
<td>238U: 0.2481 ± 0.0095, 235U: 3.5390 ± 0.1355, Th/U: 0.1034 ± 0.0008</td>
<td>1480.2 ± 39.2, 1554.6 ± 23.8, 1657.1 ± 10.2</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>206 Pb/238 U (1 s.e.)</th>
<th>207 Pb/235 U (1 s.e.)</th>
<th>207 Pb/206 Pb (1 s.e.)</th>
<th>Th/U</th>
<th>U (ppm)</th>
<th>Th (ppm)</th>
<th>206 Pb (%)</th>
<th>207 Pb (%)</th>
<th>Age (Ma)</th>
<th>Correlation of concordia ellipses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ygr26sp1a</td>
<td>0.2675 0.0108</td>
<td>3.8590 0.1560</td>
<td>0.1046 0.0044</td>
<td>0.447 490 257</td>
<td>99.9 99.1</td>
<td>1528.1 54.8</td>
<td>1605.2 32.6</td>
<td>1707.8 6.4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ygr22sp1a</td>
<td>0.2912 0.0113</td>
<td>4.2800 0.1659</td>
<td>0.1066 0.0044</td>
<td>0.531 819 511</td>
<td>100 99.7</td>
<td>1647.5 36.4</td>
<td>1689.5 31.9</td>
<td>1741.9 6.4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ygr2sp1</td>
<td>0.2292 0.0082</td>
<td>3.1720 0.1142</td>
<td>0.1004 0.0044</td>
<td>0.069 324 26</td>
<td>99.8 98.7</td>
<td>1330.4 43.0</td>
<td>1450.3 27.8</td>
<td>1630.8 7.7</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ygr30sp1</td>
<td>0.2493 0.0097</td>
<td>4.1070 0.1631</td>
<td>0.1004 0.0045</td>
<td>0.008 267 3</td>
<td>99.8 98.7</td>
<td>1642.9 57.9</td>
<td>1637.7 33.0</td>
<td>1631.0 8.8</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jgr4sp1a</td>
<td>0.3169 0.0150</td>
<td>3.8820 0.1927</td>
<td>0.0888 0.0012</td>
<td>0.220 315 82</td>
<td>97.3 79.4</td>
<td>1774.7 73.2</td>
<td>1609.7 40.1</td>
<td>1400.1 25.1</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Manson M-8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>206 Pb/238 U (1 s.e.)</th>
<th>207 Pb/235 U (1 s.e.)</th>
<th>207 Pb/206 Pb (1 s.e.)</th>
<th>Th/U</th>
<th>U (ppm)</th>
<th>Th (ppm)</th>
<th>206 Pb (%)</th>
<th>207 Pb (%)</th>
<th>Age (Ma)</th>
<th>Correlation of concordia ellipses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jgr4sp1a</td>
<td>0.1726 0.0066</td>
<td>2.4310 0.0940</td>
<td>0.1021 0.0044</td>
<td>0.288 1931 653</td>
<td>99.5 95.8</td>
<td>1026.5 36.5</td>
<td>1251.7 27.8</td>
<td>1663.2 6.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jgr7sp1a</td>
<td>0.2038 0.0081</td>
<td>2.8910 0.1164</td>
<td>0.1029 0.0045</td>
<td>0.269 796 252</td>
<td>98.8 91.3</td>
<td>1195.7 43.5</td>
<td>1379.6 30.4</td>
<td>1676.9 6.3</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jgr9sp1a</td>
<td>0.1670 0.0056</td>
<td>2.3950 0.0813</td>
<td>0.1040 0.0046</td>
<td>0.273 953 305</td>
<td>99.3 95.0</td>
<td>995.8 30.9</td>
<td>1241.2 24.3</td>
<td>1696.8 10.6</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jgr10sp1a</td>
<td>0.1474 0.0051</td>
<td>2.0460 0.0726</td>
<td>0.1007 0.0047</td>
<td>0.303 1218 434</td>
<td>98.4 88.3</td>
<td>886.2 28.7</td>
<td>1131.0 24.2</td>
<td>1637.0 13.2</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jgr13sp1a</td>
<td>0.1737 0.0063</td>
<td>2.5010 0.0909</td>
<td>0.1044 0.0045</td>
<td>0.247 1025 297</td>
<td>99.0 92.5</td>
<td>1032.4 34.4</td>
<td>1272.3 26.4</td>
<td>1704.3 8.6</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jgr17sp1a</td>
<td>0.2158 0.0070</td>
<td>3.0640 0.1086</td>
<td>0.1030 0.0033</td>
<td>0.479 2143 1206</td>
<td>99.9 99.2</td>
<td>1259.7 37.3</td>
<td>1423.8 25.1</td>
<td>1678.5 6.2</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jgr20sp1a</td>
<td>0.1362 0.0046</td>
<td>1.9160 0.0646</td>
<td>0.1020 0.0045</td>
<td>0.264 1262 392</td>
<td>99.2 93.5</td>
<td>823.0 26.1</td>
<td>1086.7 22.5</td>
<td>1661.7 9.1</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jgr19sp2a</td>
<td>0.1847 0.0069</td>
<td>2.6550 0.0996</td>
<td>0.1042 0.0045</td>
<td>0.265 1075 335</td>
<td>99.5 96.1</td>
<td>1092.6 37.7</td>
<td>1315.9 27.7</td>
<td>1700.9 8.2</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jgr14sp1</td>
<td>0.1283 0.0042</td>
<td>1.8620 0.0630</td>
<td>0.1053 0.0048</td>
<td>0.189 1025 227</td>
<td>99.1 93.6</td>
<td>777.9 24.2</td>
<td>1067.8 22.4</td>
<td>1719.6 14.0</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jgr12sp2</td>
<td>0.1645 0.0059</td>
<td>2.2870 0.0820</td>
<td>0.1008 0.0048</td>
<td>0.178 1998 418</td>
<td>99.1 92.7</td>
<td>982.0 32.5</td>
<td>1208.4 25.3</td>
<td>1639.2 8.3</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jgr5sp1</td>
<td>0.3577 0.0192</td>
<td>5.4190 0.3268</td>
<td>0.1099 0.0029</td>
<td>0.349 164 66</td>
<td>99.9 99.6</td>
<td>1971.0 91.1</td>
<td>1887.9 51.7</td>
<td>1979.6 48.4</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jgr8sp1</td>
<td>0.3819 0.0088</td>
<td>5.1640 0.1228</td>
<td>0.0981 0.0014</td>
<td>0.316 325 121</td>
<td>99.6 96.7</td>
<td>2085.2 41.0</td>
<td>1846.7 20.2</td>
<td>1587.7 20.1</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jgr1sp1</td>
<td>0.1459 0.0051</td>
<td>1.9290 0.0673</td>
<td>0.0959 0.0044</td>
<td>0.244 1956 561</td>
<td>99.6 96.6</td>
<td>878.1 28.5</td>
<td>1091.3 23.3</td>
<td>1545.6 7.6</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jgr3sp1</td>
<td>0.2132 0.0080</td>
<td>3.1680 0.1195</td>
<td>0.1078 0.0049</td>
<td>0.271 2444 778</td>
<td>99.5 96.3</td>
<td>1245.9 42.3</td>
<td>1449.4 29.1</td>
<td>1762.0 6.3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jgr7sp1</td>
<td>0.3966 0.0083</td>
<td>5.3290 0.1049</td>
<td>0.0975 0.0009</td>
<td>0.639 254 191</td>
<td>100 99.8</td>
<td>2153.3 38.4</td>
<td>1873.6 16.8</td>
<td>1576.1 17.0</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jgr11sp1</td>
<td>0.1453 0.0047</td>
<td>1.9160 0.0620</td>
<td>0.0957 0.0044</td>
<td>0.270 1647 523</td>
<td>98.6 96.6</td>
<td>874.5 26.2</td>
<td>1086.7 21.6</td>
<td>1541.0 7.1</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Grain number, spot number used in determination of U–Pb ages; see text for rationale.
Table 4
Sm/Nd whole-rock results from northern Midcontinent region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample (unit name)</th>
<th>Sm (ppm)</th>
<th>Nd (ppm)</th>
<th>147Sm/144Nd</th>
<th>143Nd/144Nd ± 2σ</th>
<th>εNd(t) (today)</th>
<th>t (Ga)</th>
<th>εNd(t) (Ga)</th>
<th>TDM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa drill holes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. IACK-01; granite</td>
<td>20.48</td>
<td>130.39</td>
<td>0.0960</td>
<td>0.511622 ± 16</td>
<td>−19.8</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>−1.4</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ILKY-07; keratophyre</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>40.44</td>
<td>0.1153</td>
<td>0.511316 ± 09</td>
<td>−25.8</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>−7.9</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. IALY-09; monzodiorite</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>63.10</td>
<td>0.0741</td>
<td>0.051040 ± 08</td>
<td>−43.7</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>−4.0</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. IAOS-01; granite</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>27.16</td>
<td>0.0859</td>
<td>0.511118 ± 10</td>
<td>−29.6</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>−4.0</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan drill hole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. MIIT-01A; granite</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>0.1157</td>
<td>0.511815 ± 13</td>
<td>−16.1</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>−0.8</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota drill holes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MNFI-01; metagabbro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. MNJK-01; granite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. MNPS-01; metarhyolite cobbles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. MNSH-01; granodiorite gneiss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska drill holes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. NBBF-01; tonalitic gneiss</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>23.28</td>
<td>0.1138</td>
<td>0.511795 ± 12</td>
<td>−16.4</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. NBBU-01; dioritic gneiss</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>30.72</td>
<td>0.1094</td>
<td>0.511765 ± 10</td>
<td>−17.0</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. NBKP-01; brecciated granite</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>69.34</td>
<td>0.1100</td>
<td>0.511663 ± 10</td>
<td>−19.0</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario: Manitoulin Island drill holes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. ONMI-01a, 1189’s; granite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. ONMI-01b, 1308’s; aplite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. ONMI-02a, 2346’s; granite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. ONMI-02b, 2391’s; migmatite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario: Croker Island Complex, North Channel of Lake Huron, outcrop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. VS62-13; granite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota drill holes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. SDCI-01; granite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. SDDA-01; granodiorite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. SDMO-01; granite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. SDMO-02; rhyolite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. SDUN-01; metagabbro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin, “1760 Ma” granites and rhyolites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. VS70-01; rhyolite, Berlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. VS70-06; rhyolite, Utley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. VS70-07; rhyolite, Marquette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. VS70-82; rhyolite, Endeevor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. VS70-83; rhyolite, Observatory Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. VS73-01B; rhyolite, Utley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Wisconsin (Penokean hosted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. VS73-08; Amberg granite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. VS73-37; Radisson granite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. “Sample 23”, Monico granite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin, Archean gneiss, eastern part of Marshfield terrane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. VS73-20; migmatite leucosome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: See Table 1 for sample location details and sources of U–Pb ages (t); Wisconsin “1760 Ma” rhyolite data from B.K. Nelson, University of Washington, adjusted to La Jolla Nd = 0.511860 (nominal value used at Isotope Geochemistry Laboratory, University of Kansas); “Sample 23” from Barovich et al. (1989); all others from W.R. Van Schmus, University of Kansas.

Sample run at the UW were also analyzed on a VG Sector, following procedures documented in Nelson (1995). Analysis of La Jolla Nd at UW yielded an average of 0.511840 ± 0.000010. Based on this replica-

able or estimated ages based on the regional geology and current results from nearby samples. Crustal residence ages (TDM) were calculated following the model of DePaolo (1981a).
tion, and replication of an in-house rock standard \((n = 8; 2\sigma = 38 \text{ ppm})\), external precision is \(\pm 40 \text{ ppm (2}\sigma)\). Van Schmus also analyzed the UW in-house rock standard several times and, allowing for normalizing differences relative to La Jolla Nd, obtained equivalent \(^{143}\text{Nd}/^{144}\text{Nd}\) for UW-analyzed samples (Wisconsin 1.76 Ga rocks) were increased by 0.000020 to account for the differences in nominal values used for \(^{143}\text{Nd}/^{144}\text{Nd}\) in the La Jolla Nd standard. Epsilon values and model ages for UW-analyzed samples (Wisconsin 1.76 Ga rocks) were recalculated using the model of DePaolo (1981a).

The changes from the original UW data that result are slight and commonly within analytical uncertainties, so that interpretations are not significantly affected by them.

### 3.3. U–Pb and Sm–Nd results

U–Pb data are presented in Tables 2 and 3 and shown in Figs. 1, 3 and 4. Sm–Nd data for samples from the north-central Midcontinent region are summarized in Tables 1 and 4 and Fig. 2. Two key samples are SDUN-01 (McCormick, 2005) and MNFI-01, both of which lie a short distance to the south of the SLtz (Fig. 1). Single-crystal TIMS analyses yield an age of 1733 \(\pm 2\) Ma for three analyses from SDUN-01 (Fig. 3A) and 1760 \(\pm 9\) Ma for three analyses from MNFI-01 (Fig. 3B). Because of the small sample sizes and the reverse discordance of some of the SDUN-01 data, zircons from this sample were also analyzed by SIMS techniques. Ion microprobe data for SDUN-01 are generally concordant and have lower U contents; the upper intercept for 10 spot analyses on nine zircon grains yields a U–Pb age of 1732 \(\pm 20\) Ma, confirming the TIMS age. In addition, zircon data from SDUN-01 with Th/U < 0.2 was plotted separately (Fig. 4), and five spot analyses yield a second age population at 1641 \(\pm 10\) Ma. While the younger date is defined by only a few spot ages, it is remarkably similar to the \(^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}\) hornblende cooling age from this same sample (1650 \(\pm 2\) Ma; see below). We firmly believe that these two separate samples confirm the presence of Yavapai-interval crust adjacent to the Archean craton along the SLtz in Iowa and Minnesota. Sm–Nd model ages \((T_{\text{DM}})\) for these two samples are 2.17 and 1.73 Ga, respectively.

Several other samples confirm this general relationship, although with less precision. A granite from the subsurface in Vermillion, SD (SDCL-01) yielded discordant zircons which give an imprecise age of 1762 \(\pm 28\) Ma (Fig. 3C). Geophysical data suggest that this sample lies south of westward continuation of the Archean margin (SLtz), and a Sm–Nd model age \((T_{\text{DM}})\) of 2.10 Ga (Table 4) supports our interpretation that post-Archean crust occurs at this location. In contrast, zircon from a granite to the north in Davison County, SD (SDDA-01) yields a Penokean (or Trans-Hudson) age of 1871 \(\pm 16\) Ma (Fig. 3C); this sample has a \(T_{\text{DM}}\) age of 2.55 Ga, which clearly indicates a major Archean crustal contribution.

To the east, a drill hole north of the SLtz in Iowa (IAOS-01) yields a U–Pb age of 1804 \(\pm 19\) Ma (Fig. 3D) with a \(T_{\text{DM}}\) age of 2.30 Ga. Similarly, granite sample MNJK-01 in Minnesota yields an age of 1792 \(\pm 31\) Ma (Southwick, 1994) with a \(T_{\text{DM}}\) of 2.20 Ga. Since these two samples lie north of the SLtz, the young (<2.5 Ga) \(T_{\text{DM}}\) ages suggest that they may be subduction-related with a significant Yavapai-interval mantle component. In contrast, another sample north of the SLtz in NW Iowa, IALY-07 (Table 1), yields an age of 1782 \(\pm 4\) Ma with a \(T_{\text{DM}}\) of 2.70 Ga, indicating derivation primarily from Archean crust. Farther north in Minnesota, a drill core sample of presumed Archean gneiss (MNSH-01) from the eastern part of the Becker Embayment (Fig. 2) yields a Sm–Nd \(T_{\text{DM}}\) age of 3.18 Ga (Table 4). This model age is compatible with those from the eastern part of the Marshfield Terrane (e.g. VS76-37A, 3.02 Ga, Fig. 2; Table 4), confirming continuation of that terrane into east-central Minnesota (NICE Working Group, 2007).

Farther west, a granite from Keya Paha County in north-central Nebraska (NBKP-01) yields a Yavapai-interval age of 1760 \(\pm 19\) Ma (Fig. 3E) with a Sm–Nd model age of 2.03 Ga, providing control for the southern limit of the pre-1800 Ma craton. U–Pb ages for several representative Paleoproterozoic basement samples from Nebraska and Kansas are included in Tables 1 and 2 (Kansas ages from Van Schmus et al., 1993a,b). Two samples, NBBU-01 and NBDA-02, are shown in Fig. 3F; their U–Pb ages of 1771 \(\pm 9\) and 1802 \(\pm 4\) Ma are clearly in the range of other northern Yavapai terrane rocks. The \(T_{\text{DM}}\) ages of 1.87 Ga for NBBU-01 and 1.90 Ga for NBBF-01 (Table 4) are also typical of northern Yavapai terrane rocks (DePaolo, 1981b; Nelson and DePaolo, 1985; Ball and Farmer, 1991).

The ca. 65 Ma Manson impact structure in north-central Iowa was drilled as part of an extensive study (Koeberl and Anderson, 1996). Some of the breccia sampled in drill core includes xenoliths of Precambrian basement rock ranging from granite to gneiss. All of these samples are severely altered, with most of the feldspar converted to clay minerals. We obtained one sample of a graphitic granite xenolith at 515 in. depth from drill hole IA-M8 and extracted zircons from it.
SIMS U–Pb data for the zircons from this xenolith are relatively discordant and the grains have generally high U contents (between 1000 and 4000 ppm). The greater discordance for IA-M8 samples compared to analyses for SDUN-01 and MNFI-01 may be a combination of both the higher U contents and thermal/strain disturbance during the impact which produced the Manson structure. In any event, eight spot analyses from seven zircon grains yielded an age of 1705 ± 30 Ma. Although this uncertainty is relatively large, it is clear that none of the zircon have ages >1800 Ma, consistent with our interpretation that geon 17 basement (rather than Penokean basement) occurs throughout northern Iowa.

A major component of the exposed Precambrian basement in Wisconsin south of the proposed SLtz boundary is comprised of the ca. 1.76 Ga granite–rhyolite suite (Smith, 1983). These felsic volcanic rocks and epizonal granite plutons formed 1750 Ma to 1760 Ma (Van Schmus et al., 1975a; Van Schmus, 1978; Holm et al., 2005), but their highly evolved, silicic compositions indicate that they do not represent juvenile orogenic basement. One of us (Nelson) analyzed several of these samples for Sm–Nd; the results are included in Table 4 and shown in Fig. 2. Although the resulting model ages cannot delineate between geon 18 (Penokean) or geon 17 (≈Yavapai) for the age of the crust underlying the rhyolites and epizonal granites south of the SLtz, they clearly indicate an absence of Archean crust and confirm the southerly and easterly limits of the Marshfield terrane.

Projecting the geon 17–geon 16 boundary north-eastward is also difficult due to cover from the Michigan Basin. One 1.47 Ga basement sample in Michigan (MIGT-01) yields a Sm–Nd TDM age of 1.9 Ga (Figs. 1 and 2), similar to those in southern Wisconsin. Farther east, two drill holes into Precambrian basement under Manitoulin Island intersected a coarse-grained granite (ONMI-01) and felsic gneiss (ONMI-02). Van Schmus et al. (1975b) determined an age of ca. 1.50 Ga for the granite, indicating that it is a major pluton similar to the Wolf River batholith in Wisconsin. SIMS analyses by two of us (Schneider and Dodson) of zircons from the gneissic sample under Manitoulin Island yielded relatively concordant data, and 25 spot analyses on 20 zircon grains yielded an average U–Pb age of 1714 ± 10 Ma (Fig. 4). Within the cluster of data, several grains suggest that the protolith age for the gneiss could be ca. 1.75 Ga, which is consistent with other data in the region (discussed further below). Sm–Nd TDM ages for samples from these drill holes (Table 4) range from 2.0 to 2.3 Ga, similar to those found from other Paleoproterozoic basement adjacent to the Superior or Wyoming craton. Another 1500 Ma granite exposed at the surface on North Benjamin Island, north of Manitoulin Island (VS62-13; Van Schmus et al., 1975b), yields a similar Sm–Nd TDM age of 2.02 Ga (Table 4), precluding derivation from Archean crust and indicating that the Archean–Proterozoic boundary must pass between it and the mainland a few km to the north.

### 3.4. 40Ar/39Ar thermochronometry

Hornblende and biotite were separated from basement drill core samples SDUN-01 and MIFI-01 (BO-1) for 40Ar/39Ar age spectrum analysis. Size fractions of >150 μm for the target minerals were obtained using standard crushing, heavy liquids, a Frantz magnetic separator, and careful handpicking. Mineral separates were loaded into machined Al discs and irradiated with flux monitor Fish Canyon Tuff sanidine (27.84 Ma; Deino and Potts, 1990) for 100 h in the L-67 position at the 2 MW Ford Reactor at the University of Michigan.

Isotopic analyses were conducted at New Mexico Tech using a MAP 215-50 mass spectrometer on line with an automated all-metal extraction system. The flux monitor crystals were placed in a copper planchet within an ultrahigh vacuum argon extraction system and fused with a 10 W Synrad CO2 continuous laser. Evolved gases were purified for 2 min using a SAES GP-50 getter operated at ∼450°C. J-Factors were determined to a precision of 0.1% (2σ) by analyzing a minimum of four single-crystal aliquots from each of 3–4 radial positions around the irradiation sample trays. The unknown minerals were step-heated in a double-vacuum Mo resistance furnace; hornblende was heated for 9 min and biotite was heated for 8 min. The gas was scrubbed of reactive species during heating with a SAES GP-50 getter at 6–8 min at 450°C. Following heating, the sample gas was further cleaned with another GP-50 for 3 min for biotite and 8 min for hornblende. Argon isotopic compositions for both the samples and monitors were determined using the MAP 215-50 mass spectrometer equipped with an electron multiplier with overall sensitivity ranging from 2.66 × 10⁻¹⁶ mol/pA.

Extraction system and mass spectrometer blanks and backgrounds were measured numerous times throughout the course of the analyses. Typical blanks (including mass spectrometer backgrounds) were 1400, 18, 0.3, 2.7, and 4.8 × 10⁻¹⁷ moles at masses 40, 39, 38, 37, and 36, respectively, for furnace temperatures below
1300 °C. Correction factors for interfering nuclear reactions were determined using K-glass and CaF<sub>2</sub> and are as follows: \( \frac{^{40}\text{Ar}}{^{39}\text{Ar}} \text{K} = 0.0256 \pm 0.0015; \) \( \frac{^{36}\text{Ar}}{^{37}\text{Ar}} \text{Ca} = 0.00027 \pm 0.00001; \) \( \frac{^{39}\text{Ar}}{^{37}\text{Ar}} \text{Ca} = 0.00070 \pm 0.00005. \) All errors are reported at the 2σ confidence level and the decay constants and isotopic abundances are those suggested by Steiger and Jäger (1977). The plateau ages shown represent the integrated ages calculated for the relatively flat portion of each age spectrum (using the concentration of \(^{39}\text{Ar}\) to weight both individual ages and errors). This rationale assumes that the steps chosen do not contain excess \(^{40}\text{Ar}\) and have not been highly affected by Ar recoil into alteration phases such as chlorite. The calculated plateau age uncertainties are relatively small because analytical precision in the age of each heating step is high. A plateau age is defined as the part of an age spectrum composed of contiguous increments representing >70% of gas released of which results in concordant ages; a preferred age fails to meet the 70% of \(^{39}\text{Ar}\) gas released criterion of a plateau age. The K/Ca plots are determined from Ca-derived \(^{37}\text{Ar}\) and K-derived \(^{39}\text{Ar}\), of which the flattest parts of the age spectra generally correspond to relatively constant K/Ca values, whereas younger apparent ages yield relatively high K/Ca values (Marcoline et al., 1999). The age and K/Ca spectra for the samples are presented in Fig. 5 and the analytical results are in Table 5.

![Fig. 5. \(^{40}\text{Ar}^{39}\text{Ar}\) spectra for hornblende and biotite from SDUN-01, and hornblende from MNFI-01 (MNGS drill hole BO-1). See text for discussion.](image)
Table 5
Ar–Ar data for selected drill hole samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>40Ar/39Ar</th>
<th>37Ar/39Ar</th>
<th>36Ar/39Ar (×10⁻³)</th>
<th>39ArK (×10⁻¹⁵ mol)</th>
<th>K/Ca</th>
<th>40Ar* (%)</th>
<th>39Ar (%)</th>
<th>Age (Ma)</th>
<th>±1σ (Ma)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-UN-01, Biotite, 0.87 mg, J = 0.01003 ± 0.22%, D = 1.0055 ± 0.001, NM-188H, Lab# 55770-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1159.1</td>
<td>0.0694</td>
<td>3729.5</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>199.1</td>
<td>0.0175</td>
<td>284.1</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1384.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>147.4</td>
<td>0.0060</td>
<td>54.22</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1516.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D*</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
<td>5.909</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>273.7</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>1549.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E*</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>139.4</td>
<td>0.0022</td>
<td>0.4951</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>231.1</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>1576.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F*</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>0.0271</td>
<td>1.459</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>1557.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G*</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>0.0321</td>
<td>0.9519</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>1558.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H*</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>137.3</td>
<td>0.0136</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>1559.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I*</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>0.0186</td>
<td>1.673</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>1557.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J*</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>138.8</td>
<td>0.0395</td>
<td>0.9700</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>1571.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K*</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>138.7</td>
<td>0.3501</td>
<td>0.8587</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>1570.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L*</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>140.5</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>8.883</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1568.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated age ±1σ</td>
<td>&amp; n = 12</td>
<td>Sum 233.3</td>
<td>Avg. 13.9</td>
<td>0.0 K₂O = 10.3%</td>
<td>1566.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plateau ±1σ</td>
<td>Steps D–L</td>
<td>n = 9</td>
<td>MSWD=24.6</td>
<td>Sum 230.2</td>
<td>Avg. 156.9</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD-UN-01, Hornblende, 3.38 mg, J = 0.010073 ± 0.15%, D = 1.0044 ± 0.001, NM-188G, Lab# 55769-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>299.6</td>
<td>1.819</td>
<td>651.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1321</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>154.1</td>
<td>0.9866</td>
<td>33.31</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1619.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>150.3</td>
<td>5.214</td>
<td>4.892</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>1659.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D*</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>148.5</td>
<td>5.433</td>
<td>2.386</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>1651.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E*</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>148.1</td>
<td>5.426</td>
<td>1.991</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>1649.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F*</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>147.3</td>
<td>7.814</td>
<td>2.350</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>1646.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G*</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>147.9</td>
<td>5.289</td>
<td>2.430</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>1647.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>145.8</td>
<td>5.102</td>
<td>5.342</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>1625.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>148.3</td>
<td>5.491</td>
<td>3.601</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>1648.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>6.512</td>
<td>2.542</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>1663.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>219.8</td>
<td>4.922</td>
<td>301.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated age ±1σ</td>
<td>&amp; n = 11</td>
<td>Sum 56.7</td>
<td>Avg. 0.091</td>
<td>0.001 K₂O = 0.64%</td>
<td>1645.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plateau ±1σ</td>
<td>Steps D–G</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>MSWD = 1.41</td>
<td>Sum 34.8</td>
<td>Avg. 0.090</td>
<td>0.015 Plateau steps 61.3</td>
<td>1649.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO-1-1335, Hornblende, 3.74 mg, J = 0.010046 ± 0.15%, D = 1.0055 ± 0.001, NM-188G, Lab# 55768-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>9650.3</td>
<td>34.03</td>
<td>30359.7</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3753</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>4511.1</td>
<td>55.22</td>
<td>13837.6</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3059</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1346.3</td>
<td>60.10</td>
<td>4124.0</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>40Ar/39Ar</th>
<th>37Ar/39Ar</th>
<th>36Ar/39Ar (×10⁻³)</th>
<th>39ArK (×10⁻¹⁵ mol K/Ca)</th>
<th>40Ar* (%)</th>
<th>39Ar (%)</th>
<th>Age (Ma) ± 1σ (Ma)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>103.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1510.5 ± 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E*</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1510.5 ± 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1510.5 ± 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>110.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1510.5 ± 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H*</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>115.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1510.5 ± 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>117.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1510.5 ± 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>132.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1510.5 ± 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>134.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1510.5 ± 5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Integrated age ± 1σ: n = 12 Sum 21.5 Avg. 0.024 ± 0.000

Correction factors:

- (39Ar/37Ar)Ca = 0.00067 ± 0.00001
- (36Ar/37Ar)Ca = 0.000274 ± 0.000002
- (38Ar/39Ar)K = 0.0124
- (40Ar/39Ar)K = 0.0233 ± 0.0012

Hornblende and biotite from sample SDUN-01 (Fig. 5) yield respectable step-heating results that define meaningful plateau ages. Hornblende steps D–G, representing about 60% of the 39Ar gas released yielded a preferred age of 1650 ± 2 Ma that is only slightly older than the integrated age of 1645 ± 1 Ma and discordant to the U–Pb metamorphic zircon age of 1641 ± 10 Ma reported above. Biotite steps D–L, constituting over 95% of the 39Ar gas released, yielded a well-defined plateau age of 1562 ± 4 Ma that is essentially indistinguishable from the integrated age of 1566 ± 2 Ma. Hornblende separated from drill core sample BO-1 reveals a more complex age spectrum with anomalous initial and final age increments probably due to impurities or alteration. However, three increments (E, H, and I), constituting over 80% of the total 39Ar gas released, yield a meaningful plateau age of 1667 ± 8 Ma.

4. Implications for distribution of Archean and Paleoproterozoic terranes

Below we use new and existing data to delineate the nature and extent of Paleoproterozoic crustal terranes across the North American Midcontinent. Specifically, we focus on formation of geon 17 (≈ Yavapai-interval) crust in the northern Midcontinent (south of the Spirit Lake tectonic zone), formation of geon 16 (≈ Mazatzal-interval) crust in the central Midcontinent, thermal and deformational overprinting due to geon 16 orogenesis, and correlation of these to the southwest and the northeast.

Because of sparse field and geochronologic control in the Midcontinent region, we obviously cannot correlate to well-documented regions to the east or west on a specific event-by-event basis. Instead, we are using the better exposed and well understood Paleoproterozoic terranes of the southwestern U.S. as a major reference base from which to extrapolate general, first-order relationships. Our discussion is not meant to convey a model whereby large, isochronous Yavapai or Mazatzal super-terrane docked along the southern margin of Laurentia, but rather, it recognizes a framework in which several smaller arcs were generated, trapped, and accreted at various times during geon 17 and geon 16, with allowances for limited areal extents of individual sub-terranes and a variety of ages within the broad time-scales of “Yavapai” and “Mazatzal” orogenesis. Finally, we recognize that events within these time frames may have been somewhat time-transgressive from one side of the continent to another.
4.1. Geon 17 (≈Yavapai) crust west of the Mississippi River

The Spirit Lake tectonic zone in the northern Midcontinent and the Cheyenne Belt in the western U.S. both mark the southern limit of Archean and/or Penokean/Trans-Hudson basement in Laurentia. South of these boundaries most, if not all, U–Pb ages obtained up to now are younger than 1800 Ma, with geon 17 ages dominant in the northern Midcontinent (Nebraska, northern Iowa, NW half of Kansas, SE Minnesota, and SE South Dakota) and geon 16 ages pervasive in the central Midcontinent (Missouri, SE half of Kansas and presumably also SE Iowa, although there are no data). Key data relevant to this conclusion are (a) U–Pb zircon data for SDUN-01, MNFI-01 (BO-1), and NBKP-01 which yield crystallization ages of ca. 1730 Ma, ca. 1760 Ma, and ca. 1775 Ma, respectively; (b) ion microprobe analysis of zircons from SDUN-01 which confirm the geon 17 age for that locality; (c) zircon separated from gneissic xenoliths in drill core from the Manson impact structure in Iowa which confirm the geon 17 age for that locality; (c) zircon data for SDUN-01, MNFI-01 (BO-1), and NBKP-01 which yield crystallization ages of ca. 1760 Ma, and ca. 1775 Ma, respectively; (d) late Paleoproterozoic Sm–Nd model ages (DePaolo, 1981b; Nelson and DePaolo, 1985) and, in particular, with northern Yavapai rocks just south of the Cheyenne Belt (1.88–2.11 Ga; Ball and Farmer, 1991). These data, plus other data from basement south of the SLtz (Tables 1 and 2; Fig. 1), yield no geon 18 (≈Penokean or Trans-Hudson) ages. Thus, all presently available U–Pb data support our interpretation that geon 17 (≈Yavapai) orogenic crust extends eastward from Colorado through Nebraska and into SE South Dakota, northern Iowa, and SE Minnesota (Fig. 1); significant geon 18 (≈Penokean) crust may be entirely absent west of the Mississippi River (see below). Discordant zircons from sample SDCL-01 from Vermillion, SD yield a poorly defined geon 17 age (Fig. 3C) with a \( T_{DM} \) age of 2.08 Ga, indicating that the SLtz probably trends just north of Vermillion in this region (Fig. 1).

Several samples in NW Iowa and SW Minnesota yield geon 17 ages, but lie north of the SLtz: IALY-07, IAOS-01, and MNJK-01 (Tables 1 and 2; Fig. 1). Sample IALY-07 overlies rocks yielding Archean U–Pb ages, and it has an Archean \( T_{DM} \) age; IAOS-01 and MNJK-01 have intermediate \( T_{DM} \) ages of 2.30 and 2.20 Ga, respectively. We suggest that geon 17 magmatism was in part generated beneath Archean crust, perhaps due to north-dipping subduction in this region. Two other samples in South Dakota (SDDA-01, SDMO-02) give geon 18 (Penokean or Trans-Hudson) ages of 1871 ± 16 and 1820 ± 8 Ma with Archean \( T_{DM} \) ages of 2.55 and 2.59 Ga, respectively, indicating that geon 18 magmatism within the Archean basement can also be found north of the SLtz.

4.2. Connection (?) of the Spirit Lake tectonic zone with the Cheyenne Belt

There are several issues which make it problematic that the Spirit Lake tectonic zone can be continued westward directly into the Cheyenne Belt. One of these, just mentioned above, is that the Archean basement north of the Spirit Lake tectonic zone in South Dakota, Iowa, and Minnesota was intruded by granitic rocks during both geon 18 and geon 17. Both of these occurrences imply north-dipping subduction under the Superior Province in the northern Midcontinent, first during geon 18 (Penokean or Trans-Hudson) and then during geon 17 (≈Yavapai) terrane convergence. A further implication is that any geon 18 crust originally present in the vicinity of the Spirit Lake tectonic zone has been removed in one way or another (rifting, transcurrent faulting?). These relationships are at variance with those in Wyoming, since geon 18 or geon 17 plutons are absent north of the Cheyenne Belt, and the suture is inferred from this and from geophysical imaging to be south-dipping (cf. Houston et al., 1993; Karlstrom et al., 2005). Thus, there must be some kind of tectonic discontinuity between the Cheyenne Belt and the Spirit Lake tectonic zone.

The Precambrian basement in the central part of North Dakota and South Dakota has major north–south trending geophysical features that continue northward into the exposed Trans-Hudson orogen in Canada (cf. Finn and Sims, 2005). Klasner and King (1986, 1990) and Sims et al. (1993) argued convincingly that these trends represent southward extension of the Trans-Hudson orogen into the north-central United States. Although there are a few geochronological data which support this interpretation, they do not provide precise constraints on the full southward extent of Trans-Hudson orogenic crust. Thus, there is considerable leeway in southern South Dakota with which to provide alternate interpretations for the connection between the Cheyenne Belt and the Spirit Lake tectonic zone. Suffice it to say, that at some point there must be juxtaposition of geon 17 crust against geon 18 crust, whether it be eastward continuation of the Cheyenne Belt, westward continuation of the Spirit Lake tectonic zone (with or without link-up), or some complicated...
connection between the two with one or more fault offsets.

4.3. Eastward continuation of Yavapai crust into Ontario

Archean basement is exposed along the north shore of Lake Huron, underlying Huronian Supergroup metasedimentary rocks. A large ca. 1500 Ma plutonic complex underlies Manitoulin Island in the North Channel of Lake Huron (MI, Fig. 1). This pluton is only known from drill core, but the smaller, coeval Croker Island complex (CI, Fig. 1) is exposed on a group of islands between drill core, but the smaller, coeval Croker Island complex (Van Schmus et al., 1975b). New Sm–Nd model ages from granite in the Croker Island complex (VS62-13) and the granite of Manitoulin Island (ONMI-01) yield model ages of 2.2–2.3 Ga (Table 4). Thus, Archean basement does not occur significantly farther south than the north shore of Lake Huron in this area. These data are insufficient, however, to determine if the host to the granitizes is Huronian, Penokean, or Yavapai.

Zircons from Manitoulin core ONMI-02 yield a SIMS zircon date of 1714 ± 10 Ma (Table 3; Fig. 4). This age is very similar to ages of 1742 ± 1 and 1732 ± 7 Ma (van Breeman and Davidson, 1988) from the Killarney magmatic complex just to the east, along the Grenville Front (“K” in Figs. 1 and 2). There are several other geon 17 plutons on both sides of the Grenville Front tectonic zone in this area (Davidson et al., 1992; Davidson and van Breeman, 1994), but geon 18 metamorphic or plutonic ages are absent (Piercey et al., 2007). Thus, these ages argue for continuation of geon 17 basement northeastward to the Grenville Front in Ontario, north of Lake Huron (van Breeman and Davidson, 1988). Crustal studies in the Grenville Province further demonstrate that geon 17 crust continues through Ontario and Quebec (Barilia) to Labrador (Makkovikia) as recognizable terranes (cf. Rivers, 1997; Dickin, 2000).

Poor exposure and strong overprinting by geon 14 magmatism severely hinders our knowledge of the deformational history of Paleoproterozoic crust in the Lake Huron region of Ontario. Historically, the effects of Penokean deformation have been thought to dominate the region. However, recent geochronologic and thermochronologic results indicate that a geon 18 overprint is lacking (Piercey et al., 2007). The oldest metamorphic ages revealed by in situ monazite U–Th–total Pb geochronology are ca. 1800 Ma, with a strong geon 17 and a local geon 14 to geon 15 signature.

4.4. Southern extent of Yavapai crust in the Midcontinent region

A major implication of defining the SLtz as the southern limit of Archean and Penokean-interval crust involves the ca. 1750–1760 Ma granites and rhyolites of central Wisconsin. These rocks (Smith, 1983; Van Schmus, 1978) lie south of the SLtz and, under this interpretation, should not be underlain by Penokean-interval crust. This implies that these rhyolites and epizonal granites were derived from partial melting of underlying, newly generated, early geon 17 crust, perhaps due to rapid melting during the development of a ‘hot’ orogen (Hyndman et al., 2005). Sm–Nd model ages for rocks of this suite (Table 4) yield TDM ages from 1.91 to 1.94 Ga, which is fully compatible with this interpretation (they do not, however, rule out a Penokean-interval component in the magma). A similar younger, possibly analogous, situation occurs in SE Missouri where ca. 1470 Ma granite–rhyolite rocks have TDM ages of 1.47–1.53 Ga and apparently overlie juvenile ca. 1500 Ma basement (Van Schmus et al., 1996).

Yavapai-interval basement rocks are found throughout Nebraska and in two locations in Kansas: NE Kansas (1.78 Ga) and SW Kansas (1.72 Ga), but no geon 17 rocks have been reported from Missouri or southern Iowa. Thus, the southern limit of geon 17 (≈Yavapai) basement probably extends from New Mexico (Jemez lineament; CD-ROM Working Group, 2002; Karlstrom et al., 2005), through SW Kansas to NE Kansas, and northeastward toward southern Lake Michigan. There are few constraints on its exact location, although the NICE Working Group (2007) argues for locating it in southern Wisconsin near the Illinois border. Terranes of geon 16 age also occur within the eastern Grenville Province, notably as “Labradoria” (cf. Rivers, 1997; Dickin, 2000), showing that the geon 17–geon 16 (≈Yavapai–Mazatzal) accretionary couplet was a transcontinental feature.

4.5. Mazatzal deformation and metamorphism in the Midcontinent region

The ca. 1700 Ma Baraboo Interval quartzites which blanket the Penokean and geon 17 (≈Yavapai) terranes of the north-central U.S. were deformed during geon 16 (≈Mazatzal) orogenesis (Holm et al., 1998b). Thermochronologic results from the Penokean orogen of northern Wisconsin reveal a greenschist-facies metamorphic overprint (between 300 and 500 °C) related to arc accretion (Romano et al., 2000; Holm et al., 2007); 40Ar/39Ar amphibole ages presented here reveal that a
significant region of the geon 17 (≈Yavapai) terrane in Iowa and southern Minnesota was also metamorphosed to amphibolite-facies during geon 16. In contrast, K/Ar ages from Archean basement rocks of the Minnesota River Valley promontory (just north of the SLtz) cluster around 2200–2400 Ma (Goldich, 1968). More recently, Hanley et al. (2006) obtained a ∼1615 Ma Ar/Ar age on detrital muscovite from the Sioux quartzite suggesting limited isotopic resetting due to Mazatzal age fluid migration just north of the SLtz. The steep gradient in thermochronologic ages across the SLtz suggests that the Archean crust comprising the promontory was a persistent stronghold in the region that remained largely unaffected by orogenic effects since its formation.

The 1560 Ma biotite cooling age reported here for SDUN-01 is somewhat younger than the cluster of 1575–1615 Ma biotite 40Ar/39Ar ages obtained from lower grade Precambrian bedrock in northern Wisconsin (Romano et al., 2000). These biotite ages may represent delayed cooling following Mazatzal metamorphism or partial resetting associated with younger ‘anorogenic’ melt production.

5. Proposed Paleoproterozoic tectonic evolution

The recognition of a Yavapai-interval terrane in the upper Midcontinent and a corresponding reduction in the southward extent of Penokean-interval crust must be considered in tectonic evolutionary models of the region. Recently, Holm et al. (2005) explained the dominant 1800–1750 Ma magmatism and metamorphic overprint in northern Wisconsin and northern Michigan as being caused by orogenic collapse of overthickened Penokean crust above a north-directed Yavapai-interval subduct-

---

Fig. 6. Schematic north-south cross-sections depicting the possible Paleoproterozoic accretionary history along the southern margin of Laurentia. (A) Initial Pembine-Wausau arc formation above a newly formed subduction zone and adjacent to the exotic(?) Archean Marshfield terrane. (B) Arc/terrane collision and thrusting along the Niagara Fault zone (NFZ) and Eau Pleine shear zone (EPsz) during the Penokean orogeny, and incipient lateral displacement within the Marshfield terrane along the future Spirit Lake tectonic zone (SLtz). (C) Shortly following subduction flip (Holm et al., 2005), Yavapai convergence facilitated orogenic collapse and formation of the gneiss dome corridor (GDC; Schneider et al., 2004), and generation of juvenile arc crust. (D) Temporary cessation of plate convergence or outboard migration of the trench lead to relative stabilization of localized crustal lithosphere and deposition of the Baraboo Interval quartzites. (E) Renewed subduction, formation of arc crust and ultimate accretion during the Mazatzal orogeny deformed the overlying quartzite units (Holm et al., 1998b) and reheated crust in the southern extent of the region (Romano et al., 2000).
ing lithosphere. In that model, post-Penokean southward growth of Laurentia occurred only by geon 16 terrane accretion of a Mazatzal-interval arc(s). Here, we propose a new history of the tectonic growth and evolution of southern Laurentia based on geochronologic data presented in this paper and on the new terrane map of the upper Midcontinent (Fig. 1).

Penokean arc formation at 1900–1860 Ma (Fig. 6A) and arc or microcontinent accretion ending at ca. 1830 Ma (Fig. 6B) resulted in foreland deformation and sedimentation along the southern continental margin of Laurentia. The Niagara Fault and Eau Pleine shear zone (Fig. 1) represent paleosutures from this stage. The original volume of juvenile and ancient crust accreted during Penokean orogenesis is not known, although its preservation only within a continental margin emplacement (Fig. 1) suggests at least some removal of accreted crust, perhaps by strike-slip translation during margin truncation shortly after Penokean orogenesis. Considerable strike-slip motion along accretionary margins is common and we speculate this process may account for the recent discovery of evidence for latest Archean and geon 18 rocks in central Colorado, south of the Archean Wyoming Province (Hill and Bickford, 2001).

We propose that subduction flip (from south-dipping to north-dipping) following Penokean accretion (Holm et al., 2005) and post-Penokean marginal modification resulted in geon 17 magmatic activity into the Penokean–Archean basement and rapid accretion of geon 17 (~Yavapai) arc material along the southern Laurentian margin (Fig. 6C) in the Great Lakes region. In this model, suturing occurred along the Spirit Lake tectonic zone simultaneous with exhumation of gneiss dome corridor rocks north of the older Niagara suture (Schneider et al., 2004). Tectonic exhumation in the north was associated with crustal thinning of the overthickened Penokean crust, whereas accretion to the south accounted for thickening of newly created thin juvenile crust. The end result of geon 17 orogenesis was the creation of young stabilized crust of relative normal thickness. Subsequent, temporary cessation of tectonic activity along the southward growing margin thus set the stage for deposition of ultramature quartz arenites in an area of subdued topographic relief (Fig. 6D; Dott, 1983). The Paleoproterozoic accretionary growth of the north-central Midcontinent culminated with geon 16 (~Mazatzal) orogenesis (Fig. 6E). The dominant effects of this event are best represented by major south-verging folding in Baraboo Interval quartzites, by emplacement of several geon 16 plutons within geon 17 crust (cf. Fig. 1; Van Schmus et al., 1993a,b), by amphibolite-facies metamorphism of much of the adjacent geon 17 terrane, and by greenschist-facies metamorphism further north in basement rocks underlying the region of Mazatzal foreland deformation (Holm et al., 1998b).

The presence of geon 16 plutons in Nebraska and Kansas, north of the geon 16–geon 17 boundary (Fig. 1), along with the foreland deformation and metamorphism in Wisconsin, are consistent with north-dipping subduction in the Midcontinent region during geon 16 (Fig. 6E). This is in variance with current models for the Mazatzal–Yavapai boundary in the southwest (cf. Karlstrom et al., 2005), which infer a south-dipping suture, and may indicate a tectonic discontinuity similar to that between the Cheyenne Belt and the Spirit Lake tectonic zone, mentioned above. Geon 16 plutons do occur in Colorado and southern Wyoming, however (e.g. Reed et al., 1993), implying either that subduction polarity was occasionally north-dipping or that there must have been coeval geon 16 extension in the northern (Yavapai) plate. Direct evidence for polarity in the Midcontinent is lacking, and resolution of this problem will have to await further studies. Finally, it should be noted that geon 16 (~Mazatzal) plutons in the Midcontinent region range to somewhat younger ages than in Arizona and New Mexico. This is probably due in part to variations in timing of orogenic pulses along strike, from Arizona to Labrador, and in part to younging-to-the-southeast variations in the timing of accretionary processes.
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