

José M. Marmolejo-Cossío¹, Isaac J. Larsen^{1,2}, Eyal Marder¹, Alan J. Hidy³

²Rocky Mountain Biological Laboratory, Crested Butte, CO, 81224, USA

Correspondence to: Isaac J. Larsen (ilarsen@umass.edu)

Abstract. Meteoric beryllium-10 ($^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$) has a wide range of applications as a geochronometer and tracer of geological processes. $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ is produced in the atmosphere by cosmic rays and delivered to Earth's surface primarily via precipitation. $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ is particularly suitable for quantifying surface process rates where use of *in situ*-produced ^{10}Be is challenging, such as landscapes with quartz-poor bedrock. However, using $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ for dating and quantifying surface process rates requires constraining depositional fluxes across space and time. Although empirical and physical models for predicting fluxes exist, the predictions can deviate substantially from measured values. Here we quantify $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ flux in the East River watershed in Colorado, USA where precipitation is dominated by snowfall. We measured the $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ precipitation were 1.8–3.8 times higher than inheritance-corrected site fluxes, but only 0.7–1.8 times higher than erosion- and desorption Be_{met} inventory in soils on five glacial moraines 13–18 ka in age that span 700 m of elevation and calculated $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ fluxes by dividing each inventory by moraine age. Inheritance-corrected fluxes range from 4.31×10^5 – 1.80×10^6 atoms $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$ and fluxes corrected for erosion using modeled erosional and desorption losses are higher by up to a factor of two. The predicted fluxes are well correlated with elevation, mean annual precipitation, mean snow depth, and snow water equivalent ($R^2 = 0.87$ to 0.98), but the relationships degrade when fluxes are corrected for erosion ($R^2 = 0.42$ – 0.63). Regression models based on applied to gridded elevation, precipitation, snow depth and snow water equivalent data predict watershed-averaged fluxes of 0.66 – 1.1×10^6 – 2.3 – 3.8×10^6 atoms $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$. Predicted fluxes from a published empirical model that estimates fluxes as a function of precipitation were within a factor of 1.8–3.8 of measured values at each site. Inheritance-corrected fluxes calculated using a profile-average desorption model. Fluxes predicted by physically-based general circulation models (GCM) are generally fall within a factor of one to three the range of our empirically estimated watershed-averaged values, but the GCM predictions are too coarse to capture fluxes, although the intra-watershed spatial variability in fluxes degree of agreement depends on the predictor variable and whether inheritance-corrected or erosion- and desorption-corrected fluxes are used. Our results highlight both the importance of factors that drive variability in $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ delivery to soils and how local calibration can improve estimates of $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ flux in mountain watersheds.

1 Introduction

The cosmogenic nuclide beryllium-10 (^{10}Be) is used widely for geochronology and to quantify rates of Earth surface processes (Bierman and Nichols, 2004; Willenbring and von Blanckenburg, 2010; Granger et al., 2013). ^{10}Be forms during high energy collisions between cosmic particles and target nuclei (Lal and Peters, 1967). ^{10}Be produced in Earth's atmosphere (typically from N and O) is known as atmospheric, garden variety, or meteoric ^{10}Be ($^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$), whereas *in situ*-produced ^{10}Be ($^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{in situ}}$) is formed in mineral lattices at and near Earth's surface. Production rates of $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{in situ}}$ are on the order of a few to tens of atoms $\text{g}^{-1} \text{yr}^{-1}$ in quartz (Gosse and Phillips, 2001; Borchers et al., 2016). In contrast, $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ is generated at orders of magnitude higher rates, with a global-averaged flux values in excess of one million atoms $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$ (Monaghan, et al., 1986; McHargue and Damon, 1991). $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ is circulated throughout resides in the atmosphere before being removed through stratosphere and troposphere for 2 years and 55 days, respectively (Yamagata et al., 2019). Hence atmospheric circulation transports $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ prior to its deposition on Earth's surface by precipitation or dry fallout (Field et al., 2006; Heikkilä et al., 2008). Once delivered to Earth's surface, $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ binds with minerals within soil, and is preferentially adsorbed to the adsorbs to and is co-precipitated on mineral surfaces of, hence the highest concentrations are associated with secondary minerals and fine-grained particles and secondary minerals with high surface areas (e.g., Graly et al., 2010). $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ is partitioned with the solid phase for approximately neutral pH values (You et al., 1989) and. $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ is generally thought to be retained in soils where pH is $> \sim 4$ (Graly et al., 2010). However, but laboratory experiments indicate pH 6 soils are more retentive than pH 4 soils and that retention also varies as a function of the type of organic compounds present (Boschi and Willenbring, 2016a, b). $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ may be lost from upper soil horizons where low pH leads to leaching (Dixon et al., 2018), where clay minerals or humic material with adsorbed Be are translocated to greater depth (Pavich et al., 1984; Jagereikova et al., 2015), and where the surface of the soil has been eroded (Harden et al., 2002). Hence soil $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ inventories depend on a variety of factors, including the local delivery rate, landform age, degree of chemical weathering, soil pH, and erosion rate (e.g., Graly et al., 2010; Willenbring and von Blanckenburg, 2010).

The high production rates, which allow $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}/^9\text{Be}$ ratios to be readily measured via accelerator mass spectrometry (AMS), the wide range of soils and regolith where $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ is retained, and – unlike $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{in situ}}$ – the ability to be measured in non-quartz-bearing materials has allowed $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ to be used widely as a geochronometer and tracer of Earth surface processes (e.g., Brown et al., 1987a; Graly et al., 2010; Willenbring and von Blanckenburg, 2010). For example, $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ has been used to date terraces and moraines (Tsai et al., 2018; Elgi et al., 2010; Dünforth et al., 2012), determine rock-to-soil production rates (Monaghan et al., 1992; McKean et al., 1993; Jungers et al., 2009), quantify soil residence times (Monaghan et al., 1983; Bacon et al., 2012; Foster et al., 2015), determine earthflow velocities (Mackey et al., 2009), trace sediment through hillslopes and fluvial systems (Brown et al., 1988; RuesserReusser and Bierman, 2010; West et al., 2014; Campforts et al., 2016), and, when coupled with ^9Be measurements, to quantify watershed-scale denudation rates and chemical weathering (von Blanckenburg et al., 2012; 2014; Dannhaus et al., 2018; Portenga et al., 2019; Deng et al., 2020a; 2021a). However, a requirement for using $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$

for dating and quantifying surface process rates is that the deposition rate or flux of $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ (F_{met} , atom $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) to the study area is known.

Numerous efforts have been made to measure or predict F_{met} at local to global spatial scales and over annual to millennial timescales (Willenbring and von Blanckenburg, 2010; Graly et al., 2011). Direct measurement of $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentrations in precipitation has been used to quantify $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ flux at point scales and short timescales to develop empirical relations that predict F_{met} as a function of precipitation rate or latitude (Brown et al., 1989; Monaghan et al., 1986; Raisbeck et al., 1981; Graham et al., 2003; Graly et al., 2011; Willenbring and von Blanckenburg 2010). ~~Global-scale values of F_{met} are predicted with nuclide~~ Nuclide production functions (e.g., Lal and Peters, 1967; Masarik and Beer, 1999) ~~that~~ are coupled with general circulation models (GCM) to simulate global scale spatial and temporal patterns of F_{met} as a function of geomagnetic field strength, solar activity, atmospheric circulation, and precipitation (Field et al., 2006; Heikkilä et al., 2008; Heikkilä and von Blanckenburg, 2015; Panovska et al., 2023; Zheng et al., 2021; Zheng et al., 2024). Millennial-averaged values of F_{met} can be inferred from soils by ~~first~~ measuring the $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ inventory (I_{met} , atom cm^{-2}), ~~which is done by multiplying) and dividing the inheritance-corrected $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentration (N_{corr} , atom g^{-1}), by soil bulk density (ρ , g cm^{-3}), the thickness of the sampling interval (z , cm), and the volumetric fraction of fine soil V_f and summing the values for all (n) individual sample depth increments (i)~~ inventory by landform age (e.g., Elgi et al., 2010; Reusser et al., 2010; Graly et al., 2011; Deng et al., 2021; 2021b).

$$I_{\text{met}} = \sum_{i=1}^n (N_{\text{corr}} \cdot \rho \cdot z \cdot V_f)_i \quad (1)$$

Provided the landform age is much less than the mean life of ^{10}Be , the I_{met} value measured on an independently dated landform is then divided by age (t , yr),

$$F_{\text{met}} = \frac{I_{\text{met}}}{t}, \quad (2)$$

to determine the flux (e.g., Graly et al., 2010; Reusser et al., 2010; Quimet et al., 2015; Clow et al., 2020).


Using soil inventories to quantify F_{met} assumes that $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ accumulation begins at the time a landform is initially exposed to wet and dry fallout. However, the ages of most landforms used to constrain flux are late Quaternary in age, or 1–2 orders of magnitude lower than the ^{10}Be half-life (1.387 Ma; Chmeleff et al., 2010; Korschinek et al., 2010). Hence most soil inventories contain inherited $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ atoms that were adsorbed to sediment grains prior to their incorporation within terraces and moraines (Graly et al., 2011). The inherited component can be identified by the presence of a near-constant $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentration in the

lower part of a measured depth profile and, once identified, can be subtracted from measurements at shallower depths to determine inheritance-corrected inventories (e.g., Reusser et al., 2010).

An additional assumption required to calculate F_{met} from soil inventories is that all $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ delivered to the soil since landform initiation has been retained (Willenbring and von Blanckenburg 2010). Potential for $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ loss due to chemical leaching can be assessed by measuring soil pH values. Potential loss of $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ due to physical erosion can be minimized by selection of stable, flat surfaces for sampling. However, if the surface erosion rate is independently known, the flux can be determined for eroding landforms, provided the $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentration in eroded material is also known (Brown, 1987b; Clow et al., 2020).

Soils contain $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ scavenged from the atmosphere by aerosols, but also from dust particles that are derived from aeolian erosion and transported in the atmosphere before being deposited (Monaghan et al., 1986; Graly, 2011). The dust-derived or "recycled" $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ can be as much as ~20% of the total flux (Monaghan et al., 1986; Graham et al., 2003) and must be accounted for before comparing measured fluxes against predictions from GCMs. However, the dust contribution to flux estimates does not need to be independently known to quantify surface process rates, provided that time-averaged delivery of dust to soils is representative of the timescale relevant to the surface process rate under investigation.

There is often disagreement between F_{met} values determined from soil inventories and global-scale physical models or precipitation-based empirical models that predict flux as a function of precipitation and latitude (Ouimet et al., 2015; Deng et al., 2020b; Krone et al., 2024). Substantial variability in F_{met} has been documented at spatial scales smaller than the grid cell size (often several hundred km) of many GCMs (Ouimet et al., 2015; Clow et al., 2020; Deng et al., 2020b). The discrepancies and spatial variability likely stem from temporal and spatial fluctuations in $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ production, atmospheric circulation/transport, and precipitation (Monaghan et al., 1986; Graham 2003; Jordan et al., 2003; Deng et al., 2020a; Krone et al., 2024). Hence, it is often desirable to locally-calibrate F_{met} prior to using $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ to quantify surface process rates (e.g., Reusser et al., 2010; Ouimet et al., 2015; Deng et al., 2021b). Local-scale calibration is particularly important in mountainous settings, where microclimate variability can cause $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ inventories and fluxes to vary over short distances (Ouimet et al., 2015). Here we quantify the $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ flux at sites throughout the East River watershed, near Crested Butte, Colorado, USA (Figure 1), a site of intensive research on the physical and biogeochemical drivers of watershed function (Hubbard et al., 2018). We measure $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ inventories on independently dated glacial moraines, assess local-scale influences on $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ flux, model potential losses of $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ due to erosion and desorption, and compare $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ flux measurements against predictions from empirical and physical models to evaluate the spatial variability and predictability of F_{met} values/ $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ fluxes in alpine environments.



130 **Figure 1: a) Digital elevation model (DEM) of Colorado, USA showing the location of East River watershed. b) Image**
of the East River watershed showing locations (red diamonds) where soil $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ inventories and fluxes were measured.

2 Study Site




Figure 2: Maps of environmental variables within the East River watershed. (a) LiDAR-derived elevation data; (Goulden et al., 2020); (b) Mean downscaled Precipitation-elevation Regressions on Independent Slopes Model (PRISM) mean annual precipitation (MAP) data averaged from 2008–2019; (Mital et al., 2022); (c) Mean mean snow depth, and (d) Mean mean snow water equivalent (SWE), derived from Airborne Snow Observatory data from 2018–2019; (Painter et al., 2018a, b). The black diamonds show each sample location.

2 Study Site

The East River drains the Elk Range of the Rocky Mountains in Colorado, USA (~38.9°N, 106.9°W). The East River joins the Taylor River to form the Gunnison River, a major tributary to the Colorado River. The East River watershed and its tributaries, Washington Gulch and the Slate River, are a steep mountainous landscape, with elevations that range from 2600 m to 4100 m above sea-level (Figure 2a). The climate is characterized by long, cold winters and cool, short summers (Hubbard

et al., 2018). The mean annual temperature is $\sim 0^{\circ}\text{C}$, with mean minimum and maximum temperatures of -9.2 and 9.8°C , respectively (Hubbard et al., 2018). Most of the annual precipitation occurs as snowfall, which can exceed several meters per year (Prather et al., 2023) ~~and varies with elevation (Figure 2).~~. Observations of enhanced precipitation rates on the windward side of mountains demonstrates that orography plays a strong role in controlling precipitation patterns within the watershed (Heflin et al., 2024). Hence like other mountain landscapes with orographically-influenced rain and snowfall (e.g., Roe, 2005), mean annual precipitation within the East River watershed increases with elevation (Figure 2). The continental subarctic climate in the East River watershed supports montane, subalpine, and alpine ecosystems, which host aspen, meadow, mixed conifer, sagebrush, grass, sedge, and forb species (Figure S1) (Harte and Shaw, 1995). Bedrock in the watershed is primarily Cretaceous-age Mancos Shale and other sedimentary rocks that are intruded by Paleocene- to Miocene-age quartz monzonite porphyry and granodiorite rocks (Gaskill et al., 1967, 1991). Pleistocene glaciers eroded high elevation cirques and deposited moraines and outwash in the main East River valley (Gaskill et al., 1967, 1991). Exposure ages based on $^{10}\text{Be}_{in situ}$ concentrations measured in samples from boulders indicate the terminal moraine at the end of the valley dates to 17.9 ka, whereas the youngest recessional moraine in a high-elevation cirque within the Copper Creek watershed was exposed at 13.0 ka (Quirk et al., 2024).

3 Methods

3.1 Field and laboratory methods

Soil $^{10}\text{Be}_{met}$ inventories were determined for five glacial moraines with exposure ages that range from 17.9 to 13.0 ka (Figure 1; Table 1; Quirk et al., 2024). Soil pits were dug on the flattest part of each moraine crest to minimize the potential of post-depositional erosion, with the exception of the Gothic moraine site, which was opportunistically located where the East River has laterally eroded a cutbank into the moraine, permitting deeper sampling. The pits were dug until shovel refusal, to depths between 60 and 145 cm. At the Washington Gulch North site, we sampled from a soil pit on a flat portion of the moraine, and collected a sample on the same moraine that was exposed by a recent landslide ~ 375 m from the soil pit to assess inheritance in a deeper sample than we could access by digging. Bulk density was determined at each site by driving a 90.8 cm^3 steel cylinder into the soil at depths corresponding to different horizons and weighing the dry soil (Table S1). Samples were collected in either 5 or 10 cm depth increments by pressing a stainless-steel box, open at the top and front, into the face of the soil pit and scraping soil into the box. Samples were dried and sieved to separate < 2 mm particles. We combined samples from adjacent ~~depth intervals~~ depths to generate composite samples that encompassed depth intervals that range from 10 to 20 cm. Samples were combined by mixing splits of the < 2 mm size fraction in proportion to the total mass of < 2 mm particles in each sampling interval. The combined < 2 mm fractions were powdered using a tungsten carbide shatter box. We measured soil pH in water and in 0.01 M CaCl_2 to assess $^{10}\text{Be}_{met}$ retention ~~by first. The measurements in water were made by mixing ~ 5 g of powdered < 2 mm grain-size material with 12 mL ultrapure water. Samples were stirred and left overnight prior to The CaCl_2 pH measurements were made by mixing approximately 5 g of powdered < 2 mm material with 25 mL of 0.01 M CaCl_2~~

to maintain a pH 1:5 soil to solution ratio (You et al., 1989). The pH values were measured with a Fisher Scientific accumet AE150 probe, calibrated with multiple U.S. National Institute of Standards and Technology-traceable standards immediately prior to use (for more details, please see Table S2).

Table 1. Age and location of, topographic attributes, and estimated surface lowering rates for the calibration sites used to assess meteoric ¹⁰Be flux.

Moraine	Age (ka)	Latitude	Longitude	Slope (°)	Curvature (m ⁻¹)	$\frac{dz}{dt}$ (mm yr ⁻¹)
Copper Creek	13.0±0.1	39.001190	-106.940171	7.0	0.00	0.000
Washington Gulch North	17.9±0.2	38.930916	-107.013397	2.0	-0.03	-0.017
Gothic moraine	14.0±1.0	38.957877	-106.990814	4.3	-0.04	-0.023
Washington Gulch South	17.3±0.1	38.907394	-106.990058	0.5	-0.01	-0.006
East River terminal	17.8±0.2	38.858632	-106.907514	4.0	-0.02	-0.012

See Quirk et al. (2024) for exposure age details. Locations were determined using a Bad Elf Flex GNSS with sub-meter precision. Slope (°) and curvature values (Figure S2) were generated using 3-meter LiDAR DEM (Goulden et al., 2020). Curvature (m⁻¹) was derived by fitting a polynomial surface to a neighbourhood of 11 pixels using LSDtopotools (Mudd et al., 2014). Locations were determined using a Bad Elf Flex GNSS with sub-meter precision. $\frac{dz}{dt}$ values were measured for the Gothic moraine site using an *in situ*-produced ¹⁰Be depth profile (Quirk et al., 2024) and modelled for the other sites using equation 4.

¹⁰Be_{met} chemistry was conducted at the University of Massachusetts Cosmogenic Nuclide Laboratory using the Stone (1998) fusion method. Approximately 0.5 g of the homogenized and pulverized < 2 mm soil particles was weighed into 30 mL Pt crucibles. We then added ~350 µg of ⁹Be from a carrier with a ¹⁰Be/⁹Be ratio of ~1.75×10⁻¹⁵ to each sample. We also added 1000 µg of Al from a commercial carrier, which reportedly improves Be yields (Stone and Balco, 2004). Samples were dried overnight at 60 °C, then mixed with ~2.5 g of KHF₂ and ~0.5 g of NaSO₄ flux prior to heating with a gas torch to melt the sample. Once the samples were fully melted, they were heated for an additional 1–2 minutes. Be was extracted by soaking the crucibles with the fusion cakes overnight in 200 mL of ultrapure water. The solution was reduced to a volume of ~30 mL by evaporation, then centrifuged. We decanted the supernatant and added ~10–15 mL of 49% HClO₄ to precipitate K as KClO₄. The solution was centrifuged to remove KClO₄ and the supernatant was dried overnight in Teflon beakers following addition of 1 mL of 8M HNO₃. The samples were redissolved in 25 mL ultrapure water and Be was precipitated as BeOH by adding

drops of ~10% NH₄OH until the solution pH was ~9. The BeOH was washed multiple times by repeatedly centrifuging, pouring off the supernatant, and remixing the BeOH with ultrapure water. The BeOH was dissolved with 2–3 drops 6M HCl, dried overnight in a quartz crucible, calcined by heating with a gas torch until BeO remained incandescent for 1 minute, and packed into cathodes with Nb powder. The ¹⁰Be/⁹Be ratios were analyzed by AMS at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) against AMS Be standard 01-5-4 (LLNL standard 07KNSTD) (Nishiizumi et al., 2007). ¹⁰Be concentrations in soil samples were blank-corrected by subtracting ¹⁰Be/⁹Be ratios measured in full process blanks from ratios measured in samples, with uncertainties added in quadrature.

Primary and secondary soil minerals contain ⁹Be at parts-per-million concentrations (e.g., Barg et al., 1997; Bacon et al., 2012). To assess the amount of naturally-occurring ⁹Be relative to the amount added as carrier, we dissolved ~0.1 g of each sample in 49% HF, re-constituted the samples in a 1% HNO₃ + 1% H₂SO₄ solution, centrifuged to separate insoluble organic matter, and measured Be in the supernatant via Inductively Coupled Plasma – Optical Emission Spectroscopy (ICP-OES).

3.2 ¹⁰Be_{met} inventory and flux analysis

We calculated ¹⁰Be_{met} inventories following equation 1 using blank- and inheritance-corrected ¹⁰Be_{met} concentrations, bulk density values measured for different soil horizons, and estimates of the < 2 mm elast volume. Bulk density was determined by driving a 90.8 cm³ steel cylinder into the soil at depths corresponding to different horizons and weighing the dry soil (Table S1). Bulk density was assigned to each ¹⁰Be_{met} depth interval based on soil horizons identified in the field (Table S2). We determined millennial-averaged F_{met} values for each moraine by measuring the ¹⁰Be_{met} inventory. The inventory was determined by multiplying the inheritance-corrected ¹⁰Be_{met} concentration (N_{corr} , atom g⁻¹), by soil bulk density (ρ , g cm⁻³), the thickness of the sampling interval (z , cm), and the volumetric fraction of fine (< 2 mm) soil V_f , and summing the values for all (n) individual sample depth increments (i) (e.g., Deng et al., 2021b):

$$I_{met} = \sum_{i=1}^n (N_{corr} \cdot \rho \cdot z \cdot V_f)_i \quad (1).$$

Using soil inventories to quantify F_{met} assumes that ¹⁰Be_{met} accumulation begins at the time a landform is initially exposed to wet and dry fallout. However, the ages of the moraines we use to constrain flux are orders of magnitude lower than the ¹⁰Be half-life (1.387 Ma; Chmeleff, et al., 2010; Korschinek et al., 2010). Hence the soils we collected contain inherited ¹⁰Be_{met} atoms that were sorbed to mineral surfaces prior to their incorporation within the moraines. The inherited concentration was identified, following methods from prior work (e.g., Reusser et al., 2010). The volumetric fraction of < 2 mm soil particles was calculated

for each depth interval following Deng et al. (2021), by the presence of a near constant $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentration in the lower part of the depth profile.) as: $V_f = (1 - V_{c1}) \times (1 - V_{c2})$, where V_{c1} and V_{c2} are volumes of two sizes of coarse clasts. V_{c1} was determined by sieving each sample to separate < 2 mm and > 2 mm clasts and the volume fraction of > 2 mm clasts was calculated assuming a density of 2.65 g cm^{-3} . V_{c2} was estimated by using field photos of each soil pit to digitize the area of large cobble- to boulder-sized clasts that were too large to be sampled by our 44.7 mm diameter steel ring. The volume fraction of large clasts was calculated by multiplying the area fraction by two-thirds (e.g., Deng et al., 2021).

At four of the five sites, the $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentration reached a near-constant value with depth (Figure 3). We assumed the concentration measured in the lowest depth interval was equal to the inherited $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentration and subtracted that value from concentrations measured in overlying samples (e.g., RuesserReusser et al., 2010) and added the 1σ AMS analytical uncertainties in quadrature. If the $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentration in the sample used for the inheritance correction was greater than the concentration of a sample higher in the profile (e.g., at the Gothic moraine site), we set the concentration for that depth interval to zero. At the fifth site in the Copper Creek watershed, the $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ profile is well-mixed above an indurated stone line at the base of the soil (Figure 3a). Hence, we used the mean inheritance value of 7.58×10^7 atoms g^{-1} measured at the other four sites to correct for inheritance at the Copper Creek site.

Since we measured bulk density by soil horizon, and not sample depth interval, we assigned bulk density values to each sample interval based on soil horizons identified in the field (Table S3). The volumetric fraction of < 2 mm soil particles was calculated for each depth interval following Deng et al. (2021b) as: $V_f = (1 - V_{c1}) \times (1 - V_{c2})$, where V_{c1} and V_{c2} are volumes of two sizes of coarse clasts. V_{c1} was determined by sieving each sample to separate < 2 mm and > 2 mm clasts and the volume fraction of > 2 mm clasts was calculated assuming a density of 2.65 g cm^{-3} . V_{c2} was estimated by using field photos of each soil pit to digitize the area of large cobble- to boulder-sized clasts that were too large to be sampled by our 44.7 mm diameter steel ring. The volume fraction of large clasts was calculated by multiplying the area fraction by two-thirds (e.g., Deng et al., 2021b). If the $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentration in the sample used for the inheritance correction was greater than the concentration of a sample higher in the profile (e.g., at the Gothic moraine site), we set the concentration for that depth interval to zero. We propagated uncertainty for individual depth increments by adding uncertainty associated with the inheritance-corrected $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentrations and an assumed 5% relative uncertainty in both ρ and V_f in quadrature. Uncertainty in I_{mer} values was determined by adding the uncertainty for individual depth increments in quadrature. Analytical uncertainties were low (1.3–2.2%) and the I_{mer} uncertainties primarily reflect the uncertainties in ρ , V_f , and in some cases, the inheritance-corrected $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentration. In some cases, uncertainties in the inheritance-corrected $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentrations were large relative to the $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentrations because the difference in concentrations between the two depth increments was small. Hence the Washington Gulch North and Gothic inventories have slightly higher uncertainties relative to the other sites.

Given that the age of the moraines we sample is much less than the mean life of ^{10}Be , and hence loss via decay is negligible, we divided the I_{met} value by moraine age (t , yr) to determine the flux (e.g., Graly et al., 2010; Reusser et al., 2010; Ouimet et al., 2015; Clow et al., 2020). Inheritance-corrected F_{met} values were calculated using equation 2, assuming no erosion.; Deng et al., 2021b):

$$F_{met} = \frac{I_{met}}{t} \quad (2).$$

Uncertainty in F_{met} for each calibration site was calculated by adding uncertainty in I_{met} values and moraine age in quadrature. Moraine age uncertainty was based on the standard error of the mean of multiple exposure ages on boulders or, for the Gothic moraine, a 1 ka uncertainty associated with a $^{10}\text{Be}_{in situ}$ depth profile age (Table 1; Quirk et al., 2024).

The F_{met} values calculated using equation 2 assume complete retention of $^{10}\text{Be}_{met}$. We corrected fluxes (F_{cor}) for erosional and desorption losses as (Clow et al., 2020):

$$F_{cor} = (\varepsilon \cdot N_{surface}) + (I_{met} \cdot \lambda) + (Q \times N_j / K_{d,j}) \quad (3),$$

where ε is the erosion rate ($\text{g cm}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$), $N_{surface}$ is the inheritance-corrected $^{10}\text{Be}_{met}$ concentration in the uppermost sample that is assumed to represent the concentration in eroding soil (atom g^{-1}), λ is the ^{10}Be decay constant ($4.998 \times 10^{-7} \text{ yr}^{-1}$), Q ($\text{L cm}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) is the flux of water through the soil, and N_j and $K_{d,j}$ are the inheritance-corrected $^{10}\text{Be}_{met}$ concentration and Be partition coefficient (L kg^{-1}), respectively, for the soil depth interval j of interest, which is described below.

The $^{10}\text{Be}_{in situ}$ depth profile method used to date the Gothic moraine, which was also sampled for $^{10}\text{Be}_{met}$, yielded a median erosion rate dz/dt value of $0.023 \text{ mm} - 2.3 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ (Quirk et al., 2024). The source area for the Gothic moraine is primarily intrusive rock, hence the till matrix contained sufficient quartz for $^{10}\text{Be}_{in situ}$ analysis measurement. However, at the other sites, the till matrix was dominated by quartz-poor Mancos shale at the other sites and because of the dense shale-derived matrix, the pits could not be excavated deep enough to permit use of a $^{10}\text{Be}_{in situ}$ profile to assess erosion rates. We assessed the potential magnitude of the influence of erosion on fluxes by calculating an erosion-corrected flux (F_{cor-e}). Hence we modeled the surface lowering rate at the other sites as:

$$F_{cor-e} = F_{met} + (\varepsilon \cdot N_{surface}) + (I_{met} \cdot \lambda) \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{dz}{dt} = D \nabla^2 z \quad (4),$$

where ϵD is the erosion rate (g cm^{-2}), topographic diffusion coefficient ($\text{m}^2 \text{yr}^{-1}$), N_{surface} and $\nabla^2 z$ is the $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentration in the uppermost sample, and λ is the ^{10}Be decay constant ($4.998 \times 10^{-7} \text{yr}$), topographic curvature (m^{-1}). For Equation 4 is appropriate for low-gradient hillslopes like the moraines we sampled, erosion (Table 1), where surface lowering rates (ϵ) scale linearly with topographic curvature,

$$\epsilon = \frac{dz}{dt} = D \nabla^2 z, \quad (4)$$

where dz/dt is the change in elevation (z) per unit time (m yr^{-1}), D is the topographic diffusion coefficient ($\text{m}^2 \text{yr}^{-1}$), and $(\nabla^2 z)$ is topographic curvature (m^{-1}) (e.g., Kwang et al., 2022). We calculated topographic curvature at each site using LSDTopoTools (Mudd et al., 2014). Based on the median erosion surface lowering rate ($-2.3 \times 10^{-5} \text{m yr}^{-1}$) and topographic curvature (-0.04m^{-1} ; Table 1), we infer the value of D at the Gothic moraine site is $5.8 \times 10^{-4} \text{m}^2 \text{yr}^{-1}$. Given the similar soils and climate, we assume D is comparable across the five moraines and use the diffusion coefficient for the Gothic moraine site and topographic curvature values to estimate erosion rates dz/dt values at the four sites that lack direct measurements. We also modeled $F_{\text{cor-e}}$ using assume dz/dt values ranging from 0 eq. 4 are equivalent to 0.04mm yr^{-1} to encompass the range of possible median erosion rates (0.016 – 0.036mm yr^{-1}) inferred from the $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{in-situ}}$ depth profile at the Gothic moraine site (Quirk et al., 2024). We converted erosion rates values in eq. 3 and convert from units of length per time to mass per area per time using bulk density values inferred for the N_{surface} sample (Table S2). We refer to the flux values corrected for inheritance only (F_{mer}) as inheritance-corrected fluxes and the inheritance- and erosion-corrected fluxes ($F_{\text{cor-e}}$) as erosion-corrected fluxes (S3).

We used gridded datasets and univariate regression to assess calculate Q as the correlation difference between F_{mer} (and $F_{\text{cor-e}}$) and environmental variables: elevation, mean annual precipitation (MAP), snow depth, and snow water equivalent (SWE) (Table 2). The influence and evapotranspiration (ET), which assumes that only the fraction of elevation was evaluated using 3-meter resolution LiDAR data (Goulden et al., 2020); the precipitation that infiltrates the entire soil profile contributes to desorption losses. We determined MAP at each site using downscaled ($400 \times 400 \text{m}$) Parameter-elevation Regressions on Independent Slopes Model (PRISM; Daly et al., 2008) data from 2008–2019 (2008) raster data, which averages over the period from 2008–2019 (Mital et al., 2022). We used annual ET data from 2014–2015 that were simulated using the Community Land Model (CLM). ET values were reported for discrete locations within the East River watershed (Tran et al., 2019) and we assigned values to our study sites using the CLM prediction with an elevation and vegetation that most closely matched each site (Table S4). Following Deng et al. (2021b), we estimated K_d values using a logistic regression relationship from Campforts et al. (2016) where K_d is predicted as a function of pH measured in H_2O .

Prior work used equation 3 to assess $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ desorption losses from the surface of the soil profile and assumed that desorbed ^{10}Be exited the profile (Clow et al., 2020). Here we model three different desorption scenarios where N_i and $K_{d,i}$ correspond to values for different depth intervals. The first analysis we conducted is for the soil surface sample, which yields results comparable to those of Clow et al. (2020). The second analysis uses profile-average values of N and K_d and assumes the mean K_d for the entire soil column is the primary influence on desorption losses. Because pH generally increases with depth, the third scenario uses K_d values for the lowermost sample in the profile and assumes desorption losses are controlled by the pH of the lowermost depth increment in the profile. The soil surface and lowermost sample scenario uses the respective K_d value and inheritance-corrected $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentration associated with each depth interval for N_i . The profile-average scenario uses the weighted mean K_d value for the entire profile and the profile weighted mean value of the inheritance-corrected $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentration for N_i , where the thickness of each sampling interval was used as the weighting factor. We report the results from all scenarios, but use the results of the profile-average scenario for regression analyses and for comparison against predictions from existing empirical and GCM-based models.

3.3 Relationships between flux, elevation, and precipitation

It is well-established that the flux of $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ is strongly influenced by precipitation rates (e.g., Willenbring and von Blanckenburg, 2010; Graly et al., 2011). Given that precipitation within the East River watershed is orographically-controlled (Heflin et al., 2024), there should also be a relationship between elevation and the flux of $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$. We used gridded datasets and univariate regression to assess the correlation between F_{met} (and F_{cor}) and elevation, MAP, snow depth, and snow water equivalent (SWE). The influence of elevation was evaluated using 3-meter resolution LiDAR data (Goulden et al., 2020). We used the same gridded MAP data described in section 3.2 that we use to estimate Q (Mital et al., 2022), and snow data products derived from the Airborne Snow Observatory (ASO; Painter et al., 2018a, b 2016). ASO combines airborne LiDAR and imaging spectrometry with snow energy balance models to generate spatially-continuous snow data-spatial maps of snowpack properties. Snow depth is calculated as the difference between a snow-covered LiDAR survey and a snow-free “bare-earth” LiDAR scan. For this study, we used ASO-derived snow depth data (3 m resolution) acquired on March 31, 2018, and April 7, 2019 (Painter et al., 2018a; Deems, 2019). We used SWE data (50 m resolution) from the same dates with snow depth (Painter et al., 2018b). We used the coefficient of determination (R^2) from linear regression analysis to assess the degree that variability in F_{met} and F_{cor} is explained by elevation and precipitation metrics. The significance of each regression model was determined using the associated p-value. For the precipitation-based metrics, we additionally calculated regression relationships with through the origin analyses where the y-intercept forced was set to be equal zero, because F_{met} and F_{cor} should be zero where precipitation is zero, assuming dry fallout of $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ is negligible.

3.4 Comparing fluxes against estimates from other methods

We ~~also~~ predicted F_{met} for each of the five calibration sites using the precipitation- and latitude-based empirical model of Graly et al. (2011) using the down-scaled PRISM MAP data (Mital et al., 2022). We re-scaled the Graly et al. (2011) predictions, which are based on present-day precipitation measurements, to Holocene-averaged values by multiplying them by 1/0.67 to account for differences in paleomagnetic and solar intensity variations (e.g., Clow et al., 2020; ~~Deng et al., 2020~~) and compared the re-scaled predictions against our F_{met} and F_{cor-e} values.


~~Using the linear regression parameters, we used the gridded The elevation and precipitation, MAP, snow depth, and SWE data for each sample location were extracted from gridded datasets to generate spatially continuous predictions of F_{met} and F_{cor-e} across the East River that span the entire watershed, including the Washington Gulch and Slate River tributaries. We applied the regression equations described in section 3.3 to generate a prediction of flux for each pixel in the watershed. We then predicted watershed-average fluxes by calculating the mean value of all pixels. We used the regression relationships with a forced y-intercept of zero through the origin models to generate predictions based on MAP, snow depth, and SWE to ensure model predictions were physically plausible (e.g., did not predict any negative fluxes). We calculated the watershed realistic (e.g., a negative y-intercept value could produce a negative flux value, which is physically implausible). Our predicted watershed-average flux values integrate over a larger area, hence they are more appropriate for comparison against GCM-based flux estimates that our point-based values from each soil pit.~~

We compared our watershed-averaged flux predicted by elevation, MAP, snow depth, and SWE and compared these predictions against three GCM-based predictions against GCM-based predictions, specifically the. The ECHAM5-HAM flux predictions of Heikkilä and von Blanckenburg (2015) are from a three-decade simulation that used pre-industrial flux predicted by aerosol and greenhouse gas concentrations and a modern solar modulation factor (ϕ) of 501.76 MeV. The solar modulation during the Holocene was lower ($\phi = 280.94$ MeV), hence Heikkilä and von Blanckenburg (2015) and then multiplied the fluxes by a factor of 1.23 to re-scale them to average Holocene values that represent the last 9,400 years. The GEOS-Chem 14.1.1 and ECHAM6.3-HAM2.3 model predictions of Zheng et al. (2024). The Heikkilä and von Blanckenburg (2015)) are modern predictions are based on the ECHAM5-HAM model that average from 2005 to 2013 and use a solar modulation factor (ϕ) of 501.76 MeV that averages ϕ value of 488 MeV. Since our flux estimates from the East River average over three recent decades, but are adjusted to the Holocene-average values. The, we multiply both of the Zheng et al. (2024) flux predictions use a ϕ value of 488 MeV and average over the period from 2005–2013. We multiplying the Zheng et al. (2024) predicted fluxes by 1.23 (e.g., Heikkilä and von Blanckenburg, 2015), by 1.23, which approximately re-scales them to Holocene-averaged values and makes them more comparable to our predicted watershed-average values.

380 4 Results

4.1 Soil pH

385 Soil pH for the uppermost sample interval of each profile ranged from 4.3–6.3 ~~and when measured in H₂O and from 3.7–5.4~~
~~when measured in CaCl₂ and the values~~ generally increased with depth (Figure 3; Table S3S2). Mean pH values averaged
across all depths for Copper Creek, Washington Gulch North, Gothic, Washington Gulch South, and East River Terminal
moraines are 4.7, 5.6, 5.7, 5.9, and 6.3, ~~for measurements in H₂O, and 3.8, 4.6, 5.2, 5.2, and 5.8, when measured in CaCl₂,~~
respectively. The most acidic soils are found at the Copper Creek ~~moraine~~ site, which ~~is~~ has the highest elevation and is
dominated by spruce-fir forest vegetation (Figure S1), ~~where the lowest pH value of 4.3 was measured in the 0 to 10-cm depth~~
~~increment.~~






Figure 3. $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentration and pH as a function of depth for (a) Copper Creek, (b) Washington Gulch North, (c) Gothic, (d) Washington Gulch South, and (e) East River Terminal moraines. Grey boxes show measured concentrations and uncertainties. Blue boxes indicate samples assumed to represent the inherited $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentration. In (a), the blue dashed line shows the mean inheritance value calculated from profiles (b)–(e). The sample used for the inheritance correction in (b) was sampled from a landslide exposure on the Washington Gulch North moraine that was 374 m away from the soil pit where the other samples were collected.

4.2 $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ profiles, inventories, fluxes, and controls on fluxes

AMS-measured $^{10}\text{Be}/^9\text{Be}$ ratios typically were on the order of 1.0×10^{-12} to 10×10^{-12} , which is several orders of magnitude greater than the 2×10^{-15} to 5×10^{-15} ratios measured in blanks (Table 2). Measured $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentrations ranged from about 2.4×10^7 to $6.4 \times 10^8 \text{ atom g}^{-1}$ (Table 2). Concentrations of ^9Be were $\sim 1 \text{ ppm}$ indicating the average mass of ^9Be in the samples was $\sim 0.2\%$ of the mass added as carrier (Table S5). Given that 0.2% is less than the uncertainty of the Be concentration of the carrier we used (1.2%), no corrections were made to the AMS-measured $^{10}\text{Be}/^9\text{Be}$ ratios. The $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentration profiles exhibit a variety of shapes. Profiles at four of the sites have relatively uniform concentrations in the upper $\sim 0.5 \text{ m}$ of the profile,

with maximum concentrations at or near the ground surface that decline at greater depths (Table 2; Figure 3a-d). At the lowest elevation site on the terminal moraine, the $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentration is greatest at the surface and declines exponentially with depth (Figure 3e). The shallowest profile was at the Copper Creek site, where a coarse, indurated stone layer 60 cm below the ground surface prevented deeper sampling. At Copper Creek the concentration profile is well mixed in the upper 40 cm, exhibits a subsurface peak concentration 40-50 cm below the ground surface, and then declines sharply in the 10 cm interval directly above the stone line, but not to levels as low as those observed in the deepest samples from other profiles (Figure 3a). Inheritance-corrected $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ inventories range from 7.68×10^9 to 2.35×10^{10} atoms cm^{-2} (Table 3), with the largest and smallest inventories at the Copper Creek and East River terminal moraine sites, respectively. Inheritance-corrected F_{met} values range from 0.43×10^6 to 1.80×10^6 atom $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$ (Table 3). Correcting for inheritance, erosion, desorption (using the profile averaged model), and decay using eq. 3 yields $F_{\text{cor-e}}$ values of 0.8631×10^6 to $1.843.7 \times 10^6$ atom $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$ (Table 4). Hence accounting for erosion and desorption caused fluxes to deviate from uncorrected values by a factor of 0.3 to 2.1 (Table 3, 4). The desorption model scenarios for the uppermost and lowermost soil depth intervals predict fluxes that are generally within a factor of two of the profile-averaged model, except for the Copper Creek site, where the flux predicted from the upper sample pH is an order of magnitude greater than the flux predicted by the pH of the lowermost sample (Table 4).

~~The potential impact of erosion on fluxes varies among the sites based on both the inferred erosion rate and the $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ concentration at the soil surface (Figure 4). We inferred erosion rates for the Copper Creek, Washington Gulch North, Washington Gulch South, and East River Terminal sites were 0.0, 0.017, 0.006, and 0.012 mm yr^{-1} respectively. The curvature value of zero at the Copper Creek moraine predicts there is no surface lowering due to erosion, implying the erosion-corrected flux is the same as the measured flux, though the erosion-corrected value is slightly lower because it also accounts for ^{10}Be decay. Accounting for erosion at the other sites leads to erosion-corrected fluxes that are 1–2 times greater than the measured fluxes (Table 3).~~

F_{met} values are well-correlated with elevation and precipitation metrics in the East River watershed (Figure 54; Table S6). F_{met} values are linearly correlated with elevation ($R^2=0.91$), mean annual precipitation ($R^2=0.82-0.85$), mean snow depth ~~in 2018–2019~~ ($R^2=0.95-0.97$), and mean SWE ~~in 2018–2019~~ ($R^2=0.97-0.98$). Due to the large range of elevation and precipitation within the watershed (Figure 2), the regression models predict substantial within-watershed variability in F_{met} (Figure 65). The erosion- and desorption corrected ($F_{\text{cor-e}}$) fluxes based on the profile-averaged model exhibit similar trends with the environmental elevation and precipitation variables, but the correlations are weaker exhibited greater variability, with R^2 values of 0.4396 for elevation, 0.46 to 0.56–0.6395 for mean annual precipitation, -0.42 to -0.72–0.5888 for mean snow depth in 2018–2019, and -0.0766 to 0.5590 for mean SWE in 2018–2019 (Figure 5). ~~Negative R^2 values for the centered data.~~ The Copper Creek site has substantially higher elevation and precipitation values than the other sites and hence strongly influences regression models forced to have a y-intercept of zero indicate relationships. When the mean Copper Creek site is a better predictor than the regression relationship omitted from the analysis, R^2 values range from 0.25 to 0.93 (Table S7).

Table 2. ¹⁰Be_{met} sample information and AMS results.

Site	Sample ID ^a (LLNL BE number)	Sample mass (g)	⁹ Be added as carrier (μg)	¹⁰ Be: ⁹ Be ratio (×10 ⁻¹²)	¹⁰ Be: ⁹ Be ratio uncertainty (×10 ⁻¹⁴)	¹⁰ Be concentration and uncertainty ^b (10 ³ atoms g ⁻¹)	Inheritance- corrected ¹⁰ Be concentration and uncertainty (10 ³ atoms g ⁻¹)
Copper Creek	ER CCT_pit_1_0-10 (BE54737)	0.5227	353.3	12.8	8.50	577993±7878	502192±8009
	ER CCT_pit_1_10-20 (BE54738)	0.5396	352.9	12.5	8.25	546146±7433	470345±7572
	~~R~~ -ER CCT_Pit_1_20_30 (BE54926)	0.5174	351.7	11.9	8.08	540389±7405	464588±7544
	ER CCT_pit_1_30-40 (BE54740)	0.4994	352.9	12.1	11.5	571221±8701	495420±8820
	ER CCT_pit_1_40-50 (BE54741)	0.4998	352.9	13.5	8.95	636818±8676	561017±8795
	ER CCT_pit_1_50-60 (BE54743)	0.5004	352.2	6.47	7.15	304159±4941	228358±5147
Washington Gulch North	ER S2_pit_1_0-10 (BE54729)	0.5456	353.8	13.2	1.16	571850±8461	464670±8682
	ER S2_pit_1_10-20 (BE54730)	0.5366	353.3	9.09	6.58	399796±5570	292616±5900
	ER S2_pit_1_20-30 (BE54731)	0.5165	352.2	9.39	6.71	427730±5938	320550±6249
	ER S2_pit_1_30-40 (BE54732)	0.4948	353.5	8.47	6.13	404217±5631	297037±5958
	ER S2_pit_1_40-55 (BE54733)	0.4992	353.4	7.19	5.21	339990±4738	232810±5122
	ER S2_pit_1_55-75 (BE54735)	0.5032	352.4	4.35	4.15	203430±3105	96250±3665
	ER S2_pit_1_75-95 (BE54736)	0.4959	353.1	2.60	4.82	123570±2725	16390±3349
	ER24 S2_Pit_2_130-145140_A (BE55950)	0.5249	351.1	2.40	3.29	107180±1947	0±0
Gothic	ER GM pit_1_0-15 (BE54756)	0.4996	352.3	7.52	4.88	354209±4802	273036±5124
	ER GM pit_1_15-30 (BE54758)	0.4975	350.6	7.89	4.06	371411±4817	290238±5138
	ER GM pit_1_30-45 (BE54759)	0.4983	351.9	6.27	5.5	295743±4374	214570±4725
	ER GM pit_1_45-65 (BE54760)	0.5025	352.1	3.14	3.65	146885±2446	65712±3030
	ER GM pit_1_65-85 (BE54761)	0.5308	354.6	1.82	2.93	90938±1505	9765±2337
	ER GM pit_1_85-105 (BE54762)	0.5149	351.3	1.11	1.99	50473±1089	0±0
	ER GM pit_1_105-125 (BE54765)	0.5073	352.1	2.06	1.81	95406±1413	14233±2279
	ER GM pit_1_125-145 (BE54766)	0.5174	351.7	1.79	3.31	81173±1788	0±0
Washington Gulch South	ER AM Pit_1_0_10 (BE54780)	0.4927	353.0	7.66	6.72	366586±5421	275648±5626
	ER AM pit_1_10-20 (BE54750)	0.4863	352.6	7.89	5.23	382133±5207	291195±5420
	ER AM pit_1_20-30 (BE54751)	0.5008	352.0	8.21	9.03	385467±6248	294529±6427

	ER_AM_pit_1_30-40 (BE54752)	0.5210	351.8	8.20	8.53	369860±5848	278922±6039
	ER_AM_pit_1_40-55 (BE54753)	0.5648	351.7	8.22	7.34	341913±5088	250975±5306
	ER_AM_pit_1_55-65 (BE54754)	0.5088	352.0	3.05	3.07	140864±2197	49926±2663
	ER_AM_pit_1_65-85 (BE54755)	0.5308	354.6	2.04	2.34	90938±1505	0±0
East River Terminal	ER_BCTM_pit_1_0-10 (BE54744)	0.4968	351.1	10.1	7.34	476832±6650	452918±6671
	ER_BCTM_pit_1_10-20 (BE54745)	0.4980	352.2	8.00	7.02	377931±5589	354017±5614
	ER_BCTM_pit_1_20-30 (BE54746)	0.5889	353.0	4.37	3.72	174923±2561	151009±2615
	ER_BCTM_pit_1_30-50 (BE54747)	0.4999	353.0	1.47	1.65	69226±1135	45312±1253
	ER_BCTM_pit_1_50-80 (BE54748)	0.4902	352.9	0.500	9.27	23914±530	0±0

^aValues at the end of each sample ID refer to the sample depth interval (cm). ^bReported ¹⁰Be concentrations are corrected using ¹⁰Be/⁹Be ratios measured in process blanks. ¹⁰Be/⁹Be ratios measured in process blanks in the same batches as the samples were: 2.44, 1.64, 2.55, 2.93, 2.11, 2.39, 4.71, 2.92, and 2.70×10⁻¹⁵. Uncertainty in I_{met} values was determined by adding the uncertainty for individual depth increments in quadrature. Analytical uncertainties were low (1.3-2.2%) and the I_{met} uncertainties primarily reflect the uncertainties in ρ , V_p and in some cases, the inheritance-corrected ¹⁰Be_{met} concentration. In some cases, uncertainties in the inheritance-corrected ¹⁰Be_{met} concentrations were large relative to the ¹⁰Be_{met} concentrations because the difference in concentrations between the two depth increments was small. Hence the Washington Gulch North and Gothic inventories have slightly higher uncertainties relative to the other sites.

Formatted: Justified

445 Table 3: Environmental variable values and ¹⁰Be_{met} fluxes at each calibration site.

Site	Elevation ^a (m)	MAP ^b (mm yr ⁻¹)	Mean snow depth ^c 2018 – 2019 (m)	Mean SWE ^d 2018 – 2019 (m)	Inheritance-corrected ¹⁰ Be _{met} inventory ±1σ uncertainty (10 ¹⁰ atoms cm ⁻²)	Inheritance-corrected ¹⁰ Be _{met} flux (I_{met}) ±1σ uncertainty (10 ⁶ atoms cm ⁻² yr ⁻¹)	Inheritance- and erosion- corrected ¹⁰ Be _{met} flux ±1σ uncertainty (10 ⁶ atoms cm ⁻² yr ⁻¹)
Copper Creek	3476	1353	1.90	0.64	2.35±0.64	1.80±0.50	~~1.81±0.50~~
Washington Gulch North	2944	784	1.01	0.34	1.80±0.57	1.01±0.32	~~1.57±0.49~~
Gothic	2885	885	0.90	0.33	1.27±0.47	0.905±0.339	~~1.79±0.67~~
Washington Gulch South	2864	655	0.80	0.31	1.73±0.34	0.998±0.197	~~1.16±0.23~~
East River Terminal	2764	585	0.42	0.19	0.768±0.131	0.431±0.074	~~0.861±0.147~~

^aelevation (m) from Goulden et al. (2020). ^bmean annual precipitation (MAP) from Mital et al. (2022). ^cmean snow depth (m) from 2018-2019 (Painter, 2018a). and ^d Mean snow water equivalent (SWE) (m) from 2018-2019 (Painter et al., 2018b).

Deleted Cells

Formatted Table

^aelevation (m) from Goulden et al. (2020); ^bmean annual precipitation (MAP) from Mital et al. (2022); (c) mean snow depth (m) from 2018-2019 (Painter, 2018a), and (d) Mean snow water equivalent (SWE) (m) from 2018-2019 (Painter et al., 2018b).




Figure 4. Meteoric ¹⁰Be flux as a function of erosion rate. The y-intercept is the measured flux based on soil inventories and moraine ages, which does not account for erosion or decay (decay has a negligible impact on flux). The diamond indicates the measured erosion rate for the Gothic site (Quirk et al., 2024). The circles are erosion rates modelled for each site using equation 4. Predictions for each site have different slopes due to differences in the concentration of ¹⁰Be_{met} at the soil surface.




Figure 5.

Table 4. Modeled erosional, decay, and desorption meteoric ^{10}Be losses and loss-corrected fluxes.

Site	Modeled erosional loss (10^6 atoms $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$)	Modeled decay loss (10^6 atoms $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$)	Modeled desorption loss (10^6 atoms $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$)			$F_{\text{cor}} \pm 1\sigma$ uncertainty (10^6 atoms $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$)		
			upper sample pH	profile-average pH	lowermost sample pH	upper sample pH	profile-average pH	lowermost sample pH
Copper Creek	0.00	0.012	8.51	3.69	0.77	8.52±0.50	3.70±0.50	0.780±0.500
Washington Gulch	0.55	0.009	1.22	0.23	0.00	1.78±0.49	0.792±0.490	0.560±0.490
North Gothic	0.88	0.006	0.99	0.10	0.00	1.88±0.67	0.988±0.670	0.888±0.670
Washington Gulch	0.15	0.009	0.16	0.14	0.00	0.318±0.230	0.306±0.230	0.162±0.230
South								

East River Terminal	0.43	0.004	0.54	0.04	0.00	0.969±0.147	0.470±0.147	0.430±0.147
------------------------	------	-------	------	------	------	-------------	-------------	-------------




Figure 4. Linear regression models of $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ flux versus (a) elevation, (b) mean annual precipitation (MAP), (c) mean snow depth (2018-2019), and (d) mean snow water equivalent (SWE) (2018-2019). Blue squares show inheritance-corrected fluxes and open gray circles show erosion-corrected fluxes and desorption-corrected fluxes. The erosion- and desorption-corrected fluxes use the profile-average desorption model. For the inheritance-corrected (IC) data, solid blue lines show results from standard regression models and the dashed blue lines show regression through the origin models where the y-intercept is forced to zero. For the erosion-corrected (EC) and desorption-corrected (DC) data, solid gray lines show standard regression model results and dashed gray lines show regression through the origin models where the y-intercept is forced to zero. Regression through the origin models are shown only for MAP, mean snow depth, and mean SWE. Regression coefficients, R^2 values, and p values are reported in Table S4-S6. Figure

S3 and Table S7 report regression results with Copper Creek excluded from the analysis. Figures S4 and S5 show the results from the uppermost and lowermost sample desorption models.

The different regression models predicted watershed-averaged F_{met} values that vary by more than about a factor of three (Table 45). For elevation, the regression model yields average F_{met} and F_{cor-e} of 1.3430×10^6 and 1.60204×10^6 atoms $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$, respectively. The MAP-based regression resulted in average F_{met} and F_{cor-e} values of 0.66110×10^6 and 1.1748×10^6 atoms $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$ for the standard and 0.75111×10^6 and 0.99157×10^6 atoms $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$ for the foreed-regression through the origin models, respectively. Snow depth models produced average F_{met} and F_{cor-e} values of 1.7633×10^6 and 1.94207×10^6 and 1.8234×10^6 and 2.34197×10^6 atoms $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$ for the standard and foreed regression through the origin regression models, respectively. Similarly, SWE-based regressions yielded watershed-averaged F_{met} and F_{cor-e} values of 1.4243×10^6 and 1.68234×10^6 for the standard regression and 1.442×10^6 and 1.84205×10^6 atoms $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$ for the foreed regressions regression through the origin models, respectively. We assessed the influence of extreme values and potential outliers by calculating watershed-averaged F_{met} and F_{cor-e} values using only pixels with the lowest 99th, 95th, and 90th percentile values, which resulted in lower mean F_{met} values, with the greatest reductions for the precipitation-snow-depth and snow-SWE-based estimates (Table 45).

Table 45. Watershed-averaged $^{10}\text{Be}_{met}$ flux predictions based on all pixels (100%) and when excluding pixels with high values by using only the lowest 99, 95, and 90th percentile values when calculating the mean.

Variable	Regression type	Meteoric ^{10}Be flux (10^6 atoms $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$)							
		100%		99%		95%		90%	
		Inheritance-corrected	Erosion- and desorption-corrected	Inheritance-corrected	Erosion- and desorption-corrected	Inheritance-corrected	Erosion- and desorption-corrected	Inheritance-corrected	Erosion- and desorption-corrected
Elevation (m)	Regular	1.3430	1.60204	1.3029	1.59200	1.2524	1.5680	1.2019	1.5371
MAP (mm yr^{-1})	Regular	0.66110	1.1748	0.64109	1.1645	0.60106	1.1234	0.55102	1.0922
	Foreed	0.75	0.99	0.73	0.97	0.70	0.92	0.65	0.86
Mean snow depth (m) 2018–2019	Origin	1.7611	1.9157	1.7011	1.8856	1.5808	1.8052	1.4804	1.7247
Mean snow depth (m) 2018–2019	Regular	1.8233	2.3407	1.7629	2.24196	1.6219	2.06169	1.5411	1.9447
	Foreed								
Mean SWE (m)	Origin	1.34	1.97	1.29	1.9	1.19	1.73	1.09	1.6
	Regular	1.4243	1.68234	1.3738	1.65221	1.2526	1.5888	1.15	1.5439

Formatted	... [1]
Formatted	... [2]
Formatted	... [4]
Formatted Table	... [3]
Formatted	... [5]
Formatted	... [6]
Formatted	... [8]
Formatted	... [9]
Formatted	... [10]
Formatted	... [7]
Formatted	... [12]
Formatted	... [13]
Formatted	... [14]
Formatted	... [15]
Formatted	... [16]
Formatted	... [17]
Formatted	... [18]
Formatted	... [19]
Formatted	... [11]
Formatted	... [21]
Formatted	... [22]
Formatted	... [23]
Formatted	... [24]
Formatted	... [25]
Formatted	... [26]
Formatted	... [27]
Formatted	... [28]
Formatted	... [20]
Merged Cells	... [29]
Formatted	... [31]
Formatted	... [32]
Formatted	... [33]
Formatted	... [34]
Formatted	... [35]
Formatted	... [36]
Formatted	... [37]
Formatted	... [38]
Formatted	... [39]
Formatted	... [30]
Formatted	... [41]
Formatted	... [42]
Formatted	... [43]
Formatted	... [44]
Formatted	... [45]
Formatted	... [46]
Formatted	... [47]
Formatted	... [48]
Formatted	... [49]
Formatted	... [40]
Split Cells	... [50]
Formatted	... [52]
Formatted	... [53]
Formatted	... [54]
Formatted	... [55]
Formatted	... [56]
Formatted	... [57]
Formatted	... [58]
Formatted	... [51]




Figure 65. Spatial predictions of $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{net}}$ flux based on inheritance-corrected regression models using: (a) elevation with the regular regression; (b) mean annual precipitation with the origin regression; (c) mean snow depth from 2018–2019 with the regular regression; (d) mean snow depth from 2018–2019 with the origin regression.

origin regression; and (d) mean snow water equivalent from 2018–2019 based on with the origin regression models for inheritance-corrected fluxes. The equivalent results for inheritance- and erosion- and desorption-corrected fluxes calculated using the profile-average desorption model are shown in Figure S2S6.

5 Discussion

$^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ profiles tend to have characteristic shapes, and the shapes are sometimes used to infer processes of $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ mobility (e.g., Graly et al., 2010). The two most common profile shapes are characterized by either a subsurface peak in concentration or concentrations that decline with depth from a maximum value at the soil surface (Graly et al., 2010). The profile on the East River Terminal moraine exhibits an exponential decline in concentration with depth, however the concentrations at the other four sites are fairly uniform with depth. The uniform profiles likely arise from bioturbation, via vegetation or burrowing mammals. Pocket gophers (*Thomomys talpoides*) are the main soil disturbing mammal within the East River watershed, and soil disturbance can be intense, with surveys indicating soil disturbance by burrowing can exceed one disturbance per m^2 within the elevation range of our sampling sites (Lynn et al., 2018). The distinct stone line at the Copper Creek site may have been generated by bioturbation (e.g., Johnson, 1989), though we cannot rule out the possibility of a periglacial origin (Ball, 1967). The stone line prevented deeper sampling at the Copper Creek site, which makes it difficult to determine whether the full $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ inventory was sampled, or whether non-inherited $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ mobilized and is present below the stone line. In either case, the high-elevation Copper Creek site has the highest inventory, which is consistent with the higher precipitation rates at the site.

Pedogenic loss of $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ Glacial moraines erode via diffusive soil transport processes (e.g., Putkonen and Swanson, 2003) and loss of $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ due to has been documented or suspected in low pH soils with substantial chemical alteration (e.g., Pavich et al., 1984; Bacon et al., 2012; Dixon et al., 2018). The partition coefficient for $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ is high when pH is greater than 4.5 (You et al., 1989) but declines at lower pH values. Analysis of a compilation of soil $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ and pH data suggest loss is most likely to occur below a pH of 3.9 (Graly et al., 2010). The 0–10 cm interval sample at Copper Creek site had the lowest measured pH value of 4.3, but pH increased with depth to a value of 5.4 at the base of the soil profile, and pH values for the other sites are higher. Hence we infer $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ loss via chemical leaching is minimal and that mobilized $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ is likely confined within the sampled horizons. Minimal chemical loss of $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ was also inferred for moraines near Pinedale, Wyoming, USA, which has a climate and ecosystem broadly similar to the East River (Clow et al., 2020).

Glacial moraines erode via diffusive soil transport processes (e.g., Putkonen and Swanson, 2003). The F_{met} values we measure are hence minimum values because erosional loss of $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ reduces inventories. Incorporating the median erosion rate for the

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Times New Roman), Not Bold

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Times New Roman), Not Bold

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Times New Roman), Not Bold

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Times New Roman), 9 pt

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Times New Roman), 9 pt

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Times New Roman), 9 pt

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Times New Roman), 9 pt


Formatted: Font: +Headings (Times New Roman), 9 pt

Formatted: Font: 9 pt

Gothic Moraine inferred from the $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{in-situ}}$ profile (Quirk et al., 2024) causes the flux inferred for that site to double. However, the other sites have lower convexity than the Gothic site (Table 1), which reduces the influence of erosion. The Copper Creek site has a planar topography (curvature = 0 m^{-1}), and hence the modelled erosion rate is zero. Accounting for topographic influences on erosion rates at the other three sites predicts that fluxes are 1.2 to 2.0 times greater than the values that are not corrected for erosion (2018). The measured F_{met} values are hence minimum values because erosional and desorption losses of $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ reduce inventories. Modeled erosional losses are largest at the Gothic moraine which has the most convex topography, whereas desorption losses are predicted to be greatest at Copper Creek where pH and therefore K_d are estimated to be lowest. The modelling predicts that desorption losses of $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ predicted by the profile averaged model tend to be greater than erosional losses, particularly at the Copper Creek site, where predicted desorption losses are about an order of magnitude greater than desorption losses predicted for the other sites. In principle, accounting for erosional, decay, and desorption losses should increase flux estimates relative to the measured inheritance-corrected values. However, using equation 3 to account for erosion and desorption results in corrected fluxes that are similar to or less than the measured values for all sites except Copper Creek (Tables 3, 4), which suggests that the modeled loss terms may not fully capture true $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ losses. Although the diffusion coefficient we calculate is comparable to values measured in other landscapes with similar climates (Richardson et al., 2019), there is still inherent uncertainty in using modelled, rather than measured erosion rates, to correct the measured fluxes. Modeled, rather than measured, erosion rates and there is uncertainty in how rates of diffusive soil transport vary with elevation within the East River watershed. There is also uncertainty in the pH-derived K_d values, particularly because the presence of organic compounds, which are abundant in soil, alters sorption relative to experimental systems consisting of only mineral material (Boschi and Willenbring, 2016 a, b).

F_{met} is highly correlated with elevation, MAP, snow depth, and SWE, which is unsurprising because these variables are related to one another via orographic controls on precipitation rates. However, different slope and intercept values for regression relationships result in different F_{met} and F_{cor} predictions for the same location and watershed-averaged fluxes that differ by a factor of about 2 to 3. The precipitation data average over only a few decades and snow depth and SWE datasets cover only two winters, which are only small fractions of the post-glacial period over which $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ has accumulated in soils. The recent snowfall magnitude and spatial patterns may also differ from Holocene averages, though the patterns are not likely to have varied substantially, given the orographic controls. However, unlike elevation and MAP datasets, the snow-based inventories yield insight on how local-scale topography may influence spatial patterns of F_{met} . For example, we predict that lower snow accumulation on sharp ridges relative to adjacent slopes leads to lower $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ accumulation on ridges (Figure 65). Watershed-averaged fluxes predicted using snow depth and SWE are more sensitive to extreme values than averages based on elevation (Table 45). The mean snow depth of 1.90 m at the highest elevation Copper Creek site is a fraction of the highest snow depth values in the watershed, which exceed 20 m (Figure S3S7) and indicates the highest snow depth values are potentially artefacts. The lack of F_{met} calibration sites in areas with higher snow accumulation may result in inaccurate predictions for such areas, however the lack of moraines or other stable, datable landforms at higher elevations makes it

difficult to measure $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ fluxes in such areas. The MAP data are based on decadal-scale precipitation measurements but are interpolated ~~based on~~ from weather station measurements using elevation as a predictor (Daly et al., 2008). However, the watershed-averaged MAP-based predictions are ~~notably~~ slightly lower than values based on elevation and snow data, suggesting precipitation may be under-estimated. Elevation is the only parameter not subject to temporal bias, caused by measurement duration. Hence, given the orographic influences on precipitation within the watershed, elevation should be a robust predictor of $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ fluxes, though. However, elevation-based predictions may be biased where local topography leads to persistent snow redistribution via wind and avalanches. Given the different $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ flux predictions from the elevation, MAP, snow depth, and SWE datasets, an ensemble approach may be appropriate for using $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ values to quantify surface process rates, in a manner similar to assessing results from multiple production rate scaling models when determining $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{in situ}}$ exposure ages (e.g., Balco et al., 2008).






Figure 76. Predicted $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ flux from the empirical precipitation-based model of Graly et al. (2011), scaled to reflect Holocene-average values (e.g., Clow et al., 2020) versus measured flux values for the five study sites. Measured erosion- and desorption-corrected fluxes use the profile-average desorption model.

Fluxes predicted by an empirical precipitation- and latitude-based model (Graly et al., 2011) are 1.8–3.8 times higher than measured inheritance-corrected fluxes (Figure 76). The erosion- and desorption-corrected fluxes are closer to the empirical predictions, but are still 1.4–2.1–6.0 times higher than observed values. The differences between empirical formulation of Graly et al. (2011) predicts fluxes as a function of both latitude and precipitation rate. Since our sites have essentially the same latitude, the variability in the predicted and fluxes solely represents differences in precipitation. Hence the cause of the discrepancy in measured point-scale values are generally similar to watershed-average predictions, although GCM-based models both over- and under-predict fluxes and predicted fluxes may simply reflect a different proportionality between precipitation and flux in the Graly et al. (2011) dataset, which included a world-wide compilation of sites, and the East River dataset. GCM-based models predict $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ fluxes of $1.46 \times 10^6 \text{ atoms cm}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (Heikillä and von Blanckenberg, 2015, pre-industrial/Holocene-average production), $1.63 \times 10^6 \text{ atoms cm}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (Zheng et al., 2024, ECHAM6.3-HAM2.3), and 2.12×10^6

atoms cm² yr⁻¹ (Zheng et al., 2024, GEOS-Chem 14.1.1) for the East River watershed and its tributaries (Figure 87). A single grid-cell from the GCM-models covers an area larger than the watershed, hence the models simulate the influence of meso-scale atmospheric dynamics on $F_{met}^{10}\text{Be}_{met}$ flux, but do not capture within-watershed $F_{met}^{10}\text{Be}_{met}$ variability caused by orographic precipitation. ~~The measured~~ For example, the point measurements of F_{met} and F_{cor-e} values and GCM-based predictions vary by ~~nearly up to a factor of four for the most extreme case. However, because they cover a larger spatial scale, 12,~~ ~~however~~ our empirically-predicted watershed-averaged F_{met} values are more directly comparable to the average predictions only differ from GCM-based predictions than the point-based measurements on each moraine. The by a factor of 1.0 to 1.9. In general, the watershed-averaged F_{met} values predicted by snow depth (1.76–1.82 predictions from the measured, inheritance-corrected inventories better match GCM-based fluxes than watershed average fluxes corrected for erosion and desorption, which tend to be higher (Figure 7). An exception is the MAP-based watershed-average flux (1.10–1.57×10⁶ atoms cm² yr⁻¹) are greater than the Heikkilä and von Blanckenburg (2015) and Zheng et al. (2024) ECHAM6.3-HAM2.3 predictions, but, which is lower than the Zheng et al. (2024) GEOS-Chem 14.1.1 prediction (Figure 8). However, the watershed-averaged F_{met} values predicted by predictions based on elevation (1.34–2.04×10⁶ atoms cm² yr⁻¹), snow depth (1.33–2.07×10⁶ atoms cm² yr⁻¹), and SWE (1.41–1.42×10⁶ atoms cm² yr⁻¹) are similar to the 1.4643–2.34 ×10⁶ atoms cm² yr⁻¹ pre-industrial prediction of Heikkilä and von Blanckenburg (2015) and the 1.63×10⁶ atoms cm² yr⁻¹ ECHAM6.3-HAM2.3 prediction of Zheng et al. (2024) (Figure 8). The MAP-based predictions of 0.66–0.75×10⁶ atoms cm² yr⁻¹ are lower than all of the GCM-based predictions (Figure 8). Hence the best agreement between), which causes the erosion- and desorption-corrected fluxes to better align with the GCM-based predictions (Figure 7). Hence, the GCM-based predictions generally fall within the range of our empirically-estimated watershed-averaged fluxes are from our elevation- and SWE-based models flux values, although the degree of agreement depends on the predictor variable and whether or not fluxes are corrected for erosion and desorption.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Superscript





Figure 8:7. Watershed-scale $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ fluxes predicted by empirical models based on elevation, mean annual precipitation (MAP), mean snow depth, and mean snow water equivalent (SWE) and flux predictions from global circulation-based (GCM) models. Boxplots show the median (horizontal line), interquartile range, and 5th and 95th percentiles of flux values. Mean fluxes are ~~shown~~ shown with circles (standard regression models, left box) and diamonds (~~forced~~-regression through origin models, right box). GCM-based flux predictions from Heikkilä and von Blanckenburg (2015) and Zheng et al. (2024) are shown as horizontal lines. IC indicates inheritance-corrected fluxes and ~~ECEDC~~ indicates erosion- and desorption-corrected fluxes calculated using the profile-average desorption model.

Comparing measured $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ fluxes against empirical models generated with data from other regions and GCM-based predictions is somewhat complicated by the likely contribution of dust to the measured values.

Soils contain $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ scavenged from the atmosphere by aerosols, but also from dust particles that are derived from aeolian erosion and transported in the atmosphere before being deposited (Monaghan et al., 1986; Graly, 2011). The dust-derived or ‘recycled’ $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ can be as much as ~20% of the total flux (Monaghan et al., 1986; Graham et al., 2003). Although the dust contribution to flux estimates does not need to be independently known to quantify surface process rates, provided that time-averaged delivery of dust to soils is representative of the timescale relevant to the surface process rate under investigation, dust contributions should be accounted for before comparing measured fluxes against predictions from GCMs. Hence the comparison of measured $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ fluxes against the GCM-based predictions is somewhat complicated by the likely contribution of dust to our measured values. The contribution of dust to $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ inventories in the East River is unconstrained, but dust fluxes inferred from lacustrine sediment in the nearby San Juan Mountains increased from ~0.01 g cm⁻² yr⁻¹ to 0.4 g cm⁻² yr⁻¹ over the last several centuries (Ballantyne et al., 2011) and recent snowpack measurements indicate seasonal dust fluxes are on the order of 5-10 g cm⁻² yr⁻¹ (Lawrence et al., 2010). Dust fluxes in the Colorado Front Range are 0.1–0.2 g cm⁻² kyr⁻¹ (Dethier et al., 2012). Dust fluxes in the Front Range contribute <10% to the total flux of $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ (Ouimet et al., 2015). If the contribution of dust in the East River is comparable to that in the Front Range, accounting for dust would not substantially influence the magnitude of discrepancies between GCM-based predictions and our empirically derived F_{met} $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ flux estimates.

At a regional level, $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ fluxes for the Colorado Front Range based on soil inventories have been estimated to be $1.5 \pm 0.2 \times 10^6$ atoms cm⁻² yr⁻¹ (Ouimet et al., 2015). Soil inventory-based ~~F_{met} values~~ $^{10}\text{Be}_{\text{met}}$ fluxes in the Wind River Mountains, Wyoming are $1.46 \pm 0.20 \times 10^6$ atoms cm⁻² yr⁻¹ and $1.30 \pm 0.48 \times 10^6$ atoms cm⁻² yr⁻¹ for Pinedale- and Bull Lake-aged moraines, respectively (Clow et al., 2020). The $0.43\text{--}1.8 \times 10^6$ atoms cm⁻² yr⁻¹ F_{met} values and ~~$0.86\text{--}1.84\text{--}3.70 \times 10^6$~~ $0.86\text{--}1.84\text{--}3.70 \times 10^6$ atoms cm⁻² yr⁻¹ $F_{\text{cor-e}}$ values we measure are consistent with those from the Front Range and Wind River Mountains, though those sites are drier, with ~500 mm yr⁻¹ of mean annual precipitation in the Front Range (Ouimet et al., 2015) and 276 mm yr⁻¹

¹ at the Wind River Mountains sites (Clow et al., 2020), relative to the 585 to 1353 mm yr⁻¹ precipitation at the five East River study sites. The driest site in the East River (terminal moraine, 585 mm yr⁻¹ MAP) has ~~inheritance- F_{meq} and erosion-corrected $^{10}\text{Be}_{met}$ fluxes/ F_{cor} values~~ of 0.43×10^6 and 0.8647×10^6 atoms cm⁻² yr⁻¹, ~~respectively~~, which are lower than fluxes inferred in the Front Range and Wind River Mountains. ~~Hence although the fluxes are similar, These comparisons suggest that precipitation alone contributes to regional differences in $^{10}\text{Be}_{met}$ flux, but~~ does not explain all of the ~~regional~~-variability ~~among sites~~.

660

Local calibration of $^{10}\text{Be}_{met}$ flux greatly increases the utility of $^{10}\text{Be}_{met}$ as a tracer of surface processes in the East River watershed, where there is prevalent shale bedrock that is not ~~very~~ amenable to the more common $^{10}\text{Be}_{in situ}$ method. Our findings show that, whereas $^{10}\text{Be}_{met}$ flux predictions from GCM-based models ~~may be~~are broadly applicable for large-scale watershed applications, such models do not capture the high spatial variability in $^{10}\text{Be}_{met}$ fluxes that is driven by orographic influences on precipitation. Hence using $^{10}\text{Be}_{met}$ to quantify physical erosion and weathering rates at the small watershed or soil profile-scale requires not only local-scale calibration of $^{10}\text{Be}_{met}$ fluxes, but also a means for predicting $^{10}\text{Be}_{met}$ fluxes for sites where elevation and precipitation ~~varies is different~~ from that of the sites used ~~to~~ for calibration. Our study demonstrates how high-resolution LiDAR elevation and snowpack datasets can be combined with locally calibrated $^{10}\text{Be}_{met}$ flux measurements to generate spatially resolved flux predictions, which furthers our understanding of the processes that control the delivery of $^{10}\text{Be}_{met}$ to soils.

670

6 Conclusions

Meteoric ^{10}Be fluxes calculated from soil inventories on five glacial moraines dated to 13.0–17.9 ka in the East River watershed, Colorado, USA range from $0.43\text{--}1.8 \times 10^6$ atoms cm⁻² yr⁻¹ when corrected for inheritance ~~only~~ and ~~0.86–1.8131–3.70~~ $\times 10^6$ atoms cm⁻² yr⁻¹ after also taking ~~erosional~~ loss of ^{10}Be ~~by erosion and desorption~~ into account. ~~Soil Accounting for pH values are above-dependent desorption substantially increases the threshold estimated flux at the Copper Creek site where loss of meteoric- ^{10}Be via leaching soil pH is likely to occur lowest.~~ The inheritance-corrected and erosion- ~~and desorption~~-corrected fluxes vary systematically with environmental gradients across the watershed and are generally correlated with elevation, mean annual precipitation, ~~mean~~-snow depth, and ~~mean~~ snow water equivalent, reflecting the important role orographic precipitation plays in influencing spatial patterns of meteoric ^{10}Be flux within the watershed. Elevation is the only predictor of flux that is not subject to temporal bias, whereas the snow-based predictions are based on only two years of measurements, and the magnitude and pattern of snow accumulation during those years may vary substantially from Holocene averages. However, the snow-based predictions yield insight into smaller-scale topographic controls on meteoric ^{10}Be fluxes, such as predictions of lower fluxes on sharp ridge crests relative to adjacent hillslopes due to snow redistribution. The fluxes measured at the five moraines are ~~higher~~lower by a factor of 1.0 to 6.0 than predictions from an empirical model relating flux

685

Formatted: Font: Italic, Subscript

and mean annual precipitation and latitude (Graly et al., 2011). Watershed-averaged fluxes predicted from empirical correlations between measured flux and elevation, mean annual precipitation, mean snow depth, and mean snow water equivalent are comparable to predictions from global-scale ~~general circulation models-GCMs~~. Although the GCM models do not capture the spatial variation in flux within the watershed and ~~cannot be used~~are of less utility for soil profile-based applications, the GCM results provide useful estimates of watershed-scale flux. The findings highlight the large degree which meteoric ¹⁰Be fluxes vary within alpine landscapes and demonstrate how combining soil meteoric ¹⁰Be inventories and high-resolution gridded datasets can generate spatially-resolved meteoric ¹⁰Be flux predictions. Our results enhance the utility of meteoric ¹⁰Be as a tracer of surface processes in the East River watershed, and other alpine landscapes with rocks that are not conducive to using *in situ*-produced ¹⁰Be and add to our overall understanding of the factors that influence the delivery and retention of meteoric ¹⁰Be in soils.

7 Data availability

Data are available at the U.S. Department of Energy ESS-DIVE archive: Marmolejo-Cossio J ; Larsen I ; Marder, E ; Hidy A (2025): ~~— (2026): Meteoric 10Be Flux Calibration Data for the East River Watershed, Colorado, USA;~~ doi:10.15485/3025240. Abiotic and Biotic Controls on Chemical Weathering Rates and Solute Generation, ESS-DIVE repository; <https://data.ess-dive.lbl.gov/datasets/doi:10.15485/3025240>

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

8 Author contribution

JM: data curation, formal analysis, investigation, writing (original draft preparation)
IL: conceptualization, funding acquisition, investigation, methodology, project administration, resources, supervision, writing (original draft preparation, reviewing and editing)
EM: formal analysis, data curation, writing (reviewing and editing)
AH: formal analysis, writing (reviewing and editing)

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Normal

9 Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

10 Acknowledgments

We thank J. Reithel at the Rocky Mountain Biological Laboratory for securing access to study sites, B. Quirk for assistance sampling, J. Deems for information on snow datasets, ~~and~~ M. Winnick for use of a pH probe, ~~and K. Deng and M. Zheng for helpful correspondence~~. This work was supported by U.S. Department of Energy grant DE-SC0020354 to Larsen. Prepared in part by LLNL under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344. This is LLNL-JRNL-2007359.

11 References

Bacon, A.R., Richter, D.D., Bierman, P.R. and Rood, D.H., 2012. Coupling meteoric ^{10}Be with pedogenic losses of ^9Be to improve soil residence time estimates on an ancient North American interfluve. *Geology*, 40(9), pp.847-850.

[Barg, E., Lal, D., Pavich, M.J., Caffee, M.W. and Southon, J.R., 1997. Beryllium geochemistry in soils: evaluation of \$^{10}\text{Be}/^9\text{Be}\$ ratios in authigenic minerals as a basis for age models. *Chemical Geology*, 140\(3-4\), pp.237-258.](#)

Ball, D.F., 1967. Stone pavements in soils of Caernarvonshire, North Wales. *Journal of Soil Science*, 18(1), pp.103-108.

Balco, G., Stone, J.O., Lifton, N.A. and Dunai, T.J., 2008. A complete and easily accessible means of calculating surface exposure ages or erosion rates from ^{10}Be and ^{26}Al measurements. *Quaternary geochronology*, 3(3), pp.174-195.

Ballantyne, A.P., Brahney, J., Fernandez, D., Lawrence, C.L., Saros, J., Neff, J.C., 2011. Biogeochemical response of alpine lakes to a recent increase in dust deposition in the Southwestern US. *Biogeosciences* 8 (9), 2689e2706. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5194/bg-8-2689-2011>.

Bierman PR, Nichols KK. 2004. Rock to sediment – slope to sea with ^{10}Be – rates of landscape change. *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Science* 32: 215–255. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.earth.32.101802.120539

Borchers, B., Marrero, S., Balco, G., Caffee, M., Goehring, B., Lifton, N., Nishiizumi, K., Phillips, F., Schaefer, J. and Stone, J., 2016. Geological calibration of spallation production rates in the CRONUS-Earth project. *Quaternary Geochronology*, 31, pp.188-198.

[Boschi, V. and Willenbring, J.K., 2016a. The effect of pH, organic ligand chemistry and mineralogy on the sorption of beryllium over time. *Environmental Chemistry*, 13\(4\), pp.711-722.](#)

[Boschi, V. and Willenbring, J.K., 2016b. Beryllium desorption from minerals and organic ligands over time. *Chemical Geology*, 439, pp.52-58.](#)

- Brown, L. (1984). Applications of Accelerator Mass Spectrometry. *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences*, 12(1), 39–59. <https://doi.org/10.1146/ANNUREV.EA.12.050184.000351>
- 745 Brown, L., Pavich, M.J., Hickman, R.E., Klein, J. and Middleton, R., 1988. Erosion of the eastern United States observed with 10Be. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 13(5), pp.441-457.
- Brown, L., Stensland, G.J., Klein, J., Middleton, R., 1989. Atmospheric deposition of ⁷Be and ¹⁰Be. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 53,135}142.
- 750 Brown, L. (1987b). 10Be as a tracer of erosion and sediment transport. *Chemical Geology: Isotope Geoscience Section*, 65(3–4), 189–196. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-9622\(87\)90002-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-9622(87)90002-9)
- Brown, L., (1987a). 10Be: Recent applications in Earth sciences. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 323(1569), pp.75-86
- 755 Campforts, B., Vanacker, V., Vanderborght, J., Baken, S., Smolders, E. and Govers, G., 2016. Simulating the mobility of meteoric 10Be in the landscape through a coupled soil-hillslope model (Be2D). *Earth and planetary science letters*, 439, pp.143-157
- 760 Chmeleff, J., von Blanckenburg, F., Kossert, K. and Jakob, D., 2010. Determination of the 10Be half-life by multicollector ICP-MS and liquid scintillation counting. *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms*, 268(2), pp.192-199.
- 765 Clow, T., Willenbring, J. K., Schaller, M., Blum, J. D., Christl, M., Kubik, P. W., & von Blanckenburg, F. (2020). Calibrating a long-term meteoric 10Be delivery rate into eroding western US glacial deposits by comparing meteoric and in situ produced 10Be depth profiles. *Geochronology*, 2(2), 411–423. <https://doi.org/10.5194/GCHRON-2-411-202>
- Daly, C., Halbleib, M., Smith, J. I., Gibson, W. P., Doggett, M. K., Taylor, G. H., Curtis, J., and Pasteris, P. P., 2008. Physiographically sensitive mapping of climatological temperature and precipitation across the conterminous United States, *Int. J. Climatol.*, 28, 2031–2064, <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.1688>, 2008.
- 770 Dannhaus, N., Wittmann, H., Krám, P., Christl, M. and von Blanckenburg, F., 2018. Catchment-wide weathering and erosion rates of mafic, ultramafic, and granitic rock from cosmogenic meteoric 10Be/9Be ratios. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 222, pp.618-641.

Deng, K., Wittmann, H., & von Blanckenburg, F. (2020b). The depositional flux of meteoric cosmogenic ^{10}Be from modeling and observation. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 550, 116530. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.EPSL.2020.116530>

780 Deng, K., Yang, S., von Blanckenburg, F., & Wittmann, H. (2020a). Denudation Rate Changes Along a Fast-Eroding Mountainous River With Slate Headwaters in Taiwan From ^{10}Be (Meteoric)/ ^9Be Ratios. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 125(2), e2019JF005251. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JF005251>

785 Deng, K., Wittmann, H., Yang, S. and von Blanckenburg, F., 2021a. The upper limit of denudation rate measurement from cosmogenic ^{10}Be (meteoric)/ ^9Be ratios in Taiwan. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 126(10), p.e2021JF006221.

790 [Deng, K., Wittmann, H., Hsieh, M.L., Yang, S. and von Blanckenburg, F., 2021b. Deposition and retention of meteoric \$^{10}\text{Be}\$ in Holocene Taiwan river terraces. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 265, p.107048.](#)

Dethier, D.P., Birkeland, P.W., McCarthy, J.A., 2012. Using the accumulation of CBD- extractable iron and clay content to estimate soil age on stable surfaces and nearby slopes, Front Range, Colorado. *Geomorphology*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2012.05.022>.

795 Dixon, J.L., Chadwick, O.A. and Pavich, M.J., 2018. Climatically controlled delivery and retention of meteoric ^{10}Be in soils. *Geology*, 46(10), pp.899-902.

800 Dühnforth, M., Anderson, R.S., Ward, D.J. and Blum, A., 2012. Unsteady late Pleistocene incision of streams bounding the Colorado Front Range from measurements of meteoric and in situ ^{10}Be . *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 117(F1).

Egli, M., Brandová, D., Böhlert, R., Favilli, F., & Kubik, P. W. (2010). ^{10}Be inventories in Alpine soils and their potential for dating land surfaces. *Geomorphology*, 119(1–2), 62–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.GEOMORPH.2010.02.019>

805 Field, C. v., Schmidt, G. A., Koch, D., & Salyk, C. (2006). Modeling production and climate-related impacts on ^{10}Be concentration in ice cores. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 111(D15). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JD006410>

Foster, M.A., Anderson, R.S., Wyshnytzky, C.E., Ouimet, W.B. and Dethier, D.P., 2015. Hillslope lowering rates and mobile-regolith residence times from in situ and meteoric ¹⁰Be analysis, Boulder Creek Critical Zone Observatory, Colorado. *Bulletin*, 127(5-6), pp.862-878.

810 Gaskill, D.L., Godwin, L.H., Mutschler, F.E., 1967. Geologic map of the Oh-Be-Joyful quadrangle, Gunnison County, Colorado, scale 1:24,000. US Geological Survey, Geologic Quadrangle 578. <https://doi.org/10.3133/gq578>.

Gaskill, D.L., Mutschler, F.E., Kramer, J.H., Thomas, J.A., Zahony, G., 1991. Geologic map of the Gothic quadrangle, Gunnison County, Colorado, scale 1:24,000. US Geological Survey Geologic Quadrangle 1689.
815 <https://doi.org/10.3133/gq1689>.

Gosse, J.C. and Phillips, F.M., 2001. Terrestrial in situ cosmogenic nuclides: theory and application. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 20(14), pp.1475-1560.

820 Goulden T ; Hass B ; Brodie E ; Chadwick K D ; Falco N ; Maher K ; Wainwright H ; Williams K (2020): NEON AOP Survey of Upper East River CO Watersheds: LAZ Files, LiDAR Surface Elevation, Terrain Elevation, and Canopy Height Rasters. Watershed Function SFA, ESS-DIVE repository. Dataset. [doi:10.15485/1617203](https://doi.org/10.15485/1617203) accessed via <https://data.ess-dive.lbl.gov/datasets/doi:10.15485/1617203> on 2026-03-31

Graham, I., ~~et al.-(Ditchburn, R. and Barry, B., 2003).~~ Atmospheric deposition of ⁷Be and ¹⁰Be in New Zealand rain (1996–
-98), ~~Geochim. Cosmochim.~~ *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, ~~67~~(3), pp.361–373, ~~doi:10.1016/S0016-7037(02)01092-X~~.

825 Graly, J. A., Bierman, P. R., Reusser, L. J., & Pavich, M. J. (2010). Meteoric ¹⁰Be in soil profiles – A global meta-analysis. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 74(23), 6814–6829.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.GCA.2010.08.036><https://doi.org/10.1016/J.GCA.2010.08.036>

830 [Graly, J.A., Reusser, L.J. and Bierman, P.R., 2011. Short and long-term delivery rates of meteoric ¹⁰Be to terrestrial soils. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 302\(3-4\), pp.329-336.](#)

Granger, D.E., Lifton, N.A. and Willenbring, J.K., 2013. A cosmic trip: 25 years of cosmogenic nuclides in geology. *Bulletin*, 125(9-10), pp.1379-1402.

835 Harden, J. W., T. L. Fries, and M. J. Pavich (2002), Cycling of beryllium and carbon through hillslope soils in Iowa, *Biogeochemistry*, 60, 317–335.

840 Harte, J., and Shaw, R. 1995. Shifting dominance within a montane vegetation community: results of a climate-warming experiment. *Science*, 267, 876–880.

Formatted: Font: Italic

840

Heflin, S., Abel, M., Biswas, S., Morales, A., Cifelli, R., Sedlar, J., Feldman, D., Chandrasekar, V. and Kennedy, P., 2024. X-band radar and surface-based observations of cold-season precipitation in western Colorado's complex terrain. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 25(10), pp.1501-1523.

845 Heikkilä, U., Beer, J. and Alfimov, V., 2008. Beryllium-10 and beryllium-7 in precipitation in Dübendorf (440 m) and at Jungfraujoch (3580 m), Switzerland (1998–2005). *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 113(D11).

Heikkilä, U. and Von Blanckenburg, F., 2015. The global distribution of Holocene meteoric 10Be fluxes from atmospheric models: Distribution maps for terrestrial Earth's surface applications. GFZ Data Services, 10.

850

Hubbard, S. S., Williams, K. H., Agarwal, D., Banfield, J., Beller, H., Bouskill, N., Brodie, E., Carroll, R., Dafflon, B., Dwivedi, D., Falco, N., Faybishenko, B., Maxwell, R., Nico, P., Steefel, C., Steltzer, H., Tokunaga, T., Tran, P. A., Wainwright, H., ... Steltzer, H. (2018). The East River, Colorado, Watershed: A Mountainous Community Testbed for Improving Predictive Understanding of Multiscale Hydrological-Biogeochemical Dynamics Special Section: Hydrological Observatories. *Vadose Zone Journal | Advancing Critical Zone Science*. <https://doi.org/10.2136/vzj2018.03.0061>

855

Jagercikova, M., Cornu, S., Bourlès, D., Antoine, P., Mayor, M. and Guillou, V., 2015. Understanding long-term soil processes using meteoric 10Be: A first attempt on loessic deposits. *Quaternary Geochronology*, 27, pp.11-21.

860 Johnson, D.L., 1989. Subsurface stone lines, stone zones, artifact-manuport layers, and biomantles produced by bioturbation via pocket gophers (*Thomomys bottae*). *American Antiquity*, 54(2), pp.370-389.

Jordan, C. E., Dibb, J. E., & Finkel, R. C. (2003). ¹⁰Be/⁷Be, 10Be/7Be tracer of atmospheric transport and stratosphere-troposphere exchange. *J. Geophys. Res.* *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 108(D8), 4234. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2002JD002395>

865

Jungers, M. C., Bierman, P. R., Matmon, A., Nichols, K., Larsen, J., and Finkel, R.: Tracing hillslope sediment production and transport with in situ and meteoric 10Be, *J. Geophys. Res.-Earth*, 114, F04020, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JF001086>, 2009.

870 Korschinek, G., Bergmaier, A., Faestermann, T., Gerstmann, U.C., Knie, K., Rugel, G., Wallner, A., Dillmann, I., Dollinger, G., Von Gostomski, C.L. and Kossert, K., 2010. A new value for the half-life of 10Be by heavy-ion elastic recoil detection

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: Font: Italic, English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

and liquid scintillation counting. Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms, 268(2), pp.187-191.

875 Krone, L. V., Wittmann, H., & von Blanckenburg, F. (2024). Precipitation control on weathering intensity and depositional flux of Meteoric ¹⁰Be revealed from soil profiles along a climate gradient (Chile). Geophysical Research Letters, 51(15), e2024GL108825. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024GL108825>

880 Kwang, J.S., Thaler, E.A., Quirk, B.J., Quarrier, C.L. and Larsen, I.J., 2022. A landscape evolution modeling approach for predicting three-dimensional soil organic carbon redistribution in agricultural landscapes. Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences, 127(2), p.e2021JG006616.

Lal, D. and Peters, B., 1967. Cosmic ray produced radioactivity on the Earth. In Kosmische strahlung II/cosmic rays II (pp. 551-612). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

885 Lawrence, C.R., Painter, T.H., Landry, C.C. and Neff, J.C., 2010. Contemporary geochemical composition and flux of aeolian dust to the San Juan Mountains, Colorado, United States. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, 115(G3).

890 Lynn, J.S., Canfield, S., Conover, R.R., Keene, J. and Rudgers, J.A., 2018. Pocket gopher (*Thomomys talpoides*) soil disturbance peaks at mid-elevation and is associated with air temperature, forb cover, and plant diversity. Arctic, Antarctic, and Alpine Research, 50(1), p.e1487659.

Mackey, B.H., Roering, J.J. and McKean, J.A., 2009. Long-term kinematics and sediment flux of an active earthflow, Eel River, California. Geology, 37(9), pp.803-806.

895 Masarik, J., & Beer, J. (1999). Simulation of particle fluxes and cosmogenic nuclide production in the Earth's atmosphere. Journal of Geophysical Research Atmospheres, 104(D10), 12099–12111. <https://doi.org/10.1029/1998JD200091>

McHargue, L.R. and Damon, P.E., 1991. The global beryllium 10 cycle. Reviews of Geophysics, 29(2), pp.141-158.

900 McKean, J.A., Dietrich, W.E., Finkel, R.C., Southon, J.R. and Caffee, M.W., 1993. Quantification of soil production and downslope creep rates from cosmogenic ¹⁰Be accumulations on a hillslope profile. Geology, 21(4), pp.343-346. Jagercikova,

Mital, U., Dwivedi, D., Brown, J., ~~B.~~ and Steefel, C., ~~I.~~, 2022. Downscaled hyper-resolution (400 m) gridded datasets of daily precipitation and temperature (2008–2019) for the East–Taylor subbasin (western United States). ~~United States: N., p., 2022.~~
905 ~~Web. doi:10.5194/essd-14-4949-2022~~ *Earth System Science Data*, 14(11), pp.4949-4966.

- Monaghan, M.C., Krishnaswami, S. and Thomas, J.H., 1983. ^{10}Be concentrations and the long-term fate of particle-reactive nuclides in five soil profiles from California. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 65(1), pp.51-60.
- 910 Monaghan, M.C., Krishnaswami, S. and Turekian, K.K., 1986. The global-average production rate of ^{10}Be . *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 76(3-4), pp.279-287.
- Monaghan, M.C., McKean, J., Dietrich, W. and Klein, J., 1992. ^{10}Be chronometry of bedrock-to-soil conversion rates. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 111(2-4), pp.483-492.
- 915 Mudd, S.M., Attal, M., Milodowski, D.T., Grieve, S.W. and Valters, D.A., 2014. A statistical framework to quantify spatial variation in channel gradients using the integral method of channel profile analysis. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 119(2), pp.138-152.
- 920 Nishiizumi, K., Imamura, M., Caffee, M.W., Southon, J.R., Finkel, R.C. and McAninch, J., 2007. Absolute calibration of ^{10}Be AMS standards. *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms*, 258(2), pp.403-413.
- 925 Ouimet, W., Dethier, D., Bierman, P., Wyshnytzky, C., Shea, N., & Rood, D. H. (2015). Spatial and temporal variations in meteoric ^{10}Be inventories and long-term deposition rates, Colorado Front Range. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 109, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.QUASCIREV.2014.11.003>
- [Painter, T.H., Berisford, D.F., Boardman, J.W., Bormann, K.J., Deems, J.S., Gehrke, F., Hedrick, A., Joyce, M., Laidlaw, R., Marks, D. and Mattmann, C., 2016. The Airborne Snow Observatory: Fusion of scanning lidar, imaging spectrometer, and physically-based modeling for mapping snow water equivalent and snow albedo. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 184, pp.139-152.](#)
- 930 Painter, T. (2018a). ASO L4 Lidar Snow Depth 3m UTM Grid. (ASO_3M_SD, Version 1). [Data Set]. Boulder, Colorado USA. NASA National Snow and Ice Data Center Distributed Active Archive Center. <https://doi.org/10.5067/KIE9QNVG7HP0>. Date Accessed 05-12-2025.
- 935 Painter, T. (2018b). ASO L4 Lidar Snow Water Equivalent 50m UTM Grid. (ASO_50M_SWE, Version 1). [Data Set]. Boulder, Colorado USA. NASA National Snow and Ice Data Center Distributed Active Archive Center. <https://doi.org/10.5067/M4TUH28NHL4Z>. Date Accessed 05-12-2025.

940 Pavich, M. J., Brown, L., Klein, J., & Middleton, R. (1984). ^{10}Be accumulation in a soil chronosequence. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 68(2), 198–204. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-821X\(84\)90151-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-821X(84)90151-1)

Panovska, S., Poluianov, S., Gao, J., Korte, M., Mishev, A., Shprits, Y. Y., & Usoskin, I. (2023). Effects of global geomagnetic field variations over the past 100,000 years on cosmogenic radionuclide production rates in the Earth's atmosphere. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 128(8), e2022JA031158. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022JA031158>

945 Portenga, E.W., Bierman, P.R., Trodick, C.D., Greene, S.E., DeJong, B.D., Rood, D.H. and Pavich, M.J., 2019. Erosion rates and sediment flux within the Potomac River basin quantified over millennial timescales using beryllium isotopes. *GSA Bulletin*, 131(7-8), pp.1295-1311.

Prather, R.M., Underwood, N., Dalton, R.M., Barr, B. and Inouye, B.D., 2023. Climate data from the Rocky Mountain Biological Laboratory (1975–2022). *Ecology*, 104(11), p.e4153.

950

Putkonen, J. and Swanson, T., 2003. Accuracy of cosmogenic ages for moraines. *Quaternary Research*, 59(2), pp.255-261.

Quirk, B.J., Larsen, I.J. and Hidy, A.J., 2024. Latest Pleistocene glacial chronology and paleoclimate reconstruction for the East River watershed, Colorado, USA. *Quaternary Research*, pp.1-13.

955

Raisbeck, G., Yiou, F., Fruneau, M. *et al.* Cosmogenic ^{10}Be concentrations in Antarctic ice during the past 30,000 years. *Nature* **292**, 825–826 (1981). <https://doi.org/10.1038/292825a0>

Reusser, L., Graly, J., Bierman, P., & Rood, D. (2010). Calibrating a long-term meteoric ^{10}Be accumulation rate in soil.

960 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 37(19). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010GL04475>

Richardson, P.W., Perron, J.T. and Schurr, N.D., 2019. Influences of climate and life on hillslope sediment transport. *Geology*, 47(5), pp.423-426.

965 [Roe, G.H., 2005. Orographic precipitation. *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.*, 33\(1\), pp.645-671.](#)

Stone, J. & Balco, G. Extraction of beryllium-10 from soil by fusion. University of Washington Cosmogenic Nuclide Laboratory. 6 p. <https://depts.washington.edu/cosmolab/chem/fusionmethod.pdf>

970 Stone, J.O.H., 1998. A rapid fusion method for separation of beryllium-10 from soils and silicates. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 62 (3), 555-561.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Tran, A.P., Rungee, J., Faybishenko, B., Dafflon, B. and Hubbard, S.S., 2019. Assessment of spatiotemporal variability of evapotranspiration and its governing factors in a mountainous watershed. *Water*, 11(2), p.243.

Tsai, H., Maejima, Y. and Hseu, Z.Y., 2008. Meteoric ^{10}Be dating of highly weathered soils from fluvial terraces in Taiwan. *Quaternary International*, 188(1), pp.185-196.

von Blanckenburg, F., Bouchez, J., & Wittmann, H. (2012). Earth surface erosion and weathering from the ^{10}Be (meteoric)/ ^9Be ratio. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 351–352, 295–305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.EPSL.2012.07.022>

von Blanckenburg, F. and Bouchez, J., 2014. River fluxes to the sea from the ocean's $^{10}\text{Be}/^9\text{Be}$ ratio. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 387, pp.34-43.

Wainwright, H., and Williams, K. 2017. LiDAR collection in August 2015 over the East River Watershed, Colorado, USA. ESS-DIVE. doi:10.21952/WTR/1412542, version: ess-dive-11cf2e833d7443c-20230504T210936015906.

West, N., Kirby, E., Bierman, P. and Clarke, B.A., 2014. Aspect-dependent variations in regolith creep revealed by meteoric ^{10}Be . *Geology*, 42(6), pp.507-510.

Willenbring, J. K., & von Blanckenburg, F. (2010). Meteoric cosmogenic Beryllium-10 adsorbed to river sediment and soil: Applications for Earth-surface dynamics. *Earth-Science Reviews*, 98(1–2), 105–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.EARSCIREV.2009.10.008><https://doi.org/10.1016/J.EARSCIREV.2009.10.008>

Yamagata, T., Nagai, H., Matsuzaki, H. and Narasaki, Y., 2019. Decadal variations of atmospheric ^7Be and ^{10}Be concentrations between 1998 and 2014 in Japan. *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms*, 455, pp.265-270.

You, C.F., Lee, T. and Li, Y.H., 1989. The partition of Be between soil and water. *Chemical Geology*, 77(2), pp.105-118.

Zheng, M., Adolphi, F., Sjolte, J., Aldahan, A., Possnert, G., Wu, M., Chen, P. and Muscheler, R., 2021. Solar Activity of the Past 100 Years Inferred From ^{10}Be in Ice Cores—Implications for Long-Term Solar Activity Reconstructions. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 48(4), p.e2020GL090896.

Zheng, M., Adolphi, F., Ferrachat, S., Mekhaldi, F., Lu, Z., Nilsson, A. and Lohmann, U., 2024. Modeling atmospheric transport of cosmogenic radionuclide ^{10}Be using geos-chem 14.1. 1 and echam6. 3-ham2. 3: Implications for solar and geomagnetic reconstructions. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 51(2), p.e2023GL106642.

Formatted: Font: Italic