# **Regional Erosion Rates Show Strong Climate-Driven Variability** in the Arctic Since the LGM

**Risa Madoff\* and Jaakko Putkonen** Harold Hamm School of Geology and Geological Engineering, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND \*risa.madoff@und.edu jaakko.putkonen@und.edu **UNDNORTH DAKOTÁ** 

#### ABSTRACT

The last 22 kyrs, since LGM, is known for significant millennial scale changes in global climate (Barker and Knorr, 2021). Sedimentary deposits in lacustrine and marine basins bear archives of corresponding changes in sediment accumulation. Yet given the scale that the global climate exerts on geomorphological processes on Earth's surface, generalizations of the relationship between the climate and the erosion remain inconclusive. Whether the possible generalizations could even be applied to all regions has also remained unclear.

Erosion rates are a first-order response to a region's climate. The variability of erosion rates through time are needed for dating of buried surfaces, quantifying soil carbon budgets, and assessing landscape stability. Until now, a truly global analysis of comparing interregional erosion rates has not been available. Recent work in Madoff and Putkonen (2022) addresses this by generating global maps of regional erosion rates since the LGM. These results are supported by corresponding published sediment accumulation rates in sink areas corresponding to given watershed. Results show the spatial extent of higher erosion rates and larger ranges of variability through time in the Arctic and subarctic in contrast to the tropics and mid-latitudes. These results also indicate that the regional variability decreases the further from the past ice sheets a given location is. Finally, a clear take home message from these results is that the regional erosion rates vary both through time and space for the past 22 kyrs.

#### With Support to attend CSDMS 2022 Thank You!





#### INTRODUCTION

Climate-driven variation in erosion was determined in one location (Fig. 1A), Mono Basin, CA (Madoff and Putkonen, 2016). This motivated us to look into whether erosion is variable everywhere.

The basic sediment transport law, q = K(dy/dx) was used to apply a novel approach designed to compare globally a relation between climate and erosion (Madoff and Putkonen, 2022). A systematic first-order global comparative assessment addresses two longstanding questions:

Can erosion rates be shown to vary with climate and where? What is the spatial variability of time-dependent erosion?



Fig. 1 (A) Curves comparing rates of elevation loss (degradation) using long-term average constant K and time varying K at a single location, Mono Basin, CA (Madoff and Putkonen, 2016) and map (Jol, 2007) showing connectivity of glacial lake basins that proxy climate record is taken from (Lowenstein, 1999).

intervals were generated in MATLAB. Gridding A non-linear relationship was found between was formatted according to transient paleoclimate and erosion (Fig.1B) when global soil global climate model TraCE-21 ka and ice creep rates, converted to topographic mask from ICE-5G (Peltier, 2004). The data diffusivities (K) in Oehm and Hallet (2005) were grouped using Köppen Climate and substitution method with a transfer classification in Madoff and Putkonen (2022) function produce a global map of average erosion since LGM (Fig.4) illustrating the are found to generate a non-linear curve. results of the non-linear curve and the Global maps of the temperatures (Fig. 2) through time in the past during which regions correlations displayed as spatial associations between erosion with air temperatures. exhibited highest K (Fig. 3) and the mean annual air temperatures (MAAT) over 500 yr

### **EROSION THROUGH TIME**

Variable  $\Rightarrow$  Arctic **Constant**  $\Rightarrow$ **Tropics** 

## Time varying diffusivities reveal largest min-max range of erosion rates in the Arctic

The Arctic region as whole exhibits the largest ranges in erosion rate variability, as a difference between minimum and max erosion rates (Fig. 5). These high ranges correlated temporally most directly with proximity to the last ice-sheet for those neighboring regions, and length of time temperatures were driven by glaciation, in those Arctic regions that were never covered by the ice sheet. Regional difference is also revealed in Fig. 6 which shows the long term average erosion in relation to the present. The present erosion is higher, i.e. there

are enough present temperatures colder than on average because the ice covered western Arctic longer, therefore erosion in the model started later there than in the eastern Arctic.

The lowest variability is displayed in the tropic regions where the past transition from glacial to interglacial correlates with the smallest erosion rate variability, as rates changed relatively little through time.

## **TAKE-HOME MESSAGE**

Global time-slice mapping reveal climate-forcing on Arctic erosion rates.

- Climate forcing on regional degradation revealed on millennial time scale in the Arctic
- Arctic erosion accelerated by last deglaciation 20-8 ka



Fig. 4 Map of regional diffusivities averaged over 500 yr intervals since LGM. Values derived through substituting present values given in Fig. 1 with associated past Ts output from TraCE-21 ka that generated past Ks.



Fig. 1 (B) Global MAATs with diffusivities (K) are related through a non-linear curve. Stippled curves are SDs and transparent boxes are the standard uncertainties, well within SDs.









	METHODS	
	SPACE-FOR-TIME SUBSTITUTION	
	COMPUTATIONAL GRIDS TRANSFER FUNCTION	Global Paleoclimate Models



time

Fig. 5 Map of global minimum to maximum ranges in diffusivity

Time and space dimensionality of computational grids generated using MATLAB



Image courtesy of IODP via https://earthobservatory.nas a.gov [accessed April 15, 2022].

- Soil creep  $\Rightarrow$  diffusivity (K)
- Soil creep coupled with climate reanalysis air temperature data (T)
- Ts grouped according to Köppen Climate Classification
- Ks plotted against the grouped average Ts
- Curve and transfer function generated from K/T relationship
- Using gridded T data output from TraCE-21 ka, transfer function transfers Ks through time to generate past diffusivities at same locations at 500 yr intervals since LGM
- Ice mask applied from ICE-5G (Peltier, 2004) to exclude ice-covered regions from substitution Erosion rates mapped
- Model erosion sources areas compared with published offshore and lake sediment accumulation rates from sink areas and correlation coefficients calculated



Examples from global ice-sheet extent model (Peltier, 2004)

#### References

- Barker, S., Knorr, G., 2021. Millennial scale feedbacks determine the shape and rapidity of glacial termination. Nature. Communications. 12. Beck, H.E., Zimmermann, N.E., McVicar, T.R., Vergopolan, N., Berg, A., Wood, E.F., 2018. Present and future köppen-geiger climate classification maps at 1-km resolution. Nature. Scientific Data 5, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2018.214
- Jol, H.. https://people.uwec.edu/jolhm/southwest2007/beatty.html [accessed 15 Apr, 2022].
- Lowenstein, T.K., Li, J., Brown, C., Roberts, S.M., Ku, T., Luo, S., Yang, W. 1999. 200 k.y. paleoclimate record from Death Valley salt core. Geology. 27. 3–6. Madoff, R.D., Putkonen, J., 2022. Global variations in regional degradation rates since the Last Glacial Maximum mapped through time and space. Quat. Res. 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1017/qua.2022.4

Madoff, R.D., Putkonen, J., 2016, Climate and hillslope degradation vary in concert; 85 ka to present, eastern Sierra Nevada, CA, USA, Geomorphology, v. 266, p. 33-40. Oehm, B., Hallet, B., 2005. Rates of soil creep, worldwide: weak climatic controls and potential feedback. Zeitschrift fur Geomorphologie. N.F. 49, 353–372. Peltier, W.R., 2004. Global glacial isostasy and the surface of the ice-age earth: The ICE-5G (VM2) model and GRACE. Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci. 32, 111–149.



Fig. 7 Panels A-F showing comparability of trends between source region model erosion rates (blue) and corresponding sink area published sediment accumulation rates (orange) from offshore and lake sediment cores representing major watersheds – A (Amazon), B (Ganges), C (Lena River watershed, D (Yenisei River watershed), E (southwest Alaska), F(Northeast Alaska). Correlation coefficients ranged from moderate to high (0.65 – 0.91), which provides supporting evidence of the erosion model's validity in approach and spatial scale.

**MODEL VALIDATION** 

Published sediment accumulation rates from offshore

modeled and adjacent sink areas (Fig. 7). The similar

preliminary validation of the model approach and at the

directions and their temporal correlations provide a

given time scale.

and lake sediment cores strongly support a physical

process connecting source area erosion rates as

