



# The distribution of sediment residence times at the foot of mountains and its implications for proxies recorded in sedimentary basins

Sebastien Carretier, Laure Guerit, R. Harries, Vincent Regard, P. Maffre, Stéphane Bonnet

## ► To cite this version:

Sebastien Carretier, Laure Guerit, R. Harries, Vincent Regard, P. Maffre, et al.. The distribution of sediment residence times at the foot of mountains and its implications for proxies recorded in sedimentary basins. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 2020, 546, pp.116448. 10.1016/j.epsl.2020.116448 . insu-02899296

**HAL Id: insu-02899296**

**<https://insu.hal.science/insu-02899296>**

Submitted on 18 Jul 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

# The distribution of sediment residence times at the foot of mountains and its implications for proxies recorded in sedimentary basins

June 5, 2020

S. Carretier<sup>1\*</sup>, L. Guerit<sup>1,2</sup>, R. Harries<sup>3</sup>, V. Regard<sup>1</sup>, P. Maffre<sup>4</sup> and S. Bonnet<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> GET, Université de Toulouse, IRD, UPS, CNRS, (Toulouse), France.

<sup>2</sup> Now at University of Rennes, CNRS, Géosciences Rennes, UMR 6118, France.

<sup>3</sup> Research Center for Integrated Disaster Risk Management (CIGIDEN), PUC, Santiago, Chile.

<sup>4</sup> Department of Earth and Planetary Science, University of California, Berkeley

\* Correspondance: [sebastien.carretier@get.omp.eu](mailto:sebastien.carretier@get.omp.eu)

## Abstract

The geochemical and physical properties of terrigenous sediment stacked in sedimentary basins are used as proxies for the paleo-environmental conditions that prevailed during their period of deposition. Nevertheless, sediment grains have a stochastic transit from mountain sources to sedimentary basins: a fraction of grains are stored for a long time while others are recycled from old deposits. Consequently, the temporal representativity of a population of grains in a sedimentary stratum is uncertain. The potential recycling of old material is a major concern in the reconstruction of paleo-environments and this recycling is usually difficult to evaluate. In particular, the distribution of grain residence times in basins, between sources and sinks, is out of reach. Here we use a landscape evolution model that traces grains to analyse the distribution of residence times in an alluvial apron at the foot of a mountain relief. We study an end-member scenario that is the least favourable for the storage of grains: when the



mountain is eroding at the same rate as rock is uplifting. In this case, the alluvial apron behaves as a by-pass zone, when averaging sediment flux over Ma, and the storage of grains of any size should be minimal. Yet, the model predicts that some grains are stored for hundreds of thousands of years before exiting the alluvial apron. Consequently, the mean residence time of sediment grains is much higher than the observed residence time of 95% of the grains exported by the alluvial apron rivers. This process may explain very long residence times found in fluvial systems by geochemical methods based on bulk measurements of sediment. Furthermore, it suggests that grains stored for a very long time, although a minority, can bias time-dependent proxies.

**Keywords:** Grain, residence time, piedmont rivers, paleo-environmental proxy, landscape evolution modelling.

## 1 Introduction

The fate of terrigenous sediment is to be stacked in sedimentary onshore or offshore basins, where they often constitute the unique record of paleo-environmental conditions that prevailed during the period of their deposition in stratum. The size, mineralogy and weathering grade of sediment, for example, provide valuable information about changes in tectonic rates (*Duller et al.*, 2010; *Whittaker et al.*, 2011), eroding sources (*Garzanti et al.*, 2007; *Weltje and Brommer*, 2011; *Riquelme et al.*, 2018) or paleo-climate (*Clift and Webb*, 2018). A conventional assumption, which relates the physical and chemical characteristics of sediment with eroding sources for some time period, is that grains are rapidly transported from their source to the basin. However, it is well known that the transport of sediment is highly variable from short timescales (*Einstein, H.A.*, 1937) to long timescales (*Kim and Jerolmack*, 2008; *Paola et al.*, 2009; *Allen et al.*, 2013). In particular, sediment grains can be stored for different periods of time in river bars and terraces (*Allison et al.*, 1998), or in intramontane sedimentary basins (*Jonell et al.*, 2018), as well as in proximal piedmonts and foreland basins. As fluvial erosion processes are highly variable in space and time, either autogenically (*Van De Wiel and Coulthard*, 2010; *Foreman and Straub*, 2017) or because the climate and the production of sediment itself varies, grains that were previously stored can be re-entrained and flushed downstream to distal basins (*Jolivet et al.*, 2014; *Guerit et al.*, 2016; *Malatesta et al.*, 2018). Consequently, grains that were stored for years to millions of years can potentially contribute to the

52 sediment outflux of rivers supplying basins ( *Wittmann et al.*, 2011; *Quick et al.*,  
53 2019).

54  
55 Of primary importance is the long-term storage of grains along the fluvial  
56 system. Sediment storage can buffer the transmission of sediment signals from  
57 source to sink, such as climatically driven sedimentary signals that are transmit-  
58 ted to basins ( *Metivier et al.*, 1999; *Fedele and Paola*, 2007; *Blöthe and Korup*,  
59 2013; *Armitage et al.*, 2013). For example, in the Indus river, about 50% of  
60 the sediment outflux to the ocean was recycled from floodplains since the last  
61 glacial maximum, masking the effect of monsoon weakening since 8 ka ( *Clift  
62 and Giosan*, 2014). The storage-recycling process has two potential negative  
63 impacts on the reconstruction of paleo-environmental conditions. First, if the  
64 proportion of recycled material is high, the bulk property of a stratum may not  
65 represent the conditions nor the eroded sources that prevailed at the time of the  
66 deposit, but rather a complex mix of previous conditions, possibly smoothing  
67 out any source variability. Secondly, if grains stay a long time in traps, their  
68 weathering, or any other proxy that depends on mean grain residence times in  
69 the fluvial system, will not correspond to the climatic conditions that prevailed  
70 during the deposition of a stratum. Such a lag has been identified, for exam-  
71 ple in South China Sea, where the onshore Holocene sediment record reflects  
72 chemical weathering during the last glacial maximum ( *Hu et al.*, 2012). The  
73 magnitude of recycled sediment is usually unknown in old deposits and this is-  
74 sue has been identified as a major potential bias for high resolution records that  
75 utilise the mean (bulk) property of a sediment sample ( *Di Giulio et al.*, 2003;  
76 *Weltje*, 2012; *Hoffmann*, 2015).

77  
78 Indeed, there are data that suggest that the storage of sediment can be long  
79 even for very fine sediment. Disequilibria between isotopes of Uranium-series  
80 ( $^{234}\text{U}/^{238}\text{U}$  *Chabaux et al.*, 2006; *Li et al.*, 2016a) have been used to determine  
81 a "comminution age" of sediment, defined as the time elapsed between the gen-  
82 eration of small grains ( $\leq 50\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ ), by any process in the source region (local  
83 weathering in the regolith, crushing during river transport), and the length of  
84 time that the deposit spent at the sampling location. The comminution age  
85 is an age that is supposed to represent a mean transit time of all the grains  
86 constituting a sample. Very long comminution ages of 110 kyr and 250 to 600  
87 kyr were found in sediment currently being transported along rivers in Taiwan,  
88 and along a river draining the east of the Tibetan edge, respectively ( *Li et al.*,  
89 2016a). These long comminution ages, and the absence of a strong correlation

90 with the "Chemical Index of Alteration" (CIA), which measures the depletion  
 91 in alkalis of sediment grains by weathering, suggest long-term storage in the  
 92 fluvial system and the reworking of older sediment. Other examples of long  
 93 and variable comminution ages (18 to 650 kyr) include large catchments drain-  
 94 ing into the Gulf of Carpentaria in northern Australia (*Martin et al.*, 2019).  
 95 Uranium-series disequilibria were also used for evidence of residence times of  
 96 a few kyr in the Amazon basin (*Dosseto et al.*, 2006) and  $\sim 100$  kyr in the  
 97 Gange plain (*Granet et al.*, 2007) for fine sediment ( $\leq 50 \mu\text{m}$ ). In addition,  
 98 *Wittmann et al.* (2011) used cosmogenic nuclides as evidence for the recycling  
 99 of old sand ( $\leq 125 \mu\text{m}$ ), stored in the Amazonian plain, by the current river.  
 100 *Lauer and Willenbring* (2010) also showed that the recycling of sediment de-  
 101 posited in the floodplain is likely to lead to a downstream increase in the mean  
 102 river sand cosmogenic nuclide concentration. Using detrital apatite fission-track  
 103 thermochronology on sediments from rivers in New Zealand, *Lang et al.* (2018)  
 104 demonstrated the importance of intermontane sediment storage over timescales  
 105 of 10 to 100 kyr. All these studies point to long ( $\gg 1$  kyr) temporary storage  
 106 of fine sediment, even in rapidly eroding landscapes.

107  
 108 Coarse sediments are transported as bedload, more slowly than fine sedi-  
 109 ment, and with a higher probability of being trapped in deposits (*Fedele and*  
 110 *Paola*, 2007). Alluvial rivers move laterally over decennial to millennial timescales,  
 111 either by slow lateral erosion in meandering rivers, through the constant re-  
 112 organization of channel connections in a braided river, or by abrupt deviation  
 113 from a former course (avulsion) during extreme floods. During this lateral mi-  
 114 gration of channels, bedload sediments are abandoned for different periods of  
 115 time (storage) and can be re-entrained, years to million of years later, when a  
 116 channel reoccupies this former position (recycling). For example, a recent study  
 117 used the distribution of cosmogenic nuclide  $^{21}\text{Ne}$  in distinct pebbles in the Great  
 118 Plains (USA) to infer that the current river is recycling Mio-Pliocene sediment  
 119 (5 Ma old) (*Sinclair et al.*, 2019). In a canyon of the Western Andes, *Carretier*  
 120 *et al.* (2019) measured the  $^{10}\text{Be}$  in distinct pebbles from a known source to show  
 121 that storage and recycling control the rate of dispersion of river pebbles over  
 122 the long-term. Yet, because the alluvial processes involved in the storage and  
 123 recycling of fine and coarse sediments are diverse and operate over a wide range  
 124 of timescales, both the distribution of grain residence times and the amount of  
 125 sediment recycling through time is poorly known (*Allison et al.*, 1998; *Bradley*  
 126 *and Tucker*, 2013).

127

128 In this contribution, we use a numerical model of topographic evolution over  
129 geological timescales (landscape evolution model) that traces grains to study  
130 the relationship between the processes controlling storage and recycling and the  
131 resulting distribution of grain residence times in an alluvial apron, referred to as  
132 a piedmont. We restrict our analysis to a piedmont system because it is the most  
133 proximal area of sediment deposition and remobilisation, between mountainous  
134 sources and distal long-term sedimentary basins, with a high potential of storage  
135 (*Fedele and Paola, 2007; Harries et al., 2019*).

## 136 2 Modelling Approach

137 We use the landscape evolution model CIDRE (see details in Appendix A and  
138 in *Carretier et al., 2016, 2018*). CIDRE models the topographic evolution of  
139 a fluvial landscape on a regular grid of square cells. Starting from an initial  
140 topography, the modification of the topography proceeds in successive time-  
141 steps. Over a time-step, a specified precipitation rate falls on the grid and a  
142 water discharge is propagated from the most elevated cell to the lowest cell.  
143 In each cell, local erosion and deposition rates are calculated according to laws  
144 that depend on the local water discharge, topographic slope and a transport  
145 length parameter that determines the mean distance that a sediment particle  
146 must travel before being deposited. In addition, rivers can erode laterally and  
147 the lateral erosion is proportional to the sediment discharge in the river. An  
148 originality of CIDRE is that it includes individual grains, allowing the paths of  
149 sediment to be traced from their source to their sink. The grains have specified  
150 sizes and initial positions within the grid and at depth. The size of grains does  
151 not change downstream and the grains are not split into different smaller clasts.  
152 Grains then move stochastically according to probability laws that depend on  
153 the local erosion and deposition rates (*Carretier et al., 2016*). The movement  
154 of grains is thus consistent with the topographic modifications calculated by  
155 CIDRE (*Carretier et al., 2016*).

156  
157 The simulations consist of a block of  $40 \times 60 \text{ km}^2$  that uplifts at a constant  
158 rate of  $1 \text{ mm yr}^{-1}$  to reach a dynamic equilibrium between erosion and up-  
159 lift. This uplifting block is coupled to a deposition area of  $40 \times 60 \text{ km}^2$ , where  
160 sediment accumulates until reaching a by-pass stage, without the influence of  
161 subsidence (Fig. 1 and see Appendix A for parameter values). The precipitation  
162 rate varies spatially and temporarily with elevation according to a Gaussian-like  
163 function of precipitation rate versus elevation (*Zavala et al., 2020*), such that the

precipitation rates vary from  $1 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$  at baselevel to a maximum of  $1.7 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$  at 1300 m, a peak elevation usually found in Himalaya or Andes (*Bookhagen and Burbank, 2006; Bookhagen and Strecker, 2008; Colberg and Anders, 2014*). In these dynamic equilibrium and by-pass conditions, the storage of grains in the alluvial apron is less likely, as any grain entering the piedmont will leave it at some time. Yet, we will show that long-term storage still occurs. This model is idealistic and does not intend to reflect a specific field location. We study this end-member model because it is useful to understand the processes that dictate sediment storage and recycling. We begin by analyzing the autogenic incision and lateral migration of rivers in the model. Then we spread, at the surface of the model, a population of gravels (1-10 cm in diameter) to analyse how these grains can be stored or leave the model grid, and further, how their residence times (the duration between entry and exit from the piedmont) are finally distributed. In a second series of simulations, we continuously feed the piedmont with grains and trace their ages (time since their entry in the piedmont) in the piedmont and their residence time once they have left the model grid. This allows us to evaluate the impact of "old" recycled grains on the mean age and mean residence time, through time, and finally to discuss the natural variability in residence-time-dependent proxies in basins.

Only some of the model parameters are likely to have an impact on the results of this study. These parameters are those that control the river erosion and sediment dynamics in the piedmont domain (Appendix A): the exponents  $m$  and  $n$  on the water discharge and slope in the sediment erosion law, which dictate how the detachment rate of sediment varies with water discharge and slope; the transport length parameter  $\zeta$  that determines the length of transport of sediment entering the piedmont domain (higher  $\zeta$  means less deposition and longer travel); the lateral erosion coefficient  $\alpha$  that controls part of the lateral mobility of piedmont rivers (higher  $\alpha$  means more intense lateral erosion). In addition, the piedmont length perpendicular to the mountain front may influence the probability of temporary storage and the precipitation rate may also affect the river dynamics in the piedmont. The model time-step used to solve the equations can also influence the non-linear dynamics of river movement on the piedmont and the grain dispersion (*Carretier et al., 2016*). We will test the effect of varying all these parameters on the residence time distribution of grains in the piedmont. All other parameters (erodibility parameters in particular) may affect grain elevation within the mountain domain, but as the duration of grain transport in the mountain domain is not studied here, these parameters will not

influence the outcomes presented in this contribution.

## 3 Results

### 3.1 Dynamic equilibrium

In order to understand the distribution of grain residence times, we run the model during 20 m.y. and analyse the model behaviour at dynamic equilibrium. A 20 m.y. duration ensures that the observations are not due to sedimentation that would keep on increasing during the transient adjustment to uplift (Fig. S1). From this situation, the model time is set to zero and the model maintains dynamic equilibrium for the succeeding 5 m.y. Fig. 2a and b show two snapshots of the model topography with the water discharge overlain. One million years separate the two snapshots and there is, indeed, no noticeable difference in the mountain part. However, the fluvial pattern in the piedmont is different. The erosion/sediment rate pattern (Fig. 2c and d) shows that sedimentation occurs along main piedmont rivers on levées and lobes. The interplay between sedimentation and erosion, as well as the lateral erosion of rivers, generate continuous lateral river migration as well as abrupt avulsions and captures, so that the deposition and the storage of material are episodic. Although the mean cross-range profile is constant over time (Fig. 2e), the transverse profile of the piedmont shows topographic variations of 60 m associated with the autogenic alluvial dynamics (Fig. 2f). Furthermore, the mountainous domain is not eroding uniformly: there are zones with sedimentation, and channel reaches with focused erosion. Fig. 3 illustrates successive steps over 500 kyr. Autogenic incision of the piedmont apex occurs naturally in these experiments, preferentially when two rivers join in the piedmont (Fig. 3a). Incision at alluvial fan apexes drives small knick-points that retreat upstream, generating a pulse of sedimentation in the piedmont (Fig. 3b-f) that favours avulsions and increases the probability of channel captures. Thus there is a positive coupling between the dynamics of the mountain and the piedmont. In summary, although a steady-state equilibrium can be defined macroscopically with 1) a constant mean long-profile from the mountain to the piedmont, 2) a constant mean erosion in the mountain and 3) by-pass of the piedmont over long timescales (Fig. S1), this equilibrium is imperfect and high frequency topographic variations ( $\sim 100$  kyr) still occur (Fig. 2e). This is fundamental to understand the distribution of grain residence times in the piedmont.

### 3.2 Tracing one population of grains

We now randomly spread 10,000 grains at the surface of the mountain domain at time 0 and we track their pathway during 1 m.y. of model time. The grain size is distributed uniformly between  $r = 1$  cm and 10 cm. Fig. 4a shows that most of the grains are rapidly evacuated from the model domain but some grains are stored in the piedmont.  $> 95\%$  of the grains were stored less than 400 years in the piedmont, but a minority of grains ( $< 1\%$ ) reached residence times approaching 1 m.y. (Fig. 4b). The mean residence time is 18 ka, one order of magnitude larger than for most of the grains. The long tail of the distribution is illustrated by the complementary cumulative distribution for different selected grain sizes in Fig. 4c. On this figure, we also added an experiment with 10,000 grains of a constant grain size of 1 mm, representative of a coarse sand fraction. This figure shows that gravel of different sizes have similar residence times whereas small grains of 1 mm have consistently lower residence times (mean of 2.8 kyr), resulting from their higher probability to be entrained ( $\propto 1/r$  in the model). The tail of the distribution may be approached by a power law between 10 and 100 kyr, whereas an exponential decline may be more appropriate for longer durations. Given the difficulty in proving a power-law trend (*Virkar and Clauset*, 2014), we did not attempt to fit our distributions. Rather, we show different reference slopes in Fig. 4c and in subsequent figures to qualitatively evaluate the length of the tail (the smaller the slope in the log-log plot the longer the tail, and thus old grains are more probable). The abrupt exponential cut-off for durations  $> 100$  kyr, results from the fact that the grains must leave the system at some moment, infinite storage is unlikely given the by-pass stage of the piedmont and the absence of subsidence.

The long-term storage of some grains is explained by episodic sedimentation, as described in Fig. 3. Most of the grains leave the piedmont in several model time-steps ( $< 400$  yr in the reference model). Nevertheless, some grains are deposited on river sides and can stay there for a long time before being recycled by an avulsion event or by the more continuous lateral migration of rivers.

Considering a grain population of 1 to 10 cm, we vary some of the parameters that likely influence the residence time and then compare their complementary cumulative distributions to the previous model, taken as reference (Fig. 5). As expected, doubling the piedmont length increases the residence time (mean  $\sim 50$  kyr) and dividing the piedmont length by two decreases the residence time (mean  $\sim 5$  kyr). The probability of a grain being stored in a river deposit

274 increases with piedmont length. The mixing layer has the shape of a wedge in  
 275 the downstream direction. It scales with the square of the piedmont length,  
 276 and thus so does the mean residence time. Consequently, the mean residence  
 277 time strongly decreases when the piedmont length decreases. A model time-  
 278 step, ten-times smaller, decreases the fraction of grains that leave the model  
 279 rapidly, but increases the fraction of grains stored for a long time, thereby  
 280 having a lesser impact on the mean residence time (mean  $\sim 23$  kyr). Multiplying  
 281 the transport length parameter  $\zeta$  by a factor of 4 predictably decreases the  
 282 residence time (mean  $\sim 10$  kyr), because a larger  $\zeta$  decreases the probability of  
 283 grain deposition. Doubling the lateral erosion efficiency  $\alpha$  has a limited impact  
 284 (mean  $\sim 18$  kyr), suggesting that abrupt changes in a river's course, through  
 285 avulsions and captures, have a stronger influence than their continuous lateral  
 286 migration. Changing the exponent  $m$  from 0.3 to 0.5 for water discharge in  
 287 the sediment erosion law (corresponding to a lower daily variability of piedmont  
 288 rainfall for example *Laque, 2014*) decreases drastically the residence time (mean  
 289  $\sim 2$  kyr). With  $m = 0.5$ , the piedmont is more gentle, the piedmont rivers  
 290 move much less laterally and thus topographic variations in the piedmont are  
 291 reduced. The rivers export sediment out of the model domain more efficiently,  
 292 and thus grains have a smaller probability of being stored in lateral deposits.  
 293 Dividing the precipitation rate by two increases the mean residence time (mean  
 294  $\sim 30$  kyr). Despite all of these different reference model scenarios, in all cases,  
 295 we observe that the distribution of residence times has a long tail, i.e. a small  
 296 but still probable proportion of grains with very large residence times.

### 297 **3.3 Distribution of grains ages and residence times through** 298 **time**

299 In order to analyse the evolution of the mean residence time through time, we  
 300 now use 200,000 grains (1-10 cm) and visualise them as they progressively cover  
 301 the piedmont. When grains leave the model domain, the time they spent in the  
 302 piedmont (residence time) is recorded. To compensate for the depopulation of  
 303 grains in the mountains, the grains leaving the models are repositioned in their  
 304 original position in the mountain and their clock is reset to zero.

305  
 306 We track the grains movement during 5 m.y. Consistent with "Reservoir  
 307 Theory", we differentiate the "age" of a grain from its "residence time". The  
 308 age applies to grains still in the piedmont and corresponds to the time elapsed  
 309 since their entrance in the piedmont. The residence time applies to grains leav-



ing the piedmont, is thus necessarily longer for a given grain, and corresponds to the total time elapsed between the entrance and the exit of a grain. In the two snapshots of Fig. 6, young grains together with grains as old as 1 Ma or more are present at the surface, but the spatial repartition of ages is different in each snapshot, highlighting a constant reworking of the piedmont surface. Grains of similar ages are grouped in different zones that correspond to different, successive sedimentary lobes. Fig. 6c thus demonstrates that older grains are not older because they are buried deeper in the lobes. Rather, for a given age, grains are buried relatively equally between 60-70 m and the surface, i.e. within the long-term mixing layer, identified on Fig. 2e. Fig. 6d demonstrates that the distribution of grain ages at 3.75 m.y. in the mixing layer is spread between a few years and >2 Ma (histogram truncated at 2 Ma).

The age distribution is different from the distribution of residence times. Fig. 7a shows the evolution of mean ages for different models (reference, longer and shorter piedmont, higher  $\zeta$ , higher  $\alpha$ ). In the reference model, the mean age increases and reaches 0.8 Ma after 5 Ma of evolution (Fig. 7a). This increase highlights the fact that the number of old grains increases through time. Nevertheless, the increase is not infinite, as grains must leave the piedmont at some point in the "steady-state" simulations. The mean ages saturate after 5 Ma (not illustrated), which is interpreted as the time needed to completely rework the piedmont mixing layer. We observe similar behaviours with the other models. Variations in piedmont length have a limited impact on this mean age whereas increases in the other two parameters tested here,  $\zeta$  and  $\alpha$ , leads to a significant decrease in the mean ages: a larger  $\zeta$  decreases the probability of grain deposition and a higher  $\alpha$  favours the lateral re-entrainment of stored grains (Fig. 7a).

In order to analyse how the mean residence times of grains leaving the piedmont varies through time, we calculated every 10 kyr, the mean residence time of grains that left the model during a model time-step (10 yr). In the reference model, the mean residence time is highly variable between several centuries and 80 kyr (Fig. 7b). This variation communicates the stochastic recycling of grains of different ages. Even if most of the grains travel fast, the incorporation of old grains will strongly affect the mean. Longer piedmonts have larger variations in residence time, although the mean age is not very different from that of the reference model (Fig. 7a and b). The probability of recycling old grains is larger for long piedmonts, which explains these variations. Consistently, a smaller piedmont leads to smaller variations (Fig. 7b). Doubling the lateral erosion ef-

348 efficiency increases the variability of mean residence time because lateral erosion  
 349 increases the probability of recycling grains along the river course (Fig. 7c). On  
 350 the contrary, increasing the transport length parameter  $\zeta$  increases the fraction  
 351 of grains that travel fast, and thus decreases the variations of the mean residence  
 352 time (Fig. 7c).

353  
 354 We expanded the period of observation by collecting all the exiting grains  
 355 during one hundred consecutive time-steps (i.e. during a period of 1000 years),  
 356 then calculated their mean residence time and compared the results with pre-  
 357 vious estimates. Fig. 8 shows that the variability in residence time is reduced  
 358 but still significant, and that exceptional large peaks still occur. This variabil-  
 359 ity thus appears to be consistent irrespective of the time scale, the size of the  
 360 system and the values of the parameters.

361  
 362 It is interesting to compare the mean age and residence time with the pre-  
 363 dicted turnover time in the piedmont. The turnover time is the duration needed  
 364 to remove a population of grains from the piedmont. In Reservoir Theory, this  
 365 time is the ratio of the total volume of the reservoir over the outgoing flux (in  
 366  $L^3 T^{-1}$ ). This time is often used to characterise the "mean" residence time of  
 367 a particle in a natural reservoir. When this reservoir is perfectly mixed and  
 368 at steady-state (influx=outflux), the predicted distributions of the grain ages  
 369 and residence times are exponential and their mean values are equivalent to  
 370 the turnover time (*Mudd and Yoo, 2010*). In our case, the reservoir volume  
 371 is the surface of the piedmont multiplied by the mean depth of the mixing  
 372 layer, estimated at  $\sim 60$  m in the reference model. The outgoing flux is sim-  
 373 ply the mountain area multiplied by the uplift rate ( $1 \text{ mm yr}^{-1}$ ). The resulting  
 374 turnover time is  $\sim 60$  kyr. The turnover times of the different models are plotted  
 375 as dashed lines of the same color as both the corresponding age and residence  
 376 time evolutions in Fig. 7. The mean age diverges and greatly exceeds the  
 377 turnover time, whereas the mean residence time is smaller. The turnover time  
 378 is thus a very poor and incorrect metric of the mean time spent by grains in a  
 379 sample taken at the outlet of the piedmont. *Bradley and Tucker (2013)* gave a  
 380 comprehensive explanation of this difference in the case of a meandering river.  
 381 They proposed that the mean age strongly exceeds the turnover time because  
 382 the probability to erode old deposits stored on the borders of the valley-floor is  
 383 smaller than the probability to erode young deposits present near the center of  
 384 the valley. A similar reason applies to the piedmont case: old deposits are lo-  
 385 cated in topographic highs or far away from main rivers, so that they are mostly

recycled during the rare passage of an avulsing river. The mean residence time is much smaller than the turnover time because most of the outgoing flux of grains are those that were conveyed very fast in a river, from their entry point in the piedmont to their exit. The perfect mixing model is thus inappropriate here.

## 4 Discussion

### 4.1 Realism of alluvial dynamics

Qualitatively, the model reproduces a variety of geomorphic features also observed in natural settings (*Bernal et al.*, 2011): levées, splay-offs, continuous migration of channels by lateral erosion, sudden avulsion by upstream deviation or by river capture.

The decreasing sedimentation rate in a direction perpendicular to a channel, as seen in Fig. 3 has been documented, for example, along a portion of the Brahmaputra (*Allison et al.*, 1998).

In laboratory experiments of alluvial fans, superimposed on variations linked to changes in water influx and base level, a cyclic pattern of incision and deposition is always observed, (*van Dijk et al.*, 2009; *Clarke et al.*, 2010; *Reitz et al.*, 2010; *Powell et al.*, 2012) where this autogenic behaviour is related to lateral erosion and fluvial avulsions, as observed in natural settings (*Field*, 2001). Several field studies recognize clustering of fluvial paleo-channels as the stratigraphic expression of autogenic fluvial processes related to fluvial migration and avulsion (*Hajek et al.*, 2010; *Hofmann et al.*, 2011; *Hajek et al.*, 2012; *Flood and Hampson*, 2014), as observed in the simulations.

Furthermore, we observe autogenic entrenchments at fan apexes and an associated retreating erosion wave in the mountain rivers, which is also observed in laboratory experiments of alluvial fans (*Schumm et al.*, 1987; *Reitz and Jerolmack*, 2012), in numerical models (*Humphrey and Heller*, 1995; *Carretier and Lucazeau*, 2005; *Wang et al.*, 2011) and in the field (*DeCelles et al.*, 1991; *Giosan et al.*, 2012). A direct consequence of this behaviour is a cyclic variation of the slope around the mean value, which can reach up to 10% (*Kim et al.*, 2006; *van Dijk et al.*, 2009), in agreement with field observations (*Kim et al.*, 2006). Scaled to our numerical piedmont, this would induce a variation in elevation of

up to 80 m, consistent with the observed 60 m layer of reworking.

It is difficult to compare more quantitatively our simulations with other experiments or natural examples, in particular concerning the frequency of avulsions, or floodings in the piedmont (*Reitz et al.*, 2010). Indeed, the alluvial dynamics in the piedmont seems intimately linked with the dynamics of erosional waves in the mountain, but laboratory experiments coupling mountain and piedmont are sparse (*Schumm et al.*, 1987; *Babault et al.*, 2005; *Rohais et al.*, 2012) and have not yet analysed this aspect. These phenomena occur over tens of thousands of years and are thus very difficult to document in the field (*Bekaddour et al.*, 2014).

## 4.2 Could the long-tailed distribution of residence times be the result of a bias in our modelling choices?

### 4.2.1 Transport parameter

In a cell, erosion and sedimentation are dependent on a  $\zeta$  transport parameter; the larger the  $\zeta$ , the lower the deposition rate and the lower the probability of having long grain residence times. Indeed, simulations using a value of  $\zeta \times 4$  generate lower residence times, however, it must be recognised that the residence time distribution always shows a long tail with a mean much higher than the 95% residence time of the grains (Fig. 5). An infinite  $\zeta$  value would not be realistic in alluvial domain because there would be no deposition. The case where  $\zeta$  is infinitesimal would increase deposition and thus the probability of storing sediments over long periods of time.

### 4.2.2 Lateral erosion

Lateral erosion is also poorly constrained in landscape evolution models. While other lateral erosion laws have been used (e.g. *Hancock and Anderson*, 2002), lateral erosion appears to have a minor role on grain storage over long periods in our simulations where storage occurs mainly due to avulsions and captures. This is confirmed by similar results obtained for two simulations with two differing values of  $\alpha$  (Fig. 5). An additional simulation that does not account for lateral erosion results also in a long-tailed residence time distribution ( $\alpha = 0$ , Fig. S2). We therefore conclude that the parameterization of lateral erosion

455 should not bias our conclusions.

456

### 457 **4.2.3 Erosion law**

458 Our simulations show that the choice of erosion law has a very large influence  
459 on the lateral mobility of rivers and thus on residence times: A slight increase  
460 in the exponent of the power law between the detachment rate and the flow  
461 rate (0.3 to 0.5) drastically decreases residence times (Fig. 5). Rivers become  
462 less mobile such that grains leaving the mountain are exported more quickly  
463 from the foothills, while still maintaining a residence time distribution with a  
464 long tail due to the storage of some grains for long time periods on alluvial  
465 fans. This exponent is likely also dependant on variations in water discharge  
466 and grain size (e.g. *Deal et al.*, 2017). Although a constant and homogeneous  
467 value is simplifying, it does not seem to artificially introduce a residence time  
468 distribution with a long tail.

469

### 470 **4.2.4 Grain size**

471 Another important simplification is the absence of downstream change in grain  
472 size. The importance of coarse grains in influencing channel mobility under vari-  
473 able sediment and water discharges was recently demonstrated experimentally  
474 (*MacKenzie and Eaton*, 2017). The downstream sediment fining in basins also  
475 leads to changes in alluvial dynamics perpendicular to the range: the more distal  
476 transition to meandering rivers (*Dingle et al.*, 2020) is not taken into account in  
477 Cidre. Similarly, the existence of a transport threshold in the detachment law,  
478 which can modify the slope of the fans (*Parker et al.*, 1998) and the alluvial  
479 dynamics, remains to be evaluated. We anticipate, however, that an erosion  
480 threshold would increase the heterogeneity of erosion on the foothills and thus  
481 would favour the storage of certain grains for long periods.

482

## 483 **4.3 Does the grain displacement algorithm influence the** 484 **residence time distribution?**

485 *Carretier et al.* (2016) verified that the mean and standard deviation of grain dis-  
486 placement were consistent with the calculated sediment fluxes. The dispersion  
487 of grains displaced by purely gravitational processes (without water entrain-  
488 ment) is, however, overestimated (*Carretier et al.*, 2016), but these phenomena

are negligible on the piedmont. There is also a simplifying assumption that the probability of grain detachment is inversely proportional to size and not to deposition. If the probability of deposition increased with grain size, there would be more large grains with long residence times, which would be in line with our conclusions. Furthermore, simulations with a single grain size do show a long-tailed residence time distribution (Fig. 4). We therefore conclude that the choice of probability law to move the grains does not artificially bias the shape of the residence time distribution.

Despite these limitations, we consider that our main findings can be confidently extrapolated to the real world. In all of our simulations, we observed long-tailed distributions of residence times. There is thus a significant probability for grains, which were once stored for a long time in former deposits, to be recycled. The reasons for such long-term storage are well-identified: Deposition is episodic and the probability of eroding previous deposits is lower for older deposits than for younger deposits. Episodic deposition occurs due to levées, splay-offs, lobes, avulsions and captures, and their autogenic feedbacks with erosional waves in the mountain. The lower probability of eroding older deposits is a simple geometrical problem (*Bradley and Tucker, 2013*): old deposits are topographically higher or distant from active rivers after an avulsion. Their long-term preservation, achieved by avoiding erosion, is the reason why they are so old. If the probability of erosion was homogeneous in the piedmont, the piedmont would have a much thinner distribution of younger ages. Thus, although the absolute value of residence times can vary between models and the real world, the prediction of long-term storage is a robust result.

#### 4.4 Departure from equilibrium

In nature, mountain front systems are usually out of equilibrium, contrary to the simulations presented here. In natural systems with active subsidence, like the Pyrenees during the Eocene, the Bolivian Andes during the Neogene or the Apennines in recent times, very old grains would not be found in the mixing layer at the basin surface because these grains would be buried deeper. Storage and recycling would occur within the piedmont mixing layer, potentially leading to a long tailed-distribution of residence times, but with a much smaller range of times. The maximum age of grains found at the piedmont surface will depend on the ratio between the subsidence rate and the reworking rate of the mixing

525 layer ( $\sim 60$  m in our simulations).

526

527 At the beginning of an orogeny, when the subsidence rate is rapid with a  
528 Flysch stage, the reworking rate is small compared to the subsidence rate. In  
529 our simulations, the time needed to rework completely the piedmont surface is  
530  $\sim 5$  m.y. If a basin subsides at  $0.25 \text{ mm yr}^{-1}$  for example, grains are buried  
531 below 1.25 km in 5 m.y. Only grains of several thousand years in age can be  
532 present at the surface (see supplementary Fig. S3).

533

534 On the contrary, when the mountain range approaches a dynamic equilib-  
535 rium, as could be the case in some portions of New Zealand or Taiwan (*Hovius*  
536 *et al.*, 2000), the subsidence rate decreases and grains as old as several m.y.  
537 can be recycled at the surface of the piedmont. Recycling can take place in the  
538 forebergs that exhume sediments, like in the Siwaliks (*Quick et al.*, 2019) or di-  
539 rectly on the surface of the foothills, as in our simulations. This phenomena can  
540 be amplified if a climate change drives a flexural rebound of the range and its  
541 foreland, exhuming old sediment by river incision, as proposed for the Himalaya  
542 foreland (*Burbank*, 1992).

543

544 Finally, in the post-orogenic stage, previously buried sediment is exhumed  
545 and can be recycled into the flux of sediment exported to distal basins, with  
546 grains potentially dating back to the Neogene (*Tucker and van der Beek*, 2013).  
547 This is the case in the Great Plains, USA (*Sinclair et al.*, 2019) and the Euro-  
548 pean Alps (*Cederbom et al.*, 2004). The probability of recycling old grains must,  
549 therefore, vary during the orogenic cycle. We anticipate that this probability  
550 could be formalised as proportional to the ratio  $H/\dot{S}\Delta t$  where  $H$  is the rework-  
551 ing or mixing layer,  $\dot{S}$  is the sedimentation rate and  $\Delta t$  is the time needed to  
552 rework all of the foreland surface.

553

554 Climate variability also drives fluctuations in the erosional flux from moun-  
555 tain ranges over geological timescales (e.g. *Clift*, 2006; *Goodbred and Kuehl*,  
556 2003). Over the Quaternary, entrenchment and aggradation are often associ-  
557 ated with shifts in climate and sea level (e.g. *Bekaddour et al.*, 2014; *Ganti*  
558 *et al.*, 2016; *Malatesta et al.*, 2018). These behaviours likely influence the de-  
559 gree of sediment recycling. For example, when rivers incise into their former  
560 deposits, they first recycle a large amount of previously stored grains, but once  
561 constrained between their valley walls, the recycling may become a minor com-  
562 ponent. This variable degree of recycling during entrenchment is illustrated by

563 a recent study based on Optically Stimulated Luminescence (OSL) data of a  
 564 large population ( $> 100$ ) of individual grains. Along a New Zealand river, *Bon-*  
 565 *net et al.* (2019) document an overestimation of the age of fluvial deposits, up  
 566 to order of magnitude, when a bulk mean OSL age is considered. Interestingly,  
 567 however, they also demonstrate that the magnitude of the age overestimation,  
 568 depending on the tail of the single grain distribution, is primarily influenced  
 569 by the incision rate of a river, through its control on sediment supply from the  
 570 hillslopes to the river. In addition, when rivers aggrade, their lateral mobility  
 571 increases (*Reitz and Jerolmack*, 2012; *Bufe et al.*, 2016), favouring recycling.  
 572 It is thus predicted that the degree of recycled sediment varies across climatic  
 573 cycles but temporary grain storage in valleys or on alluvial fans, as shown in  
 574 our simulations, should still occur.

575

## 576 4.5 Implications for proxy in sedimentary basins

577 Our results show that the recycling of very old grains has a strong influence  
 578 on mean residence times, which can be orders of magnitude higher than the  
 579 residence time of 95% of transported grains. Our study complements recent  
 580 evidence of storage in intramontane domains (*Lang et al.*, 2018; *Jonell et al.*,  
 581 2018), in arid river valleys (*Giosan et al.*, 2012; *Carretier et al.*, 2019) and in  
 582 simulated floodplains (*Bradley and Tucker*, 2013) (Fig. 9). Consequently, any  
 583 proxy that depends on the residence time of sediment and which is determined  
 584 from a bulk measurement of a sediment sample, can be affected by recycled  
 585 grains.

586

587 Although our simulations were carried out with coarse sediment, the identi-  
 588 fied causes for long storage and long tailed distributions of residence times likely  
 589 apply to fine sediment as well. For example, this age amplification effect may  
 590 partly explain the very old comminution times of several hundreds of thousands  
 591 of years found for very fine sediment in rapidly eroding mountains like Taiwan  
 592 or New Zealand. Variations in residence times illustrated by Fig. 8 may also  
 593 be consistent with the order-of-magnitude difference in inferred comminution  
 594 ages at the same sampling point in a catchment in the Gulf of Carpentaria,  
 595 northern Australia, for two dates separated by 8 years (*Martin et al.*, 2019).  
 596 Although this example is not a piedmont, a long-tailed distribution of residence  
 597 time, generated by variable recycling in the fluvial system, may explain the  
 598 observed differences. Comminution times, although useful for quantifying sedi-



ment transfer rates, may thus represent a maximum value for the residence time of the majority of grains in a sample.

Other proxies that depend on grain residence times may also be affected, such as the Chemical Index of Alteration. The presence of a minority of old weathered grains in a sample can lead to a high CIA, whereas most of the other grains have a lower CIA. However, weathering rate scales with  $t^{-0.4}$  ( $t$  time of exposure to weathering - *Gabet and Mudd, 2009*) and long-tailed CIA distributions are therefore less likely. Several studies have shown a correlation between the CIA and other paleo-climatic proxies over periods of millions of years (e.g. *Wang et al., 2019*) in Asia for the  $\sim 15$  Ma monsoon strengthening (e.g. *Clift et al., 2008*). These consistent variations suggest either a minor effect of the addition of highly weathered grains on these timescales, or the absence of significant additional weathering during storage in the foothills (e.g. *Mondal et al., 2012*). In other cases, variations in CIA have been found to be uncorrelated with other proxies, such as in the South China Sea where CIA remains unresponsive to monsoon intensification and duration over the last 14 ka (e.g. *Hu et al., 2012*). The variations of CIA in these cases could correspond to the chaotic recycling phenomena observed in our simulations (e.g Fig. 7). For offshore basins, delta dynamics may also transform the sedimentary signal (*Li et al., 2016b; Foreman and Straub, 2017*) and influence the residence time distribution of deposited grains, which remains to be assessed.

As the recycling process is stochastic, Figs. 7 and 8 show that the mean residence time varies at piedmont outlets. We propose that the internal dynamics of alluvial rivers can generate strong autogenic fluctuations in sediment residence times at their outlets, over timescales of hundreds of thousands of years. As recycling should increase during the orogenic cycle, it is expected that residence-time dependent proxies integrate an increasing period of time as deposits become younger. Paradoxically, younger deposits that have a higher stratigraphic resolution may lose temporal resolution in their paleo-environmental proxies because these proxies integrate older grains, potentially masking recent climatic variations. One way to evaluate the effect of recycled old grains may be to divide each sample into grains or aliquots and to measure the proxy in each aliquot when possible.

## 5 Conclusion

We show simulations of mountain-piedmont systems that have reached a macroscopic equilibrium, i.e. a mountain eroding at the same rate as it is uplifting and a piedmont acting as a by-pass for sediment exported from the mountain over long timescales. This equilibrium is however imperfect as episodic sedimentation, associated with alluvial piedmont dynamics and their coupling with mountain erosion dynamics, suggests that sediment can be stored for Ma in the piedmont before being exported. As a result, the residence time of grains in the piedmont is distributed over a very large range, and a range that varies with time. Grains with long residence times significantly increase the mean residence time of a population of grains, such that the mean residence time of grains in a sample can be orders of magnitude larger than 95% of the grains. Consequently, paleo-environmental proxies of mean residence times recorded in onshore or offshore basins may produce a maximum value well above that of the majority of grains in a sample. Variation in these proxies may be partly explained by stochastic variability in the processes that recycle old grains.

### Acknowledgments

This paper is a contribution to LMI COPEDIM funded by IRD. L.G. is funded by the COLORS project. R.H. is funded by the Research Center for Integrated Disaster Risk Management (CIGIDEN) ANID/FONDAP/15110017. The funding sources had no involvement in the preparation of this manuscript. We thank Frédéric Christophoul for discussions. Valerie Chavagnac is thanked for useful feedback, although we are alone responsible for any error or misconception. We thank Fritz Schlunegger and an anonymous reviewer for their constructive reviews.

**Color figures:** Color should be used for any figures in print.

**Competing interests statement:** The authors have no competing interests to declare.

## 666 Appendix A CIDRE Model and parameters val- 667 ues

### 668 A.1 Erosion and sedimentation

669 Starting from an initial topography, the modification of the topography pro-  
670 ceeds with successive time-steps. During a time-step, precipitation falls on the  
671 grid at a rate  $P$  [ $\text{LT}^{-1}$ ] and a multiple flow algorithm propagates the water  
672 flux  $Q$  [ $\text{L}^3\text{T}^{-1}$ ] towards all downstream cells in proportion to the slope in each  
673 direction. Then the elevation  $z$  (river bed or hillslope surface) changes on each  
674 cell (size  $dx$ ) according to the balance between erosion  $\epsilon$  [ $\text{LT}^{-1}$ ] and deposition  
675  $D$  [ $\text{LT}^{-1}$ ]. The erosion is different for sediment and for bedrock and  $\epsilon$  is the  
676 sum of two values, one corresponding to gravitational processes without involv-  
677 ing the runoff, usually dominating on the hillslopes, and another one associated  
678 with water discharge, typically dominating in rivers. Water flowing in one di-  
679 rection is also able to detach material from the cells located perpendicular to  
680 this direction to simulate river bank erosion. This erosion generates a lateral  
681 (bank) sediment discharge  $q_{sl}$  [ $\text{L}^2\text{T}^{-1}$ ] towards the cell where the water is flow-  
682 ing. Finally, elevation also changes by adding an uplift  $U$  [ $\text{LT}^{-1}$ ] (subsidence if  
683 negative).

684  
685 The rate of elevation change on a cell is determined by the following mass  
686 balance equation (e.g. *Davy and Lague*, 2009; *Carretier et al.*, 2016; *Shobe et al.*,  
687 2017):

$$\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} = -\epsilon_r - \epsilon_h + D_r + D_h - \frac{dq_{sl}}{dx} + U \quad (1)$$

688 where the subscript "r" ("river") denotes rates associated with flowing water  
689 and "h" ("hillslope") denotes rates that depends only on the topographic gradi-  
690 ent or slope  $S$ . Then we define a constitutive law for each of these components:  
691 (*Carretier et al.*, 2016)

$$\epsilon_r = Kq^m S^n \text{ for river processes} \quad (2)$$

$$\epsilon_h = \kappa S \text{ for hillslope processes} \quad (3)$$

692 where  $K$  [ $\text{L}^{1-2m}\text{T}^{m-1}$ ],  $\kappa$  [ $\text{LT}^{-1}$ ] are erodibility parameters,  $m$  and  $n$  are  
693 lithology-dependent (different for bedrock or sediment) erosion parameters,  $S$   
694 is the slope,  $q$  [ $\text{L}^3\text{T}^{-1}$ ] is the water discharge per stream unit width, and

$$D_r = \frac{q_{sr}}{\zeta q} \text{ for river processes} \quad (4)$$

$$D_h = \frac{q_{sh}}{\frac{dx}{1-(S/S_c)^2}} \text{ for hillslope processes} \quad (5)$$

where  $q_{sr}$  and  $q_{sh}$  are the incoming river and hillslope sediment fluxes (total  $q_s = q_{sr} + q_{sh}$ ) per unit width [ $L^2T^{-1}$ ],  $\zeta$  is a river transport length parameter [ $T L^{-1}$ ] and  $S_c$  is a slope threshold. These fluxes are the sum of sediment fluxes leaving upstream neighbour cells while the deposition rates on a cell are a fraction of the incoming sediment.

700

Concerning the river processes,  $\epsilon_r$  is known as the stream power law and derives from the assumption that  $\epsilon_r$  is proportional to a power law of the shear stress or to the unit stream power applied by the flowing water on the river bed (e.g. *Whipple et al.*, 2000; *Lague*, 2014)

$$\epsilon_r \propto \tau^a \quad (6)$$

$\epsilon_r$  is proportional to the river bottom shear stress  $\tau$  if  $a = 1$  and to the unit stream power if  $a = 1.5$ .  $\epsilon_r$  can also depend on a critical shear stress for detachment but we neglect it here. Assuming steady, uniform flow in a wide channel, and using the Manning equation for the resistance to water flow by river bed friction (e.g. *Tucker*, 2004) then

$$\epsilon_r \propto q^{0.7a} S^{0.7a} \quad (7)$$

710 OR

$$\epsilon_r \propto \left(\frac{Q}{w}\right)^{0.7a} S^{0.7a} \quad (8)$$

where  $w$  is the river width and  $Q$  the volumetric water discharge. Considering classical river width-discharge relationship (*Leopold and Maddock*, 1953) neglecting the effect of slope (*Finnegan et al.*, 2005)

$$w \propto Q^{0.5} \quad (9)$$

714 then

$$\epsilon_r \propto Q^{0.7a-0.5} S^{0.7a} \quad (10)$$

dividing  $Q$  by the pixel width  $dx$  leads to the form of Equation 2 where  $m = 0.7a - 0.5$  and  $n = 0.7a$ . With  $a$  between 1 and 1.5,  $m$  varies between 0.2 and 0.5, whereas  $n$  varies between 0.7 and 1. In the simulations presented in this paper, we use  $m = 0.3$  or  $m = 0.5$ . Considering the cumulative contribution of the full discharge distribution and a non zero critical shear stress to parametrize  $\epsilon_r$  leads to the same form of Equation 2 but with different values of  $m$  and  $n$  (e.g. *Lague, 2014*). In particular,  $n$  is thought to be larger than 1 in mountain rivers, what motivated our choice to take  $n = 1.3$  for bedrock. Alternatively, we could have set a non zero critical shear stress and have imposed a distribution of precipitation events as input parameters in our simulations, as done for example by *Tucker (2004)*. Nevertheless, in that case, it is more difficult to control the numerical stability of the model in the piedmont area. To ensure that the autogenic variations of rivers is physical and not numerical, we preferred to use the time-averaged form of the stream power law in Equation 2.

The deposition rate  $D_r$  is a fraction of the incoming sediment flux and this fraction ( $\zeta q$ ) has the dimension of the inverse of a length. We call this length a transport length because it has the physical meaning of a characteristic distance over which a volume of detached material will transit downstream before being deposited. In particular, when the local  $q$  is large, little sediment eroded from upstream will deposit on the cell. The transport length depends on  $\zeta$ , proportional to the inverse of a settling velocity of sediment in water (e.g. *Davy and Lague, 2009; Lajeunesse et al., 2013*). In instantaneous river models,  $\zeta$  should be fixed by the grain size of sediment. In landscape evolution models, where the water discharge  $q$  averages the periods with and without transport,  $\zeta$  is an "apparent" parameter that can take a large range of values in real situations depending on climate variability (*Guerit et al., 2019*).

Note that in this erosion-deposition model, the transport capacity  $q_t$  is implicit and emerges from Equations 1 and 4 (see discussion in *Davy and Lague, 2009*). Considering only the river processes without lateral erosion

$$\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} = \frac{q_s}{\zeta q} - \epsilon_r + U \quad (11)$$

OR

$$\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} = \frac{q_s - q_t}{\zeta q} + U \quad (12)$$

Where the transport capacity is defined as

$$q_t = \zeta q \epsilon_r \quad (13)$$

Consequently,  $q_t$  scales with  $q^{1.2}$  if  $a = 1$  and with  $q^{1.5}$  if  $a = 1.5$ . This scaling is consistent with many coarse to fine sediment transport formulae. For example,  $q_t \propto q^{1.2} \propto \tau^{1.8}$  that is close to the scaling  $q_t \propto \tau^{1.6}$  in the Meyer-Peter and Muller formulae for gravel (*Wong and Parker, 2006*).

Concerning the hillslopes processes, the philosophy is the same, except that the detachment rate  $\epsilon_r$  and the deposition rate  $D_r$  depend only on the slope. The linear slope dependence of  $\epsilon_r$  describes diffusion processes.  $D_r$  depends on a specified critical slope  $S_c$ : when the slope is close to  $S_c$ , the deposition rate  $D_r$  decreases rapidly, simulating, on average, the onset of shallow landslides. The transport length associated with gravitational processes ( $\frac{dx}{1-(S/S_c)^2}$ ) is inversely proportional to the probability of depositing sediment on the cell. This erosion-deposition formulation leads to similar solutions as the critical slope-dependent hillslope model studied for example by *Roering et al. (1999)* (*Carretier et al., 2016*).

Flowing water in each direction can erode lateral cells perpendicular to that direction. Little is known about the law that describes the widening rate of valleys therefore establishing a lateral erosion law suitable for landscape evolution models, which average processes over millennia, is a challenge (*Langston and Tucker, 2018; Langston and Temme, 2019*). Here, the lateral sediment flux per unit length  $q_{sl}$  [ $L^2T^{-1}$ ] eroded from a lateral cell is simply defined as a fraction of the river sediment flux  $q_{sr}$  [ $L^2T^{-1}$ ] in the considered direction (e.g. *Murray and Paola, 1997; Nicholas and Quine, 2007*), assuming that lateral mobility of channels, and thus lateral erosion, increases with the flux of river sediment (*Bufe et al., 2016, 2019*):

$$q_{sl} = \alpha q_{sr} \quad (14)$$

where  $\alpha$  is a bank erodibility coefficient.  $\alpha$  is specified for loose material (sediment) and is implicitly determined for bedrock layers, such that the ratio of

lateral erodabilities is equal to the ratio of fluvial erodabilities ( $\alpha_{loose}/\alpha_{bedrock} = K_{loose}/K_{bedrock}$ , with  $K$  from Equation 2). If sediment covers the bedrock of a lateral cell,  $\alpha$  is weighted by its respective thickness above the target cell.

Finally, the sediment leaving a cell is spread in the same way as water, i.e. proportionally to the downstream slopes. This procedure starts from the most elevated cell and ends with the lowest cell and is repeated in the next time-steps until the end of the specified model time (m.y. in our case).

## A.2 Grain tracers

At the end of a time-step, once the grids of erosion and deposition rates are known, grain tracers are moved. Grains are spheres with a radius  $r$ . In the following simulations, thousands of grains are set randomly at the surface of the steady-state topography, with grain sizes ranging from 1 mm up to 10 cm. We therefore consider the coarse sand and gravel fractions of the sedimentary load, mostly transported as bedload by rivers. Each grain is independent of the others. At each time-step, a grain located in a given cell moves if its depth is shallower than the eroded thickness calculated over the time-step on that cell. To account for preferential erosion and transport according to the size of a grain, the probability of leaving the cell is inversely proportional to the grain size (*Carretier et al.*, 2016). Grains entering a cell have a probability to be deposited set by the ratio between the local deposition flux and the incoming sediment flux. Their probability to go in one of the downstream directions (i.e. to cross a cell) is simply the ratio of the local slope and the sum of the downstream slopes. During a time-step grains are moved until they are deposited on a cell or leave the model. When a grain crosses the line separating the mountain from the piedmont, its clock is set to zero and then increments at each time-step until it exits the model domain at the lowest border.

## A.3 Parameter values for the reference simulation

In the following simulations, the uplifted domain grid is 60x40 km<sup>2</sup> (300x200 cells of size 200 m), and the piedmont domain is also 60x40 km<sup>2</sup> in the reference experiment (Fig. 1) but varies in other ones. For the bedrock, we use  $K = 3.10^{-4} \text{ m}^{-0.2} \text{ yr}^{-0.4}$ ,  $m = 0.6$ ,  $n = 1.3$  and  $\kappa = 10^{-4} \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ . These parameters are motivated by evidences that  $n > 1$  (*Harel et al.*, 2016; *Clubb*

811 *et al.*, 2016; *Deal et al.*, 2017) and generate a final realistic maximum relief of  
 812  $\sim 1700$  m. For the sediment, we use  $K = 6.10^{-3} \text{ m}^{0.4} \text{ yr}^{-0.7}$ ,  $m = 0.3$ ,  $n = 1$   
 813 and  $\kappa = 2.10^{-4} \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ . With these values, for a given slope and discharge,  
 814 erosion of sediment is larger than bedrock. The transport length parameter  $\zeta$  is  
 815 set to  $0.1 \text{ yr m}^{-1}$ , and corresponds to a low value for natural systems (median  
 816 at  $17 \text{ yr/m}$  *Guerit et al.*, 2019). It is difficult to link  $\zeta$  with physical properties  
 817 of sediment because  $\zeta$  changes according to the variability of transport periods,  
 818 but low values seem to correspond to temperate perennial rivers (*Guerit et al.*,  
 819 2019). The lateral erosion parameter  $\alpha$  is set as  $5.10^{-4}$ . Finally, the critical  
 820 slope is  $S_c = \tan(40^\circ)$ . The northern side of the model is closed (i.e. no water  
 821 nor sediment can leave the model through this side) while the south boundary  
 822 is open and fixed to  $z = 0$  m. Periodic boundary conditions are imposed on the  
 823 two other sides meaning that material leaving on one side is reinjected at the  
 824 other.

825  
 826  $U$  is fixed to  $10^{-3} \text{ m yr}^{-1}$  and there is no subsidence in the piedmont. We  
 827 discuss subsidence extensively in the Discussion. Although we want to design the  
 828 simplest simulations, we incorporate a precipitation gradient with elevation that  
 829 characterises most mountain-foreland systems and may influence the sediment  
 830 residence time in the piedmont. Starting from a precipitation rate of  $1 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$   
 831 at baselevel,  $P$  varies dynamically with elevation  $z$  according to a specified  
 832 relationship similar to a Gaussian curve that reaches a maximum of  $1.7 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$   
 833 at  $1300$  m, a peak elevation usually found in the Himalaya or Andes (*Bookhagen*  
 834 *and Burbank*, 2006; *Bookhagen and Strecker*, 2008; *Colberg and Anders*, 2014):

$$P(z) = 1. + 0.7e^{\frac{(z-1300)^2}{2 \cdot 1300^2}} \quad (15)$$

## 835 References

- 836 Allen, P. A., J. J. Armitage, A. Carter, R. A. Duller, N. A. Michael, H. D.  
 837 Sinclair, A. L. Whitchurch, and A. C. Whittaker (2013), The Qs problem:  
 838 Sediment volumetric balance of proximal foreland basin systems, *Sedimentol-*  
 839 *ogy*, 60(1, SI), 102–130, doi:10.1111/sed.12015.
- 840 Allison, M., S. Kuehl, T. Martin, and A. Hassan (1998), Importance of flood-  
 841 plain sedimentation for river sediment budgets and terrigenous input to the  
 842 oceans: Insights from the brahmaputra-jamuna river, *Geology*, 26(2), 175–  
 843 178.



844 Armitage, J., T. Jones, R. Duller, A. Whittaker, and P. Allen (2013), Tempo-  
845 ral buffering of climate-driven sediment flux cycles by transient catchment  
846 response, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, *369*, 200–210.

847 Babault, J., S. Bonnet, A. Crave, and J. van den Driessche (2005), Influence of  
848 piedmont sedimentation on erosion dynamics of an uplifting landscape: An  
849 experimental approach, *Geology*, *33*(4), 301–304.

850 Bekaddour, T., F. Schlunegger, H. Vogel, R. Delunel, K. Norton, N. Akçara,  
851 and P. Kubik (2014), Paleo erosion rates and climate shifts recorded by Qua-  
852 ternary cut-and-fill sequences in the Pisco valley, central Peru, *Earth Planet.*  
853 *Sci. Lett.*, *390*, 103–115.

854 Bernal, C., F. Christophoul, J. Darrozes, J.-C. Soula, P. Baby, and J. Bur-  
855 gos (2011), Late Glacial and Holocene avulsions of the Rio Pastaza Megafan  
856 (Ecuador-Peru): frequency and controlling factors, *Int. Journal Of Earth Sci-*  
857 *ences*, *100*(7), 1759–1782, doi:10.1007/s00531-010-0555-9.

858 Blöthe, J. H., and O. Korup (2013), Millennial lag times in the himalayan  
859 sediment routing system, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, *382*, 38–46.

860 Bonnet, S., T. Reimann, J. Wallinga, D. Lague, P. Davy, and A. Lacoste (2019),  
861 Landscape dynamics revealed by luminescence signals of feldspars from fluvial  
862 terraces, *Scientific Reports*, *9*, doi:10.1038/s41598-019-44533-4.

863 Bookhagen, B., and D. W. Burbank (2006), Topography, relief, and trmm-  
864 derived rainfall variations along the himalaya, *Geophysical Research Letters*,  
865 *33*(8).

866 Bookhagen, B., and M. R. Strecker (2008), Orographic barriers, high-resolution  
867 TRMM rainfall, and relief variations along the eastern Andes, *Geophys. Res.*  
868 *Lett.*, *35*, L06,403, doi:10.1029/2007GL032011.

869 Bradley, D. N., and G. E. Tucker (2013), The storage time, age, and ero-  
870 sion hazard of laterally accreted sediment on the floodplain of a simulated  
871 meandering river, *J. Geophys. Res. Earth Surface*, *118*(3), 1308–1319, doi:  
872 10.1002/jgrf.20083.

873 Bufo, A., C. Paola, and D. W. Burbank (2016), Fluvial bevelling of topography  
874 controlled by lateral channel mobility and uplift rate, *Nature Geoscience*,  
875 *9*(9), 706.

876 Bufer, A., J. M. Turowski, D. W. Burbank, C. Paola, A. D. Wickert, and  
877 S. Tofelde (2019), Controls on the lateral channel-migration rate of braided  
878 channel systems in coarse non-cohesive sediment, *Earth Surf. Proc. Land.*,  
879 *44*(14), 2823–2836, doi:10.1002/esp.4710.

880 Burbank, D. (1992), Causes of recent Himalayan uplift deduced from de-  
881 posited patterns in the Ganges basin, *Nature*, *357*(6380), 680–683, doi:  
882 10.1038/357680a0.

883 Carretier, S., and F. Lucazeau (2005), How does alluvial sedimentation at range  
884 fronts modify the erosional dynamics of mountain catchments?, *Basin Res.*,  
885 *17*, 361–381, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2117.2005.00270.x.

886 Carretier, S., P. Martinod, M. Reich, and Y. Godd  ris (2016), Modelling sed-  
887 iment clasts transport during landscape evolution, *Earth Surf. Dynam.*, *4*,  
888 237–251, doi:10.5194/esurf-4-237-2016.

889 Carretier, S., Y. Godderis, J. Martinez, M. Reich, and P. Martinod (2018),  
890 Colluvial deposits as a possible weathering reservoir in uplifting mountains,  
891 *Earth Surface Dynamics*, *6*(1), 217–237, doi:10.5194/esurf-6-217-2018.

892 Carretier, S., V. Regard, L. Leanni, and M. Farias (2019), Long-term dis-  
893 persion of river gravel in a canyon in the Atacama Desert, Central Andes,  
894 deduced from their 10Be concentrations, *Scientific Reports*, *9*, 17,763, doi:  
895 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-53806-x>.

896 Cederbom, C., H. Sinclair, F. Schlunegger, and M. Rahn (2004), Climate-  
897 induced rebound and exhumation of the European Alps, *Geology*, *32*(8), 709–  
898 712, doi:10.1130/G20491.1.

899 Chabaux, F., M. Granet, E. Pelt, C. France-Lanord, and V. Galy (2006), 238U-  
900 234U-230Th disequilibria and timescale of sedimentary transfers in rivers:  
901 clues from the Gangetic plain rivers, *Journal of Geochemical Exploration*, *88*,  
902 373–375.

903 Clarke, L., T. Quine, and A. Nicholas (2010), An experimental investigation  
904 of autogenic behaviour during alluvial fan evolution, *Geomorphology*, *115*,  
905 278–285.

906 Clift, P. (2006), Controls on the erosion of Cenozoic Asia and the flux of clas-  
907 tic sediment to the ocean, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, *241*(3-4), 571–580, doi:  
908 10.1016/j.epsl.2005.11.028.

909 Clift, P. D., and L. Giosan (2014), Sediment fluxes and buffering in the post-  
910 glacial Indus Basin, *Basin Res.*, *26*(3), 369–386, doi:10.1111/bre.12038.

911 Clift, P. D., and A. A. G. Webb (2018), A history of the asian monsoon and  
912 its interactions with solid earth tectonics in cenozoic south asia, *Geological*  
913 *Society, London, Special Publications*, *483*, SP483–1.

914 Clift, P. D., K. V. Hodges, D. Heslop, R. Hannigan, H. Van Long, and G. Calves  
915 (2008), Correlation of Himalayan exhumation rates and Asian monsoon in-  
916 tensity, *Nature GeoSciences*, *1*(12), 875–880, doi:10.1038/ngeo351.

917 Clubb, F. J., S. M. Mudd, M. Attal, D. T. Milodowski, and S. W. D. Grieve  
918 (2016), The relationship between drainage density, erosion rate, and hilltop  
919 curvature: Implications for sediment transport processes, *J. Geophys. Res.*  
920 *Earth Surface*, *121*(10), doi:10.1002/2015JF003747.

921 Colberg, J. S., and A. M. Anders (2014), Numerical modeling of spatially-  
922 variable precipitation and passive margin escarpment evolution, *Geomorphol-*  
923 *ogy*, *207*, 203–212, doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2013.11.006.

924 Davy, P., and D. Lague (2009), The erosion / transport equation of landscape  
925 evolution models revisited, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *114*, doi:10.1029/2008JF001146.

926 Deal, E., A.-C. Favre, and J. Braun (2017), Rainfall variability in the himalayan  
927 orogen and its relevance to erosion processes, *Water Resources Research*,  
928 *53*(5), 4004–4021.

929 DeCelles, P. G., M. B. Gray, K. D. Ridgway, R. B. Cole, D. A. Pivnik, N. Pe-  
930 quera, and P. Srivastava (1991), Controls on synorogenic alluvial-fan archi-  
931 tecture, Beartooth Conglomerate (Palaeocene), Wyoming and Montana, *Sed-*  
932 *imentology*, *38*(4), 567–590.

933 Di Giulio, A., A. Ceriani, E. Ghia, and F. Zucca (2003), Composition of modern  
934 stream sands derived from sedimentary source rocks in a temperate climate  
935 (northern apennines, italy), *Sedimentary Geology*, *158*(1-2), 145–161.

936 Dingle, E., H. Sinclair, J. Venditti, M. Attal, T. Kinnaird, M. Creed, L. Quick,  
937 J. Nitttrouer, and D. Gautam (2020), Sediment dynamics across gravel-sand  
938 transitions: Implications for river stability and floodplain recycling, *Geology*,  
939 (48), , doi:https://doi.org/10.1130/G46909.1.

940 Dosseto, A., B. Bourdon, J. Gaillardet, L. Maurice-Bourgoin, and C. Allègre  
941 (2006), Weathering and transport of sediments in the Bolivian Andes: Time

942 constraints from uranium-series isotopes, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, *248*, 759–  
943 771.

944 Duller, R. A., A. C. Whittaker, J. J. Fedele, A. L. Whitchurch, J. Springett,  
945 R. Smithells, S. Fordyce, and P. A. Allen (2010), From grain size to tectonics,  
946 *J. Geophys. Res. Earth Surface*, *115*, doi:10.1029/2009JF001495.

947 Einstein, H.A. (1937), Bed load transport as a probability problem, Ph.D. thesis,  
948 ETH Zurich.

949 Fedele, J. J., and C. Paola (2007), Similarity solutions for fluvial sediment fining  
950 by selective deposition, *J. Geophys. Res. Earth Surface*, *112*(F2), F02,038,  
951 doi:10.1029/2005JF000409.

952 Field, J. (2001), Channel avulsion on alluvial fans in southern Arizona, *Geo-*  
953 *morphology*, *37*(1), 93–104.

954 Finnegan, N., G. Roe, D. R. Montgomery, and B. hallet (2005), Controls on the  
955 channel width of rivers: Implications for modeling fluvial incision of bedrock,  
956 *Geology*, *33*, 229–232, doi:10.1130/G21171.1.

957 Flood, Y. S., and G. J. Hampson (2014), Facies and architectural analysis to  
958 interpret avulsion style and variability: Upper cretaceous blackhawk forma-  
959 tion, wasatch plateau, central utah, usa, *Journal of Sedimentary Research*,  
960 *84*(9), 743–762.

961 Foreman, B. Z., and K. M. Straub (2017), Autogenic geomorphic processes de-  
962 termine the resolution and fidelity of terrestrial paleoclimate records, *Science*  
963 *Advances*, *3*(9), doi:10.1126/sciadv.1700683.

964 Gabet, E., and S. Mudd (2009), A theoretical model coupling chemical weath-  
965 ering rates with denudation rates, *Geology*, *37*, 151–154.

966 Ganti, V., C. von Hagke, D. Scherler, M. P. Lamb, W. W. Fischer, and J.-  
967 P. Avouac (2016), Time scale bias in erosion rates of glaciated landscapes,  
968 *Science Advances*, *2*(10), doi:10.1126/sciadv.1600204.

969 Garzanti, E., G. Vezzoli, S. Andò, J. Lavé, M. Attal, C. France-Lanord, and  
970 P. DeCelles (2007), Quantifying sand provenance and erosion (marsyandi  
971 river, nepal himalaya), *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, *258*(3-4), 500–  
972 515.

973 Giosan, L., P. D. Clift, M. G. Macklin, D. Q. Fuller, S. Constantinescu, J. A.  
974 Durcan, T. Stevens, G. A. T. Duller, A. R. Tabrez, K. Gangal, R. Adhikari,  
975 A. Alizai, F. Filip, S. VanLaningham, and J. P. M. Syvitski (2012), Fluvial  
976 landscapes of the Harappan civilization, *PNAS*, *109*(26), E1688–E1694, doi:  
977 10.1073/pnas.1112743109.

978 Goodbred, S., and S. Kuehl (2003), The production, transport, and accumu-  
979 lation of sediment: a cross-section of recent developments with an emphasis  
980 on climate effects, *Sedimentary Geology*, *162*(1-2), 1–3, doi:10.1016/S0037-  
981 0738(03)00215-X.

982 Granet, M., F. Chabaux, P. Stille, C. France-Lanord, and E. Pelt (2007), Time-  
983 scales of sedimentary transfer and weathering processes from u-series nuclides:  
984 clues from the himalayan rivers, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, *261*(3-  
985 4), 389–406.

986 Guerit, L., L. Barrier, M. Jolivet, B. Fu, and F. Métivier (2016), Denudation  
987 intensity and control in the Chinese Tian Shan: new constraints from mass  
988 balance on catchment-alluvial fan systems, *Earth Surface Processes and Land-*  
989 *forms*, *41*(8), 1088–1106.

990 Guerit, L., X.-P. Yuan, S. Carretier, S. Bonnet, S. Rohais, J. Braun, and  
991 D. Rouby (2019), Fluvial landscape evolution controlled by the sediment de-  
992 position coefficient: Estimation from experimental and natural landscapes,  
993 *Geology*, *47*(9), 853–856, doi:10.1130/G46356.1.

994 Hajek, E., P. Heller, and E. Schur (2012), Field test of autogenic control on al-  
995 luvial stratigraphy (ferris formation, upper cretaceous–paleogene, wyoming),  
996 *Bulletin*, *124*(11-12), 1898–1912.

997 Hajek, E. A., P. L. Heller, and B. A. Sheets (2010), Significance of channel-belt  
998 clustering in alluvial basins, *Geology*, *38*(6), 535–538.

999 Hancock, G. S., and R. S. Anderson (2002), Numerical modeling of fluvial strath-  
1000 terrace formation in response to oscillating climate, *Geol. Soc. Am. Bull.*, *114*,  
1001 1131–1142.

1002 Harel, M.-A., S. Mudd, and M. Attal (2016), Global analysis of the stream power  
1003 law parameters based on worldwide 10be denudation rates, *Geomorphology*,  
1004 *268*, 184–196.

1005 Harries, R. M., L. A. Kirstein, A. C. Whittaker, M. Attal, and M. I.  
1006 (2019), Impact of recycling and lateral sediment input on grain size fining

1007 trends?Implications for reconstructing tectonic and climate forcings in an-  
1008 cient sedimentary systems, *Basin Res.*, pp. 1–26, doi:10.1111/bre.12349.

1009 Hoffmann, T. (2015), Sediment residence time and connectivity in non-  
1010 equilibrium and transient geomorphic systems, *Earth-Science Reviews*, *150*,  
1011 609–627, doi:10.1016/j.earscirev.2015.07.008.

1012 Hofmann, M. H., A. Wroblewski, and R. Boyd (2011), Mechanisms controlling  
1013 the clustering of fluvial channels and the compensational stacking of cluster  
1014 belts, *Journal of Sedimentary Research*, *81*(9), 670–685.

1015 Hovius, N., C. P. Stark, C. Hao-Tsu, and L. Jiun-Chuan (2000), Supply and  
1016 removal of sediment in a landslide-dominated mountain belt: Central Range,  
1017 Taiwan, *J. Geol*, *108*, 73–89.

1018 Hu, D., P. Boening, C. M. Koehler, S. Hillier, N. Pressling, S. Wan, H. J. Brum-  
1019 sack, and P. D. Clift (2012), Deep sea records of the continental weathering  
1020 and erosion response to East Asian monsoon intensification since 14 ka in the  
1021 South China Sea, *Chem. Geol.*, *326*, 1–18, doi:10.1016/j.chemgeo.2012.07.024.

1022 Humphrey, N., and P. L. Heller (1995), Natural oscillations in coupled geo-  
1023 morphic systems: an alternative origin for cyclic sedimentation, *Geology*, *23*,  
1024 499–502.

1025 Jolivet, M., L. Barrier, S. Dominguez, L. Guerit, G. Heilbronn, and B. Fu (2014),  
1026 Unbalanced sediment budgets in the catchment - alluvial fan system of the  
1027 Kuitun River (northern Tian Shan, China): Implications for the erosion and  
1028 uplift rate estimates in mountain ranges, *Geomorphology*, *214*, 168 – 182.

1029 Jonell, T. N., L. A. Owen, A. Carter, J.-L. Schwenniger, and P. D. Clift (2018),  
1030 Quantifying episodic erosion and transient storage on the western margin of  
1031 the Tibetan Plateau, upper Indus River, *Quaternary Research*, *89*(1, SI),  
1032 281–306, doi:10.1017/qua.2017.92.

1033 Kim, W., and D. J. Jerolmack (2008), The pulse of calm fan deltas, *The Journal*  
1034 *of Geology*, *116*(4), 315–330, doi:10.1086/588830.

1035 Kim, W., C. Paola, J. B. Swenson, and V. R. Voller (2006), Shoreline response  
1036 to autogenic processes of sediment storage and release in the fluvial system,  
1037 *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, *111*(F4).

1038 Lague, D. (2014), The stream power river incision model: evidence, theory and  
1039 beyond, *Earth Surf. Proc. Land.*, *39*(1), 38–61, doi:10.1002/esp.3462.

1040 Lajeunesse, E., O. Devauchelle, M. Houssais, and G. Seizilles (2013),  
1041 Tracer dispersion in bedload transport, *Advances in GeoSciences*, *37*, doi:  
1042 10.5194/adgeo-37-1-2013.

1043 Lang, K. A., T. A. Ehlers, P. J. J. Kamp, and U. Ring (2018), Sedi-  
1044 ment storage in the Southern Alps of New Zealand: New observations  
1045 from tracer thermochronology, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, *493*, 140–149, doi:  
1046 10.1016/j.epsl.2018.04.016.

1047 Langston, A. L., and A. J. A. M. Temme (2019), Bedrock erosion and  
1048 changes in bed sediment lithology in response to an extreme flood event:  
1049 The 2013 Colorado Front Range flood, *Geomorphology*, *328*, 1–14, doi:  
1050 10.1016/j.geomorph.2018.11.015.

1051 Langston, A. L., and G. E. Tucker (2018), Developing and exploring a theory for  
1052 the lateral erosion of bedrock channels for use in landscape evolution models,  
1053 *Earth Surface Dynamics*, *6*(1), 1–27, doi:10.5194/esurf-6-1-2018.

1054 Lauer, J. W., and J. Willenbring (2010), Steady state reach-scale theory for  
1055 radioactive tracer concentration in a simple channel/floodplain system, *J.*  
1056 *Geophys. Res. Earth Surface*, *115*, doi:10.1029/2009JF001480.

1057 Leopold, L. B., and T. J. Maddock (1953), The hydrolic geometry of stream  
1058 channels and some physiographic implications, *U. S. Geol. Survey. Profes-*  
1059 *sional Paper*, *252*, 57.

1060 Li, C., S. Yang, J.-x. Zhao, A. Dosseto, L. Bi, and T. R. Clark (2016a), The  
1061 time scale of river sediment source-to-sink processes in East Asia, *Chemical*  
1062 *Geology*, *446*(SI), 138–146, doi:10.1016/j.chemgeo.2016.06.012.

1063 Li, Q., L. Yu, and K. M. Straub (2016b), Storage thresholds for relative  
1064 sea-level signals in the stratigraphic record, *Geology*, *44*(3), 179–182, doi:  
1065 10.1130/G37484.1.

1066 MacKenzie, L. G., and B. C. Eaton (2017), Large grains matter: contrasting  
1067 bed stability and morphodynamics during two nearly identical experiments,  
1068 *Earth Surf. Proc. Land.*, *42*(8), 1287–1295, doi:10.1002/esp.4122.

1069 Malatesta, L., J.-P. Avouac, N. Brown, S. Breitenbach, J. Pan, M.-L. Chevalier,  
1070 E. Rhodes, D. Saint-Carlier, W. Zhang, J. Charreau, J. Lavé, and P.-H. Blard  
1071 (2018), Lag and mixing during sediment transfer across the tian shan pied-  
1072 mont caused by climate-driven aggradation–incision cycles, *Basin Research*,  
1073 (30(4)), 613–635.

1074 Martin, A. N., A. Dosseto, J.-H. May, J. D. Jansen, L. P. Kinsley, and A. R.  
1075 Chivas (2019), Sediment residence times in catchments draining to the gulf  
1076 of carpentaria, northern australia, inferred by uranium comminution dating,  
1077 *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, *244*, 264–291.

1078 Metivier, F., Y. Gaudemer, P. Tapponnier, and M. Klein (1999), Mass accu-  
1079 mulation rates in Asia during the Cenozoic, *Geophys J Int.*, *137*(2), 280–318,  
1080 doi:10.1046/j.1365-246X.1999.00802.x.

1081 Mondal, M. E. A., H. Wani, and B. Mondal (2012), Geochemical signature of  
1082 provenance, tectonics and chemical weathering in the Quaternary flood plain  
1083 sediments of the Hindon River, Gangetic plain, India, *Tectonophysics*, *566*,  
1084 87–94, doi:10.1016/j.tecto.2012.07.001.

1085 Mudd, S., and K. Yoo (2010), Reservoir theory for studying the geochemical  
1086 evolution of soils, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *115*, F03,030, doi:10.1029/2009JF001591.

1087 Murray, A. B., and C. Paola (1997), Properties of a cellular braided-stream  
1088 model, *Earth Surf. Proc. Land.*, *22*, 1001–1025.

1089 Nicholas, A., and T. Quine (2007), Modeling alluvial landform change in  
1090 the absence of external environmental forcing, *Geology*, *35*, 527–530, doi:  
1091 10.1130/G23377A.1.

1092 Paola, C., K. Straub, D. Mohrig, and L. Reinhardt (2009), The “unreasonable  
1093 effectiveness” of stratigraphic and geomorphic experiments, *Earth-Science Re-*  
1094 *views*, *97*(1-4), 1–43, doi:10.1016/j.earscirev.2009.05.003.

1095 Parker, G., Member, ASCE, C. Paola, K. X. Whipple, and D. Mohrig (1998),  
1096 Alluvial fans formed by channelized fluvial and sheet flow. I: Theory, *Journal*  
1097 *of Hydraulic Engineering*, *124*(10), 985–995.

1098 Powell, E. J., W. Kim, and T. Muto (2012), Varying discharge controls on  
1099 timescales of autogenic storage and release processes in fluvio-deltaic envi-  
1100 ronments: Tank experiments, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *117*.

1101 Quick, L., H. Sinclair, M. Attal, and V. Singh (2019), Conglomerate recycling  
1102 in the Himalayan foreland basin: Implications for grain size and provenance,  
1103 *Geol. Soc. Am. Bull.*, *in press*, doi:https://doi.org/10.1130/B35334.1.

1104 Reitz, M., and D. Jerolmack (2012), Experimental alluvial fan evolution: Chan-  
1105 nel dynamics, slope controls, and shoreline growth, *Journal of Geophysical*  
1106 *Research*, *117*.



1107 Reitz, M. D., D. J. Jerolmack, and J. B. Swenson (2010), Flooding and flow path  
1108 selection on alluvial fans and deltas, *GRL*, *37*, doi:10.1029/2009GL041985.

1109 Riquelme, R., M. Tapia, E. Campos, C. Mpodozis, S. Carretier, R. González,  
1110 S. Munoz, A. Fernández-Mort, C. Sanchez, and C. Marquardt (2018), Super-  
1111 gene and exotic cu mineralization occur during periods of landscape stability  
1112 in the centinela mining district, atacama desert, *Basin Research*, *30*(3), 395–  
1113 425.

1114 Roering, J. J., J. W. Kirchner, and W. E. Dietrich (1999), Evidence for nonlin-  
1115 ear, diffusive sediment transport on hillslopes and implications for landscape  
1116 morphology, *Wat. Resour. Res.*, *35*, 853–870.

1117 Rohais, S., S. Bonnet, and R. Eschard (2012), Sedimentary record of tec-  
1118 tonic and climatic erosional perturbations in an experimental coupled  
1119 catchment-fan system, *Basin Res.*, *24*(2), 198–212, doi:10.1111/j.1365-  
1120 2117.2011.00520.x.

1121 Schumm, S., M. Mosley, and W. Weaver (1987), *Experimental fluvial geomor-*  
1122 *phology*, John Wiley and Sons Inc., New York, NY.

1123 Shobe, C. M., G. E. Tucker, and K. R. Barnhart (2017), The SPACE 1.0 model:  
1124 a Landlab component for 2-D calculation of sediment transport, bedrock  
1125 erosion, and landscape evolution, *Geoscientific Model Development*, *10*(12),  
1126 4577–4604, doi:10.5194/gmd-10-4577-2017.

1127 Sinclair, H. D., F. M. Stuart, S. M. Mudd, L. McCann, and Z. Tao (2019), Detri-  
1128 tal cosmogenic Ne-21 records decoupling of source-to-sink signals by sediment  
1129 storage and recycling in Miocene to present rivers of the Great Plains, Ne-  
1130 braska, USA, *Geology*, *47*(1), 3–6, doi:10.1130/G45391.1.

1131 Tucker, G. (2004), Drainage basin sensitivity to tectonic and climatic forcing:  
1132 Implications of a stochastic model for the role of entrainment and erosion  
1133 thresholds, *Earth Surf. Proc. Land.*, *29*, 185–205, doi:10.1002/esp.1020.

1134 Tucker, G., and P. van der Beek (2013), A model for post-orogenic develop-  
1135 ment of a mountain range and its foreland, *Basin Res.*, *24*, 241–259, doi:  
1136 10.1111/j.1365-2117.2012.00559.x.

1137 Van De Wiel, M. J., and T. J. Coulthard (2010), Self-organized criticality in river  
1138 basins: Challenging sedimentary records of environmental change, *Geology*,  
1139 *38*(1), 87–90, doi:10.1130/G30490.1.

1140 van Dijk, M., G. Postma, and M. Kleinhans (2009), Autocyclic behaviour of fan  
1141 deltas: an analogue experimental study, *Sedimentology*, *56*(5), 1569–1589.

1142 Virkar, Y., and A. Clauset (2014), Power-law distributions in binned empirical  
1143 data, *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, *8*(1), 89–119.

1144 Wang, P., Y. Dua, W. Yua, T. Algeo, Q. Zhoud, Y. Xua, L. Qi, L. Yuan, and  
1145 W. Pan (2019), The chemical index of alteration (CIA) as a proxy for climate  
1146 change during T glacial-interglacial transitions in Earth history, *Earth Sc.*  
1147 *Rev.*, *201*, 103,032, doi:10.1016/j.earscirev.2019.103032.

1148 Wang, Y., K. M. Straub, and E. A. Hajek (2011), Scale-dependent compensa-  
1149 tional stacking: an estimate of autogenic time scales in channelized sedimen-  
1150 tary deposits, *Geology*, *39*(9), 811–814.

1151 Weltje, G. J. (2012), Quantitative models of sediment generation and prove-  
1152 nance: State of the art and future developments, *Sedimentary Geology*,  
1153 *280*(SI), 4–20, doi:10.1016/j.sedgeo.2012.03.010.

1154 Weltje, G. J., and M. B. Brommer (2011), Sediment-budget modelling of multi-  
1155 sourced basin fills: application to recent deposits of the western adriatic mud  
1156 wedge (italy), *Basin Research*, *23*(3), 291–308.

1157 Whipple, K. X., G. S. Hancock, and R. S. Anderson (2000), River incision into  
1158 bedrock: Mechanics and relative efficacy of plucking, abrasion and cavitation,  
1159 *Geol. Soc. Am. Bull.*, *112*, 490–503.

1160 Whittaker, A. C., R. A. Duller, J. Springett, R. A. Smithells, A. L. Whitchurch,  
1161 and P. A. Allen (2011), Decoding downstream trends in stratigraphic grain  
1162 size as a function of tectonic subsidence and sediment supply, *Geol. Soc. Am.*  
1163 *Bull.*, *123*(7-8), 1363–1382, doi:10.1130/B30351.1.

1164 Wittmann, H., F. von Blanckenburg, L. Maurice, J.-L. Guyot, N. Filizola, and  
1165 P. W. Kubik (2011), Sediment production and delivery in the amazon river  
1166 basin quantified by in situ-produced cosmogenic nuclides and recent river  
1167 loads, *Bulletin*, *123*(5-6), 934–950.

1168 Wong, M., and G. Parker (2006), Reanalysis and correction of bed-load relation  
1169 of Meyer-Peter and Muller using their own database, *J. of Hydraulic Engineer-*  
1170 *ing*, *132*(11), 1159–1168, doi:10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9429(2006)132:11(1159).

1171 Zavala, V., S. Carretier, and S. Bonnet (2020), Influence of orographic precipi-  
1172 tation on the topographic and erosional evolution of mountain ranges, *Basin*  
1173 *Res., in press*, doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/bre.12443.

Figure 1: Model setup illustrated with a stage of the topographic evolution that corresponds to a dynamic equilibrium between the mountain uplift and erosion in the reference simulation (the darker the blue, the larger the water discharge). The reference simulation starts with a Gaussian distribution of elevations centered to 0 m and with a deviation of 0.5 m. Then the drainage organises itself, controlled by the boundary conditions, the uplift of the mountain domain and the deposition into the piedmont domain. The east and west boundary conditions are connected, which means that water and sediment leaving the east border enters the west border and vice versa. These boundary conditions avoid "border effects". The maximum elevation is  $\sim 1700$  m.

Figure 2: (a-) and (b-) Snapshots of the topography at two times during the period of dynamic equilibrium, showing lateral stability of the drainage network in the mountain, but varying in the piedmont (differences highlighted by the ovals). (c-) and (d-) Erosion and sediment rates for these two snapshots, demonstrate sedimentary and geomorphic features in the piedmont that are observed in all the presented simulations. Note that topographic shading creates apparent erosion rate variations in the mountain, but erosion varies only slightly around the uplift rate of  $1 \text{ mm yr}^{-1}$ . (e-) Mean stacked topographic profiles showing that dynamic variation has been reached. (f-) Time variations of a topographic cross-profile taken across the middle of the piedmont, located in (a-). Despite a macroscopic equilibrium, the piedmont is reworked over a mixing layer of 60-70 m.

Figure 3: Successive snapshots (a- to f-) of erosion and sedimentation rates and water discharge (normalised by the maximum value on the grid) illustrating the interplay between the erosional dynamics in the mountain and the depositional dynamics in the piedmont. Erosion waves are often generated during a river capture, leading to a temporary fan entrenchment at its apex that propagates into the mountain, as in panel (a-). These erosion waves are associated with higher local erosion rate and a convexity in the river profile, called a knick-point. The initiation and upstream propagation of such a knick-point is highlighted with circles and arrows in panels (a-) to (f-). The erosion waves associated with the upstream propagation of knick-points deliver a pulse of sediment which, in turn, generates lobes and splay-offs in the piedmont. This episodic deposition favours the lateral mobility of piedmont rivers, which fosters, in turn, river captures. There is thus an intimate coupling between the erosion and sedimentation dynamics in the mountain and in the alluvial apron. The topographic contour lines are every 200 m.

Figure 4: (a-) Three snapshots of topography and grain locations after their introduction at  $t=0$  during dynamic equilibrium. 10,000 grains were randomly set at the surface of the mountain. They are then transported and when they enter the piedmont, their clock is activated. The symbol size is related to the size of the grains, which varies here between 1 and 10 cm. Note that after 1 m.y. there are still grains stored in the piedmont. (b-) Distribution of residence times (duration between entry and exit from the piedmont) taken at 2 kyr to emphasise that 95% of grains spent less than several centuries in the piedmont. Yet, the mean residence time is 18 kyr. (c-) Cumulative frequency in log-log scale to visualise the full distribution. The red symbols correspond to all grain sizes and the yellow and purple symbols correspond to selected grain sizes, with no noticeable differences. The blue symbols correspond to the same experiment but with smaller grains of 1 mm, for which the residence times are consistently smaller. In all the cases, the distribution displays a long tail, underlined by the inset segment indicators (the more gentle the segment, the longer the tail, the higher the probability to find very old grains).

Figure 5: Same as Fig. 4c (Ref - all grain sizes between 1 and 10 cm), but for different model parameters.

Figure 6: (a-) and (b-) Snapshots of grains ages (time since their entry into the piedmont) at the surface of the piedmont during dynamic equilibrium. 200,000 grains were set initially on the mountain at  $t=0$  m.y. Part of these grains are stored in the piedmont, others leave the piedmont and are automatically replaced at their initial location in the mountain. (c-) Depth distribution of grains ages (circle size consistent with grain size) in the piedmont at 3.75 m.y. (d-) Corresponding distribution of grain ages cut at 2 m.y.

Figure 7: (a-) Time evolution of grain ages in the piedmont (one point every 10 ka). After a transient period of  $\sim 0.8$  m.y. for grains to cover the whole piedmont, the mean age of piedmont grains keeps on increasing because it includes grains that have been preserved from erosion for an increasing period of time. Other simulations with different parameters are also shown. (b-) and (c-) Time evolution of the mean residence time for different model parameters. In all the cases, the mean residence time shows large variations. The dashed line corresponds to the predicted turnover time in each case, i.e. the ratio between the mixing volume in the piedmont ( $\sim 60$  m times the piedmont area) and the flux of material entering the piedmont (uplift rate times mountain area). The turnover time is much larger than the residence time for most of the run because most of the exiting grains have transited quickly in rivers through the piedmont (recycled old grains are minority).

Figure 8: Same as Fig. 7 for the Ref simulation, but comparing the mean residence time calculated for grains that exited the model during the last time-step (10 yr), with the mean residence time calculated with grains that exited during the last 100 time-steps (1000 yr).

Figure 9: Different geomorphic sectors with evidence of long-tailed distributions of residence time, leading to potential recycling of old grains over the long-term ( $> 1$  kyr). All these sectors may contribute to an overestimation of sediment residence times deduced from bulk (mean) measurements in sediment samples.

Supplementary Fig. S 1: Mean elevation, mountain erosion rate and sediment thickness in the piedmont through time. After 4 m.y. a dynamic equilibrium is reached, although there are variations in erosion rates explained by autogenic alluvial entrenchments in the piedmont and associated retreating knick-points in the mountain. After 20 m.y. of simulation, to be sure that a macroscopic dynamic equilibrium has been well established, grains are set at the surface of the mountain to trace their time spent in the piedmont.

Supplementary Fig. S 2: The same as Fig. 4 only with one grain size (1 mm) and for cases with and without lateral erosion (a -reference model and b-, respectively). The simulation without lateral erosion results in more grains leaving the piedmont quickly because the river channels are narrower (see b-) and thus grains travel faster downstream. This physical distinction explains the different cumulative frequencies (c-). Nevertheless, both distributions display a long tail, albeit shorter (or steeper trend in the log-log graph) in the case without lateral erosion. The existence of a long tail in the case that does not account for lateral erosion confirms that the lateral erosion law used in Cidre is not responsible for the long tail.

Supplementary Fig. S 3: Comparing the age of piedmont grains in the first 60 m of depth without subsidence (a- dynamic equilibrium) and with active subsidence (b-) after 2 m.y. of model time. All the parameters are the same in both experiments (parameters of the reference model), except for the simulation with subsidence: a triangular subsidence pattern is imposed in the piedmont, with a maximum subsidence rate of 0.25 mm/yr at the transition between the mountain and the piedmont, to 0 mm/yr at the downstream end of the piedmont. As grains are progressively buried at different rates along the piedmont with subsidence, only young grains ( $< 400$  kyr) are present at the alluvial fan apex, while old grains are present at the downstream end, where subsidence and burial occur at a much lower rate.



























