

1 **Tracks made by swimming Hippopotami: an example from Koobi Fora (Turkana**  
2 **Basin, Kenya)**

3

4 Matthew R. Bennett<sup>a1</sup>, Sarita A. Morse<sup>b</sup>, Peter L. Falkingham<sup>c</sup>

5 <sup>a</sup>*School of Conservation Sciences, Bournemouth University, Poole, BH12 5BB, UK.*

6 <sup>b</sup>*Institute of Aging and Chronic Disease, University of Liverpool, Sherrington Building, Ashton Street,*  
7 *Liverpool, L69 3GE, UK.*

8 <sup>c</sup>*Department of Comparative Biomedical Sciences, Structure and Motion Laboratory, Royal Veterinary*  
9 *College, London, AL9 7TA, UK.*

10

11 **ABSTRACT**

12 Here we report an ichnological surface close to Koobi Fora, Kenya in palaeontological collecting Area  
13 103. The surface is marked by hominin tracks, as well as many traces from large animals. A southern  
14 excavation of the surface some 70 m from the hominin tracks displays a diverse range of animal track  
15 typologies, most of which appear to have been made by a four digit animal moving via punting or bottom  
16 walking in a shallow water body. Due to the track morphology and the associated fossil record, the  
17 non-hominin tracks are interpreted as being made by hippopotami, potentially including pygmy species  
18 or juveniles. The track typologies are explained using modern analogue observations of hippopotami  
19 sub-aquatic locomotion. This work provides important environmental context for adjacent hominin  
20 tracks and fossils, as well as providing the first recorded description of fossilized swim tracks made by  
21 mammals. The site has implications for the interpretation of swim tracks in the geological record  
22 particularly the widespread and controversial tracks made by sauropods and other dinosaurs.

23

24 **Keywords:** ichnology, hippopotamus, swim tracks, swimming dinosaurs

25

26 **Highlights:**

- 27
- 28 • Ichnological context for hominin footprint site GaJi10, Koobi Fora (Kenya)
  - 29 • First recorded example of swim tracks made by hippopotami
  - 30 • Implications for the interpretation of swim tracks in the geological record made by sauropods  
and other dinosaurs.

31

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author: [mbennett@bmath.ac.uk](mailto:mbennett@bmath.ac.uk); Tel. +44(0) 1202968997

## 32 **1.0 Introduction**

33 Inferring the range of locomotory capabilities of animals from the traces they leave provides  
34 opportunities for insight into the kinematics of extinct species, however it is not without its challenges.  
35 Given the appropriate geological conditions, the locomotion of terrestrial animals can leave a clear  
36 record of their footfall, allowing for inferences on foot morphology, biomechanics, gait and plantar load  
37 (Lockley and Meyer, 2000; Falkingham, 2014). Those with an aquatic or semi-aquatic habit provide a  
38 greater challenge, since not only are the tracks often incomplete due to partial contact, but discrete  
39 trackways (or more accurately swimways) are frequently absent and different biomechanical models  
40 apply due to the micro-gravity environment provided by water (Coughlin and Fish, 2009).

41 Fossil swim tracks are commonly reported for turtles and crocodylians (e.g., McCrea et al. 2004;  
42 Avanzini et al. 2005; Milan and Hedegaard, 2010), which is perhaps unsurprising given their respective  
43 lifestyles. What is perhaps less intuitive is that there is a substantial record of purported swim tracks of  
44 dinosaurian origin in the literature. Despite being highly adapted for terrestrial locomotion, a wide range  
45 of dinosaur taxa appear to have left sub-aqueous swim tracks, including theropods (Coombs, 1980;  
46 Milner et al., 2006; Ezquerro et al., 2007; Xing et al., 2013) and sauropods (Ishigaki, 1989; Lockley and  
47 Rice, 1990). Oddly, ornithischian dinosaurs are conspicuous by their absence in the swim-track record.

48 Dinosaur swim tracks often attract controversy, because it is difficult to explore the swimming  
49 capabilities of extant taxa with no modern analogue. Romilio et al. (2013) interpreted the Lark Quarry  
50 tracksite, Australia, as containing many swim-traces potentially made by ornithomimids, but this was later  
51 refuted by Thulborn (2013). The sauropod manus-dominated trackways that were frequently  
52 interpreted as having been made by the large, long-necked animals 'punting' off the bottom with their  
53 forelimbs are now thought, in light of several studies, to be the results of issues of preservation–  
54 artefacts of underfoot pressures resulting from centre of mass position and substrate consistency (e.g.,  
55 Vila et al., 2005; Falkingham et al., 2011).

56 We find it interesting that despite the wealth of dinosaur swim tracks reported, there is as yet no record  
57 of swimming tracks produced by mammals or birds (Milner and Lockley, in review). To be able to link  
58 such tracks with trackmakers for whom there is a modern analogue, or closely related taxa, would be  
59 of immense help in identifying the morphological characteristics of tracks made by swimming animals

60 compared with those made on land. A number of mammals, including hippopotami, are known to  
61 'bottom walk' and they may provide an alternative source of insight into the sub-aquatic locomotion of  
62 larger extinct animals such as dinosaurs.

63 In this context we report an ichnological surface in the Okote Member of the Koobi Fora Formation  
64 (Turkana Basin, Kenya) which contains tracks of swimming hippopotami (Figs 1 and 2). Not only is this  
65 an important set of tracks in their own right, given the existence of hominin tracks on the same surface  
66 (Behrensmeyer and Laporte, 1981; Bennett et al., 2009), but they provide evidence of the type of  
67 ichnological variability associated with punting locomotion and therefore provide a useful analogue with  
68 which to interpret the traces left by sub-aquatic extinct species such as dinosaurs.

69

## 70 **2.0 Excavations and methods**

71 The site (Gaji10) lies on the southern edge of the Koobi Fora Ridge in the paleontological collecting  
72 zone known as Area 103 (Fig. 1). The excavations described here lie on the western flank of a north-  
73 south strike-parallel dry valley in beds of the Okote Member (Koobi Fora Formation; Brown and Feibel,  
74 1991). The eastern valley side is formed by an indurated sandstone layer which dips between 15° and  
75 18° to the west. Excavations were made from the valley floor into the western valley side, along bedding  
76 surfaces dipping to the west into the slope and were therefore limited in east-west extent by the rapid  
77 increase in overburden (Fig. 2A-D). The original excavation of Behrensmeyer and Laporte (1981; c. 4  
78 m by 4 m) was re-excavated in July 2008 (Bennett et al., 2009) and a further excavation (13 m along  
79 strike and 3 m wide) on the same ichnological surface was made 70 m to the south, down valley in  
80 January and July of 2009 (Fig. 1). The surface outcrop of the Akait Tuff provides a visible datum  
81 allowing the tracked surface to be traced and correlated between excavations. A further small  
82 excavation 20 m to north of the original excavation was also made. These excavations are referred to  
83 as Gaji10 North, Central and South with the central site being that of Behrensmeyer and Laporte (1981;  
84 Fig. 1). In addition to exposures in the excavation walls, geo-trenches were dug at locations of  
85 opportunity and described using the facies codes of Miall (1977).

86 The site was surveyed using a Leica System 500 (SR530) dGPS with a vertical accuracy of  $\pm 30$  mm.

87 Track surfaces were excavated and cleaned before being photographed and digitised using an optical

88 laser scanner (Vi900 Konica-Minolta Scanner; Bennett et al. 2009). Scan data was captured in Konica-  
89 Minolta Polygon Editing Tool and either output as a cdm file for subsequently manipulation in Rapidform  
90 2006 or output as XYZ point clouds in asc format. The point cloud data was viewed in Foot Processor,  
91 a piece of bespoke freeware [<http://footprints.bournemouth.ac.uk/>] that allows rapid visual editing of  
92 XYZ data files in order to: (1) rectify tracks to the orthogonal plane; (2) rotate and mirror tracks; (3) crop  
93 extraneous material from tracks; (4) create contour plot, place landmarks and measure inter-landmark  
94 distances; and (5) converts the files if required to csv format for use in ArcGIS. Photographs of the  
95 surface were georectified using surveyed control points and merged in ArcGIS for the purposes of  
96 mapping.

97 The submerged locomotion of two female common Nile hippopotami (*Hippopotamus amphibius*) was  
98 videoed through the side of a glass walled tank at the Adventure Aquarium in Philadelphia in 2008.  
99 Video was used to observe the range of locomotion styles displayed and short segments of video  
100 footage were analysed frame-by-frame where the hippopotami moved parallel to the glass tank wall. It  
101 is appreciated that this may not be wholly typical of natural hippopotamus behaviour but is at least  
102 indicative and complimentary to the observations of Coughlin and Frank (2009).

103

## 104 **3.0 Stratigraphic context and lithofacies**

### 105 *3.1 Stratigraphic context*

106 Behrensmeyer (1970) provided an initial description of the sediments in the Koobi Fora region in which  
107 she documented the presence of approximately 160 m of lacustrine sediments overlain by fluvial facies  
108 (Vondra et al., 1971; Bowen and Vondra, 1973). This lithostratigraphy was refined by Brown and Feibel  
109 (1986) on the basis of inter-bedded and increasingly dated tuffs (McDougall et al., 1992; Brown et al.,  
110 2006; McDougall and Brown, 2006). The current consensus is that the Koobi Fora Formation (~4.3 Ma  
111 to 0.6 Ma) encompasses the entire Plio-Pleistocene and is subdivided into eight members defined on  
112 the basis of volcanic ash horizons (Brown and Feibel, 1986). The KBS and Okote members which out  
113 crop in Area 103 record the gradual silting up of a former lake within the rift floor between 2.0 Ma and  
114 1.5 Ma (Brown and Feibel, 1986, 1991; Lepre et al., 2007). The base of the KBS Member is defined by  
115 the KBS Tuffs dated to  $1.869 \pm 0.021$  Ma (McDougall and Brown, 2006) and the boundary to the Okote

116 Member by the Okote Tuff with an interpolated age of  $1.56 \pm 0.05$  Ma being overlain within a few metres  
117 by the Lower Koobi Fora ( $1.476 \pm 0.013$  Ma) and the Koobi Fora Tuff ( $1.485 \pm 0.014$  Ma; Brown and  
118 Feibel, 1986, 1991; McDougall and Brown, 2006).

119 Units of the Okote Member in Area 103 dip to the east and south east at between  $5^\circ$  and  $18^\circ$  and are  
120 cut along strike by a series of listric normal and reverse faults forming a series of escarpments and  
121 cuesta with a north-south axis and dry river beds between (Lepre et al., 2007; Fig. 1C). On the basis  
122 of unit conformity GaJi10 is believed lie within a single fault block separated from others by two  
123 prominent river valleys (Fig. 1C). The tuff that outcrops at GaJi10 in the valley floor and excavations  
124 was originally identified by Behrensmeyer and Laporte (1981) as the Kobi Fora Tuff, but has on the  
125 basis of the geochemical correlations reported in Bennett et al. (2009) been re-assigned to the Akait  
126 Tuff ( $1.43 \pm 0.01$  Ma; Brown et al., 2006; Bennett et al., 2009) placing it firmly within the Okote Member.

127

### 128 *3.2 Lithofacies and palaeoenvironment*

129 The lithofacies at selected sites in Area 103 was documented by Behrensmeyer (1975) and within the  
130 underlying KBS Member more recently by Lepre et al. (2007). This is supplemented here by the  
131 description of a number of geo-trenches and excavations (Figs 1-4). On the basis of the lithofacies  
132 present, four broad facies associations have been identified and are summarised in Table 1. They are  
133 consistent with previous interpretations of the KBS and Okote members which envisage a low energy  
134 fluvial-lacustrine system with both short-term seasonal and millennial scale water variations  
135 (Behrensmeyer, 1975; Brown and Feibel, 1991; Lepre et al., 2007). Behrensmeyer (1975) interprets  
136 the lithofacies in Area 103 as being those of a delta flat on the margins of large lake fed inland by a  
137 more stable fluvial system. In contrast Brown and Feibel (1991) favour a more complex and laterally  
138 variable facies model in which the size of the lacustrine element is more restricted and/or absent  
139 especially in the upper KBS and Okote members.

140 What is clear from the lithofacies observed here is that: (1) the landscape was relatively low lying with  
141 palaeosol development in drying-wetting conditions (Wynn 2004); (2) subject to seasonal/millennial  
142 regressions (episodes of desiccation) and transgressions of shallow water bodies, with a complex and  
143 variable geometry of unknown size; (3) transgressive elements are associated with stromatolites (Abel

144 et al., 1982), mollusc horizons (Williamson, 1981, 1982) and shoreline facies (Renaut and Owen, 1991);  
145 and (4) these water bodies were fed by a range of broad, shallow, laterally variable channels subject to  
146 fluctuating flow regimes with low flow and sediment re-working punctuated by episodes of high  
147 sediment/water discharge. There is no direct evidence in the vicinity of GaJi10 of a deep water lake  
148 facies although there is a limited outcrop of laminated clay, equivalent to the deep water facies of Lepre  
149 et al. (2007), in an adjacent fault block. Figure 5 provides a schematic summary of the type of  
150 environment envisaged with the key features being the local complexity and the presence of numerous  
151 water bodies whether small lakes, river lagoons or channels.

152 This landscape was rich in a diverse range of vertebrate and semi-aquatic fauna and has yielded a  
153 plethora of vertebrate remains. Behrensmeyer (1975) suggests that the skeletal remains around Area  
154 103 contained a higher proportion of aquatic and semi-aquatic fauna consistent with her interpretation  
155 of a delta plain. Table 2 provides a summary of surface skeletal elements recovered along a transect  
156 running from KMN ER1808 in the east and GaJi14 in the east via a series of bone walks (Fig. 1). This  
157 data takes no account of potential preservation bias of individual skeletons, or multiple sampling from  
158 one skeleton, and therefore provides only an approximation of the species present not necessarily their  
159 abundance on the landscape. The faunal list is similar to that reported by Brehensmeyer (1975). The  
160 terrestrial vertebrates are dominated by bovids and suids, while the aquatic and semi-aquatic finds  
161 predominantly consisted of hippopotami and crocodiles. The faunal list is consistent with a diverse and  
162 rich ecosystem dominated by numerous small and varied water bodies in a landscape subject to  
163 seasonal and decadal change.

164

165

166

167

## 168 **4.0 Ichnology**

### 169 *4.1 Tracks: GaJi10 (Central and North)*

170 This surface (c. 12 m<sup>2</sup>; Figs 1 and 2D, E) was originally excavated by Behrensmeyer and Laporte (1981)  
171 and contains over 89 distinct impressions (200-380 mm deep) identified as the tracks of large  
172 vertebrates. According to Behrensmeyer and Laporte (1981) 22 had morphology similar to that of  
173 modern hippopotamus and three distinct trails associated with hippopotami walking in shallow water.  
174 The inference of shallow water (<100 mm deep) was based on the presence of wading bird tracks. The  
175 larger tracks (250 to 320 mm) were attributed to the large fossil hippopotami, *Hippopotamus gorgops*,  
176 while the smaller ones (180 – 200 mm) were thought to be either juveniles or pigmy species,  
177 (*Hippopotamus aethiopicus*). Both species of hippotami are known from the fossil record of the Koobi  
178 Fora region (Harris et al., 2008). This surface was re-excavated in 2008 and while a small part of the  
179 front edge had been lost to erosion the rest was intact (Bennett et al., 2009). The non-hominin tracks  
180 take the form of deep amorphous, crudely circular craters (Figs 2D-E and 6B). In some the presence  
181 of four digits with nail impressions can be identified consistent with the interpretation proposed by  
182 Behrensmeyer and Laporte (1981). A small excavation to the north (GaJi10(North); Fig. 1)  
183 approximately one metre by three metres in the same surface revealed one clear four digit track with  
184 nail impressions (Fig. 2F). In all these cases the entire plantar surface of tracks is visible suggesting  
185 that track makers were walking normally on the surface and the water depths to shallow to allow buoyant  
186 locomotion.

187

#### 188 4.2 Tracks: Description – GaJi10 (South)

189 In 2009 a larger excavation was opened up to the south in the same surface as that excavated by  
190 Behrensmeyer and Laporte (1981; Figs 1, 2B, C and 7). The surface has little relief and is composed  
191 of consolidated, partially lithified, fine silt with no apparent spatial variation in grain size. The tracks,  
192 approximately 240 individual examples, are exclusively non-human and randomly distributed with no  
193 evidence of identifiable trackways.

194 Figures 7-11 provide an overview of the typical track typologies present (See Supplementary Figures  
195 S1-9). The tracks range in width from 73 to 299 mm with a mean of 188 mm, and length which varies  
196 from 59 to 269 mm with an average of 143 mm (Fig. 8A-B). Each track is composed of a maximum of  
197 four digits and we recognise five main typologies, although none are mutually exclusive:

- 198 1. Type One (Figs 9A, F, H, M, L, 10A and 11A). These tracks typically have four well-defined  
199 parallel/aligned digits, with toenail marks visible in some tracks. The central two digits are more  
200 prominent than the lateral and medial ones and their extent is often exaggerated either as the  
201 digits scratch at the surface during first contact with the substrate or as the foot leaves contact  
202 with the surface and are dragged forward. To the rear of the track a central pad impressions is  
203 sometimes visible (Fig. 9I), although in many cases this is obscured by the proximal movement  
204 of sediment within a track (Fig. 8E) and the fact that in most cases there appears to be an inclined  
205 plane of contact between the indenter and the substrate. This often results in tracks with a  
206 marked longitudinal asymmetry in the direction of travel. Some of the tracks (Fig. 11A) have a  
207 two stage form; a broader imprint of all four digits, including proximal pad, into which the two  
208 central digits have been imprinted further during the later stages of contact. The individual toes  
209 are distinct and there is no obvious evidence of webbing between them, although in some  
210 examples the two central toes merge to form a single impression.
- 211 2. Type Two (Fig. 9G). In a limited number of cases the lateral and medial toes are not visible and  
212 the track is dominated by just two digits. The digits are truncated by a steep rear track wall often  
213 showing evidence of a rim structure. There is a variation between these tracks and that of Type  
214 One suggesting that they are formed by the same species of track maker, just that the contact  
215 between the substrate and the foot is limited to the central two digits.
- 216 3. Type Three (Figs 9B, J, P and 10B). In these tracks the lateral and medial toes are visible but  
217 tend to form oval-shaped impressions to the rear of the central digits which are also shorter.
- 218 4. Type Four (Figs 9C, E and 11B). These tracks consist of up to four shallow (10 to 40 mm), oval-  
219 or tear-shaped prod-like impressions, sometimes containing distal toenail impressions,  
220 distributed around a broad arc giving the appearance from above of a crown. The marks are  
221 made by vertical or sub-vertical contact between the digits and the substrate; the exact plan-form  
222 shape is probably controlled by the angle of contact with and the degree of forward drag as the  
223 digits lift from, the substrate. The overall width and spacing of the digits is much greater than in  
224 the other track typologies and they form a radial rather than parallel pattern. While the best  
225 examples contain four impressions, the surface is covered locally by partial examples indicative  
226 of vertical contact between one or more digits (Figs 9K, N and 11B).



227 5. Type Five (Figs 9O and 10C, D). A wide variety of complex forms exist associated with the  
228 overtracking (or partial overtracking) of one or more track. In some cases these complex forms  
229 consists of deeper (20 -40 mm) elongate craters, traverse to the long axis of individual discernible  
230 tracks and containing multiple and superimposed impressions, apparently made by laterally  
231 adjacent feet. The examples in Figure 10C, D are the simplest consisting of two tracks set side  
232 by side, separated laterally by between 245 mm and 316 mm and backed proximally by a clear  
233 ridge. Other examples are more irregular and there is evidence of multiple tracks within the  
234 elongated crater.

235

236 Tracks occur in close juxtapositions with a variety of orientations (Fig. 7) and often overlap, but do not  
237 form clearly identifiable trackways. There is however a preponderance of tracks with a west-east  
238 direction of travel across the excavated surface (i.e. across the shortest axis) and given greater  
239 excavation width it might be possible to link tracks more systematically. Individual tracks are associated  
240 to varying degrees with proximal displacement rims (10 to 30 mm high) and show a proximally rather  
241 than vertically directed plantar force consistent with the longitudinal asymmetry present in many of the  
242 tracks. No systematic variation in track typology allows for the identification of manus or pes tracks;  
243 suggesting either a predominance of manus/pes contact or more likely a common foot anatomy. While  
244 some tracks are clearly made by adjacent feet (Fig. 10 C, D) others are too closely spaced (Fig. 9J, K)  
245 and potentially represent examples of manus and pes tracks in close juxtaposition supporting the  
246 contention that there is a lack of anatomical variation between the manus and pes of the print maker.  
247 A range of track widths are associated with any given track depth, and depth does not correlate with  
248 width of the track digits and by assumption with body size of the print maker (Fig. 8C-D). Instead one  
249 may hypothesize that depth is linked to the degree of applied contact pressure and/or variations in the  
250 consistency of the substrate. In Figure 11C it is possible to deduce several cross-cutting tracks of  
251 varying size; the well-defined Type One track on the left is superimposed on a much larger Type Four  
252 track providing direct evidence of multiple individuals and animal sizes. The distribution of track sizes  
253 (Fig. 8A-B) shows a continuous distribution.

254 The tracks described here have a different but potentially cognate typology from the crater-like  
255 impressions found at GaJi10 (Central and North; Fig. 6) interpreted by Behrensmeyer and Laporte

256 (1981) as being those of walking hippopotami. The presence of four digits with nails is common to both  
257 and while the tracks at GaJi10 (South) are generally smaller there is some overlap in sizes (Fig. 8A).  
258 They do not resemble the tracks of crocodiles or turtles (cf. Avanzini et al., 2005; Milàn and Hedegaard,  
259 2010; Romano and Whyte, 2010) which are the only other plausible track makers given the fauna  
260 present as identified in the bone surveys (Table 1). The observed topological differences between the  
261 tracks at GaJi10 (South) and those at GaJi10 (Central) are therefore interpreted as due to differences  
262 in locomotion with those at GaJi10 (South) being swim tracks. This interpretation is consistent with the  
263 lack of discernible track ways and the typological variation present caused by different patterns of  
264 bottom-contact. The implication here is that water depth increased to the south of GaJi10 (Central)  
265 giving rise to different locomotor styles. The absence of desiccation structures on the surface is also  
266 supportive of a subaqueous interpretation. Behrensmeyer and Laporte (1981) noted the presence of a  
267 wading bird (Fig. 6A) and bovid tracks at GaJi10 (Central), all of which are absent at this site consistent  
268 with the increased water depth and the interpretation made here.

269 Hippopotami have distinctive four digit feet as shown in Figure 12A. Detailed anatomical dimensional  
270 data for hippopotami is not available making size comparisons difficult but individual hippo tracks (250-  
271 290 mm wide) have been described by Ashley and Liutkus (2002) although their focus was on terrestrial  
272 trails/trackways (1.2 m wide and over 0.6 m deep) linking hippo pools and grazing meadows.  
273 Behrensmeyer and Laporte (1981) report sizes of 250 to 320 mm for the larger tracks which partially  
274 overlap with the dimensions reported here, although their smaller tracks (180-200 mm) do fall within the  
275 range of observed dimensions (Fig. 8A). Notwithstanding the different mode of locomotion between  
276 the two sites, it is possible to speculate that the track maker at GaJi10 (South) may have been the  
277 pygmy hippopotami (*Hippopotamus aethiopicus*; Harris et al., 2008) or alternatively it may reflect the  
278 presence of calves. The occurrence of two superimposed tracks of very different sizes (Fig. 11C),  
279 despite the typological differences, is perhaps more consistent with the latter. Little is known about the  
280 habitats of these extinct hippopotami and whether pygmies would use the same water body as larger  
281 species, although not necessarily at the same time. Modern pygmies (*Choeropsis liberiensis*) have  
282 more prominent nails/claws and do not have webbing between the toes (Eltringham, 1999) which is  
283 consistent with the tracks described here, although it must be noted that pygmy hippopotami are not  
284 particularly social animals (Eltringham, 1999) and the abundant presence of tracks may therefore be  
285 an issue. There is nothing to say however how many hippopotami generated the assemblage of tracks

286 since the surface represents a time averaged record and the length of time over which imprinting  
287 occurred is not known. The range of sizes present (Figs 8A, B and 11C) does suggest that more than  
288 one individual was involved.

289

## 290 **5.0 Discussion**

291 The tracks and associated ichnofacies described here provide the first accounts of a mammal swim  
292 record. They are important not only because of the human tracks which have been found on the same  
293 surface (Behrensmeyer and Laporte, 1981; Bennett et al., 2009), but also because they provide  
294 important information with which to help interpret swim tracks of extinct animals such as sauropods and  
295 tetrapods.

296 GaJi10 (Central) contains a hominin trackway attributed to *Homo erectus* by Behrensmeyer and Lapotre  
297 (1981), a conclusion tentatively confirmed by their re-analysis (Bennett et al., 2009), although more  
298 than one hominin is known to have been present on the landscape 1.5 Ma (Spoor et al., 2007; Dingwell  
299 et al., 2013). In comparison to the slightly older tracks at Ileret 40 km to the north, the tracks are very  
300 poorly defined anatomically and add little to the discussion of foot morphology across the  
301 *Australopithecus* to *Homo* transition (Bennett et al., 2009; Crompton et al., 2012). This almost certainly  
302 reflects the poor imprinting and preservation conditions of a sub-aqueous site. The tracks in the GaJi10  
303 trail transition from large craters to more shallow and better formed tracks and may suggest that the  
304 track maker emerged from deeper water to shallow or sub-aerial conditions. The tracks described from  
305 GaJi10 (South) are 70 m down valley and appear to represent much deeper water in that the  
306 hippopotami tracks represent swimming/punting rather than ambulatory type motion. Water depth is  
307 hard to estimate and depends on the body mass and stature of the hippopotami present. The Common  
308 Hippopotamus (*Hippopotamus amphibius*) is typically between 150-165 cm high (Males 1,475 kg;  
309 Females 1,360 kg) with pygmy hippos about half that height (Eltringham, 1999) and given that they like  
310 to be able to rest on the bottom while breathing at the surface water depths could range from as little  
311 0.5 to as much as 1.6 metres deep. Blowers et al. (2012) found that in artificial enclosures, hippopotami  
312 preferred water depths of 0.6 to 1.0 m.

313 On land and in shallow water hippopotami use a lateral sequence walk which ensures that there are  
314 three limbs in contact with the ground at all times to maintain stability (Hildebrand, 1989). When running  
315 they use a trotting gait in which diagonally opposite legs swing in unison (Hildebrand, 1989). In water  
316 however Coughlin and Frank (2009) observed an unstable galloping gait in which the forelimbs extend  
317 in unison providing for extended unsupported intervals; a mode of gait referred to as 'punting'. This  
318 involves the limbs pushing off the substrate for alternating phases of thrust and glide through the water  
319 (Koester and Spirito, 2003; Martinez et al. 1998). Coughlin and Frank (2009) found that as horizontal  
320 speed increases the time interval between periods of ground contact decreases as one might expect  
321 and the vertical displacement or rise between each period of ground contact decreases. More ground  
322 contact is associated with greater rise (Coughlin and Frank, 2009).

323 The authors' videoed the motion of two female Nile *Hippopotamus amphibius* through the side wall of  
324 their tank at the Adventure Aquarium Philadelphia in 2008 (See Supplementary Information). Two  
325 different types of motion were observed (Fig. 12). In the first type the hippopotami move in a hybrid  
326 form, neither in a classic trot or gallop. Periods of glide, in which the limbs were folded limply beneath  
327 the body (Fig. 12B), were separated by substrate contact via a single extended forelimb (Fig. 12C), on  
328 occasions this was followed by a hind limb although not necessarily the diagonally opposite foot. In  
329 fact the glide was often maintained by contact with a single forelimb in which only the digit tips made  
330 contact. Where greater control was needed, for example when the two hippopotami were in close  
331 contact a more stable and conventional trot was observed in which diagonally limbs moved in unison.  
332 During phases of glide, especially with increasing speed, a single forelimb was often the only point of  
333 contact as noted by Coughlin and Frank (2009) the amount rise and fall between steps was minimal.  
334 This type of motion contrasts with the other observed in which the hippopotami thrust upwards towards  
335 the water surface using both hind feet placed firmly apart (Fig. 12D). In some cases limbs return to the  
336 same spot, thrusting upwards again, while at others times there may be some forward motion such that  
337 the limbs make contact further forward.

338 These types of motion and behaviours are consistent with the tracks at GaJi10 (South). Type One  
339 tracks represent situations where the foot is placed flat on the substrate, thrusting off principally through  
340 the central two digits cause them to be impressed into the substrate and for sediment to be pushed in  
341 a proximal fashion. At other times forward glide is maintained by contact with only the extended digits

342 moving vertically or sub-vertically into the substrate to create prod-like marks (Type Three Tracks).  
343 Variations between plantigrade and digitgrade placement of the feet account for the range of track  
344 typologies. The capacity for this range of different motions is reflected in the myology of hippopotami  
345 limbs explored in detail by Fisher et al. (2007, 2010) in relation to pygmy hippopotami. Specifically they  
346 outline the presence of musculature which allows for control of the degree of separation of the digits.  
347 The short powerful limbs and musculatures are also highly adapted to punting type locomotion. The  
348 near-placement of tracks, off-set by just a few tens of millimetres, may represent the passage of both  
349 manus and pes limbs in the form of the one-sided trot observed by the authors. Thrusting upwards  
350 often from a static or semi-static position leads to the double tracks spaced apart backed proximally by  
351 more substantial rim structures.

352 As illustrated above, swim tracks involve an understanding of the physical influence of water depth,  
353 current flow directions (or lack of current flow as in this case) and substrate consistency, alongside the  
354 biological influences of animal size, foot/limb morphology of feet and limbs, buoyancy, and different  
355 swimming behaviours (Milner and Lockley, in review). Here the critical control on track morphology  
356 appears to be swimming behaviour and both the flexibility and control of the digit's musculature. There  
357 is no doubt that where the centre of mass or locomotion style of an animal leads to the differential  
358 application of force that critical substrate yield strengths may lead to the selective formation and track  
359 sampling as argued by Falkingham et al. (2011), but this may not account for all cases as we have  
360 illustrated here, where tracks can be linked to an extant analogue. The observations here are consistent  
361 with those of Milner et al. (2006) in that swim trackways can sometimes be distinguishable (Ezquerro  
362 et al. 2007; Romilio et al. 2013; Xing et al. 2013), but are more commonly absent if linking tracks is  
363 extremely challenging, especially where several animals are involved or they pass repeatedly over a  
364 spot as for example in a constrained water body or one with a favoured water depth for habitation.

365

366

367

## 368 **6.0 Conclusion**

369 We have documented an ichnosurface characterised by a wide range of track typologies interpreted  
370 here as being formed by a species of hippopotami moving in a shallow water body. The size range of  
371 these tracks may represent a combination of adult, juvenile or pygmy hippopotami. The track typologies  
372 are consistent with a range of locomotor strategies associated with punting or bottom walking. They  
373 reflect the unique characteristics of the hippopotami foot with four weight bearing digits. Typologies  
374 vary from tracks where the plantar surface has been largely in contact with the substrate and the load  
375 is directed vertically as well as laterally, to others which consist of prod-marks where the digits have  
376 touched the ground vertically or sub-vertically and have been made in balancing an unstable pattern of  
377 gait or to maintain forward momentum of the glide. It is not possible to separate manus from pes tracks  
378 due to similar morphologies. Tracks occur singularly and in close juxtaposition with slight lateral and  
379 forward offsets suggesting that the feet in contact are laterally congruous. Direct observations do not  
380 show a predominance of a trot or a gallop type motion but a mixture of the two. In other cases double  
381 tracks with clear separation of manus/pes are indicative of thrusting from the substrate in which both  
382 limbs are placed side by side. Clear swimways are not apparent but the predominant direction of  
383 movement seems to be across the narrow width of the excavation. It is not clear whether these tracks  
384 were made by a multitude or a few individuals. It is very possible that only a few individuals could build  
385 up this complex pattern of tracks over time. While some of the variation in track sizes may be due to  
386 variation in the foot dimensions of the individuals, some of it is likely to result from typological variation.

387 The significance of this paper lies in the first description of mammalian fossil swim tracks, providing  
388 environmental context for nearby hominin tracks and linking track morphology to the known/observed  
389 punting behaviour of a large animal. As such, these tracks provide an important analogue in aiding the  
390 understanding of swim tracks in extinct species such as sauropods or theropods.

391

## 392 **Acknowledgements**

393 Fieldwork was undertaken in 2008 and 2009 as part of the Koobi Fora Field School and the kind support  
394 and permission of the National Museum of Kenya is duly acknowledged. The assistance and support  
395 of Professors Jack Harris (Rutgers University), Anne K. Behrensmeyer (Smithsonian Institute), Brian  
396 G. Richmond (George Washington University) is also gratefully acknowledged. Data analysis for this  
397 paper was funded by the Natural Environment Research Council in the UK under grant number  
398 NE/H004246/1. The unpublished faunal data (Table 1) was collected by Dr Jack McCoy and students

399 of the Koobi Fora Field School as part of wider project overseen by the senior author in Area 103 in  
400 2009 and is reproduced here with permission which is gratefully acknowledged. Permission to film the  
401 hippopotami at the Adventure Aquarium in 2008 and to reproduce the information is gratefully  
402 acknowledged. Foot Processor was written by Marcin Budka (Bournemouth University) and can be  
403 downloaded along with the raw data from [<http://footprints.bournemouth.ac.uk/>]

404

## 405 **References**

406 Abell, P.I., Awramik, S.M., Osborne, R.H., Tomellini, S. 1982. Plio-Pleistocene lacustrine stromatolites  
407 from Lake Turkana, Kenya: morphology, stratigraphy and stable isotopes. *Sedimentary Geology*  
408 32, 1-26.

409 Avanzini, M., García-Ramos, J., Lire, J., Menegon, M., Piñuela, L., Fernández, A., 2005. Turtle tracks  
410 from the Late Jurassic of Asturias, Spain. *Acta Palaeontologica Polonica* 50, 743-755.

411 Behrensmeyer, A.K., 1970. New Hominid Remains and Early Artefacts from Northern Kenya:  
412 Preliminary Geological Interpretation of a New Hominid Site in the Lake Rudolf Basin. *Nature*  
413 226, 225-226.

414 Behrensmeyer, A.K., 1975. The taphonomy and paleoecology of Plio-Pleistocene vertebrate  
415 assemblages east of Lake Rudolf, Kenya. *Bulletin of the Museum of Comparative Zoology* 146,  
416 473–578.

417 Behrensmeyer A.K., Laporte, L.F. 1981. Footprints of a Pleistocene hominid in northern Kenya. *Nature*  
418 289, 167-169.

419 Blowers, T.E., Waterman, J.M., Kuhar, C.W., Bettinger, T.L., 2012. Female Nile hippopotamus  
420 (*Hippopotamus amphibius*) space use in a naturalistic exhibit. *Zoo Biology* 31, 129-136.

421 Bennett, M.R., Harris, J.W.K., Richmond, B.G., Braun, D.R., Mbua, E., Kiura, P., Olago, D., Kibunjia,  
422 M., Omuombo, C., Behrensmeyer, A.K., Huddart, D., Gonzalez, S., 2009. Early Hominin Foot  
423 Morphology Based on 1.5 Million Year Old Footprints from Ileret, Kenya. *Science* 323, 1197-  
424 1201.

425 Bowen, B.E., Vondra, C.F., 1973. Stratigraphical relationships of the Plio-Pleistocene deposits, East  
426 Rudolf, Kenya. *Nature* 242, 391-393.

427 Brown, F.H., Feibel, C.S., 1986. Revision of lithostratigraphic nomenclature in the Koobi Fora region,  
428 Kenya. *Journal of the Geological Society, London* 143, 297-310.

429 Brown, F.H., Feibel, C.S., 1991. Stratigraphy, depositional environments and palaeogeography of the  
430 Koobi Fora Formation. *Koobi Fora research project*, 3, 1-30.

- 431 Brown, F.H., Haileab, B., McDougall, I., 2006. Sequence of tuffs between the KBS Tuff and the Chari  
432 Tuff in the Turkana Basin, Kenya and Ethiopia. *Journal of the Geological Society* 163, 185-204.
- 433 Coombs, W.P. 1980. Swimming Ability of Carnivorous Dinosaurs. *Science* 207, 1198-1200.
- 434 Coughlin, B.L., Frank E.F. 2009. Hippopotamus Underwater Locomotion: Reduced-Gravity Movements  
435 for a Massive Mammal." *Journal of Mammalogy* 90, 675-679.
- 436 Crompton, R.H., Pataky, T.C., Savage, R., D'Août, K., Bennett, M.R., Day, M.H., Bates, K., Morse, S.A.  
437 Sellers, W.I., 2012. Human-like external function of the foot, and fully upright gait, confirmed in  
438 the 3.66 million year old Laetoli hominin footprints by topographic statistics, experimental  
439 footprint-formation and computer simulation. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* 9, 707-719.
- 440 Dingwall H.L., Hatala K.G., Wunderlich R.E., Richmond B.G., 2013. Hominin stature, body mass, and  
441 walking speed estimates based on 1.5 million-year-old fossil footprints at Ileret, Kenya. *Journal*  
442 *of Human Evolution*, doi.10.1016/j.jhevol.2013.02.004.
- 443 Eltringham, S.K., 1999. *The hippos: natural history and conservation*. A&C Black.
- 444 Ezquerro R, Doublet S, Costeur L, Galton PM, Pérez-Lorente F (2007) Were non-avian theropod  
445 dinosaurs able to swim? Supportive evidence from an Early Cretaceous trackway, Cameros  
446 Basin (La Rioja, Spain). *Geology* 35, 507-510.
- 447 Falkingham, P.L., (2014) Interpreting ecology and behaviour from the vertebrate fossil track record.  
448 *Journal of Zoology*. doi:10.1111/jzo.12110
- 449 Falkingham, P. L., Bates, K.T., Margetts, L., Manning, P.L., 2011. Simulating sauropod manus-only  
450 trackway formation using finite-element analysis *Biology Letters* 7, 142-145.
- 451 Fisher, R.E., Scott, K.M., Naples, V.L., 2007. Forelimb myology of the pygmy hippopotamus  
452 (*Choeropsis liberiensis*). *The Anatomical Record* 290, 673-693.
- 453 Fisher, R.E., Scott, K.M., Adrian, B., 2010. Hind limb myology of the common hippopotamus,  
454 *Hippopotamus amphibius* (Artiodactyla: Hippopotamidae). *Zoological Journal of the Linnean*  
455 *Society* 158, 661-682.
- 456 Feibel, C.S., Brown, F.H., McDougall, I., 1989. Stratigraphic context of fossil hominids from the Omo  
457 Group deposits: Northern Turkana Basin, Kenya and Ethiopia. *American Journal of Physical*  
458 *Anthropology* 78, 595-622.
- 459 Feibel, C.S., J.M. Harris, et al. 1991. Palaeoenvironmental context for the Late Neogene of the Turkana  
460 Basin. *Koobi Fora Research Project Volume 3: The Fossil Ungulates: Geology, Fossil*  
461 *Artiodactyls, and Palaeoenvironments*. Anonymous, 321-369.
- 462 Gathogo, P.N., Brown, F.H., 2006. Stratigraphy of the Koobi Fora Formation (Pliocene and Pleistocene)  
463 in the Ileret region of northern Kenya. *Journal of African Earth Sciences* 45, 369-390.



- 464 Harris, J.M., Cerling, T.E., Leakey, M.G., Passey, B.H., 2008. Stable isotope ecology of fossil  
465 hippopotamids from the Lake Turkana Basin of East Africa. *Journal of Zoology* 275, 323-331.
- 466 Hildebrand, M., 1989. The quadrupedal gaits of vertebrates: the timing of leg movements relates to  
467 balance, body shape, agility, speed, and energy expenditure. *BioScience* 39,766–775.
- 468 Ishigaki S., 1989. Footprints of swimming sauropods from Morocco. In: Gillette DD, Lockley MG, editors.  
469 *Dinosaur tracks and traces*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 83-86.
- 470 Koester, D.M., Spirito, C.P., 2003. Punting: an unusual mode of locomotion in the little skate, *Leucoraja*  
471 *erinacea* (Chondrichthyes: Rajidae). *Copeia* 2003, 553–561.
- 472 Lepre, C.J., Quinn, R.L., Joordens, J.C., Swisher, C.C., Feibel, C.S., 2007. Plio-Pleistocene facies  
473 environments from the KBS Member, Koobi Fora Formation: implications for climate controls on  
474 the development of lake-margin hominin habitats in the northeast Turkana Basin (northwest  
475 Kenya). *Journal of human evolution* 53, 504-514.
- 476 Lockley, M.G., Meyer, C., 2000. *Dinosaur tracks and other fossil footprints of Europe*. New York,  
477 Columbia University Press, 323p.
- 478 Lockley, M.G., Rice, A., 1990. Did Brontosaurus ever swim out to sea?: Evidence from brontosaurus and  
479 other dinosaur footprints. *Ichnos: An International Journal for Plant and Animal Traces* 1, 81-90.
- 480 Martinez, M.M., Full, M.R.J., Koehl, M.A.R., 1998. Underwater punting by an intertidal crab: a novel gait  
481 revealed by kinematics of pedestrian locomotion in air versus water. *Journal of Experimental*  
482 *Biology* 201, 2609–2623.
- 483 McCrea, R.T., Pemberton, S.G., and Currie, P.J., 2004. New ichnotaxa of mammal and reptile tracks  
484 from the upper Paleocene of Alberta. *Ichnos* 11, 323-339.
- 485 McDougall, I., Brown, F.H., Cerling, T.E., Hillhouse, J.W., 1992. A reappraisal of the geomagnetic  
486 polarity time scale to 4 Ma using data from the Turkana Basin, East Africa. *Geophysical Research*  
487 *Letters* 19, 2349-2352.
- 488 McDougal, I.A.N., Brown, F.H., 2006. Precise  $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$  geochronology for the upper Koobi Fora  
489 Formation, Turkana Basin, northern Kenya. *Journal of the Geological Society* 163, 205-220.
- 490 Miall, A.D., 1977 A review of the braided-river depositional environment. *Earth Science Reviews* 13, 1–  
491 62
- 492 Milàn, J., Hedegaard, R., 2010. Interspecific variation in tracks and trackways from extant crocodylians.  
493 In: Milàn, J., Lucas, S.G., Lockley, M.G., and Spielmann, J.A. (eds.), *Crocodile Tracks and*  
494 *Traces*. New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science Bulletin, Albuquerque, NM  
495 51.pp.15-29.

- 496 Milner, A.R.C., Lockley, M.G., Kirkland, J.I., 2006. A large collection of well-preserved theropod  
497 dinosaur swim tracks from the Lower Jurassic Moenave Formation, St. George, Utah. In: Harris,  
498 J.D., Lucas, S.G., Spielmann, J.A., Lockley, M.G., Milner, A.R.C., Kirkland, J.I. (eds.), The  
499 Triassic-Jurassic Terrestrial Transition. New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science  
500 Bulletin, Albuquerque, NM, 37 pp 315-328
- 501 Milner, A.R.C., Lockley, M. G. in review. Dinosaur swim track assemblages: Characteristics, contexts  
502 and ichnofacies implications. In Dinosaur tracks: Next Steps.
- 503 Renaut, R.W., Owen R.B., 1981. Shore-zone sedimentation and facies in a closed rift lake: the  
504 Holocene beach deposits of Lake Bogoria, Kenya. In: Anadon, P., Cabrera, L., Kelts, K. (Eds.),  
505 Lacustrine Facies Analysis, Spec. Publ. Int. Assoc. Sedimentol. 13, pp. 175–195
- 506 Romilio, A., Tucker, R.T., Salisbury, S.W., 2013. Reevaluation of the Lark Quarry dinosaur tracksite  
507 (late Albian-Cenomanian Winton Formation, central-western Queensland, Australia): No longer  
508 a stampede? *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 33, 102-120.
- 509 Thulborn, R.A., 2013. Lark Quarry revisited: a critique of methods used to identify a large dinosaurian  
510 track-maker in the Winton Formation (Albian–Cenomanian), western Queensland, Australia.  
511 *Alcheringa*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03115518.2013.748482>.
- 512 Spoor, F., Leakey, M.G., Gathogo, P.N., Brown, F. H., Antón, S.C., McDougall, I., Leakey, L.N., 2007.  
513 Implications of new early Homo fossils from Ileret, east of Lake Turkana, Kenya. *Nature* 448,  
514 688-691.
- 515 Vila, B., Oms, O., Galobart, À., 2005. Manus-only titanosaurid trackway from Fumanya (Maastrichtian,  
516 Pyrenees): further evidence for an underprint origin. *Lethaia* 38, 211-218.
- 517 Vondra C.F., Johnson G.D., Behrensmeyer A.K., Bowen B.E., 1971. Preliminary studies of the East  
518 Rudolf basin, Kenya. *Nature* 231, 245–248.
- 519 Vondra, C.F., Bowen, B.E., 1978. Stratigraphy, sedimentary facies and paleoenvironments, East Lake  
520 Turkana, Kenya. Geological Society, London, Special Publications 6, 395-414.
- 521 Williamson, P.G., 1981. Palaeontological documentation of speciation in Cenozoic molluscs from  
522 Turkana Basin. *Nature* 293, 437-443.
- 523 Williamson, P.G., 1982. Molluscan biostratigraphy of the Koobi Fora hominid-bearing deposits. *Nature*  
524 295, 140 – 142
- 525 Wynn, J.G., 2004. Influence of Plio-Pleistocene aridification on human evolution: Evidence from  
526 paleosols of the Turkana Basin, Kenya. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 123, 106-  
527 118.

528 Xing LD, Lockley MG, Zhang JP, Milner ARC, Klein H, et al., 2013. A new early cretaceous dinosaur  
529 track assemblage and the first definite non-avian theropod swim trackway from China. Chinese  
530 Science Bulletin 58, 2370-2378.

531

## 532 **Figure and Table Captions**

533 Figure 1. Location and site maps. **A.** General over view showing the line of transect for the faunal  
534 analysis, drainage and general strike and dip of the outcropping beds. Hominin marker sites are  
535 also shown. **B.** Detailed topographic map for the GaJi10 based on a primary field survey using  
536 a Lecia System 500 (SR530) dGPS. The outcrop of the Akait Tuff is shown. **C.** Cross-section  
537 transverse to strike between GaJi14 and the famous hominin site of KMNER1808.

538 Figure 2. Photographs of GaJi10. **A.** General overview of the excavation of GaJi10 (Central) showing  
539 the scanning rig in action. Note the dip of the bedding into the slope and away from the valley  
540 floor. **B.** General overview of the excavation of GaJi10 (South). **C.** Ichnological surface at  
541 GaJi10 (South). **D-E.** Ichnological surface at GaJi10 (Central) both in overview and close-up.  
542 **D.** Single print at GaJi10 (North). **G.** Hippopotami prints in cross-section with the south wall of  
543 GaJi10 (Central). **H.** Track from GaJi10 (South) showing the striated substrate caused by the  
544 proximal movement of the trackmaker's foot across the surface. **I.** Double track at GaJi10  
545 (South), note the rim structure immediately behind the print. **J-L.** Ichnological surface of GaJi10  
546 (South) showing the general pattern of tracks.

547 Figure 3. Sedimentary logs for geo-trenches in the vicinity of GaJi10. Log locations can be found in  
548 Figure 1 and the key to the facies codes in Table 1.

549 Figure 4. A. Sketch of the rear wall of GaJi10 (South). See Table 1 for code to the facies logs. B.  
550 Sedimentary log through the rear wall of the excavation GaJi10 (Central).

551 Figure 5. Schematic visualisation of the landscape around GaJi10 based on the lithofacies analysis.

552 Figure 6. Contour maps derived from optical laser scans of selected tracks on the ichnological surface  
553 at GaJi10 (Central).

554 Figure 7. Map of the ichnological surface at GaJi10 (South).

555 Figure 8. **A-D**. Dimensions of the tracks found at GaJi10 (South) measurements are taken from  
556 landmarks placed on digital scans analysed in Foot Processor. **C**. Longitudinal cross-section of  
557 Track in Figure 9M.

558 Figure 9. **A-P**. Photographs of typical tracks from GaJi10 (South). See text for detailed description of  
559 individual tracks.

560 Figure 10. **A-D**. Selected scans of track complexes, warm colours represent areas of elevation.

561 Figure 11. **A-C**. Contour maps created in ArcGIS for selected tracks and track assemblages. Contour  
562 interval is 1 mm.

563 Figure 12. Selected photographs of two Nile *Hippopotamus amphibius* through the side wall of their  
564 tank at the Adventure Aquarium Philadelphia in 2008 showing an anatomy of a right front foot (**A**)  
565 and various styles of punting behaviour (**B-D**). See the text for detailed description..

566 Table 1. Lithofacies documented in the vicinity of GaJi(10) see Figures 3 and 4 for associated sediment  
567 logs. Modified lithofacies codes after Mail (1977): Dmm = massive diamict; GRt = trough cross-  
568 bedded granule gravel; GRh = horizontally bedded granule gravel; GRfu = normally graded  
569 granule gravel; GRm = massive granule gravel; Su = fine to coarse shallow scours and cross-  
570 stratification sand; Sh = horizontally stratified sand; Sm = massive sand; Sr = rippled sand ;Sl =  
571 parallel laminated sand ;Sd = deformed sand beds; Fm = massive silt/clay; Fl = laminated  
572 silt/clay; ... (p) = weathered/palaeosol.

573 Table 2. Faunal data for six parallel 25 m transects running from GaJi 14 in the west through GaJi10  
574 to KNM-ER-1808 in the east (Fig. 1). All surface bone specimens were flagged and surveyed  
575 and identified by Dr Jack McCoy and Dr Stephen Merrit. Data collection was in July 2008.  
576 (Source: Personal Communication Dr Jack McCoy.

577 -

578 Table 1. Lithofacies documented in the vicinity of GaJi(10) see Figures 3 and 4 for associated sediment logs. Modified lithofacies codes after Mail (1977):  
 579 Dmm = massive diamict; GRt = trough cross-bedded granule gravel; GRh = horizontally bedded granule gravel; GRfu = normally graded granule gravel; GRm  
 580 = massive granule gravel; Su = fine to coarse shallow scours and cross-stratification sand; Sh = horizontally stratified sand; Sm = massive sand; Sr = rippled  
 581 sand ;Sl = parallel laminated sand ;Sd = deformed sand beds; Fm = massive silt/clay; Fl = laminated silt/clay; ... (p) = weathered/palaeosol.

Facies Association	Component Facies	Architecture	Description	Interpretation
<b>FA-1</b>	Su, Sh, St, GRh, GRm, GRt, GRfu, Sm(p), Dmm	Varies laterally and vertically over a range of distances. Broad sheets infilling shallow troughs (0.5 to 1 m thick) over 10 to 100 m. Scours and small cross-cut channels locally.	Sheets containing: multiple cross-cutting scours and small channels (<0.5 m wide) of coarse sand and granule gravel (0.1-0.4 m thick); trough cross sets; normally graded granule gravel to medium sand units; palaeosols (<100 mm - >2.5 m thick; columnar and polished peds); occasional units (0.2 - 0.5 m) of diamict with soft-sediment clasts; and occasional siltling lines and fine-grained rip-up clasts and palaeosol peds. Distinctive oolitic, stromatolites and indurated carbonate horizons occur in places.	Low energy fluvial environment consisting of a series of shallow troughs and channels at a range of scales. At the largest scale, broad sand dominated troughs with a range of sinusoidal bedforms and dunes. At a smaller scale there are multiple erosional channels and scours re-working abandoned channel and trough floors during periods of low flow. Channel instability with rapid lateral erosion during peak flows, with palaeosol formation on exposed bars and adjacent slopes. The presence of occasional diamict units indicates debris or hyperconcentrated flows typical of periodic high energy floods.
<b>FA-2</b>	Fm, Sl, Sh, Sr, Fm(p), Dmm	This association consists of multiple, thin (typically <0.3 m) sheets extending over 100s of metres laterally.	Massive silt units (50-500 mm) inter-bedded with thin beds of parallel laminated and rippled fine to medium sand with scoured bases and draped upper contacts. Upper surface of silt units often show evidence of desiccation cracks and surface weathering verging towards palaeosols. Above punctuated by laterally extensive sheets of sand (0.2-0.5 m) thick have cemented to form prominent marker horizons. Contain stromatolites small nodular domes and mamal (50-150 mm diameter). Diamict units occur as tabular sheets and include soft-sediment clasts and sand stringers. Some thicker units of medium sand may contain mollusc horizons, particular where they overlie desiccated silt surfaces.	Flat, planar sediment surfaces subject to oscillations in water level with periodic desiccation of thick silt units typical of shallow lacustrine or lagoonal conditions receiving varying water supply either due to seasonal variations in water flow or switching /migration of feeder channels. This gives a distinct couplet of sediment with thin coarse units indicative of water and sediment inflow punctuated by periods of quiet water where silts settle and the water level falls, revealing desiccated surface. This wetting and drying leads to algal growth structures. More widespread flood events involve the transgression of medium to coarse sand with isolated mollusc shells. Lake margins or lagoonal system.
<b>FA-3</b>	Sh, Sd, Sm, Su, Fm, Fm(p)	Either sheets of mollusc rich sand 0.2 to 0.6 m thick extending laterally along strike for tens if not hundreds of metres, although the shell concentrations varies rapidly both vertically and laterally. The facies can also be found in filling scours and smaller channels (<5m wide).	Units containing commuted mollusc shells (10-95%) set in matrix of massive medium/coarse sand. Mollusc concentration typically has inverse grading or shows evidence of soft-sediment deformation. Mollusc units infill desiccation cracks in underlying units. Occasional in fill small scours (0.5 m wide). Rippled, laminated and graded sand units plus massive mollusc free sand units form prominent and laterally extensive inter-beds. Hummocky cross-stratification present locally. Tabular, domal and nodular carbonate concentrations occur locally especially on the upper surface of units.	Shoreline or near shore units with winnowed, re-worked mollusc horizons concentrated as lag deposits. Migration of carbonate through leaching of ground waters to form nodules and other carbonate concentrations. Part of transgressive lake episodes.

<b>FA-4</b>	Fm, Fl	Tabular sheets of appear to be of limited lateral extent, infilling troughs and channels	Massive or weakly laminated clay with manganese and iron staining. Draped basal contacts and occasional granule gravel dropstones. Little evidence of palaeosol formation, although near-surface units may be over printed with modern soil formation	Deep water infilling abandoned channels, pools or larger water bodies.
<b>FA-5</b>	Su, Sl, Sh, GRh, Sr	Planar sheets with broad trough like geometry over 10 to 100 m+	Multiple units often forming fining upwards sequences culminating in thicker, more massive silt units. Range of ripple cross lamination plus climbing ripples. Local soft-sediment deformation; rip-up clasts including tuff in places; asymmetrical infills to broad troughs; multiple alternating units of silts, fine sand with thicker units of medium to coarse sand. Very occasional small scale scours. Trough cross laminations in sand and silt, usually small. Diverse range of bedforms; relatively high energy sheet like deposits Multiple gaded units; 1- 5 mm individual units making up 0.3 m packages scours; contorted laminations	Broad shallow channels to inflow across shallow lake floor; graded units present but little evidence of sediment gravity flows more limited; mostly tractional currents; couplets limited. Shallow water deposits under sheet flow in troughs or near shore lacustrine environments

582

583

584 Table 2. Faunal data for six parallel 25 m transects running from GaJi14 in the west through GaJi10 to KNM-ER-1808 in the east (Fig. 1). All surface bone  
585 specimens were flagged and surveyed and identified by Dr Jack McCoy and Dr Stephen Merrit. Data collection was in July 2008. (Source: Personal  
586 Communication with Dr Jack McCoy)

	<b>Bovid</b>	<b>Suid</b>	<b>Equid</b>	<b>Elephant</b>	<b>Primate</b>	<b>Carnivore</b>	<b>Camel</b>	<b>Bird</b>	<b>Giraffe</b>	<b>Terrestrial Sub-Total</b>
<b>Transect 1</b>	48	5	4	0	6	0	0	0	0	63
	49%	5%	4%	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
<b>Transect 2</b>	39	12	5	2	1	1	1	0	0	61
	46%	14%	6%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	
<b>Transect 3</b>	27	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
	47%	11%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
<b>Transect 4</b>	43	14	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	68
	33%	11%	8%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
<b>Transect 5</b>	36	15	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	60
	38%	16%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	
<b>Transect 6</b>	41	9	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	69

	34%	7%	12%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
<b>Totals</b>	234	61	44	7	7	1	1	1	0	356
	40%	10%	8%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	

587

	Hippo	Croc	Fish	Turtle	Aquatic/semi Sub-Total	Total Specimens All Taxa
<b>Transect 1</b>	21	7	4	2	34	97
	22%	7%	4%	2%		
<b>Transect 2</b>	11	7	2	3	23	84
	13%	8%	2%	4%		
<b>Transect 3</b>	14	4	2	2	22	57
	25%	7%	4%	4%		
<b>Transect 4</b>	43	11	5	5	64	132
	33%	8%	4%	4%		
<b>Transect 5</b>	21	6	5	2	34	94
	22%	6%	5%	2%		
<b>Transect 6</b>	31	11	8	3	53	122
	25%	9%	7%	2%		
<b>Totals</b>	141	46	26	17	230	586
	24%	8%	4%	3%		

588

589

590