

Interpretation of Lunar Topography: Impact Cratering and Surface Roughness

Thesis by

Margaret A. Rosenberg

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy



California Institute of Technology

Pasadena, California

2014

(Defended May 23, 2014)

© 2014

Margaret A. Rosenberg

All Rights Reserved

The impact theory applies a single process to the entire series, correlating size variation with form variation in a rational way... In fine, it unites and organizes as a rational and coherent whole the varied strange appearances whose assemblage on our neighbor's face cannot have been fortuitous.

—**G. K. Gilbert, 1893**

She died early, but thus saved upon herself the marks of youth. She is not an aged, decrepit world, since the dead do not age; she is an embalmed mummy, and by her outer appearance we can judge the appearance of other worlds at the beginning of Creation.

—**E. J. Öpik, 1916**

The origin of the principal morphological features on the lunar surface—the circular or subcircular craters ranging from centimeters to hundreds of kilometers in diameter—remains a controversial subject. On the one hand the countless number of craters attests to an intense bombardment of the moon by interplanetary debris over eons of time. But on the other hand there is ample evidence for extensive volcanic activity that many workers argue has been active either directly or indirectly as a major crater-forming process. Undoubtedly, both exogenic and endogenic processes have been in action and the controversy now revolves around the relative significance of the two agents for crater formation.

—**D. E. Gault, 1970**

Acknowledgements

I have been extraordinarily lucky during my time at Caltech to have had friends and mentors who support my broad range of interests and who have, at times relentlessly, insisted that I see them through. The last seven years have been a time of great professional and personal growth for me, as a scientist, an aspiring historian of science, and a communicator, and for that I have a great many people to acknowledge.

First, my advisor in GPS, Oded Aharonson, has been an excellent mentor to me and unfailing in his support, both of my work in planetary science and of my interest in the history of science. He has often gone out of his way to check in with me, never hesitating to let me know when I've met or even exceeded expectations, and I can't thank him enough for providing that occasional boost of confidence. Over the years we have developed a frank conversation style that I think has served us well, both in person and separated by many time zones. I am happy to count him as a friend as well as an an advisor, and delighted to have found a kindred spirit when it comes to proper grammar.

I have been very fortunate to work with Re'em Sari on many pieces of this dissertation. His clarity of vision and talent for getting to the heart of the matter at hand are both impressive and inspiring, and I have learned a great deal from the time I've spent working with him.

The grad students in Oded's group that have gone before me, Troy Hudson, Kevin Lewis, Margarita Marinova, and Alex Hayes, have provided invaluable advice along the way, both before and after their own respective thesis defenses. Thank you also to Aaron Wolf, Steve Chemtob, Michelle Selvans, Melanie Channon, Gretchen Keppel-Aleks, Sonja Graves, Colette Salyk, Dan Bower, June Wicks, Xi Zhang, Zane Selvans, and many other intelligent and talented GPS grad students who have helped me, both in and out of the office. In many ways, I judge the measure of my success in

planetary science by the standards they have set, and I've never had far to look to find the best role models anyone could ask for.

I am indebted to Moti Feingold in HPS for helping me to take my fledgling interest in the history of science and turn it into a project I can truly be proud of. Bridging disciplines is not easy, and he has been unwavering in patience and encouragement. It has sometimes been difficult to balance the time spent on each aspect of my academic work, and Moti has always provided a clear head, a positive outlook, and wealth of knowledge to keep me on the right path. I can't thank him enough.

Likewise, I have to thank the members of my thesis committee, David Stevenson, Andy Ingersoll, and Mike Gurnis, for their help and support. The administrators in the GPS office, especially Irma Black, Margaret Carlos, and Nora Oshima, have been very helpful to me over the years. I also thank Felicia Hunt, Natalie Gilmore, and Joe Shepherd in the Graduate Office, as well as Mary Morley and Tess Legaspi in the Registrar's Office, for helping me find the best path forward to achieve my goals at Caltech.

It may sound strange to credit an extracurricular activity with anything so weighty as character development, but I owe much of the personal growth I've experienced over the past few years to my participation in Caltech theater: TACIT, EXPLiCIT, and Caltech Playreaders. A play is a funny thing. It takes an incredible amount of effort by a great many people to put together a production, and, start to finish, it only lasts a few weeks before it's over. But it's the opportunity to create something from nothing in such a short time, the pulling together of everyone involved—and at Caltech, that means every person has a lab to return to, a problem set to finish, or a spacecraft to monitor—that makes it worthwhile. Brian Brophy has been a tireless advocate for theater on campus, and Caltech is lucky to have him. Kathryn Bikle has generously allowed me to assist her in directing two summer Shakespeare plays, and I have learned so much from her example. David and Ella Seal, Todd Brun, Cara King, Kim Becker, Ann Lindsey, Teagan Wall, Kim Boddy, Ben Sveinbjornsson, Doug Smith, Sarah Slotznick, Ben Solish, Holly Bender, Miranda Stewart, Ashley Stroupe, Kari Hodge, Amit Lakhanpal—you all have made such a tremendous difference in my life.

I also have Caltech theater to thank for landing me the amazing opportunity to produce *The PHD*

Movie with Jorge Cham, a lucky break in many ways that has opened my eyes to the possibilities of science communication. I was incredibly shy as a child, and I still cannot quite believe that I see a role for myself as a communicator, but working with Jorge has taught me to keep creating, to accept and learn from feedback, and to trust my instincts. I am so grateful for everything I've learned from Jorge and from everyone else involved in the movie and PHD TV, including (but not limited to) Laurence Yeung, Crystal Dilworth, Alex Lockwood, Matt Siegler, Roser Segura Flor, Vahe Gabuchian, Zachary Abbott, and Zach Tobin. Thank you!

I credit my parents with inspiring and fostering my love of learning, and I am grateful to them and to my sisters, Sharon and Amanda, for all of the support they've provided throughout my time in graduate school. I am blessed to have gained another set of parents almost four years ago, and I thank them for welcoming me into their family. When I first moved to Pasadena, it was comforting to know that my Aunt Judith and Uncle Brad would be so close, and that my grandparents would be there as well for many months out of the year. I have greatly enjoyed getting to know them and my cousins, Zach and Jackson, and I am incredibly proud that Grandad will be at my defense. I wish that Nonny could have been here too, and I dedicate this thesis to her. She taught me the importance of living life to the fullest, starting new adventures, and finding happiness in the relationships we build with others.

Above all, I thank my husband, Jonathan Wolfe, without whom none of this could have happened. He is the real deal: a true partner, an honest critic, and a good friend. Thanks to him (and to our schnauzer, Simon, of course!), Pasadena has become my home.

The MIT Shakespeare Ensemble has a tradition of reciting a quote from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* just before the curtain goes up, and I think it's only fitting that I continue that tradition now, so here goes: "Take pains, be perfect. Adieu!"

Abstract

This work seeks to understand past and present surface conditions on the Moon using two different but complementary approaches: topographic analysis using high-resolution elevation data from recent spacecraft missions and forward modeling of the dominant agent of lunar surface modification, impact cratering. The first investigation focuses on global surface roughness of the Moon, using a variety of statistical parameters to explore slopes at different scales and their relation to competing geological processes. We find that highlands topography behaves as a nearly self-similar fractal system on scales of order 100 meters, and there is a distinct change in this behavior above and below approximately 1 km. Chapter 2 focuses this analysis on two localized regions: the lunar south pole, including Shackleton crater, and the large mare-filled basins on the nearside of the Moon. In particular, we find that differential slope, a statistical measure of roughness related to the curvature of a topographic profile, is extremely useful in distinguishing between geologic units. Chapter 3 introduces a numerical model that simulates a cratered terrain by emplacing features of characteristic shape geometrically, allowing for tracking of both the topography and surviving rim fragments over time. The power spectral density of cratered terrains is estimated numerically from model results and benchmarked against a 1-dimensional analytic model. The power spectral slope, β , is observed to vary predictably with the size-frequency distribution of craters, as well as the crater shape. The final chapter employs the rim-tracking feature of the cratered terrain model to analyze the evolving size-frequency distribution of craters under different criteria for identifying “visible” craters from surviving rim fragments. A geometric bias exists that systematically over counts large or small craters, depending on the rim fraction required to count a given feature as either visible or erased.

Contents

Acknowledgements	iv
Abstract	vii
List of Figures	x
List of Tables	xii
List of Acronyms	xiv
1 Introduction	2
1.1 The Lunar Topography	2
1.1.1 Interpreting Cratered Terrains	3
1.1.2 Surface Roughness	5
1.1.3 Planetary Surface Topography from Laser Altimetry	6
1.2 Chapter Overview	8
2 Global Surface Slopes and Roughness from the Lunar Orbiter Laser Altimeter	11
2.1 Introduction	12
2.2 Topography Data	14
2.3 Global Surface Roughness of the Moon	14
2.3.1 RMS and median slopes	14
2.3.2 Median differential slope	21
2.3.3 Hurst exponent	24

2.4	Conclusions	32
2.5	Acknowledgements	32
3	Geologic Applications of Roughness Maps	33
3.1	Introduction	33
3.2	Lunar South Pole	35
3.2.1	Large Craters and Basins	37
3.2.2	Shackleton Crater	43
3.3	Roughness of Mare Surfaces	47
3.4	Summary	50
4	Power Spectral Density of Cratered Terrains	52
4.1	Introduction	53
4.2	Models	54
4.2.1	1D Numerical Model	55
4.2.2	Synthetic PSDs	61
4.2.3	Effect of Crater Shape	68
4.2.4	2-Dimensional Emplacement Models	73
4.2.5	Effect of Inheritance	74
4.3	Size-Frequency Distributions	76
4.4	Model Comparisons with LOLA Data	79
4.5	Discussion	82
4.6	Conclusions	85
5	Understanding Geometric Bias in Crater Counts	86
5.1	Introduction	86
5.2	Criteria for “Visible” Craters	88
5.3	Cratered Terrain Model	90
5.3.1	Rim Tracking	90

5.3.2	Erasure by Ejecta Emplacement	91
5.4	Model Results and Observations	93
5.4.1	Craters of One Size	93
5.4.2	Multiple Crater Sizes: Geometric Bias	97
5.4.3	Potential Corrections	103
5.4.3.1	Pristine-Crater Criterion	103
5.4.3.2	Weighting by Rim Fraction	103
5.4.3.3	Personal Visibility Criteria	105
5.5	Discussion	105
5.6	Conclusions	108
	Bibliography	110

List of Figures

1.1	Lunar topography from the Lunar Orbiter Laser Altimeter (LOLA)	9
2.1	Along-track configuration of the LOLA spots	13
2.2	Median bidirectional slope map at the ~ 17 -meter effective baseline	16
2.3	Median bidirectional slope: lunar maria	17
2.4	Global slope histograms for the Moon	20
2.5	Global composite color map of median differential slope	22
2.6	Lunar far-side crater Jackson and its ray system	24
2.7	Method of detrending slope data	25
2.8	Global Hurst exponent map	27
2.9	Observed devioqram shape classes	28
2.10	Abundance of devioqram shapes within major geographical regions	30
2.11	Breakover point histogram within major geographical regions	31
3.1	Median differential slopes of the lunar south pole	36
3.2	Lyman Crater	38
3.3	Antoniadi Basin	40
3.4	Mare deposits on the floor of Antoniadi	41
3.5	Schrödinger Basin	42
3.6	Median differential slopes at Shackleton Crater	44
3.7	Comparison of differential slopes at many baselines, Shackleton Crater	46
3.8	Context map for sampled regions within the lunar maria	48

3.9	Comparison of differential slope at many baselines, lunar maria	49
4.1	Crater shape parameters used in the numerical and analytic models	55
4.2	Crater shape PSDs	58
4.3	Effect of surface resetting on the PSD	60
4.4	Comparison of the numerical and analytic PSDs	62
4.5	Equilibrium PSDs for craters of size $D = 10$ km with varying shape parameters	64
4.6	Power law exponent of the equilibrium PSD, β as a function of α	66
4.7	Shape parameter ratios for lunar craters	70
4.8	Equilibrium PSDs for varying α , shape-dependent craters	72
4.9	Effect of inheritance on the PSD	75
4.10	PSD slope (β) estimated for scales in the range of ~ 115 m to 1 km	80
4.11	PSD slope (β) estimated for scales in the range of ~ 1 to 6 km	81
4.12	Humboldt Crater	83
5.1	Sample topography generated by the cratered terrain model	89
5.2	Model terrain showing overlapping rim fragments with $r_{\text{fac}} = 1.2$	92
5.3	Crater density as a function of time (craters emplaced) for different f_{vis}	95
5.4	Surviving rim points for single-size crater simulations	96
5.5	Observed size-frequency distribution as a function of f_{vis} , $\alpha = 1.5$	98
5.6	Crater overlap diagram illustrating A_{hit} and A_{cover}	99
5.7	A_{cover} and A_{hit} as a function of D_B	100
5.8	Slope of the observed size-frequency distribution for different values of f_{vis}	102
5.9	Example correction using the method of <i>Mullins</i> (1976)	104

List of Tables

1.1	Laser altimeters flown on planetary missions	7
2.1	Statistical estimators of surface roughness for major lunar geographic regions	19
4.1	Morphometric relations for lunar craters	69

List of Acronyms

HPF Hartmann Production Function

LOLA Lunar Orbiter Laser Altimeter

LRO Lunar Reconnaissance Orbiter

LROC Lunar Reconnaissance Orbiter Camera

MESSENGER MErcury Surface, Space ENvironment, GEochemistry, and Ranging

MLA Mercury Laser Altimeter

MOLA Mars Orbiter Laser Altimeter

NAC Narrow Angle Camera

NLR NEAR Laser Rangefinder

PSD Power Spectral Density

PSR Permanently Shadowed Region

SLA Shuttle Laser Altimeter

USGS United States Geological Survey

WAC Wide Angle Camera

