

Climate Controls on River Chemistry

Li Li^{1*}, Bryn Stewart¹, Wei Zhi¹, Kayalvizhi Sadayappan¹, Shreya Ramesh¹, Devon Kerins¹, Gary Sterle², Adrian Harpold², Julia Perdrial³

¹Dept. Civil & Environmental Engineering, The Pennsylvania State University; University Park, Pennsylvania, United States.

²Dept. Natural Resources & Environmental Science, University of Nevada; Reno, Nevada, United States.

³Dept. Geology, University of Vermont; Burlington, Vermont, United States.

*Corresponding author: lili@engr.psu.edu

Abstract: How does long-term river chemistry vary across climate gradients? Existing literature has examined extensively the response of river chemistry to short-term weather conditions from event to monthly scales. Patterns and drivers of long-term, baseline river chemistry have remained poorly understood. Here we compile and analyze chemistry data from 506 minimally-impacted rivers (412,801 data points) in the contiguous United States to identify its patterns and predominant control. Despite distinct sources and diverse reaction characteristics, a universal pattern emerges for 16 major solutes at the continental scale. Their long-term mean concentrations (C_m) decrease with mean discharge (Q_m), with elevated concentrations in arid climates and lower concentrations in humid climates, indicating overwhelming regulation by climate compared to local Critical Zone characteristics such as lithology.

To understand the $C_m Q_m$ pattern, a watershed biogeochemical reactor model was solved by bringing together hydrology (storage-discharge relationship) and biogeochemical reaction theories from traditionally separate disciplines. The derivation of long-term, steady state solutions lead to a power law form of $C_m Q_m$ relationships. The model illuminates competing processes that determine mean solute concentrations: solute production by soil biogeochemical and chemical weathering reactions, and solute export (or removal) by mean discharge, the water flushing capacity dictated by climate and vegetation. With space-for-time substitution, these results indicate that in places where river discharge dwindles in a warming climate, solute concentrations will elevate, threatening water quality and aquatic ecosystems even without human perturbation. Water quality deterioration therefore should be considered in the global calculation of future climate risks.

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as doi: [10.1029/2021EF002603](https://doi.org/10.1029/2021EF002603).

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Key Points:

- Continental-scale river chemistry data show that mean discharge predominantly regulates mean concentrations of 16 solutes
- A biogeochemical reactor model illuminates that river chemistry is driven by the relative rates of solute production and solute export
- Where river discharge dwindles in a warmer climate, higher concentrations will deteriorate water quality even without human perturbations

Key words:

Changing climate, warming, water quality, river chemistry, concentration-discharge relationships, carbon, nutrients, droughts, flooding,

1. Introduction

Rivers host a myriad of invisible chemical solutes that define the baseline quality of life-sustaining flowing waters. River chemistry reflects the response of Earth's Critical Zone, the zone from the tree top to the bottom of groundwater, to external climate forcing and human perturbations [Brantley *et al.*, 2017]. River water originates from precipitation, most of which infiltrates and flows via subsurface flow paths (Figure 1). Along its journey, water mobilizes solutes by interacting with roots, microbes, soils, and rocks. As it eventually re-emerges in rivers, it carries the chemical signature of its interactions along flow paths, and reflect the relative magnitude of biogeochemical reactions that produce solutes and export processes that transport solutes out of the Critical Zone [Li *et al.*, 2021].

River chemistry is essential in regulating carbon-climate feedbacks, water quality, and aquatic ecosystem health. Solute such as dissolved organic and inorganic carbon (DOC and DIC) and nutrients readily transform in rivers and emit greenhouse gases including CO₂, N₂O, and CH₄ [Castellano *et al.*, 2010; Duvert *et al.*, 2018; Hutchins *et al.*, 2020; Raymond *et al.*, 2013; Yao *et al.*, 2020]. DOC can also mobilize toxic metals and facilitates the formation of carcinogenic disinfectant by-products during water treatment [Laudon *et al.*, 2012]. Nitrogen-containing solutes such as nitrate have persisted for decades, causing algae blooms and dead zones in receiving waters [Brookfield *et al.*, 2021; Van Meter *et al.*, 2018]. High cation concentrations from rock weathering can clog pipes via solid precipitates. Water quality degradation can elevate water treatment costs and energy use to beyond the current water-related primary energy consumption of 12.6% in the US [Sanders and Webber, 2012]. Deterioration of water quality therefore can present long-term, multi-faceted, and far-reaching threats to aquatic ecosystems, food sources (e.g., fishes), and human society.

Despite its importance, the risks of changing river chemistry and degrading water quality under a warming climate have received marginal attention. An example is the 12-chapter, 1,300-page Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Assessment Report 6 [IPCC, 2021]. The report discusses changing water chemistry in oceans, including ocean acidification and deoxygenation. The risks of changing chemistry of inland waters that sustain all aquatic and terrestrial lives, including human, have barely been discussed. This is in stark contrast to multiple chapters in IPCC

report and extensive literature on the impacts of changing climate on water cycles, climate disasters, and hydrological extremes [AghaKouchak et al., 2021; Bales et al., 2006; Higuera and Abatzoglou, 2021; IPCC, 2021; Paschalis et al., 2020].

Such insubstantial attention on water quality risks may arise from limited understanding on how river chemistry evolves under a changing climate. The common perception is that river chemistry is regulated more by local material abundance instead of climate. For example, concentrations of geogenic solutes (e.g., elements released from rock weathering) are conceived as depending on lithology [Bluth and Kump, 1994; Gaillardet et al., 1999; Ibarra et al., 2016]. In contrast, concentrations of biogenic solutes involved in biological processes (e.g., nutrients and carbon), are thought to hinge on vegetation, land cover, and anthropogenic input [Kim et al., 2020; Van Meter et al., 2018; Worrall and Burt, 2007].

Existing literature has extensively documented the response of river chemistry to weather conditions in streams and rivers at event to monthly scale, often encapsulated in concentration-discharge relationships [Dupas et al., 2016; Ebeling et al., 2021; Godsey et al., 2009; Godsey et al., 2019; Hooper et al., 1990; Knapp et al., 2020; Moatar et al., 2017; Pinder and Jones, 1969]. Geogenic solutes often exhibit dilution patterns where concentrations decrease with discharge or chemostatic patterns where concentrations vary negligibly compared to discharge [Godsey et al., 2009; Ibarra et al., 2016; Torres and Baronas, 2021]. On the other hand, biogenic solutes such as DOC often exhibit flushing patterns where concentrations increase with discharge [Boyer et al., 1997; Herndon et al., 2015; Zarnetske et al., 2018]. The response of nitrate concentrations to discharge varies with land uses: flushing patterns emerge in most agriculture sites, whereas diverse patterns have been observed in natural rivers with minimal human influence [Botter et al., 2020; Ebeling et al., 2021; Moatar et al., 2020; Zhi and Li, 2020]. Mounting evidence has shown that these contrasting patterns arise from the influence of changing weather, flow paths, and distinct source water chemistry in shallow soils and in deeper groundwater [Seibert et al., 2009; Zhi et al., 2019; Zimmer and McGlynn, 2018].

Long-term river chemistry response to different climate conditions however has been scarcely studied. Riverine mean concentrations of geogenic solutes have been observed to decrease from arid to humid climates [Maher and Chamberlain, 2014; White and Blum,

1995]. These concentration variations have been explained by the thermodynamics limits of chemical weathering and the approach to equilibrium at long water travel times under arid climates [Ibarra *et al.*, 2016; Maher and Chamberlain, 2014]. More recently, a wide range of solutes has been shown to similarly exhibit dilution patterns across climate gradients, with high concentrations under arid climates [Godsey *et al.*, 2019]. This has been postulated to depend on the time scales of soil buffering. In general, however, we lack conceptual and quantitative principles that can mechanistically explain and project baseline concentrations for solutes of diverse origins.

How does river chemistry vary across climate gradients? With space-for-time substitution, answers to this question can help project river chemistry in the future climate. Here we aim to identify patterns across climate gradients and understand predominant control of river chemistry at the continental scale. We compile and analyze chemistry data from 506 minimally-impacted rivers (412,801 data points) in the contiguous United States. In doing so we focus on the effects of climate without the entangled effects of human perturbation. We calculate long-term, baseline concentrations of pervasive solutes of diverse origins for each river. We further derive solutions to a parsimonious watershed biogeochemical reactor model to explain the observed patterns and quantitatively depict the relationship between long-term mean concentrations and mean specific discharge, a key measure of climate conditions.




Figure 1: A conceptual model of a watershed hydro-biogeochemical reactor. Water originates from precipitation and travels via subsurface flow paths before re-emerging in rivers. Along its flow paths, water mobilizes solutes by interacting with roots, microbes, soil, and rocks. The dynamics of solute concentrations in the stored water (V_w) are therefore regulated primarily by two competing processes:

the addition of solutes by external input (I) and production of solutes by biogeochemical reactions (R) in soils, rocks, and streams, and the export of solutes by discharge (QC) (Equation (1)). External input can happen but are often insignificant in natural, minimally-impacted watersheds. Under warming climate, some places will become more arid, leading to lower river discharge ($Q = P - ET$) and solute export (QC); some places will become more humid, resulting in lower solute concentrations but higher solute export fluxes to rivers.

2. Methods

The CAMELS-Chem database

This work compiled a new dataset CAMELS-Chem. The new dataset augments the existing CAMELS (Catchment Attributes and Meteorology for Large-sample Studies) dataset [Addor *et al.*, 2017], and comprises the U.S. Geological Survey chemistry data (412,801 data points, 1980 to 2014) from 506 minimally-impacted rivers [Sterle *et al.*, 2022]. It pairs atmospheric deposition and water chemistry data with the existing CAMELS (Catchment Attributes and Meteorology for Large-sample Studies) dataset, therefore filling the need of a data set with complementary watershed attributes, river water flow, and river chemistry data. The dataset includes 18 common river chemistry constituents: Al, Ca, Cl, Dissolved Organic Carbon (DOC), Total Organic Carbon (TOC), HCO_3 , K, Mg, Na, Total Dissolved Nitrogen (TDN) [nitrate + nitrite + ammonia + organic-N], Total Organic Nitrogen (TON), Nitrate (NO_3), Dissolved Oxygen (DO), pH (field), pH_I (lab), Si, SO_4 , and water temperature. This work used data of all solutes except DO, a solute that depends largely on river temperature, light, and flow dynamics [Bernhardt *et al.*, 2018; Zhi *et al.*, 2021], and pH_I (lab) that is similar to pH (field).

The solutes are loosely categorized based on their origins into biogenic (from soil biogeochemical reactions) and geogenic groups (from chemical weathering). The solute HCO_3 can be biogenic from soil respiration (that produces soil CO_2) and geogenic from carbonate weathering. Its concentration limits however are controlled by the thermodynamics of carbonate minerals and is therefore grouped into geogenic solutes.

The mean concentrations (C_m) of each solute were calculated as the arithmetic mean of available concentration data at each site in CAMELS-Chem. We purposely choose to use arithmetic mean, instead of the commonly used flux-normalized mean concentrations [Godsey

et al., 2019; *Ibarra et al.*, 2016; *White and Blum*, 1995], because arithmetic mean gives equal weight to every data point. Flux-normalized mean concentrations are weighted by fluxes (discharge) that often vary by orders of magnitude, and therefore give more weight to concentrations at high discharge. This could lead to more biased mean concentrations, especially when the timing and frequency of sampling are inconsistent across different discharge regimes at different sites.

The long-term energy and water balance of watersheds

The amount of precipitated water (in both rainfall and snowfall forms) that eventually ends up in streams and rivers, or mean discharge, is influential in regulating water transit time and the extent of interactions among water, soil, and rocks, and therefore river chemistry [*Ibarra et al.*, 2019; *Keller*, 2019; *Li et al.*, 2021]. Here we relate mean solute concentrations to climate conditions at each site using a widely used relationship, Budyko equation. Various forms of Budyko equations relate the long-term ratio of evaporative index to aridity index [*Chen and Sivapalan*, 2020; *Gentine et al.*, 2012; *Reaver et al.*, 2020]. Here we used the original form [*Budyko*, 1974]:

$$\frac{ET}{P} = \frac{1}{\left[\left(\frac{P}{PET} \right)^\beta + 1 \right]^{1/\beta}} \quad (0)$$

Where P is precipitation, ET is evapotranspiration, i.e., the summation of evaporation (from open water, bare soil, and vegetated surfaces), transpiration (from within plant leaves), and sublimation from ice and snow surfaces. Evapotranspiration is regulated by the land-surface interactions that regulate the exchange of energy and water between land surface and atmosphere. The climatic potential ET (PET) measures the “drying power” regulated by both climate and land cover [*Dingman*, 2015]. The dimensionless parameter β modifies the curvature of the evaporative index ET/P as a function of aridity index PET/P.

The CAMELS-Chem dataset includes PET, mean annual precipitation (P), and mean annual specific discharge (Q_m , thereafter mean discharge) for each site. Actual evapotranspiration (ET) was calculated as the difference between P and Q_m , assuming water-balanced watersheds.

The watershed biogeochemical reactor model

Broadly, we can consider mean river chemistry as reflecting long-term, baseline chemistry, and their instantaneous variations from event to monthly scales as reflecting variations to rapidly changing weather and hydrological conditions. We can conceptualize watersheds as well-mixed hydro-biogeochemical reactors (Figure 1). Solutes can come from external input such as atmospheric deposition and/or human input such as the addition of nutrients from agriculture or urban watersheds. As meteoric water infiltrates and travels through subsurface and river, it mobilizes solutes by interacting with materials along its flow paths (at rates R), and ultimately exports solutes at the rates QC .

The governing equation and solutions. The mass conservation of an arbitrary solute in a well-mixed watershed reactor can be written as follows:

$$\frac{d(V_w C)}{dt} = I + R - QC \quad (1)$$

Here V_w is water volume per drainage area (m^3 water/ m^2 drainage area); C is aqueous concentration of the solute (g/m^3 water, equivalent to mg/L water); I is external input rate (g/m^2 drainage area/yr) (grey arrows across the land surface, Figure 1), which can be dry or wet deposition or both in a minimally-impacted watershed; R is reaction rate (g/m^2 drainage area/yr) that produces or consumes the solute; Q is specific discharge (m^3 water / m^2 drainage area/yr, blue arrows in Figure 1). Individual solutes are often involved in multiple reactions. In the simple representation of equation (1), the single R term may lump multiple reactions and can be considered as the net reaction rate of multiple reactions. For a water-balanced watershed, $Q = P - ET$, where P and ET are precipitation and evapotranspiration (m^3 water / m^2 drainage area/yr, green arrow in Figure 1), respectively.

As detailed in Supporting Materials (SM), the time-dependent analytical solution to equation (1) is

$$C(t) = C_m + [C_0 - C_m] e^{-\frac{t}{\tau_w}}, \quad \text{where } C_m = \frac{I_m + R_m}{Q_m} \quad (2)$$

Here C_m is the long-term, steady state, baseline mean concentration in individual sites. The second term $[C_0 - C_m] e^{-\frac{t}{\tau_w}}$ is time dependent with an exponential form. The characteristic time

$\tau_w = \frac{V_w}{Q_m}$ quantifies the mean water travel time t from its entry on land to its exit point (river) in a

watershed [Rinaldo et al., 2015; Sprenger et al., 2019; Tetzlaff et al., 2009]. If time is sufficiently long (large t), the exponential term approaches zero such that the concentration becomes

$C_m = \frac{I_m + R_m}{Q_m}$, the steady state solution. For example, when $t = \tau_w$, $e^{-\frac{t}{\tau_w}} = 0.37$; when $t = 3\tau_w$, $e^{-\frac{t}{\tau_w}}$

$= 0.05$. That is, when the time is longer than three times of τ_w , the second term becomes negligible.

Almost all solutes have varied sources. Solute such as Cl, SO₄, and NO₃ may have comparably larger atmospheric input (I) than other solutes. In urban and agricultural sites, the human input for nutrient-containing solutes can be significant. In minimally-impacted watersheds here, the external input however tends to be low compared to productions from reactions in the subsurface [Berner and Berner, 2012]. We therefore focus primarily on the reaction rate R as the major source. In that case, the mean concentration has the following form with mean reaction rate R_m and mean discharge Q_m :

$$C_m = \frac{R_m}{Q_m} \quad (3)$$

Equation (3) reveals that the long-term, steady-state mean concentration is regulated by the relative magnitude of two processes. One is the reactions in the subsurface that produce a solute (at rate R_m), the other is the export process that carries a solute out of the subsurface (at rate Q_m). High R_m and low Q_m result in high concentrations, and low R_m and high Q_m lead to low concentrations in subsurface and by extension in rivers. This equation can be used broadly as an organizing framework to understand competing processes that regulate baseline solute concentrations.

The $C_m Q_m$ relationships. The values of R_m at the watershed scale are typically unknown. We do know the functional dependence of rates on measurable variables such as temperature, soil moisture, material abundance, intrinsic rates, and aqueous geochemistry from reaction kinetic theory. We can combine theories from hydrology and reaction kinetics and thermodynamics from biogeochemistry for different groups of solutes based on their origin and

reaction types (details below and in SM) to derive steady state relationships between C_m and Q_m in the form of Equations (4) and (5) below.

For biogenic solutes, the derivation of $C_m Q_m$ relationship involved the use of water storage-discharge relationships from hydrology and reaction kinetics with dependence on temperature and water content (or soil moisture) from biogeochemistry. The reaction rate R_m depends on temperature (T) and soil moisture (or water content S_w) [Davidson *et al.*, 1998; Mahecha *et al.*, 2010]. The rate dependence on water content takes the general form $R_m = R_0 = k_0 S_A f(T) f(S_w)$, where k_0 is the maximum reaction rate constant; S_A is the surface area that quantifies the abundance of organic materials; $f(T)$ describes the rate dependence on temperature, which can take the form of Q_{10} formula (e.g., $f(T) = Q_{10}^{(T-20)/10}$, [Lloyd and Taylor, 1994]); $f(S_w)$ describes the rate dependence on soil moisture. Reactions such as soil respiration and carbon decomposition often reach maxima at intermediate water content (e.g., soil moisture of 0.5 ~ 0.7 in many places) [Yan *et al.*, 2018], because rates tend to be low under extremely dry and wet conditions. The mean soil moisture in particular locations and at the watershed scale however rarely become higher than 0.5, even in wet places and at wet times (e.g., [Lin *et al.*, 2006]). We therefore use a simple form $f(S_w) = (S_w)^n$, where the exponent n quantifies the sensitivity of reaction rates to water content. Water content (or storage) and discharge can be linked by storage-discharge relationships in various forms [Kirchner, 2009]. Here we use a simple form $Q = \alpha_0 S_w^{\beta_0}$ [Wittenberg, 1999]. Large β_0 values indicate rapidly changing discharge responding to changes in S_w , whereas small β_0 values indicate relatively stable discharge that varies insignificantly with S_w .

With these reaction rate laws and functional dependence, the following $C_m Q_m$ relationship can be derived for biogenic solutes (details in SM):

$$C_m = A Q_m^B, \text{ where } A = k_0 S_A f(T) \alpha_0^{\left(\frac{n}{\beta_0}\right)}, B = \frac{n}{\beta_0} - 1 \quad (4)$$

The parameter A is a bulk measure of reaction rates and combines several rate-related parameters, including reaction rate k_0 , surface area S_A , rate dependence on soil moisture n and temperature $f(T)$, and parameters in S_w - Q relationships. The parameter B is determined by the ratio of the rate dependence on water content (n) and discharge dependence on water content (β_0). The B value quantifies concentration sensitivity to variations in mean discharge.

For geogenic solutes, weathering reaction kinetics follow the transition state theory with a thermodynamic limit term $R_m = R_0(1 - \frac{C}{C_{eq}})$, with the last term indicating the distance from reaction equilibrium [Lasaga, 1998; Lasaga et al., 1994]. This rate law leads to the following equation (details in SM):

$$C_m = \frac{C_{eq} Da}{1 + Da} = \frac{C_{eq} R_0}{Q_m C_{eq} + R_0} \quad (5)$$

where $Da = \frac{\tau_w}{\tau_{eq}}$, the dimensionless Damköhler number that quantifies the relative magnitude of water travel time (τ_w) and the time to reach equilibrium $\tau_{eq} = \frac{C_{eq} V_w}{R_0}$. This equation builds upon a rich history of reactive transport formulation in literature for geogenic solutes with thermodynamic limits [Ibarra et al., 2016; Maher, 2011; Maher and Chamberlain, 2014; Salehikhoo et al., 2013; Steefel, 2007; Torres and Baronas, 2021; Wen and Li, 2017; Wen and Li, 2018; Wymore et al., 2017].

Under the conditions that τ_w is small (humid climate) or τ_{eq} is large (e.g., for silicate weathering), $Da = \frac{\tau_w}{\tau_{eq}} \ll 1$, reaction is far from equilibrium, Equation (5) becomes

$$C_m = C_{eq} Da = C_{eq} \times \frac{\frac{V_w}{Q_m}}{\frac{V_w C_{eq}}{R_0}} = \frac{R_0}{Q_m} = \frac{R_m}{Q_m}. \text{ This equation has the same form as equation (3) for}$$

biogenic solutes and can be further rearranged into the same form of equation (4) with parameters specific for weathering reactions. For example, weathering of rocks such as silicates, shale, and evaporites releases cations (Na, K, Si, and Al) and anions (Cl, SO_4 , HCO_3).

These reactions lead to the precipitation of clay, effectively reducing concentrations of solutes from silicates such that they hardly reach reaction equilibrium.

For geogenic solutes involved in carbonate weathering (Ca, Mg, and HCO_3^- , and pH), they can rapidly reach equilibrium such that their $C_m Q_m$ relationships follow equation (5). For these

solutes, when τ_w is small (wet climate), $Da = \frac{\tau_w}{\tau_{eq}} \ll 1$, slow water flow in arid climates entails that

$\tau_w \gg \tau_{eq}$ and $Da \gg 1$, such that Equation (5) becomes $C_m = C_{eq}$. In humid climates, C_m decreases with increasing Q_m and depends on R_0 .

Model assumption, implications, and utilities

The model conceptualizes watersheds as well-mixed reactors that drain to rivers. It is meant to broadly capture controls of long-term, baseline mean concentrations. It is not meant to represent detailed short-term temporal dynamics and spatial structure such as flow paths and source water chemistry at different subsurface depths. In-stream processes may also influence concentrations, especially under low flow conditions [Dodds, 2006; Perdril et al., 2014]. In-stream reaction processes are not explicitly counted for as an independent term in the governing equation (1), although one can consider in-stream reactions as contributing partially to R_m . The parsimonious representation entails a slim number of parameters and salient relationship that reveal first-order mechanisms. As we will illustrate in the Results section, these relationships capture concentration variations across climate gradients and reveal competing mechanisms that ultimately drive river chemistry.

For solutes that are not thermodynamically limited by equilibrium, the derivation here accidentally arrives at a power law form ($C_m = A Q_m^B$). This $C_m Q_m$ power law relationship however differs from the short-term, instantaneous CQ patterns ($C = a Q^b$) at event to monthly time scales that has been extensively studied in literature, as we will elaborate more in Discussion. It depicts the dependence of long-term, baseline concentration on mean discharge at annual time scales and beyond.

Although this work focuses on minimally-impacted watersheds, the application of the model is not limited to such watersheds. For example, the input term I in equation (1) is loosely defined: it can be atmospheric input and/or human input such as the addition of nutrients in

Accepted Article

agriculture or urban watersheds. The long-term accumulation of nutrients on agriculture lands can also change some of reaction parameters, for example, the surface area A that quantifies the abundance of nitrogen- and phosphorus- containing materials. The model can be used broadly as an organizing framework to understand competing processes that regulate mean solute concentrations. More complex reactive transport models at the watershed scale can be used to complement such simple models and to examine detailed processes, variables, and spatial heterogeneities that reflect idiosyncrasies of specific sites [Li, 2019; Wen *et al.*, 2021; Wen *et al.*, 2020].




Figure 2. Maps of mean specific discharge (mm/yr) (top left) and mean concentrations (mg/L). Annual mean discharge varies from 1.5 to 2,000 mm/yr, notably lowest in the Great Plains from North Dakota down to Texas. Mean concentrations are higher under arid climates, and are highest in the Great Plains for many solutes.

3. Results

Higher concentrations in dry places; lower concentrations in wet places

The compiled data indicate that mean discharge varies by three orders of magnitude and is higher in the eastern US and along the coasts, and lowest in the Great Plains from North Dakota down to Texas (Figure 2). Mean concentrations also vary by orders of magnitude across sites, depending on specific solutes. They are highest in the Great Plains for many solutes, including Cl, SO₄, and cations (e.g., Na, K, Ca, and Mg). Concentrations are typically higher in arid climates and lower in humid climates, although considerable variations occur. Although eastern US has historically received more acid deposition [Berner and Berner, 2012], rivers in the western US generally have higher SO₄ concentrations, possibly due to gypsum from evaporites and lack of dilution due to low discharge. NO₃ concentrations are highest in mid-west Corn Belt area, possibly elevated by dust and dry deposition from nearby agricultural areas.

Higher concentrations of biogenic solutes at lower mean discharge

Biogenic solutes include Total and Dissolved Organic Carbon (TOC and DOC), Total and Dissolved Organic Nitrogen (TON and DON), Total Nitrogen (TN), and nitrate (NO₃) (Figure 3). They are primarily involved in vegetation- and microbe-mediated reactions including soil respiration, nitrification, and denitrification. Some solutes, including NO₃, also come from atmospheric deposition and fertilizer application [Berner and Berner, 2012]. The climate conditions of these rivers cover a wide range, as manifested in evaporative (ET/P) and aridity index (PET/P) values (red lines in left figures of each pair, Figure 3). Concentrations decrease as mean discharge increases and are typically higher under arid climates with high ET/P and PET/P (Figure 3, right). Red lines in the right figures of Figure 3 depict the $C_m Q_m$ relationship $C_m = A Q_m^B$ (Equation (4)) at different A and B values. The prediction lines generally capture the trend and range of concentration variation with mean discharge.

Values of B vary across solutes, indicating distinct sensitivity to mean discharge variations. For TOC and DOC, B values are close to -0.9; for TON and DON, they are around -0.5 to -0.6. Organic carbon is typically more abundant than nitrogen-containing solutes in natural systems. Carbon- and nitrogen-containing solutes also experience distinct reactions with different rate

sensitivity to temperature and water content. These differences could lead to dissimilar B values and sensitivity to mean discharge. At similar discharge, concentrations vary considerably and hinge upon mean reaction rates, as indicated by the red lines with different A values. The model inferred that rates of TOC and DOC vary from 0.1 – 5 g/m²/yr, whereas the rates of nitrogen-containing solutes are typically one to two orders of magnitude lower. This is in fact consistent with the observed range of C:N ratios between 1 – 100 [Cleveland and Liptzin, 2007], as carbon is much more abundant than nitrogen in natural soils.




Figure 3. Biogenic solutes. Each solute has one pair of figures. The **left figure** of each pair is the mean concentrations C_m within the Budyko framework. Red lines from Equation (0) with different non-linearity indicator β . The positions of circles are determined by evaporative index (ET/P) and aridity index (PET/P) of each site. Water limitation under arid climates lead to high ET/P and PET/P, meaning most precipitation returns to the atmosphere to meet the climate and vegetation demand for water. The circle sizes indicate concentration levels. The **right figure** of each pair is the mean concentration (C_m) versus mean discharge (Q_m) data (gray circles). The red lines are from Equation (4), $C_m = A Q_m^B$, where parameter A is a bulk measure of reaction rates (g/m²/yr), and B reflects the sensitivity of C_m to variations in Q_m . Although with considerable variations, concentrations are typically higher in arid climates and decrease with discharge.

Elevated concentrations of geogenic solutes from silicate weathering at higher aridity

Soil and rock weathering release cations (Na, K, Si, and Al) and anions (Cl, SO₄, HCO₃). Weathering of silicates, shale, and evaporites rarely reach equilibrium such that the $C_m Q_m$ relationships of solutes from these rocks have the same form as those of biogenic solutes ($C_m = A Q_m^B$, Equations

(2)). The concentrations of these solutes are similarly higher in arid environments (Figure 4 left figure of each pair) and decrease with discharge (Figure 4 right figure of each pair).

The data and model solution indicate that the reaction rates (A values) vary by orders of magnitude, with more abundant solutes having higher rates. For anions, the values of A vary from 0.1 – 10 g/m²/yr for Cl and 0.2 – 25 g/m²/yr for SO₄. Among cations, Na and Al have the highest (0.03 – 1) and lowest (0.0002 – 0.1 g/m²/yr) A values, respectively. This is expected, as Na is highly soluble and has the highest concentration range of all cations. In contrast, Al released from silicate dissolution is usually immobilized rapidly via clay precipitation. Equation (4) also predicts that B values of Na and K are around -0.6 and -0.5, whereas that of Si is around -0.2. The B values of Cl and SO₄ are close to -1. Cl can come from dissolution of evaporites. SO₄ can originate from atmospheric acid deposition but also from pyrite oxidation in shale and gypsum dissolution [Berner and Berner, 2012]. These source rocks dissolve rapidly with high solubility. In particular, pyrite dissolution is known to hinge upon the rise and fall of water tables and the availability of oxygen [Crawford et al., 2019]. These characteristics can lead to its high sensitivity to discharge and therefore more negative B values.




Figure 4. Geogenic solutes from weathering without thermodynamic limitation. Each solute has one pair of figures. **The left figure** of each pair is C_m within the Budyko framework. Red lines are from Equation (0) with different non-linearity indicator β . The positions of circles are determined by evaporative index (ET/P)

and aridity index (PET/P). The **right figure** of each pair is mean concentration C_m versus mean discharge Q_m data (gray circles). The red lines are from Equation (4), $C_m = A Q_m^B$, where parameter A is a bulk measure of reaction rates ($\text{g}/\text{m}^2/\text{yr}$), and B reflects the sensitivity of C_m to variations in Q_m . Although with considerable variations, concentrations are higher in arid climates and decrease with increasing discharge.

Concentrations of geogenic solutes from carbonate weathering escalate with aridity but with limits

Geogenic solutes related to carbonate weathering (Ca, Mg, and HCO_3 , and pH) can reach equilibrium rapidly because of high reaction rates. Their $C_m Q_m$ relationship (Equation (5)) indicates a form of dependence on mean discharge that differs from biogenic and non-thermodynamic-limiting geogenic solutes discussed in the previous section. Instead of monotonic increase with decreasing discharge, values of C_m reach maxima at a threshold discharge. Data in Figure 5 confirm the existence of such threshold: at $Q_m > \sim 200 \text{ mm}/\text{yr}$, concentrations decrease sharply with discharge. Carbonate as a parent rock mostly occurs in Midwestern US [Moosdorf et al., 2010]. However, pedogenic carbonate is known to prevail in dry soils in the western US and under arid climates around the globe [Monger et al., 2015; Zamanian et al., 2016]. Concentrations of each solute vary considerably, depending on the reaction rate R_0 and equilibrium constant C_{eq} . Pedogenic carbonates often have different solubility due to dust and impurities [Macpherson and Sullivan, 2019], and therefore can have variable C_{eq} values. Between solutes, HCO_3 has the highest R_0 and C_{eq} , possibly because HCO_3 can also come from biological processes such as soil respiration in addition to carbonate weathering.




Figure 5. Geogenic solutes from carbonate weathering. Each solute has one pair of figures. The **left figure** of each pair includes C_m within the Budyko framework. Red lines are from equation (0). The **right figures** are C_m versus Q_m data (gray circles). Red lines are from Equation (5), $C_m = \frac{C_{eq}R_0}{Q_m C_{eq} + R_0}$, with different equilibrium concentrations C_{eq} (mg/L) and reaction rates R_0 (g/m²/yr). Mean concentrations increase with decreasing Q_m until reaching maxima at a threshold Q_m around 200 mm/yr.

4. Discussion

The climate regulation of river chemistry

This work used a large data set to identify patterns of baseline river chemistry at the contiguous United States. A universal $C_m Q_m$ pattern emerges: mean concentrations of all 16 solutes increase with aridity and decrease with increasing mean discharge. This pattern contrasts the general perception that river chemistry is primarily controlled by local material abundance in the Critical Zone, including lithology [Gaillardet et al., 1999], vegetation, and organic matter [Raymond et al., 2008; Van Meter et al., 2018; Worrall and Burt, 2007].

A watershed biogeochemical reactor model was solved analytically to understand the processes that drive the pattern. The derivation of the solution and $C_m Q_m$ relationships (Equations 4 and 5) brings together theories from traditionally separate disciplines: storage-discharge relationship in hydrology and reaction kinetics in biogeochemistry and chemical weathering. The steady state solution illuminates two competing processes that drive the continental-scale pattern (Equation 3, Figure 1): solute production via reactions and solute export by discharge. Such solution has been developed before for geogenic solutes (chemical weathering solutes) (e.g., [Maher and Chamberlain, 2014]) but not for biogenic solutes such as carbon and nutrient solutes. The dilution patterns of geogenic solutes, where high concentrations under arid climates and lower, rapidly decreasing concentrations under humid climates, echo earlier observations in literature [Maher and Chamberlain, 2014; White and Blum, 1995]. This work therefore brings a unified framework for solutes of both biogenic and geogenic origins.

The model underscores the first-order control of mean discharge and the secondary influence of material abundance, as expressed in reaction rate parameters (A or R_0). As shown in Table 1, the A values are lowest (0.0002-0.1 g/m²/yr) for Al, which happens to have the lowest concentration range. The A values are highest (9-80 g/m²/yr) for HCO₃, which also has the highest

concentration range. In other words, high A or R_0 indicate rapid solute production and high concentrations. This is hardly surprising, as these values encapsulate the intertwined influence of reactivity (k_0), mineral abundance (S_A), climate ($f(T)$) and water flow (α_0) (Equations 4 and 5). For biogenic solutes, values of A may also indicate the quantity and quality of organic matter (and therefore vegetation) and microbial communities. The lumped nature of A and R_0 however alludes to the challenges of differentiating the influence of individual factors.

Table 1. Summary of parameters in Equations 4-5 for all solutes

Solute	A (g/m ² /yr)	B
TOC	0.1 ~ 5	-0.9
DOC	0.2 ~ 5	-0.9
TN	0.01 ~ 1	-0.9
TON	0.002 ~ 0.05	-0.6
NO ₃	0.002 ~ 0.2	-0.8
DON	0.0005 ~ 0.03	-0.5
Na	0.03 ~ 1	-0.6
K	0.005 ~ 0.08	-0.5
Si	0.008 ~ 0.08	-0.2
Al	0.0002 ~ 0.1	-0.9
Cl	0.1 ~ 10	-1
SO ₄	0.2 ~ 25	-1
Solute	R ₀ (g/m ² /yr)	C _{eq} (mg/L)
Ca	1.5 ~ 50	100 ~ 400
HCO ₃	9 ~ 80	300 ~ 800
Mg	0.5 ~ 10	10 ~ 150
pH*	10 ~ 90	8 ~ 9

*Note that R_0 values for pH are not particularly meaningful as pH is a negative log. The C_{eq} values of pH however indicate that the upper limits pH values in US rivers are around 8-9.

The sensitivity of concentrations to discharge variation is quantified by the value of B (= $n/\beta_0 - 1$), which depends on the reaction rate dependence on water content (n) and discharge dependence on water content (β_0). The former (n) likely hinges upon chemical properties of materials (e.g., organic matter and minerals) that produce solutes. The latter (β_0) depends on the physical structure that regulates water storage and flow generation. For example, steep topography and clay-rich soils respond rapidly to precipitation and have high β_0 values [Kirchner, 2009; Xiao et al., 2019]. When $n > \beta_0$, or reaction rates are more sensitive to water content than discharge, $B > 0$; when $n < \beta_0$, or reaction rate is less sensitive to water content than discharge, $B < 0$.

Values of B are negative for all solutes, indicating reaction rates are less sensitive to water content than discharge. This is expected, as discharge predominately depends on water content, whereas reaction rates depend on an array of factors other than water content, which may subdue the impacts of water content. Overall, the expression of B underscores the importance of the subsurface physical and chemical structure in regulating the sensitivity of solute concentrations to discharge variations.

It is important to note that in CAMEL-Chem, there are more sites in the eastern than the western US. Between different sites, measurement duration, frequency, and time periods vary for different solutes. Some biogenic solutes were measured using different approaches in different time periods. These data inconsistencies can influence the values of parameters including A, B, R_0 , and C_{eq} . Despite these uncertainties, mean concentrations of all 16 solutes consistently decrease with increasing discharge, underscoring the first-order control of mean discharge. We therefore expect the general conclusion will remain the same when more data become available.

Distinct controls of long-term C_mQ_m versus short-term CQ patterns

The long-term, cross-site C_mQ_m patterns here differ from the short-term, within-site instantaneous CQ patterns ($C=aQ^b$) at event to monthly time scales. The latter reflects instantaneous river chemistry to short term hydrological changes whereas the former carries signature of baseline response to climate conditions. The instantaneous CQ patterns have been studied extensively whereas the cross-site C_mQ_m patterns has received relatively scarce attention [Godsey et al., 2019; Maher and Chamberlain, 2014; White and Blum, 1995]. The instantaneous concentrations of geogenic solutes have shown dilution patterns with concentrations decreasing with increasing discharge [Ibarra et al., 2016; Torres and Baronas, 2021; Zhi et al., 2020]. Instantaneous concentrations of DOC however have seen increase with discharge in more than 80% of the US sites [Zarnetske et al., 2018], the opposite of the C_mQ_m pattern here. The instantaneous CQ patterns at individual sites reflect switching flow paths under different hydrological conditions and depth distribution of source water chemistry [Botter et al., 2020; Ebeling et al., 2021; Zhi and Li, 2020][Dwivedi et al., 2018]][Knapp et al., 2020]. In other words, instantaneous CQ patterns arise from mechanisms that differ from long-term C_mQ_m patterns.

Even if these patterns at different time scales are “apparently” similar, they should not be interpreted as originated from the same mechanisms.

The C_mQ_m patterns of all solutes exhibit dilution patterns, albeit with differences in the forms for solutes with and without thermodynamic limitation and parameter values. This is remarkable given the diverse origin and reactions across solutes, and the wide range of site idiosyncrasies in lithology, soil type, vegetation cover, among other characteristics. This indicates that climate is the most predominant control on baseline concentrations. In contrast, the short-term CQ relationships are mostly governed by switching flow paths and distinct source water chemistry at different depths, characteristics that are more regulated by subsurface physical and biogeochemical properties, or the subsurface structure of the Critical Zone [Sullivan *et al.*, 2022]. For example, the extent of concentration variation with instantaneous discharge, quantified as the power law slope b , has been shown to depend on the magnitude of chemical contrasts in shallow soil water and in deeper groundwater, which is in turn regulated by the abundance of materials such as organic matter and weathering materials at different depths [Zhi and Li, 2020]. Solute that are more abundant in shallow soil water tends to exhibit flushing CQ patterns; solutes that are more abundant in deeper groundwater tends to exhibit dilution CQ patterns [Botter *et al.*, 2020; Seibert *et al.*, 2009; Stewart *et al.*, 2022; Zimmer and McGlynn, 2018]. Under conditions where only one major flow path exist, or where the shallow and deep subsurface has similar water chemistry, CQ patterns tend to be chemostatic [Zhi *et al.*, 2019].

The future of river chemistry and water quality

How does river chemistry change under a changing climate? Climate disasters, including flooding, droughts, and wildfire, can modify material fluxes and water quality [Robinne *et al.*, 2021; Whitehead *et al.*, 2009]. Warmer climates are expected to change river discharge, as well as the timing and magnitude of precipitation events, although the extent and direction will vary by region. River discharge is also expected to decrease due to increasing water demand by a growing population [AghaKouchak *et al.*, 2021]. Intermittent streams have already seen longer dry periods, especially in the western US [Zipper *et al.*, 2021]. Groundwater aquifers are over extracted and are subject to surface contaminations [Hartmann *et al.*, 2021; Jasechko and Perrone, 2021; Jasechko *et al.*, 2017; Kumar *et al.*, 2020].

A warmer climate can possibly accelerate soil biogeochemical reactions and chemical weathering, although their response to warming depends on a variety of complex and coupled ecosystem processes that generally remain poorly understood [Greaver *et al.*, 2016; Perdril *et al.*, 2018; Stegen *et al.*, 2011]. For example, vegetation structure will shift in response to shifts in precipitation amount and timing, with ensuing effects on water demand and eventually discharge [Keller, 2019]. This in turn will influence river chemistry.

Nonetheless, many places have already seen elevating solute concentrations, although it is often challenging to tease apart the convoluted influence of climate versus human drivers [Kaushal *et al.*, 2013; Noacco *et al.*, 2017]. Salinity and electrical conductance, a collective measures of geogenic solutes (cations and anions), have been observed to rise in many places across the United States [Kaushal *et al.*, 2018]. Riverine DOC has observed increasing trend since 1980s in Europe and North America [Monteith *et al.*, 2007], often attributed to factors including changing climate, recovery from acid rain, and modified land uses [Adler *et al.*, 2021]. In places without acid rain and human activities, DOC exhibits elevated concentrations in warmer and drier years, indicating strong climatic influence [Zhi *et al.*, 2020]. Dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) and alkalinity has also seen continued increase [Drake *et al.*, 2020; Kaushal *et al.*, 2013; Najjar *et al.*, 2020; Raymond and Cole, 2003; Zamanian *et al.*, 2018]. Low discharge also entails longer residence time [Benettin *et al.*, 2020] and possibly more extensive transformation of nutrients and carbon into greenhouse gases [Campeau *et al.*, 2019].

Using the space-for-time substitution, we can interpret the data and model here for the future climate. Because all sites are minimally impacted by human perturbations, the results particularly speaks to the effects of a changing climate without the convoluted effects of human perturbations. In places that will become wetter, higher discharge can lower solute concentrations but possibly increased fluxes. This in fact has been predicted for nutrient contamination [Sinha *et al.*, 2017]. In places that will become drier, mean concentrations are expected to escalate even without human perturbation. The magnitude of concentration change will vary among solutes and hinges upon the sensitivity of concentrations to discharge variations. For example, some solutes (e.g., TOC, DOC, Cl, SO₄) are highly sensitive ($B \sim -1$) whereas other solutes (e.g., Si) will vary less ($B \sim -0.2$). With B values close to -1 , mean concentrations of TOC

and DOC can double when mean discharge decreases by half. This is alarming as carbon solutes are highly influential in regulating biological activities and sustaining aquatic life in rivers and streams.

The Clean Water Act, the water quality regulation in the US, establishes total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) and MCLs in Drinking Water Standards for many solutes discussed here, including cations, nitrate, and carbon solutes (often categorized as chemical or biological oxygen demand). Increasing solute concentrations can elevate costs and energy use for water treatment, and demand renovated or augmented infrastructure for growing treatment demands [Sanders and Webber, 2012]. Water quality risks therefore are an important aspect of climate risks and should be accounted for when we consider future adaptation and mitigation strategies.

Acknowledgments: This work is supported by the National Science Foundation under grant numbers NSF-EAR-1724440 and EAR-2012123 to LL, 1724171 and 2012123 to JP and AH, respectively. We acknowledge two anonymous reviewers whose constructive comments have improved the manuscript.

Data and materials availability: All data in this analysis are available at the zenodo website: <https://zenodo.org/record/6540786#.Yn0GPOjMI2y>, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.6540786, data citation: LiReactiveWater/EarthsFutureLiEtal2022_CAMELS-Chem_WaterQuality_dataset: Dataset_Lietal2022

Supplementary Materials: Detailed model derivation are in the Supplementary Materials.

Author credits: Conceptualization and paper design: LL; Model and analytical solution, LL; Data compilation: GS, AH; Conceptual Figure 1: LL; Data analysis and figure visualization: BS, WZ, KS, SR; Writing – first draft: LL; Writing – review & editing: LL, JP, BS, WZ, KS, SR, AH, DK; Funding acquisition: LL, JP, AH; Project administration: LL, JP, AH.

References:

- Addor, N., Newman, A.J., Mizukami, N. and Clark, M.P. (2017), The CAMELS data set: catchment attributes and meteorology for large-sample studies, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 21(10), 5293-5313.
- Adler, T. et al. (2021), Drivers of Dissolved Organic Carbon Mobilization from Forested Headwater Catchments: A Multi Scaled Approach, *Frontiers in Water*, <https://doi.org/10.3389/frwa.2021.578608>.
- AghaKouchak, A. et al. (2021), Anthropogenic Drought: Definition, Challenges, and Opportunities, *Rev. Geophys.*, 59(2), e2019RG000683.
- Bales, R.C., Molotch, N.P., Painter, T.H., Dettinger, M.D., Rice, R. and Dozier, J. (2006), Mountain hydrology of the western United States, *Water Resour. Res.*, 42(8).

- Benettin, P., Fovet, O. and Li, L. (2020), Nitrate removal and young stream water fractions at the catchment scale, *Hydrol. Process.*, 2020, 1–14.
- Berner, E.K. and Berner, R.A. (2012), *Global Environment. Water, Air and Geochemical Cycles*, Princeton University Press, Princeton and Oxford, .
- Bernhardt, E.S. et al. (2018), The metabolic regimes of flowing waters, *Limnology and Oceanography*, 63(S1), S99-S118.
- Bluth, G.J.S. and Kump, L.R. (1994), Lithologic and climatologic controls of river chemistry, *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 58(10), 2341-2359.
- Botter, M., Li, L., Hartmann, J., Burlando, P. and Fatichi, S. (2020), Depth of Solute Generation Is a Dominant Control on Concentration–Discharge Relations, *Water Resour. Res.*, 56(8), e2019WR026695.
- Boyer, E.W., Hornberger, G.M., Bencala, K.E. and McKnight, D.M. (1997), Response characteristics of DOC flushing in an alpine catchment, *Hydrol. Process.*, 11(12), 1635-1647.
- Brantley, S.L., Lebedeva, M.I., Balashov, V.N., Singha, K., Sullivan, P.L. and Stinchcomb, G. (2017), Toward a conceptual model relating chemical reaction fronts to water flow paths in hills, *Geomorphology*, 277, 100-117.
- Brookfield, A.E., Hansen, A.T., Sullivan, P.L., Czuba, J.A., Kirk, M.F., Li, L., Newcomer, M.E. and Wilkinson, G. (2021), Predicting algal blooms: Are we overlooking groundwater?, *Science of The Total Environment*, 769, 144442.
- Budyko, M.I. (1974), *Climate and Life*, Academic Press, New York, NY.
- Campeau, A., Bishop, K., Amvrosiadi, N., Billett, M.F., Garnett, M.H., Laudon, H., Öquist, M.G. and Wallin, M.B. (2019), Current forest carbon fixation fuels stream CO₂ emissions, *Nature Communications*, 10(1), 1876.
- Castellano, M.J., Schmidt, J.P., Kaye, J.P., Walker, C., Graham, C.B., Lin, H. and Dell, C.J. (2010), Hydrological and biogeochemical controls on the timing and magnitude of nitrous oxide flux across an agricultural landscape, *Global Change Biology*, 16(10), 2711-2720.
- Chen, X. and Sivapalan, M. (2020), Hydrological Basis of the Budyko Curve: Data-Guided Exploration of the Mediating Role of Soil Moisture, *Water Resour. Res.*, 56(10), e2020WR028221.
- Cleveland, C.C. and Liptzin, D. (2007), C:N:P stoichiometry in soil: is there a “Redfield ratio” for the microbial biomass?, *Biogeochemistry*, 85(3), 235-252.
- Crawford, J.T., Hinckley, E.-L.S., Litaor, M.I., Brahney, J. and Neff, J.C. (2019), Evidence for accelerated weathering and sulfate export in high alpine environments, *Environmental Research Letters*, 14(12), 124092.
- Davidson, E.A., Belk, E. and Boone, R.D. (1998), Soil water content and temperature as independent or confounded factors controlling soil respiration in a temperate mixed hardwood forest, *Global Change Biology*, 4(2), 217-227.
- Dingman, S.L. (2015), *Physical Hydrology*, 3rd ed., 657 pp., Waveland Press, Inc., Long Grove, Illinois.
- Dodds, W.K. (2006), Eutrophication and trophic state in rivers and streams, *Limnology and Oceanography*, 51(1), 671-680.
- Drake, T.W., Podgorski, D.C., Dinga, B., Chanton, J.P., Six, J. and Spencer, R.G.M. (2020), Land-use controls on carbon biogeochemistry in lowland streams of the Congo Basin, *Global Change Biology*, 26(3), 1374-1389.
- Dupas, R., Jomaa, S., Musolff, A., Borchardt, D. and Rode, M. (2016), Disentangling the influence of hydroclimatic patterns and agricultural management on river nitrate dynamics from sub-hourly to decadal time scales, *Science of The Total Environment*, 571, 791-800.
- Duvert, C., Butman, D.E., Marx, A., Ribolzi, O. and Hutley, L.B. (2018), CO₂ evasion along streams driven by groundwater inputs and geomorphic controls, *Nature Geoscience*, 11(11), 813-818.

- Dwivedi, D. et al. (2018), Geochemical Exports to River From the Intrameander Hyporheic Zone Under Transient Hydrologic Conditions: East River Mountainous Watershed, Colorado, *Water Resour. Res.*, 54(10), 8456-8477.
- Ebeling, P., Kumar, R., Weber, M., Knoll, L., Fleckenstein, J.H. and Musolff, A. (2021), Archetypes and Controls of Riverine Nutrient Export Across German Catchments, *Water Resour. Res.*, 57(4), e2020WR028134.
- Gaillardet, J., Dupré, B., Louvat, P. and Allègre, C.J. (1999), Global silicate weathering and CO₂ consumption rates deduced from the chemistry of large rivers, *Chem. Geol.*, 159(1–4), 3-30.
- Gentine, P., D'Odorico, P., Lintner, B.R., Sivandran, G. and Salvucci, G. (2012), Interdependence of climate, soil, and vegetation as constrained by the Budyko curve, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 39(19).
- Godsey, S.E., Kirchner, J.W. and Clow, D.W. (2009), Concentration–discharge relationships reflect chemostatic characteristics of US catchments, *Hydrol. Process.*, 23(13), 1844-1864.
- Godsey, S.E., Hartmann, J. and Kirchner, J.W. (2019), Catchment chemostasis revisited: Water quality responds differently to variations in weather and climate, *Hydrol. Process.*, 33(24), 3056-3069.
- Greaver, T.L. et al. (2016), Key ecological responses to nitrogen are altered by climate change, *Nature Climate Change*, 6(9), 836-843.
- Hartmann, A. et al. (2021), Risk of groundwater contamination widely underestimated because of fast flow into aquifers, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(20), e2024492118.
- Herndon, E.M., Dere, A.L., Sullivan, P.L., Norris, D., Reynolds, B. and Brantley, S.L. (2015), Landscape heterogeneity drives contrasting concentration-discharge relationships in shale headwater catchments, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 19(8), 3333-3347.
- Higuera, P.E. and Abatzoglou, J.T. (2021), Record-setting climate enabled the extraordinary 2020 fire season in the western United States, *Global Change Biology*, 27(1), 1-2.
- Hooper, R.P., Christophersen, N. and Peters, N.E. (1990), Modelling streamwater chemistry as a mixture of soilwater end-members — An application to the Panola Mountain catchment, Georgia, U.S.A, *Journal of Hydrology*, 116(1–4), 321-343.
- Hutchins, R.H.S., Tank, S.E., Olefeldt, D., Quinton, W.L., Spence, C., Dion, N., Estop-Aragones, C. and Mengistu, S.G. (2020), Fluvial CO₂ and CH₄ patterns across wildfire-disturbed ecozones of subarctic Canada: Current status and implications for future change, *Global Change Biology*, 26(4), 2304-2319.
- Ibarra, D.E., Caves, J.K., Moon, S., Thomas, D.L., Hartmann, J., Chamberlain, C.P. and Maher, K. (2016), Differential weathering of basaltic and granitic catchments from concentration–discharge relationships, *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 190, 265-293.
- Ibarra, D.E., Rugenstein, J.K.C., Bachan, A., Baresch, A., Lau, K.V., Thomas, D.L., Lee, J.-E., Boyce, C.K. and Chamberlain, C.P. (2019), Modeling the consequences of land plant evolution on silicate weathering, *American Journal of Science*, 319(1), 1-43.
- IPCC (2021), Climate Change: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 1,300 pp.
- Jasechko, S. and Perrone, D. (2021), Global groundwater wells at risk of running dry, *Science*, 372(6540), 418-421.
- Jasechko, S. et al. (2017), Global aquifers dominated by fossil groundwaters but wells vulnerable to modern contamination, *Nature Geoscience*, 10(6), 425-+.
- Kaushal, S.S., Likens, G.E., Utz, R.M., Pace, M.L., Grese, M. and Yepsen, M. (2013), Increased River Alkalinization in the Eastern U.S, *Environmental Science & Technology*, 47(18), 10302-10311.
- Kaushal, S.S., Likens, G.E., Pace, M.L., Utz, R.M., Haq, S., Gorman, J. and Grese, M. (2018), Freshwater salinization syndrome on a continental scale, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(4), E574-E583.

- Keller, C.K. (2019), Carbon Exports from Terrestrial Ecosystems: A Critical-Zone Framework, *Ecosystems*, 22(8), 1691-1705.
- Kim, J.H., Jobbágy, E.G., Richter, D.D., Trumbore, S.E. and Jackson, R.B. (2020), Agricultural acceleration of soil carbonate weathering, *Global Change Biology*, 26(10), 5988-6002.
- Kirchner, J.W. (2009), Catchments as simple dynamical systems: Catchment characterization, rainfall-runoff modeling, and doing hydrology backward, *Water Resour. Res.*, 45.
- Knapp, J.L.A., von Freyberg, J., Studer, B., Kiewiet, L. and Kirchner, J.W. (2020), Concentration–discharge relationships vary among hydrological events, reflecting differences in event characteristics, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 24(5), 2561-2576.
- Kumar, R. et al. (2020), Strong hydroclimatic controls on vulnerability to subsurface nitrate contamination across Europe, *Nature Communications*, 11(1), 6302.
- Lasaga, A.C. (1998), *Kinetic theory in the earth sciences*, 811 pp., Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Lasaga, A.C., Soler, J.M., Ganor, J., Burch, T.E. and Nagy, K.L. (1994), CHEMICAL-WEATHERING RATE LAWS AND GLOBAL GEOCHEMICAL CYCLES, *Geochimica Et Cosmochimica Acta*, 58(10), 2361-2386.
- Laudon, H., Buttle, J., Carey, S.K., McDonnell, J., McGuire, K., Seibert, J., Shanley, J., Soulsby, C. and Tetzlaff, D. (2012), Cross-regional prediction of long-term trajectory of stream water DOC response to climate change, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 39(18).
- Li, L. (2019), Watershed reactive transport, in *Reviews in Mineralogy & Geochemistry: REACTIVE TRANSPORT IN NATURAL AND ENGINEERED SYSTEMS*, edited by J. Druhan and C. Tournassat, Mineralogical Society of America.
- Li, L. et al. (2021), Toward catchment hydro-biogeochemical theories, *WIREs Water*, n/a(n/a), e1495.
- Lin, H.S., Kogelmann, W., Walker, C. and Bruns, M.A. (2006), Soil moisture patterns in a forested catchment: A hydrogeological perspective, *Geoderma*, 131(3), 345-368.
- Lloyd, J. and Taylor, J.A. (1994), On the Temperature Dependence of Soil Respiration, *Functional Ecology*, 8(3), 315-323.
- Macpherson, G.L. and Sullivan, P.L. (2019), Dust, impure calcite, and phytoliths: Modeled alternative sources of chemical weathering solutes in shallow groundwater, *Chem. Geol.*, 527, 118871.
- Mahecha, M.D. et al. (2010), Global Convergence in the Temperature Sensitivity of Respiration at Ecosystem Level, *Science*, 329(5993), 838-840.
- Maher, K. (2011), The role of fluid residence time and topographic scales in determining chemical fluxes from landscapes, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 312(1-2), 48-58.
- Maher, K. and Chamberlain, C.P. (2014), Hydrologic Regulation of Chemical Weathering and the Geologic Carbon Cycle, *Science*, 343(6178), 1502-1504.
- Moatar, F., Abbott, B.W., Minaudo, C., Curie, F. and Pinay, G. (2017), Elemental properties, hydrology, and biology interact to shape concentration-discharge curves for carbon, nutrients, sediment, and major ions, *Water Resour. Res.*, 53(2), 1270-1287.
- Moatar, F. et al. (2020), Stream Solutes and Particulates Export Regimes: A New Framework to Optimize Their Monitoring, *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, 7(516).
- Monger, H.C., Kraimer, R.A., Khresat, S.e., Cole, D.R., Wang, X. and Wang, J. (2015), Sequestration of inorganic carbon in soil and groundwater, *Geology*, 43(5), 375-378.
- Monteith, D.T. et al. (2007), Dissolved organic carbon trends resulting from changes in atmospheric deposition chemistry, *Nature*, 450, 537.
- Moosdorf, N., Hartmann, J. and Dürr, H.H. (2010), Lithological composition of the North American continent and implications of lithological map resolution for dissolved silica flux modeling, *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems*, 11(11), n/a-n/a.

- Najjar, R.G., Herrmann, M., Cintrón Del Valle, S.M., Friedman, J.R., Friedrichs, M.A.M., Harris, L.A., Shadwick, E.H., Stets, E.G. and Woodland, R.J. (2020), Alkalinity in Tidal Tributaries of the Chesapeake Bay, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 125(1), e2019JC015597.
- Noacco, V., Wagener, T., Worrall, F., Burt, T.P. and Howden, N.J.K. (2017), Human impact on long-term organic carbon export to rivers, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, 122(4), 947-965.
- Paschalis, A. et al. (2020), Rainfall manipulation experiments as simulated by terrestrial biosphere models: Where do we stand?, *Global Change Biology*, 26(6), 3336-3355.
- Perdrial, J. et al. (2018), A net ecosystem carbon budget for snow dominated forested headwater catchments: linking water and carbon fluxes to critical zone carbon storage, *Biogeochemistry*, 138(3), 225-243.
- Perdrial, J.N. et al. (2014), Stream water carbon controls in seasonally snow-covered mountain catchments: impact of inter-annual variability of water fluxes, catchment aspect and seasonal processes, *Biogeochemistry*, 118(1), 273-290.
- Pinder, G.F. and Jones, J.F. (1969), Determination of the ground-water component of peak discharge from the chemistry of total runoff, *Water Resour. Res.*, 5(2), 438-445.
- Raymond, P.A. and Cole, J.J. (2003), Increase in the export of alkalinity from North America's largest river, *Science*, 301(5629), 88-91.
- Raymond, P.A., Oh, N.-H., Turner, R.E. and Broussard, W. (2008), Anthropogenically enhanced fluxes of water and carbon from the Mississippi River, *Nature*, 451(7177), 449-452.
- Raymond, P.A. et al. (2013), Global carbon dioxide emissions from inland waters, *Nature*, 503(7476), 355-359.
- Reaver, N.G.F., Kaplan, D.A., Klammler, H. and Jawitz, J.W. (2020), Reinterpreting the Budyko Framework, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.*, 2020, 1-31.
- Rinaldo, A., Benettin, P., Harman, C.J., Hrachowitz, M., McGuire, K.J., van der Velde, Y., Bertuzzo, E. and Botter, G. (2015), Storage selection functions: A coherent framework for quantifying how catchments store and release water and solutes, *Water Resour. Res.*, 51(6), 4840-4847.
- Robinne, F.-N. et al. (2021), Scientists' warning on extreme wildfire risks to water supply, *Hydrol. Process.*, 35(5), e14086.
- Salehikhoo, F., Li, L. and Brantley, S.L. (2013), Magnesite dissolution rates at different spatial scales: The role of mineral spatial distribution and flow velocity, *Geochimica Et Cosmochimica Acta*, 108(0), 91-106.
- Sanders, K.T. and Webber, M.E. (2012), Evaluating the energy consumed for water use in the United States, *Environmental Research Letters*, 7(3), 034034.
- Seibert, J., Grabs, T., Köhler, S., Laudon, H., Winterdahl, M. and Bishop, K. (2009), Linking soil- and stream-water chemistry based on a Riparian Flow-Concentration Integration Model, *Hydrology and earth system sciences*, 13(12), 2287-2297.
- Sinha, E., Michalak, A.M. and Balaji, V. (2017), Eutrophication will increase during the 21st century as a result of precipitation changes, *Science*, 357(6349), 405-408.
- Sprenger, M. et al. (2019), The Demographics of Water: A Review of Water Ages in the Critical Zone, *Rev. Geophys.*, 0(0).
- Steeffel, C.I. (2007), Geochemical kinetics and transport, in *Kinetics of Water-Rock Interaction*, edited by J.K. S. Brantley, A. White, pp. 545-589, Springer New York.
- Stegen, J.C., Swenson, N.G., Enquist, B.J., White, E.P., Phillips, O.L., Jørgensen, P.M., Weiser, M.D., Monteagudo Mendoza, A. and Núñez Vargas, P. (2011), Variation in above-ground forest biomass across broad climatic gradients, *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 20(5), 744-754.
- Sterle, G., Perdrial, J., Li, L., Adler, T., Underwood, K., Rizzo, D., Wen, H. and Harpold, A. (2022), CAMELS-Chem: Augmenting CAMELS (Catchment Attributes and Meteorology for Large-sample Studies)

- with Atmospheric and Stream Water Chemistry Data, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.*, 2022, 1-23.
- Stewart, B. et al. (2022), Streams as Mirrors: Reading Subsurface Water Chemistry From Stream Chemistry, *Water Resour. Res.*, 58(1), e2021WR029931.
- Sullivan, P.L. et al. (2022), Embracing the dynamic nature of soil structure: A paradigm illuminating the role of life in critical zones of the Anthropocene, *Earth-Science Reviews*, 225, 103873.
- Tetzlaff, D., Seibert, J., McGuire, K.J., Laudon, H., Burns, D.A., Dunn, S.M. and Soulsby, C. (2009), How does landscape structure influence catchment transit time across different geomorphic provinces?, *Hydrol. Process.*, 23(6), 945-953.
- Torres, M.A. and Baronas, J.J. (2021), Modulation of Riverine Concentration-Discharge Relationships by Changes in the Shape of the Water Transit Time Distribution, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 35(1), e2020GB006694.
- Van Meter, K.J., Van Cappellen, P. and Basu, N.B. (2018), Legacy nitrogen may prevent achievement of water quality goals in the Gulf of Mexico, *Science*, 360(6387), 427-430.
- Wen, H. and Li, L. (2017), An upscaled rate law for magnesite dissolution in heterogeneous porous media, *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 210, 289-305.
- Wen, H. and Li, L. (2018), An upscaled rate law for mineral dissolution in heterogeneous media: The role of time and length scales, *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 235, 1-20.
- Wen, H., Brantley, S.L., Davis, K.J., Duncan, J.M. and Li, L. (2021), The Limits of Homogenization: What Hydrological Dynamics can a Simple Model Represent at the Catchment Scale?, *Water Resour. Res.*, 57(6), e2020WR029528.
- Wen, H. et al. (2020), Temperature controls production but hydrology regulates export of dissolved organic carbon at the catchment scale, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 24(2), 945-966.
- White, A.F. and Blum, A.E. (1995), Effects of climate on chemical weathering in watersheds, *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 59(9), 1729-1747.
- Whitehead, P.G., Wilby, R.L., Battarbee, R.W., Kernan, M. and Wade, A.J. (2009), A review of the potential impacts of climate change on surface water quality, *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 54(1), 101-123.
- Wittenberg, H. (1999), Baseflow recession and recharge as nonlinear storage processes, *Hydrol. Process.*, 13(5), 715-726.
- Worrall, F. and Burt, T.P. (2007), Flux of dissolved organic carbon from U.K. rivers, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 21(1).
- Wymore, A.S., Brereton, R.L., Ibarra, D.E., Maher, K. and McDowell, W.H. (2017), Critical zone structure controls concentration-discharge relationships and solute generation in forested tropical montane watersheds, *Water Resour. Res.*, 53(7), 6279-6295.
- Xiao, D., Shi, Y., Brantley, S.L., Forsythe, B., DiBiase, R., Davis, K. and Li, L. (2019), Streamflow generation from catchments of contrasting lithologies: the role of soil properties, topography, and catchment size, *Water Resour. Res.*, n/a(n/a).
- Yan, Z., Bond-Lamberty, B., Todd-Brown, K.E., Bailey, V.L., Li, S., Liu, C. and Liu, C. (2018), A moisture function of soil heterotrophic respiration that incorporates microscale processes, *Nature Communications*, 9(1), 2562.
- Yao, Y., Tian, H., Shi, H., Pan, S., Xu, R., Pan, N. and Canadell, J.G. (2020), Increased global nitrous oxide emissions from streams and rivers in the Anthropocene, *Nature Climate Change*, 10(2), 138-142.
- Zamanian, K., Pustovoytov, K. and Kuzyakov, Y. (2016), Pedogenic carbonates: Forms and formation processes, *Earth-Science Reviews*, 157, 1-17.
- Zamanian, K., Zarebanadkouki, M. and Kuzyakov, Y. (2018), Nitrogen fertilization raises CO₂ efflux from inorganic carbon: A global assessment, *Global Change Biology*, 24(7), 2810-2817.

- Zarnetske, J.P., Bouda, M., Abbott, B.W., Saiers, J. and Raymond, P.A. (2018), Generality of Hydrologic Transport Limitation of Watershed Organic Carbon Flux Across Ecoregions of the United States, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 45(21), 11,702-711,711.
- Zhi, W. and Li, L. (2020), The Shallow and Deep Hypothesis: Subsurface Vertical Chemical Contrasts Shape Nitrate Export Patterns from Different Land Uses, *Environmental Science & Technology*, 54(19), 11915-11928.
- Zhi, W., Li, L., Dong, W., Brown, W., Kaye, J., Steefel, C. and Williams, K.H. (2019), Distinct Source Water Chemistry Shapes Contrasting Concentration-Discharge Patterns, *Water Resour. Res.*, 55(5), 4233-4251.
- Zhi, W., Williams, K.H., Carroll, R.W.H., Brown, W., Dong, W., Kerins, D. and Li, L. (2020), Significant stream chemistry response to temperature variations in a high-elevation mountain watershed, *Communications Earth & Environment*, 1(1), 43.
- Zhi, W., Feng, D., Tsai, W.-P., Sterle, G., Harpold, A., Shen, C. and Li, L. (2021), From Hydrometeorology to River Water Quality: Can a Deep Learning Model Predict Dissolved Oxygen at the Continental Scale?, *Environmental Science & Technology*, 55(4), 2357-2368.
- Zimmer, M.A. and McGlynn, B.L. (2018), Lateral, Vertical, and Longitudinal Source Area Connectivity Drive Runoff and Carbon Export Across Watershed Scales, *Water Resour. Res.*, 54(3), 1576-1598.
- Zipper, S.C. et al. (2021), Pervasive changes in stream intermittency across the United States, *Environmental Research Letters*, 16(8), 084033.