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Figure S1. Far UV circular dichroism spectra of C16C19-GGY $(236 \mu \mathrm{M})$ taken before $(■)$ and after $(\bullet)$ the addition of $\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{I})(283 \mu \mathrm{M})$ in 0.2 M acetate buffer, pH 5.4 in the presence of 1 mM TCEP. Inset: Plot of $\theta_{222}$ as a function of added $\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{I})$.
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Figure S2. UV titration of $100 \mu \mathrm{M} \mathrm{C16C19-GGY}$ by $\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{I})$ in 0.2 M acetate buffer pH $5.4500 \mu \mathrm{M}$ TCEP. Inset: Difference spectra of the $\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{I}) / \mathrm{C} 16 \mathrm{C} 19-\mathrm{GGY}$ solutions.


Figure S3. Residuals (top panel) and overlays (bottom panel) of a fit of the experimental equilibrium data from the $\mathrm{Cu}-\mathrm{C} 16 \mathrm{C} 19 \mathrm{GGY}$ peptide to a "two-component ideal noninteracting" model. In the experiment, 280 nm scans were taken at equilibrium from 3 concentrations ( 200,320 and $450 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) and 4 different speeds ( $50.0,53.3,56.7$ and 60.0 krpm ) and globally analyzed with UltraScan (Demeler, B. (2005) UltraScan version 7.0) by fitting to self-associating and noninteracting models. The "two-component ideal noninteracting" model provided the best fit as judged by the variance and the residual run patterns, with the monomer-tetramer model being the next best candidate. The fit resulted in a species with a molecular weight of 2.9 kD , and a species with a molecular weight of 12.1 kD and a variance of $2.36 \times 10^{-5}$. The "monomer-tetramer" model resulted in a monomer molecular weight of 3.06 kD and a variance of $5.01 \times 10^{-5}$. The partial specific volume of C16C19GGY peptide was determined by the method of Cohn and Edsall (Cohn, E. J., and Edsall, J. T. (1943) Proteins, Amino Acids, and Peptides as Ions and Dipolar Ions. New York, Reinhold.) from the protein sequence of C16C19GGY peptide and found to be $0.7425 \mathrm{ccm} / \mathrm{g}$.
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XAS Data Collection and Analysis:

Copper K-edge XAS data for $\mathrm{Cu}-\mathrm{C} 16 \mathrm{C} 19-\mathrm{GGY}$ were collected on beam line X9B at the National Synchrotron Light Source at Brookhaven National Laboratory. The sample was placed in a polycarbonate sample holder and frozen in liquid nitrogen. For XAS data collection, the plastic sample holder was then inserted into an aluminum frame that was held near 50 K by a He displex cryostat. Data were collected under ring conditions of 2.8 GeV and $120-300 \mathrm{~mA}$ using a sagitally focusing $\mathrm{Si}(111)$ double-crystal monochromator. Harmonic rejection was accomplished with a focusing mirror left flat. The X-ray energy of the focused monochromatic beam was internally calibrated to the first inflection of a Cu foil spectrum ( 8980.3 eV ). X-ray fluorescence data were collected using a 13-element Ge detector (Canberra). X-ray absorption near-edge structure (XANES) data were collected from ca. $8780-9180 \mathrm{eV}$ and X-ray absorption fine structure (EXAFS) were collected from $8780-10000 \mathrm{eV}$. For both sets of data the primary vertical aperture was set to 0.3 mm .

The integrity of the samples was monitored by comparing XANES data from sequential scans. No significant changes were noted. Upon removal from the sample holder, visual inspection revealed that where the beam had been incident on the sample, the color had changed from colorless to yellow.

The XANES analysis was performed by fitting a baseline to the pre-edge and edge regions of the spectrum (ca. $8780-8960$ ) using a cubic function for the pre-edge and $75 \%$ Gaussian and $25 \%$ Lorenzian function to fit the rise in fluorescence occurring at the edge. Gaussian functions were added for transitions occurring at lower energy and
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the areas of the Gaussian fits were taken as peak areas. An average of $c a .3$ scans (39 spectra with edge energy variation $\leq 0.2 \mathrm{eV}$ ) were used in the XANES analysis.

EXAFS data were analyzed using the program EXAFS123. ${ }^{1}$ Eight scans were averaged to generate an EXAFS spectrum (edge energy variation $\leq 0.4 \mathrm{eV}$ ). The summed data files were background corrected and normalized using a five section cubic spline to fit the background in the pre-edge and post-edge regions. The data were converted to $k$ space using the relationship $\left[2 m_{e}\left(E-E_{0}\right) / h^{2}\right]^{1 / 2}$ (where $m_{e}$ is the electron mass, $\hbar$ is Plank's constant divided by $2 \pi$ and $E_{0}$ is the threshold energy of the absorption edge, which was chosen to be 8990 eV . Least-squares fits of the EXAFS data over a $k$ range of 2-12.5 $\AA^{-1}$ were performed on Fourier-filtered data with a backtransform window $=1-4$ $\AA$. The upper limit of the $k$ space range was limited by high-frequency noise. Best fits were generated by minimizing the goodness of fit criterion $\left(G O F=[n\{i d p\} /(n\{i d p\}-n\{p\})]^{1 / 2} R\right.$, where $R=\operatorname{avg}[$ data simulation/esd(data)], $n(p)$ is the number of varied parameters, and $n(i d p)$ is the number of data points for unfiltered refinements or $2\left(r_{\max }-r_{\min }\right)\left(k_{\max }-k_{\min }\right) \pi$ for filtered refinements).

Theoretical phases and amplitudes for EXAFS analyses were calculated using FEFF 8 and the crystallographically characterized model compounds: benzil bisthiosemicarbazonatocopper(II) ${ }^{2}$, bis( $\mu_{2}$-thiourea)-tetrakis(thiourea)-di-copper(I) bis(tetrafluoroborate) ${ }^{3}$, and tetrakis( N -methylimidazole)copper(I) perchlorate ${ }^{4}$. Upon determining the first coordination sphere around the copper, additional scatterers were added to fit the FT between 2 and $4 \AA$. The number of copper atoms was initially allowed to refine, giving a value of 2.8 Cu atoms. This value was then locked to either two or three for subsequent fits. With the exception of the Cu scattering atoms, the
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number of scattering atoms in a given fit were set to integer values and not allowed to refine. This led to three free-running parameters for each shell: the distance (r), the disorder parameter $\left(\sigma^{2}\right)$ and $\mathrm{E}_{0}$.
(1) Padden, K. M.; Krebs, J. F.; Trafford, K. T.; Yap, G. P. A.; Rheingold, A. H.; Borovik, A. S.; Scarrow, R. C. Chem. Mater. 2001, 13, 4305.
(2) Bushnell, G. W.; Tsang, A. Y. M. Can. J. Chem. 1979, 57, 603.
(3) Taylor, I. F.; Weininger, M. S.; Amma, E. L. Inorg. Chem. 1974, 13, 2835.
(4) Clegg, W.; Acott, S. R.; Garner, C. D. Acta Crystallogr., Sect. C: Cryst. Struct. Comтии. 1984, 40, 768.
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Table S1. Fits for Cu-C16C19-GGY Fourier-filtered Cu K-edge EXAFS Data (backtransform window of 1-4 Å.)

| Shells | Radius (Å) | $\sigma^{2}\left(\check{A}^{2}\right)$ | E(0)shift (eV) | GOF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 S | 2.05(7) | 0.007(4) | -15(15) | 1.62 |
| 2S | 2.10(6) | 0.012(4) | -8(9) | 1.47 |
| 3 S | 2.11(5) | 0.016(4) | -8(8) | 1.40 |
| 45 | 2.10(5) | 0.019(4) | -9(7) | 1.38 |
| 5 S | 2.09(5) | 0.021(4) | -10(7) | 1.38 |
| 6 S | 2.08(5) | 0.024(4) | -11(7) | 1.39 |
| 1 S | 2.04(7) | 0.006(4) | -16(16) | 1.62 |
| 1 Cu | 2.81(4) | 0.009(5) | 79(0) |  |
| 2S | 2.09(6) | 0.012(4) | -8(9) | 1.46 |
| 1 Cu | 2.81(6) | 0.009(4) | 77(8) |  |
| 3 S | 2.10 (5) | 0.016(4) | -8(8) | 1.37 |
| 1 Cu | 2.80(5) | 0.009(4) | 77(7) |  |
| 4 S | 2.10 (5) | 0.019(4) | -9(7) | 1.34 |
| 1 Cu | 2.80(5) | 0.009(4) | 76(7) |  |
| 1 S | 2.05(7) | $0.007(4)$ | -14(16) | 1.65 |
| 2 Cu | 2.87(9) | 0.02(1) | 82(7) |  |
| 2S | 2.11(5) | $0.012(4)$ | -6(8) | 1.29 |
| 2 Cu | 2.87(5) | 0.010(3) | 12(9) |  |
| 3 S | $2.12(5)$ | 0.016(3) | -5(6) | 1.18 |
| 2 Cu | 2.86(5) | 0.010(2) | 12(8) |  |
| 4 S | 2.12(4) | 0.019(3) | -6(5) | 1.13 |
| 2 Cu | 2.86(5) | 0.010(2) | 12(8) |  |
| 1 S | $2.06(6)$ | $0.007(4)$ | $-12(14)$ | 1.52 |
| 3 Cu | 2.87(6) | 0.013(3) | 13(8) |  |
| 2S | 2.12(5) | 0.013(4) | -5(8) | 1.30 |
| 3 Cu | 2.86(5) | 0.013(3) | 12(8) |  |
| 3 S | 2.13(5) | 0.016(3) | -5(6) | 1.18 |
| 3 Cu | 2.86(5) | 0.013(3) | 11(7) |  |
| 1 N | 1.92(3) | -0.001(2) | 15(8) | 1.10 |
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| 2 S | 2.18(4) | 0.009(4) | -5(7) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Cu | 2.88(4) | 0.005(2) | 14(9) |  |
| 1N | 1.92(2) | -0.001(2) | 18(6) | 1.08 |
| 3 S | 2.16(4) | 0.012(3) | -7(5) |  |
| 1 Cu | 2.87(4) | 0.005(2) | 13(9) |  |
| 1 N | 1.92(4) | 0.000(3) | 9(15) | 1.15 |
| 1S | 2.22(7) | 0.005(5) | 2(16) |  |
| 2 Cu | 2.87(4) | 0.009(2) | 13(7) |  |
| 1N | 1.90(3) | 0.000(2) | 4(10) | 1.08 |
| 2S | 2.22(5) | 0.013(4) | 3(6) |  |
| 2 Cu | 2.87(4) | 0.010(2) | 12(7) |  |
| 1N | 1.88(4) | 0.001(2) | -2(11) | 1.06 |
| 3 S | 2.22(5) | 0.020(4) | 4(5) |  |
| 2 Cu | 2.86(4) | 0.009(2) | 12(7) |  |
| 1N | 1.92(4) | 0.000(3) | 9(15) | 1.18 |
| 1S | 2.22(7) | 0.006(5) | 3(15) |  |
| 3 Cu | 2.87(4) | 0.013(3) | 12(7) |  |
| 1N | 1.90(3) | 0.001(2) | 5(10) | 1.08 |
| 2S | 2.22(5) | 0.013(2) | 4(6) |  |
| 3 Cu | 2.86(4) | 0.013(4) | 11(6) |  |
| 1N | 1.88(4) | 0.001(2) | -2(11) | 1.06 |
| 3S | 2.22(5) | 0.019(4) | 11(6) |  |
| 3 Cu | 2.86(4) | 0.013(2) | 4(4) |  |
| 1N | 1.89(2) | 0.001(1) | 2(6) | 0.62 |
| 2S | 2.22(3) | 0.013(2) | 4(4) |  |
| 2 Cu | 2.86(1) | 0.009(1) | 11(4) |  |
| 1 Cu | 3.87(3) | 0.001(1) | 35(6) |  |
| 1 N | 1.89(1) | 0.0004(7) | 2(4) | 0.37 |
| 2S | 2.22(2) | 0.013(2) | 4(2) |  |
| 2 Cu | 2.88(1) | 0.0085(7) | 17(3) |  |
| 1 Cu | 3.91(1) | 0.0009(7) | 41(0) |  |
| 2S | 3.54(3) | 0.006(2) | -5(4) |  |
| 1N | 1.90(3) | 0.001(2) | 3(10) | 1.00 |
| 2S | 2.22(4) | 0.013(4) | 4(6) |  |
| 2 Cu | 2.90 (4) | 0.009(2) | 19(6) |  |
| 2S | 3.55(4) | 0.003(2) | -2(6) |  |

