TABLE 1. U-Pb ANALYTICAL DATA

Fraction[a]	wt.[b] (μg)	U (ppm)	Pb[c] (ppm)	$^{206}Pb/^{204}Pb$[d]	Pb_c[e] (pg)	Th/U	$^{206}Pb/^{238}U$[f]	$^{207}Pb/^{235}U$[f]	$^{207}Pb/^{206}Pb$[f]	$^{206}Pb/^{238}U$(Ma)[g]	$^{207}Pb/^{235}U$(Ma)[g]	corr. coef.	$^{207}Pb/^{206}Pb$(Ma)[g]	disc.[h] (%)
AV-J8: Hydrothermal alteration, albitization.														
Titanite														
A	78.8	72.15	44.25	6755	17.2	3.59	0.3293±0.09	5.130±0.10	0.1130±0.03	1835.2±2.8	1841.1±1.7	0.94	1847.8±1.2	0.8
B	100.4	33.36	20.79	3451	19.9	3.70	0.3301±0.09	5.143±0.11	0.1130±0.04	1838.7±3.0	1843.2±1.8	0.93	1848.2±1.5	0.6
C	168.9	20.48	10.51	3743	19.0	2.39	0.3296±0.09	5.137±0.10	0.1130±0.04	1836.5±2.8	1842.1±1.7	0.92	1848.5±1.4	0.7
D	97.8	45.40	22.55	4550	20.0	2.19	0.3292±0.09	5.132±0.10	0.1130±0.04	1834.6±2.8	1841.3±1.7	0.93	1849.0±1.4	0.9
E	27.7	68.29	35.75	645	60.2	2.63	0.3234±0.24	5.054±0.36	0.1134±0.36	1806.3±7.6	1828.5±6.1	0.34	1853.8±13.0	2.9
F	147.6	27.69	16.35	2237	37.8	3.27	0.3315±0.09	5.168±0.10	0.1131±0.08	1845.7±2.8	1847.3±1.7	0.69	1849.2±2.7	0.2
AV-162: Spherulitic dyke contemporaneous with peperite.														
Zircon														
A,s	3.0	431.3	171.3	783	41.0	0.15	0.3892±0.42	7.823±0.46	0.1458±0.17	2119.2±15.0	2210.8±8.2	0.93	2296.9±5.8	9.1
B,s	3.0	153.5	107.8	810	17.1	1.59	0.5038±0.19	12.13±0.22	0.1747±0.10	2630.2±8.1	2614.7±4.0	0.89	2602.8±3.3	-1.3
C,s	2.0	75.09	48.06	369	13.4	1.09	0.5022±0.42	12.19±0.44	0.1761±0.17	2623.1±18.1	2619.1±8.3	0.92	2616.0±5.7	-0.3
D,s	2.0	187.4	102.4	973	10.2	0.48	0.4850±0.22	11.86±0.24	0.1774±0.10	2548.8±9.1	2593.5±4.4	0.91	2628.6±3.2	3.7

[a] s, single grain.
[b] Weighing error: ±1 μg.
[c] Radiogenic Pb.
[d] Measured ratio, corrected for spike and Pb fractionation of 0.09%±0.03%/AMU.
[e] Total common Pb in analysis corrected for fractionation and spike.
[f] Corrected for blank Pb and U, and common Pb (Cumming and Richards (1975) model Pb composition equivalent to the interpreted age of the individual zircons); errors are 1 standard error of the mean in percent for ratios.
[g] Corrected for blank and common Pb; errors are 2 standard errors of the mean in Ma.
[h] Discordance in percent.

Zircon and titanite were analyzed by conventional U-Pb methods (Parrish et al., 1992; Roddick, 1987; Roddick et al., 1987) after abrasion (Krogh, 1982).

References for table submitted to Geology repository regarding MS#14337

Ames et al., 1998: Dating of a regional hydrothermal system induced by the 1850 Ma Sudbury impact event.

Cummings, G.L. and Richards J.R., 1975, Ore lead in a continuously changing Earth: Earth Planetary Science Letters, v. 28, p. 155- 171.

Krogh, T. E., 1982, Improved accuracy of U-Pb ages by the creation of more concordant systems using an air abrasion technique: Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta,v. 46, p. 637-649.

Parrish, R. R., Bellerive, D., and Sullivan, R. W., 1992, U-Pb chemical procedures for titanite and allanite in the Geochronology Laboratory, Geological Survey of Canada: Geological Survey of Canada paper 91-2, Radiogenic and isotopic studies: report 5.

Roddick, J. C., 1987, Generalized numerical error analysis with applications to geochronology and thermodynamics: Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, v. 51, p. 2129-2135.

Roddick, J. C., Loveridge, W. D., and Parrish, R. R., 1987, Precise U-Pb dating of zircon at the sub-nanogram Pb level: Chemical Geology, Isotope Geoscience Section, v. 66, p. 111-121.