

# JGR Atmospheres

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

10.1029/2019JD031207

### Key Points:

- Peak emissions in November 2017 were enhanced by above-normal air temperatures, implying a  $Q_{10}$  for emissions of 2.5
- The intensive livestock emissions from northern Iowa accounted for 17.5% of the abundance in tall-tower  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios
- We estimated a mean annual  $\text{NH}_3$  NEE of  $1.60 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  for agricultural lands and  $-0.07 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  for forested land

### Supporting Information:

- Supporting Information S1

### Correspondence to:

C. Hu and T. J. Griffis,  
 huxxx991@umn.edu;  
 timgriffis@umn.edu

### Citation:

Hu, C., Griffis, T. J., Baker, J. M., Wood, J. D., Millet, D. B., Yu, Z., & Lee, X. (2020). Modeling the sources and transport processes during extreme ammonia episodes in the U.S. Corn Belt. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 125, e2019JD031207. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JD031207>

Received 20 JUN 2019

Accepted 19 DEC 2019

Accepted article online 22 DEC 2019

### Author Contributions:

**Funding acquisition:** Timothy J. Griffis, John M. Baker, Jeffrey D. Wood  
**Investigation:** Zhongjie Yu

**Project administration:** Timothy J. Griffis, John M. Baker, Jeffrey D. Wood

**Supervision:** Timothy J. Griffis, John M. Baker, Dylan B. Millet, Xuhui Lee

**Writing - original draft:** Cheng Hu

## Modeling the Sources and Transport Processes During Extreme Ammonia Episodes in the U.S. Corn Belt

Cheng Hu<sup>1,2</sup>, Timothy J. Griffis<sup>1</sup>, John M. Baker<sup>1,3</sup>, Jeffrey D. Wood<sup>4</sup>, Dylan B. Millet<sup>1</sup>, Zhongjie Yu<sup>1</sup>, and Xuhui Lee<sup>5,6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Soil, Water, and Climate, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, St. Paul, MN, USA, <sup>2</sup>College of Biology and the Environment, Joint Center for sustainable Forestry in Southern China, Nanjing Forestry University, Nanjing, China, <sup>3</sup>U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Research Service, St. Paul, MN, USA, <sup>4</sup>School of Natural Resources, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO, USA, <sup>5</sup>School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA, <sup>6</sup>Yale-NUIST Center on Atmospheric Environment, International Joint Laboratory on Climate and Environment Change (ILCEC), Nanjing University of Information, Science and Technology, Nanjing, China

**Abstract** Atmospheric ammonia ( $\text{NH}_3$ ) is the primary form of reactive nitrogen ( $\text{N}_r$ ) and a precursor of ammonium ( $\text{NH}_4^+$ ) aerosols. Ammonia has been linked to adverse impacts on human health, the loss of ecosystem biodiversity, and plays a key role in aerosol radiative forcing. The midwestern United States is the major  $\text{NH}_3$  source in North America because of dense livestock operations and the high use of synthetic nitrogen fertilizers. Here, we combine tall-tower (100 m) observations in Minnesota and Weather Research and Forecasting model coupled with Chemistry (WRF-Chem) modeling to investigate high and low  $\text{NH}_3$  emission episodes within the U.S. Corn Belt to improve our understanding of the distribution of emission sources and transport processes. We examined observations and performed model simulations for cases in February through November of 2017 and 2018. The results showed the following: (1) Peak emissions in November 2017 were enhanced by above-normal air temperatures, implying a  $Q_{10}$  (i.e., the change in  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions for a temperature increase of  $10^\circ\text{C}$ ) of 2.5 for emissions. (2) The intensive livestock emissions from northern Iowa, approximately 400 km away from the tall tower, accounted for 17.6% of the abundance in tall-tower  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios. (3) Ammonia mixing ratios in the innermost domain 3 frequently (i.e., 336 hr, 48% of November 2017) exceeded 5.3 ppb, an important air quality health standard. (4) In November 2017, simulated  $\text{NH}_3$  net ecosystem exchange (the difference between  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions and dry deposition) accounted for 60–65% of gross  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions for agricultural areas and was 2.8–3.1 times the emissions of forested areas. (5) We estimated a mean annual  $\text{NH}_3$  net ecosystem exchange of  $1.60 \pm 0.06 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  for agricultural lands and  $-0.07 \pm 0.02 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  for forested lands. These results imply that future warmer fall temperatures will enhance agricultural  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions, increase the frequency of dangerous  $\text{NH}_3$  episodes, and enhance dry  $\text{NH}_3$  deposition in adjacent forested lands.

## 1. Introduction

Atmospheric ammonia ( $\text{NH}_3$ ) is the primary form of reactive nitrogen ( $\text{N}_r$ ) and a precursor of ammonium ( $\text{NH}_4^+$ ) aerosols via chemical reactions with sulfuric ( $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$ ) and nitric ( $\text{HNO}_3$ ) acids (Erismann et al., 2008; Galloway et al., 2008; Li et al., 2016). Ammonium aerosols form the dominant inorganic component in fine particulate matter (i.e., particulate matter [PM] 2.5) and have a significant influence on radiative scattering, cloud formation, and human health (Warner et al., 2017). Although both gaseous  $\text{NH}_3$  and ammonium particles are short-lived species, with lifetimes varying between a few hours and a few weeks, they can lead to eutrophication and soil acidification by atmospheric transport (tens to hundreds of kilometers from the source) and dry/wet deposition to sensitive natural ecosystems (Dragosits et al., 2002; Makar et al., 2015; Stevens, 2019). Excessive reduced nitrogen  $\text{NH}_x$  ( $\text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{NH}_4^+$ ) can also be transported by runoff and drainage waters and lead to river acidification, algal blooms, and biodiversity loss in aquatic systems (Erismann et al., 2008; Hellsten et al., 2008).

The main  $\text{NH}_3$  sources include agriculture, industry, and biomass burning, with over 80% from anthropogenic sources globally (Butler et al., 2016; Sutton et al., 2013). In the United States, 84% of the anthropogenic  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions are attributed to agricultural categories with 30% attributed to fertilizer volatilization and 54% to livestock production (Butler et al., 2016). The U.S. Corn Belt has been identified as a global  $\text{NH}_3$


hotspot driven by intense agricultural activity including significant use of synthetic nitrogen fertilizers and highly concentrated animal feedlots (Shephard et al., 2011; Yu et al., 2018). For example, Iowa and Minnesota accounted for approximately 50% of national hog production in 2018 according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA Annual Report, 2018, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/194371/top-10-us-states-by-number-of-hogs-and-pigs/>). Ammonia dry deposition downwind of these intensive agricultural areas can dominate the total  $N_r$  load from the atmosphere (Li et al., 2016, 2017) and potentially have significant input to the nitrogen load of natural ecosystems via atmospheric and river transport (Ellis et al., 2013).

In the Upper Midwest, direct observations indicate that both dry and total deposition rates of nitrogen (i.e.,  $NH_3$ ,  $NH_4^+$ ,  $NO_3^-$ , and  $HNO_3$ ) are higher than anywhere else in the United States (Li et al., 2016). Dry deposition of  $NH_3$  plays a dominant role and estimated to account for around 50% and 80% for the total and dry N deposition in Upper Midwest, respectively (Li et al., 2016). For these reasons, robust estimation of  $NH_3$  emissions from these agricultural regions is essential for air quality modeling, quantifying its environmental impacts, and developing  $NH_3$  mitigation strategies.

The uncertainty of  $NH_3$  emission estimates for the U.S. Corn Belt remains relatively high compared to other reactive nitrogen species (i.e.,  $N_2O$ ) or other pollutants such as  $NO_x$  or  $SO_2$ . The high uncertainty is attributed to the overall lack of observations and the difficulty associated with measuring  $NH_3$  fluxes (Reis et al., 2009; Sutton et al., 2013). Short-term weather variations and lack of detailed crop cultivation information, including fertilizer types and application practices, heterogeneity in land management activities, and the dynamic bidirectional  $NH_3$  flux, are important factors contributing to these large and persistent  $NH_3$  emission uncertainties (Lonsdale et al., 2017; Nowak et al., 2012). Further, since  $NH_3$  is not yet a regulated pollutant in the United States, there has been less emphasis related to reducing its uncertainty (Paulot et al., 2014).

Ammonia emission inventories, based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) methodology (IPCC, 2013), make use of activity data and emission factors (EFs) and have been applied broadly in calculating gross  $NH_3$  emissions. Available  $NH_3$  inventories include EDGAR (Emission Database for Global Atmospheric Research, Olivier et al., 1994) and NEI (National Emission Inventory, Reis et al., 2009). Large biases have been reported for these  $NH_3$  inventories. For example, NEI was found to underestimate by a factor of 2.7 in Colorado (Battye et al., 2016). By comparing with satellite and ground  $NH_3$  concentration observations,  $NH_3$  inventories were found to be underestimated by 2 to 4 times in California (Heald et al., 2012; Lonsdale et al., 2017; Nowak et al., 2012; Zhu et al., 2015). Although some empirical scaling factors (i.e., monthly) were applied (Paulot et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2012), the magnitude and seasonality of  $NH_3$  emissions are also found with large biases in the U.S. Midwest; a priori EDGAR monthly  $NH_3$  inventories peaked in summer following volatilization in high-temperature conditions, while a recent study concluded that it should have a higher peak in spring due to corn fertilization (Paulot et al., 2014). It is important to note that constant EFs are applied in most inventories as a simplification. However, it is well established that these emissions are highly dependent on environmental factors such as air temperature and can vary dramatically on short time scales (Sutton et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2017). Further, some studies have shown that the use of online temperature-dependent  $NH_3$  emissions can significantly improve simulated  $NH_3$  mixing ratios (Warner et al., 2017).

Measurements of  $NH_3$  emissions from agricultural sources remain challenging and are relatively rare through the U.S. and other major agricultural regions of the world. Measurement approaches have included chambers (Aneja et al., 2000; Parker et al., 2013), eddy covariance (Ferrara et al., 2012, 2016; Sun et al., 2015), relaxed eddy-accumulation (Nelson et al., 2017, 2019; Zhu et al., 2000), flux-gradients (Nelson et al., 2019; Phillips et al., 2004), and satellite-based remote sensing (Lonsdale et al., 2017; Zhu et al., 2013). Direct measurements of agricultural  $NH_3$  emissions have shown high sensitivity to climate (Skjøth & Geels, 2013; Sutton et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2017). Ammonia emissions are thought to increase exponentially as a function of air temperature (Riddick et al., 2016). In principle, the  $NH_3$  volatilization rate can double with a temperature increase of 5°C, equivalent to a  $Q_{10}$  of 3 to 4 (Sutton et al., 2013). Many studies have tried to quantify the temperature sensitivity of  $NH_3$  emissions and have reported  $Q_{10}$  values ranging between 1.25 and 10 for different  $NH_3$  sources and climate zones (Hensen et al., 2009; Sutton et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2017). Other field-based studies have also reported that agricultural  $NH_3$  EFs show large seasonal variability, with summer EFs 2 to 5 times larger than for winter (McGinn et al., 2007; Yang et al., 2016).



**Figure 1.** Maps of (a) three domain setups used in Weather Research and Forecasting model coupled with Chemistry (WRF-Chem) model: the 10 states represent U.S. Corn Belt is bounded by a green line; (b) land use categories and urban areas; (c) the percent plant functional types (PFTs) for crops; and (d) tree and shrub. Note that the additional purple symbols in c and d are the locations of monitoring stations appearing in Table 1, and black “x” indicate tall tower site.

The  $\text{NH}_3$  concentration observations reported in previous studies have largely been obtained using ground-level passive samplers for its relatively low instrumentation and technical requirements, such as those used at the Ammonia Monitoring Network (AMoN) sites (National Atmospheric Deposition Program [NADP], 2017). These data have provided important information on regional  $\text{NH}_3$  concentration distributions and shed light on potential  $\text{NH}_3$  hotspots (Yu et al., 2018). However, these ground-level passive samplers have a very limited source footprint and very low temporal resolution, and large uncertainties have been reported when using these data to estimate dry deposition fluxes (Schrader et al., 2018). Further, they are not ideal for measuring vertical gradients of  $\text{NH}_3$ , which can lead to difficulty in interpreting near-surface observations from a single sampling altitude. Some passive samplers have been used to measure vertical  $\text{NH}_3$  profiles (Zhang et al., 2018) in order to estimate  $\text{NH}_3$  net ecosystem exchange (hereafter  $\text{NH}_3$  net ecosystem exchange [NEE]). Unfortunately, these measurements have relatively low temporal resolution, from weekly to biweekly, and therefore cannot characterize shorter-term emission changes that are needed to understand the underlying processes (i.e., short-term weather variability or land management activities).

Ammonia measurements at finer time scales that can better characterize the full atmospheric boundary layer are needed to evaluate model performance, emission inventory uncertainties, and to provide deeper insights regarding  $\text{NH}_3$  source/sink behavior and regional transport. Only a few studies have reported hourly  $\text{NH}_3$  profiles using tall towers (i.e., 160 and 280 m) in the Netherlands (Dammers et al., 2017) and Colorado, USA (Li et al., 2017; Tevlin et al., 2017). Here, we build on our previous tall tower  $\text{NH}_3$  work conducted within the U.S. Corn Belt (Griffis et al., 2019) by using the Weather Research and Forecasting model coupled with Chemistry (WRF-Chem) model to assess the regional sinks, sources, and transport processes associated with high  $\text{NH}_3$  emission events.

The objectives of this study therefore were to (1) compare observed and modeled hourly  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios and evaluate  $\text{NH}_3$  inventories at the hourly to monthly time-scales, (2) examine the  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions and transport processes associated with high  $\text{NH}_3$  emission episodes and secondary  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  formation, and (3) quantify the  $\text{NH}_3$  NEE by accounting for both  $\text{NH}_3$  dry deposition and gross emissions from land surfaces within the U.S. Corn Belt including agricultural and natural ecosystems.

## 2. Materials and Methods

### 2.1. Research Site

The main research site is the tall (244-m height) tower trace gas observatory (KCMP radio tower, 44.69°N, 93.07°W), located about 25 km south of the Minneapolis-Saint Paul metropolitan area (Figure 1). Our previous work has shown that the land use surrounding the tall tower for a radius extending to 300 km consists of cropland, forest, and grass/pasture occupying 40%, 25%, and 21%, respectively (Hu et al., 2018). Past work at this site has examined surface-atmosphere fluxes of  $\text{CO}_2$  (Griffis et al., 2010; Hu et al., 2018),  $\text{CH}_4$  (Chen et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2014),  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  (Chen et al., 2016; Griffis et al., 2017),  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  (Griffis et al., 2016), CO, and VOCs (Hu et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2013). Further details about the research facility and study site can be found in Griffis et al. (2013).

### 2.2. Ammonia, Aerosol, and Meteorology Observations

Two sets of  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratio observations were used in this study. First,  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios were measured at 1-Hz frequency from the 56- and 100-m levels of the KCMP tall tower using an off-axis cavity ring-down spectrometer (Model EAA-30-EP, Los Gatos Research, San Jose, CA, USA; Griffis et al., 2019). Ammonia mixing ratio measurements were initiated on 21 March 2017 and are ongoing as of 15 December 2019. These high-frequency data were block averaged at hourly intervals for comparison with the WRF-Chem model results. The manufacturer-reported  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratio uncertainty ( $1\sigma$ ) is less than 0.2 ppb for an integration period of 100 s. Calibrations performed under field conditions showed that the Allan deviation was 0.24 ppb for an integration period of 100 s (Griffis et al., 2019).

The second set of  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratio observations were obtained from AMoN sites (<http://nadp.slh.wisc.edu/data/AMoN/>). These sites provide ground-level observations with broad spatial coverage across the United States at biweekly temporal resolution and have been available since 2007. AMoN data have been used in the past to assess  $\text{NH}_3$  trends and for model evaluation (Butler et al., 2016; Paulot et al., 2014; Yu et al., 2018). The ground-level  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratio measurements use Radiello passive samplers (<http://www.radiello.com>); previous studies have found that these have a mean relative bias of  $-9\%$  compared with annular denuder systems and a precision of 5% (Puchalski et al., 2011, 2015).

Four of the AMoN sites are located within our innermost nested model domain (D3; see Figure 1), while three sites are within our intermediate nested domain (D2). Site and model domain details are provided in Figure 1, Table 1, and section 2.3. These seven sites are located in four different land use regions including crop land (WI35, IL37, and IL11), livestock (NE98), remote or background sites (WI07 and MN18), and Urban (IN99). The AMoN sites used here thus represent a diversity of  $\text{NH}_3$  emission characteristics within the U.S. Corn Belt for comparisons with our model results.

Fine particle ( $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  mass) observations within the Minneapolis-Saint Paul metropolitan area (Table 2) were also used to evaluate the WRF-Chem model performance. These data were provided by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) air quality system (<https://aq5.epa.gov/api>). Such data have been widely used to evaluate atmospheric model performance (Hu et al., 2013; Yegorova et al., 2011; Zhu et al., 2018). Supporting meteorological data including wind direction (WD), wind speed (WS), 2-m air temperature ( $T_2$ ), and relative humidity (RH) were measured at the US-Ro1 Ameriflux site, which is located within 5 km of the KCMP tall tower. Three additional Ameriflux sites, including Ro4, Ro5, and Ro6, were also used to evaluate  $T_2$ . Planetary boundary layer (PBL) height observations (seasonal average from November to February) were obtained at a nearby site ( $\sim 20$ -km distance) in 2009 and used to compare with our model simulations given the lack of direct observations during our study period. The 3-hourly NARR (North American Regional Reanalysis) PBL heights reanalysis were also used.

**Table 1**  
*NH<sub>3</sub> Observation Sites (Including AMoN Sites and KCMP Tall Tower) and EPA PM<sub>2.5</sub> Site Information*

Site ID	State	Latitude (°)	Longitude (°)	Elevation (m)	Model domain	Land use
KCMP	MN	44.69	-93.07	290	Domain3	Agriculture
WI35	WI	45.21	-90.60	472	Domain3	Agriculture
NE98	NE	42.83	-97.85	443	Domain3	Agriculture (Range)
IL37	IL	42.29	-90.00	274	Domain3	Agriculture
WI07	WI	43.47	-88.62	287	Domain3	Remote
MN18	MN	47.95	-91.50	524	Domain2	Remote
IL11	IL	40.05	-88.37	212	Domain2	Agriculture
IN99	IN	39.81	-86.11	230	Domain2	Urban
Apple Valley	MN	44.75	-93.20	305	Domain3	Urban
Ben Franklin School	MN	44.00	-92.45	/	Domain3	Urban
Harding High School	MN	44.96	-93.04	296	Domain3	Urban
Talahi School	MN	45.55	-94.13	/	Domain3	Urban
St. Michael School	MN	45.21	-93.67	288	Domain3	Urban

Abbreviations: EPA: Environmental Protection Agency; PM<sub>2.5</sub>: particulate matter 2.5.

### 2.3. WRF-Chem Model Setup

The WRF-Chem model (version 3.9.1.1) simulations used three nested domains with spatial resolutions of 45, 15, and 5 km, respectively (Figure 1). The intermediate 15-km domain (D2) contained the majority of the U.S. Corn Belt including 10 states (Chen et al., 2018). The innermost 5-km domain (D3) included Northern Iowa (a hotspot for NH<sub>3</sub> livestock emissions) and southern Minnesota, which is dominated by agricultural lands. Comparisons of average NH<sub>3</sub> emissions, NH<sub>3</sub> mixing ratios, NH<sub>3</sub> dry deposition velocity ( $V_d$ ), and NH<sub>3</sub> dry deposition fluxes were conducted based on different land use classifications, where the percent coverage for 25 plant functional types was provided by CLM45-BGC (Community Land Model coupled to Biogeochemistry) with a spatial resolution of 0.125° (Oleson et al., 2013). As shown in Figures 1b and 1c, we aggregated land use into two different categories: crops and tree/shrub (the latter is referred to hereafter as forested area) to represent agricultural and natural ecosystems. To better evaluate uncertainties associated with different land uses, model results were compared across varying coverage thresholds of 70%, 80%, and 90% to define these two different land surfaces (see results in section 3.5). As shown in Figure 1, the tall tower observations can provide important information regarding the atmospheric transport of NH<sub>3</sub> from both managed agricultural lands (predominantly lying to the south and east) and natural ecosystems (to the north and west), which provides a unique opportunity to quantify anthropogenic emissions and deposition for both managed and natural ecosystems.

All three model domains have 36 vertical layers extending from the land surface to a height of 20 km, corresponding to a pressure height of 50 hPa. This includes eight additional layers we added below 100 m

**Table 2**  
*Descriptions of Eight Different NH<sub>3</sub> Emission Cases in WRF-Chem Model*

Case number	NH <sub>3</sub> sources	Details for NH <sub>3</sub> emissions	Time period	Spatial resolution	NH <sub>3</sub> emissions in domain 3 (nmol · m <sup>-2</sup> · s <sup>-1</sup> )
Case1	NEI 2011	Diurnal variations	November 2017	4 km	3.23
Case2	NEI 2011	Constant (no diurnal variations)	November 2017	4 km	3.23
Case3	NEI 2017	Scaled NEI 2011 to 2017	November 2017	4 km	2.18
Case4	NEI 2017	Zero North Iowa State	November 2017	4 km	1.50
Case5	NEI 2017	Zero domains 2 and 3	November 2017	4 km	0
Case6	EDGAR	Diurnal variations	November 2017	0.1°	1.75
Case7	NEI 2011,2017, EDGAR	Same as Cases 1, 5, and 6	November 2018	0.1° and 4 km	1.75–3.23
Case8	NEI 2017	Scale NEI 2011 to 2017	2017	4 km	2.18

Abbreviations: EDGAR: Emission Database for Global Atmospheric Research; NEI: National Emission Inventory; WRF-Chem: Weather Research and Forecasting model coupled with Chemistry.

to improve the simulation of  $\text{NH}_3$  in terms of its vertical transport and gas-particle phase partitioning. Specifically, levels were added at vertical intervals of 10–20 m, including two with midpoints at 100- and 56-m elevation for direct comparison with the tall tower observations. The namelist settings are available in the supporting information.

### 2.3.1. Gas-Phase Chemical and Aerosol Mechanisms

The gas-phase mechanism applied is the Regional Acid Deposition Model, version 2 (RADM2; Stockwell et al., 1990), which contains 59 chemical species and 157 gas phase reactions, of which 21 are photolytic. The aerosol modules include the inorganic fraction of the Modal Aerosol Dynamics Model for Europe (MADE) and the Second Organic Aerosol Model (SORGAM) for the carbonaceous fraction (Ackermann et al., 1998; Schell et al., 2001). Three log-normally distributed modes were applied for the simulation of particle size distribution in the MADE/SORGAM mechanisms, including the Aitken mode ( $<0.1\text{-}\mu\text{m}$  diameter), accumulation mode ( $0.1\text{--}2\ \mu\text{m}$ ), and coarse mode ( $>2\ \mu\text{m}$ ).

The chemical boundary conditions applied idealized profiles, which were embedded in the WRF-Chem model, and then by running the model for 1 week prior to each 1-month simulation, the simulated chemical fields at the end of this 7-day WRF-Chem spin up were applied as the background values for our simulations (Chu et al., 2018; Tuccella et al., 2012). Initial and boundary conditions for relevant meteorological fields were based on reanalysis data from the National Centers for Environmental Prediction with horizontal and temporal resolution of  $1^\circ$  and 6 hr, respectively. The physical configurations are summarized in Table S1 in the supporting information.

In WRF-Chem, the dry deposition ( $F_d$ ) of  $\text{NH}_3$  is simulated following the parameterization of Wesely (1989),

$$F_d = C_{\text{NH}_3} \times V_d \quad (1)$$

where  $C_{\text{NH}_3}$  is the  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratio at the first grid height and  $V_d$  represents  $\text{NH}_3$  dry deposition velocity calculated as


$$V_d = 1 / (r_a + r_b + r_c) \quad (2)$$

where  $r_a$ ,  $r_b$ , and  $r_c$  represent the aerodynamic, quasi-laminar boundary layer, and canopy resistance terms, respectively. We note here that the WRF-Chem model framework does not yet include a dynamic bidirectional representation of the  $\text{NH}_3$  fluxes. The potential limitations and uncertainties associated with this simplification are discussed further below.

### 2.3.2. Anthropogenic Emissions

Three different anthropogenic inventories were used in this study: EDGAR HTAP v2 (hereafter EDGAR) for global emissions, as well as NEI 2011 and NEI 2017 (derived based on NEI 2011 and hereafter defined as derived NEI 2017) for North American emissions (EPA, see details in section 2.3.3). EDGAR provides monthly emissions, while NEI provides an annual emission estimate. It is well known that  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions exhibit strong seasonal variations and are generally highest in spring/summer; however, the EDGAR  $\text{NH}_3$  emission rates for November are close to the annual average (scaling factor: 94.1%). Therefore, we applied the NEI annual emissions for the simulation of  $\text{NH}_3$  in November. For other months, we did not apply monthly scaling factors on  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions given that large biases were previously reported (Paulot et al., 2014) and we also found that the monthly scaling factors for EDGAR HTAP v2 and v4.3.1 products showed poor agreement for each month and differed by as much as a factor of 3 during the spring and summer (Figure S1 in the supporting information). Further, based on our sensitivity tests (Table S2), the simulated ground-level  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios and the dry deposition changed almost linearly with changes in  $\text{NH}_3$  emission. For these reasons, we also applied these monthly scaling factors (derived from EDGAR HTAP v2, which looks more reasonable than v4.3.1; Figure S1) offline to calibrate  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratio and dry deposition for comparisons, as discussed in section 3.5.

For perspective, within a 100-km radius of the tall tower, agricultural  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions (fertilizer and livestock) accounted for 92% ( $2.30\ \text{nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ ) of annual total emissions based on the EDGAR dataset, with the remaining 8% attributed to energy, industry, residential, and transport categories. The annually averaged  $\text{NH}_3$  emission for the U.S. Corn Belt was  $1.53\ \text{nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ . Hotspot emissions of  $5.00\ \text{nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  were associated with intensive livestock operations near the northern border of Iowa (Figures 2a–2c).



**Figure 2.** (a) National Emission Inventory (NEI) 2011  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions for Case 1, (b) North Iowa hotspot removed for Case 4, (c) Emission Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR) emissions for Case 6, and (d) diurnal variations factors of  $\text{NH}_3$  in NEI 2011. Note that the numbers indicate domain-averaged  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions.

According to the USDA 2018 report on agricultural products, 36% of U.S. hogs are raised in Iowa. The NEI 2011 emission inventory indicated that fertilizer and livestock accounted for 41.2% and 58.8% of the total agricultural emissions for Minnesota. In Iowa, these emissions accounted for 26.6% and 73.3%, respectively.

NEI 2011 is the most recent inventory available for conducting these WRF-Chem experiments. We applied annual scaling factors (Table S3, <https://www.epa.gov/air-emissions-inventories>) from EPA for both Minnesota and the United States in order to derive NEI 2017 pollutant emissions (including NH<sub>3</sub>, CO, NO, NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>) for the year of our analysis (2017) based on the NEI 2011 inventory. We note here that the EPA assumed pollution emissions that were constant from 2014 to 2017 given the lack of available data at the state scale. The scaling factor for 2014 was thus applied for the NEI 2017 emissions for domain 3. Based on the EPA annual NH<sub>3</sub> emission trends (not including biomass burning) for Minnesota and the United States, NH<sub>3</sub> emissions have decreased from about  $2.06 \times 10^5$  tons in 2011 to  $1.39 \times 10^5$  tons (32.5% decrease) in 2014 for Minnesota and decreased from  $4.24 \times 10^5$  tons to  $3.56 \times 10^5$  tons (15.5% decrease) for the United States from 2011 to 2017.

### 2.3.3. Case Studies and Model Experiments

We used the following case studies to gain new insights into regional NH<sub>3</sub> emissions, source transport, and dry deposition behavior. The simulation periods included November for both 2017 and 2018 and four example months in 2017. Cases 1–6 are focused on relatively high NH<sub>3</sub> emission episodes in November 2017 and Case 7 examined very low emissions during November 2018 using parallel model experiments. Finally, in Case 8, we extended the analyses to four example months in 2017 representing the four seasons to evaluate annual NH<sub>3</sub> emissions and dry deposition. The most recent state-of-the-art emission inventory is NEI 2011. Here, we use NEI 2011 as the baseline for comparisons outlined in the case studies below. Further, we derived the NEI 2017 emissions with the assumption that there are no spatial variations in emission trends observed from 2011 through 2017.

Case 1 involves simulations for November 2017, which is based on emissions prescribed using NEI 2011 and is used here as a first try and baseline simulation (Figure 2a). This case aims to simulate the hourly NH<sub>3</sub> mixing ratios and dry deposition and is compared with the tall tower observations to see whether the high NH<sub>3</sub> episodes can be captured by the WRF-Chem model and the NEI 2011 NH<sub>3</sub> emission inventory.

Case 2 focuses on the same period (November 2017) and uses temporally constant (without hourly variations) NH<sub>3</sub> 2011 emissions with all other conditions the same as for Case 1. When compared with the tall tower NH<sub>3</sub> mixing ratio observations, Case 2 can be used to quantify the meteorological effect on NH<sub>3</sub> emissions and mixing ratios.

Case 3 applies the derived NEI 2017 inventory and compared the results with Case 1 to examine if the NH<sub>3</sub> emission trends provide a more accurate simulation than NEI 2011. This case represents a best estimate of 2017 emissions.

Case 4 uses the same emissions as prescribed for Case 3. However, the NH<sub>3</sub> emission hotspots in northern Iowa (42.5–43.5°N, 91–96.5°W, around 450 km<sup>2</sup>) were zeroed out (Figure 2b) to help quantify how these hotspots in the U.S. Corn Belt impact regional NH<sub>3</sub> distribution and transport. Specifically, we used Case 4 to examine how much these NH<sub>3</sub> hotspots contributed to the tall tower observations in Minnesota.

Case 5 applies zero NH<sub>3</sub> emissions in both domains 2 and 3 for November 2017 (other pollution emissions are the same as for Case 1), while the NEI 2017 inventory is used for domain 1. This case is a zero local emission study. Case 5 was used to quantify the NH<sub>3</sub> mixing ratio and dry deposition associated with long-range atmospheric transport by comparing the results with Case 3.

Case 6 uses NH<sub>3</sub> emissions from the EDGAR inventory (other pollution emissions are the same as for Case 1) and then compared the results with the NEI 2011 simulations and observations to examine which inventory best simulated the high emission event observed in November 2017 (Figure 2c).

Case 7 examines differences in observations and simulations for November 2018 (lower NH<sub>3</sub> mixing ratio observations) and November 2017 (higher NH<sub>3</sub> mixing ratios) using all three inventories. Case 7 provides an opportunity to better understand the factors contributing to high NH<sub>3</sub> emissions and our ability to simulate them. It provides a good opportunity to evaluate the temperature sensitivity of NH<sub>3</sub> emissions.

Case 8 aims to quantify the annual dry deposition to managed and natural ecosystems and to evaluate the atmospheric transport processes on the observed seasonal  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratio variations. Four months are simulated (using derived NEI 2017 emissions) in 2017 to represent seasonal variation (spring: May, summer: August, autumn: November, and winter: February); see details in sections 3.4 and 3.5.

### 3. Results and Discussions

#### 3.1. Spatial Distribution of $\text{NH}_3$ Emissions

The spatial distribution of  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions from NEI 2011 and EDGAR inventories is shown in Figures 2a and 2c (and Table 2). Ammonia emissions from NEI 2011 and derived NEI 2017 were larger than from EDGAR, implying that a national inventory and a global inventory are unlikely to make use of the same level of details of emission information. Based on the EDGAR inventory, agricultural emissions play a dominant role in the regional  $\text{NH}_3$  balance, accounting for 97% of total  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions in domain 3. This value is close to the NEI 2011 value (i.e., 95%). Diurnal variation factors for  $\text{NH}_3$  (scaled to the daily average; Figure 2d) were derived from the default WRF-Chem emission generator for different source categories. According to the EDGAR inventory, the mean emission rate from the Northern Iowa hotspot is 3.3 times that of the U.S. Corn Belt average and 2.9 times that of our study domain 3. This hotspot is related to intensive livestock production where 22.6 million hogs were raised in Iowa in 2018, representing 35.9% of the national hog production.


#### 3.2. Evaluation of Simulated Meteorological Fields and $\text{PM}_{2.5}$

Comparisons between observed and simulated  $T_2$ , RH, WD, and WS are displayed in Figure S2 and Table S4. The statistical metrics (RMSE: root-mean-square error, MB: mean bias, and  $R^2$ : correlation coefficient) indicate reasonably good performance for these selected variables. WS was slightly overestimated, perhaps because of discrepancies in surface roughness between the WRF-Chem grid cell (i.e., 5-km resolution) and the field scale (i.e., less than 100-m resolution) observations where roughness is consistent and well defined. Overall, these comparisons did not reveal large or persistent biases that would be expected to significantly compromise the model-measurement analyses for  $\text{NH}_3$ .

The PBL height is a critical factor controlling scalar concentration variations. Hu et al. (2018) and Fu et al. (2017) conducted atmospheric inverse analyses for this same study domain and tall tower site for  $\text{CO}_2$  and  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  budgets, respectively. Their results indicated relatively good performance in simulating PBL height using the WRF model with the same boundary layer scheme (Yonsei University [YSU] scheme), as applied in our WRF-Chem simulations. Figure S3 shows that the WRF-Chem model generally reproduces the diurnal variations of PBL height and simulated a lower PBL height than NARR ( $R^2 = 0.52$  for 2017 and 0.53 for 2018,  $p < 0.001$ ; RMSE = 427 m for 2017 and 414 m for 2018). Here we note that the NARR PBL height was unrealistic for a number of days (e.g., days 11–14 and days 25–27, November 2018), with PBL heights greater than 1,000 m during the nighttime. Based on the observations for winter 2009 at a nearby observation site, the WRF-Chem simulations show close agreement with the observations at 6:00 and 18:00, where the observations were  $217 \pm 42$  m (mean  $\pm$  SD) at 6:00, and  $337 \pm 36$  m at 18:00. The WRF-Chem model showed lower bias than NARR (Figure S3c).

Variations in mass concentrations of  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  were well captured by WRF-Chem (Figure 3 for Cases 3 and 6). Daily averages for  $\text{NH}_4^+$ ,  $\text{NO}_3^-$ , and  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$  particles are also displayed in Figure S4. When derived NEI 2017 was specified as the emission source, the primary  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  emissions were 76% of the EDGAR case (Table S3) and simulated  $\text{NH}_4^+$  particles were 0.11 and 0.10  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  for NEI 2017 and EDGAR respectively, indicating a relatively small role in secondary  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  formation (Figure 3 for  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ ). The simulated  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  results were between Cases 3 and 5 (without  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions within domains 2 and 3) and showed that the domain 3 averaged ground-level  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  decreased by only 0.27  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  (<5% of total 5.55  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ) even without any  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions within domains 2 and 3. This indicates that agricultural  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions play a relatively minor role in total particle formation within this domain.

As shown in Figure 3, both emission cases performed well in simulating the daily variations of  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  for the five sites. Here, the EDGAR emission case resulted in an RMSE of 4.37, 5.08, 6.31, 3.54, and 3.63  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  for Apple Valley, Ben Franklin School, Harding High School, Talahi School, and Michael Elementary School sites, respectively. The RMSEs for Case 3 (the derived NEI 2017 emission case) were slightly lower at 4.10,



**Figure 3.** (a–e) Comparison of daily averaged particulate matter 2.5 between WRF-Chem simulations and five Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) observation sites for November 2017 and (f) combined data for all site observations and simulations. Note that National Emission Inventory (NEI) 2011 case (Case 1) was not shown because it has the same emissions (exclude  $\text{NH}_3$ ) and almost identical results as Emission Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR) case.


4.58, 5.90, 3.30, and  $3.28 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ , respectively. The observations and simulations showed a peak between days 10 and 15 for November 2017. The simulated values were slightly overestimated at Ben Franklin School and Harding High School sites. In general, both the observed and modeled low  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  mass concentrations are attributed to low primary  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  emissions and relatively low  $\text{NO}_x$  and  $\text{SO}_2$  emissions within this agricultural dominated region.

The 1:1 plot (Figure 3f) summarizes the model  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  performance for all five sites and for both emission cases including NEI 2017 and EDGAR. The ensemble five-site average values were  $8.92$  and  $9.96 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  for NEI 2017 and EDGAR cases, respectively, and were 17.3% and 31.1% higher than the average value of the observations ( $7.60 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ). The overall performance was very good for the derived NEI 2017 case, which slightly overpredicted  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  ( $\text{MB} = 1.32 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ,  $R = 0.58$  for both  $p < 0.001$ ). The difference between the EDGAR versus derived NEI 2017 simulated  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  was mainly attributed to the primary  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  emissions, where the primary  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  emission for the derived NEI 2017 case was 76% of EDGAR. Further, the model simulations indicated that the secondary particles from  $\text{NH}_3$ ,  $\text{NO}_x$ , and  $\text{SO}_2$  emissions made a minor contribution (Figure S4). When emissions were specified using the derived NEI 2017 emissions, the WRF-Chem simulated  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  was closer to the 1:1 line in Figure 3f. We note here that the EPA assumed that state-level pollution emissions were constant from 2014 to 2017 due to a lack of available data. We therefore hypothesize that reduced primary  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  emission for the years 2014 to 2017 can help to explain the model overestimate of the observations.

### 3.3. Simulations of November $\text{NH}_3$ Mixing Ratios and Dry Deposition Fluxes

#### 3.3.1. Spatial Distribution of $\text{NH}_3$ Mixing Ratios

The spatial distribution of simulated  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios is displayed in Figures 4a and 4b. Because there was high spatial correlation, with respect to the distribution, between simulations using NEI 2011, derived NEI 2017 and EDGAR, we have shown only results for Case 3 of derived NEI 2017. Monthly averages from 7 AMoN sites and the KCMP tower are also shown and were found to be highly correlated with the simulated  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios. Intensive livestock production in northern Iowa is an  $\text{NH}_3$  hotspot within our study



**Figure 4.** (a) Spatial distribution of simulated NH<sub>3</sub> mixing ratios at ground-level for domain 2: note that Ammonia Monitoring Network (AMoN) site observations are at ground-level; (b) 100-m height for domain 3 for November 2017, NH<sub>3</sub> observations of seven AMoN sites, and KCMP tall tower are also shown. (c) Comparisons between model results with AMoN and tall tower observations (in red colors), biweekly results are shown, and the error bars indicated 9% relative error.

domain. The simulated  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios at this hotspot exceeded 30 ppb at the ground-level. Further, the simulations also show that agricultural lands in southern Minnesota are associated with high  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios.


The simulated  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios at the 100-m height above these agricultural hotspots reveal that averaged mixing ratios can exceed 10 ppb. These simulations for the 100-m height also illustrate the effect of atmospheric transport from northern Iowa to Minnesota. The difference of  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios (Case 3 versus Case 4—i.e., simulations with and without emissions from the northern Iowa hotspots) is shown in Figure S5. It reveals that northern Iowa hotspots can have a strong influence on regional  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratio distributions and also at the KCMP tower site. The results indicate that these emissions contributed to a mean 1.07 ppb enhancement at 100-m height during November, which is 17.6% of the simulated  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios and indicates a significant contribution via long-distance transport. Considering the average distance (400 km) between KCMP and the Iowa hotspot and a simulated November WS of 5.0 m/s at the 100-m height, the average transport time was about 23 hr.

The large vertical gradient in  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios between ground-level and the 100-m height can reflect variations in emissions, deposition, or atmospheric chemical reactions related to gas-particle phase partitioning. As noted above, the simulated ammonium particle concentration was relatively small ( $<0.15 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  equivalent to  $<0.18$  ppb gaseous  $\text{NH}_3$ ). This suggests that these vertical  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratio gradients are driven primarily by emissions and deposition. The  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratio profiles at our tall tower site are shown in Figure S6. Each case demonstrates that the profile decreases logarithmically with increasing height. To better understand the vertical distribution of  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios, we compared the model simulations with the tall tower observations from the 100- and 56-m heights. Here, the average  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratio observations were 6.64 and 6.76 ppb for the 100- and 56-m levels in November 2017, respectively. The observations thus showed a mean  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratio gradient of  $-0.27$  ppb/100 m when assuming a linear fit as a function of height extending to 100 m. The simulated gradients for the tall tower location ranged from  $-0.21$  to  $-0.84$  ppb/100 m and were in good agreement with the observations (data shown in Figure S6). For most of the simulation cases and observation periods, the negative gradient between 100 and 56 m indicated that the study domain acted as a net  $\text{NH}_3$  source.

It is interesting to note in Case 5 (zero local emissions scenario for hotspots in domains 2 and 3) that the modeled  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios exhibited a positive gradient (i.e., increasing with increasing height) below 300–500 m, which is the opposite direction of the other cases. Here, the  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratio peaked at  $\sim 400$  m and decreased both above and below this height. This indicates that this height acts as a transition layer where downward and long-range-transport  $\text{NH}_3$  from outer domain was balanced. Similar results have been observed near the Colorado Front Range, USA (Li et al., 2017; Tevlin et al., 2017), where some individual profile observations have shown a decreasing  $\text{NH}_3$  gradient below 10 m and an increase above this height when the land acts as a strong  $\text{NH}_3$  sink. Further, aircraft  $\text{NH}_3$  observations near coastal Virginia and Maryland, USA, reveal vertical gradients ( $\sim 0.3$  ppb per 1 km) with  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios increasing with increasing height above the surface, indicating that the surface was acting as a net  $\text{NH}_3$  sink (Lebel et al., 1985).

### 3.3.2. Comparisons Between Simulated and Observed Hourly $\text{NH}_3$ Mixing Ratios

Simulated hourly  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios for November 2017, using three different  $\text{NH}_3$  emission inventories, were compared with the 100-m  $\text{NH}_3$  observations in Figure 5a. The monthly averages were 6.65, 8.44, 4.82, and 6.11 ppb for the observations, NEI 2011 (Case 1), EDGAR (Case 6), and derived NEI 2017 (Case 3), respectively. The RMSE among NEI 2011, EDGAR and derived NEI 2017 were 6.09, 5.12, and 5.37 ppb, respectively. The simulated  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios using NEI 2011 emissions were biased high before 12 November and on 20 November. Simulations based on derived NEI 2017 and EDGAR emissions performed better during the same period, and after 13 November. The simulations based on EDGAR emissions were slightly lower than the tall tower observations. In general, derived NEI 2017 gave the overall best fit to the observations of November 2017. As shown in Figure 5a, the observations reveal nine high (i.e., greater than 10 ppb)  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratio episodes during this study period. These episodes were consistent in having southerly wind flow and increasing air temperature (Figure 5c). Observed  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios reached 35 ppb on 15 November with three other episodes occurring on 20, 24, and 28 November that exceeded 20 ppb. The model results showed high consistency with the  $\text{NH}_3$  observations and performed well in reproducing all



**Figure 5.** (a) Comparisons of NH<sub>3</sub> mixing ratios between observations and simulations using different NH<sub>3</sub> emissions, (b) simulated dry deposition flux and velocity for NH<sub>3</sub>, and (c) the relationship between wind direction, air temperature and NH<sub>3</sub> observations.

nine high NH<sub>3</sub> emission episodes observed in November 2017. A recent study in Ireland defined five different health risk categories associated with varying NH<sub>3</sub> concentrations. The most serious health risk is associated with NH<sub>3</sub> mixing ratios in excess of 4 μg/m<sup>3</sup> (~5.3 ppb; Kelleghan et al., 2019). Thus, ground-level NH<sub>3</sub> mixing ratios for our domain 3 frequently (336 hr, 48% of this month) exceeded this threshold in November 2017 when using the derived NEI 2017 inventory.

Here, we examine the key drivers that can influence these high NH<sub>3</sub> episodes. As shown earlier, particulate NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> makes up only a minor fraction of the NH<sub>x</sub> budget and thus does not explain the episodes. The synoptic weather patterns can control such high episodes with southerly air flow transporting emissions from key source areas. Further, the model simulation and observational results described above, occasionally exhibiting high or low biases, indicate that NH<sub>3</sub> emissions cannot be explained with only activity data and constant EFs. For instance, the reported Q<sub>10</sub> of NH<sub>3</sub> emissions can vary from 1.25 to 4.6 (Riddick et al., 2016; Sutton et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2017) indicating relatively strong sensitivity to air temperature. During our study

period,  $\text{NH}_3$  EFs varied from 1.56 to 21 for air temperatures ranging from 12 to 33°C. Therefore, some of the model disagreement describe in Figure 5a is partially attributed to the variations in air temperature effect on  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions that are not explicitly considered by these default  $\text{NH}_3$  emission inventories.


In November 2018,  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios observed at the tall tower were substantially lower compared to November 2017. These observations and differences in weather and climate between years provide a unique opportunity to examine the fidelity of the WRF-Chem model simulations and the reasons for high  $\text{NH}_3$  episodes. In these simulations the emissions are specified using the same inventories applied to November 2017. However, differences in meteorological conditions (i.e., transport, boundary layer height, and temperature) varied between these years. We compared the simulated PBL heights between these two periods with 416 m for 2017 and 448 m for 2018, indicating a minor role in the simulated  $\text{NH}_3$  difference. The observed November  $T_2$  in 2017 was 3.1°C higher than 2018, which was in relatively good agreement with modeled difference of 2.32°C, indicating that higher air temperature in November 2017 enhanced  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions. The observed frequency of southerly wind flow decreased from 37.1% in November 2017 to 27.6% in November 2018. Further, the actual amounts of synthetic and organic nitrogen fertilizer applied within the study domain are expected to be relatively consistent based on recent fertilizer trends (Griffis et al., 2019). In this way, the model simulations can be used to help isolate how different factors influence these observations.

For November 2018, the observed monthly average  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratio was 3.75 ppb. The simulated monthly average mixing ratios were 6.53, 3.49, and 4.46 ppb based on the NEI 2011 (Case 1), EDGAR (Case 6), and derived NEI 2017 (Case 3) emission inventories, respectively (Figure 6). The RMSE between NEI 2011, EDGAR, derived NEI 2017, and the observations were 4.32, 2.80, and 3.22 ppb, respectively. The model results based on NEI 2011 were consistently biased high. The results based on derived NEI 2017 and EDGAR emission inventories showed better agreement with the observations over the entire month. Further, the simulated  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios in November 2018 also showed high  $\text{NH}_3$  episodes that exceeded 20 ppb. These simulated episodes, however, were not consistent with the tower observations. This discrepancy between November 2017 and November 2018 suggests that the temperature sensitivity of  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions is strong (not captured by the model) on  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions. The average  $\text{NH}_3$  observations in November 2017 were 1.77 times when compared with November 2018. The ratios (simulated  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios) of NEI 2011 (Case 1), EDGAR (Case 6), and derived NEI 2017 (Case 3) between November 2017 and 2018 were 1.29, 1.38, and 1.37, respectively. Because the WRF-Chem model applied the same emissions for these 2 years, these ratios of 1.29 to 1.38 can be used to help isolate the effect of atmospheric transport on  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios. For example, WD differences between these years, in relation to the source distribution, is one key factor causing the large difference in mixing ratios between the two years. Note that  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratio observation differences between these two years are primarily attributed to both atmospheric transport factors and changes in actual  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions. Further, the results of 1.37 (1.77/1.29) to 1.28 (1.77/1.38) can be attributed to emission differences between November 2017 and November 2018.

### 3.3.3. Temperature Effect on $\text{NH}_3$ Mixing Ratio and Emissions

The combination between large air temperature differences with higher concentrations (after accounting for other meteorological effects) between November 2017 and 2018 provides evidence that temperature can have a substantial effect on the  $\text{NH}_3$  EFs. Based on previous field studies, the observed EFs are considered zero when the air temperature is below 0°C (Sutton et al., 2013; Xiuming Zhang et al., 2017). Here, we attempt to quantify the sensitivity of  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions based on simulated  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios and average domain 3 simulated air temperatures at the 2-m level. The average  $T_2$  were 1.49°C in November 2017 and 0.76°C in November 2018. We also calculated the cumulative temperature, when air temperatures exceeding the freezing temperature, in November for these two years, and found that the cumulative  $T_{2m}$  was 1625°C for November 2017 and 1018°C for November 2018. The cumulative  $T_{2m}$  in 2017 was 1.60 times than that of 2018. These results suggest that the higher temperatures in 2017 caused higher  $\text{NH}_3$  EFs and emissions. The temperature effect ( $Q_{10}$ ) will be further discussed below.

Case 2 used temporally constant  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions, for November 2017, to help isolate the meteorological effects on  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions. Both observations and the WRF-Chem model results revealed an exponential relationship between  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios and air temperature. The Case 2 results also reveal the exponential relationship between  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios and air temperatures (even though  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions from the




**Figure 6.** Simulations for November 2018 for (a) comparisons of  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios between observations and simulations using different  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions) and (b) dry deposition flux and velocity for  $\text{NH}_3$ .

inventories are not temperature dependent), indicating that the observed and modeled exponential relationships were not solely caused by the sensitivity of  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions to temperature but also by atmospheric transport processes such as a change of WD in relation to source distribution.

We fit an exponential relation to these data as shown in Figure 7a. There are three potential explanations for these relations. First, higher air temperature caused higher  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions (biological sensitivity, excluding Case 2). Second, higher air temperatures were correlated with synoptic weather patterns and southerly air flow where there are known  $\text{NH}_3$  hotspots (transport sensitivity; i.e., there is correlation between air temperature and WD and source area). Third, higher air temperature favors  $\text{NH}_4\text{NO}_3$  particle partitioning to gaseous  $\text{NH}_3$ . However, as discussed above, we believe that this last factor is negligible for this region. Based on the regression analyses of the tall tower observations, we found that  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios increased from about 4 to 19 ppb ( $Q_{10} = 4.8$ , including both biological sensitivity and transport sensitivity) when air temperature increased from 0 to 10°C. Case 2 showed that  $\text{NH}_3$  increased from about 7 to 13 ppb, indicating a  $Q_{10}$  of 1.9 (i.e., this only represents the transport sensitivity). The relative changes from 1.9 to 4.8 times can only reflect the biological sensitivity on  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions that was mainly caused by air temperature; we therefore interpret the ratio 2.5 between the two as the temperature sensitivity of  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions.

Dynamic reemission of  $\text{NH}_3$  is not accounted for in the WRF-Chem model, which may bring some potential biases and uncertainties in the temperature-dependent simulations. These uncertainties are likely to be within the overall uncertainties of the simulated gross  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions, because the EFs of agricultural  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions are based on field experiments, which also contain the reemission of deposited  $\text{NH}_3$ . Here, the simulated  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios from April to September are in very good agreement with the tall tower observations. Most of the scatters in these plots are close to the 1:1 line, and their histograms show very similar distributions. Some of the large departures might be related to the fact that we do not simulate bidirectional  $\text{NH}_3$  flux or they could result from transport errors in the model simulations. Further, we also note that there is relatively good agreement between our estimate of NEE and that observed based on the tall tower flux-gradient observations (Griffis et al., 2019).




**Figure 7.** (a) Exponential relationship between 2 m air temperature and NH<sub>3</sub> mixing ratios for different case studies and (b) the linear relationship between NH<sub>3</sub> emissions and dry deposition flux in six cases for November 2017.

These results for  $Q_{10}$  agree reasonably well with previous studies (Riddick et al., 2016; Sutton et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2017). Sutton et al. (2013) used a land-atmosphere model that included a bidirectional NH<sub>3</sub> flux scheme. Their model incorporated the effects of temperature and moisture on NH<sub>3</sub> emissions. They showed that NH<sub>3</sub> emissions increased by 42% (28–67%) when the model temperature increased by 5°C, indicating a  $Q_{10}$  of 2.0 (1.6–2.8) in their model. Zhang et al. (2017) applied  $Q_{10}$  values of 1.25–2.50 for different NH<sub>3</sub> sources and used a value of 2.0 for all fertilizer applications. These  $Q_{10}$  values are similar to those derived from our tall tower NH<sub>3</sub> observations and WRF-Chem modeling.

### 3.3.4. Interpreting the Relationship Between NH<sub>3</sub> Emissions and Dry Deposition Flux

We examined the relation between NH<sub>3</sub> emissions and deposition for the case studies described above. Figure 7b illustrates that there is a strong linear relationship between NH<sub>3</sub> emissions and the dry deposition flux for the six different emission scenarios of our study. This relation appears to be robust and holds for the two extreme experimental cases of zero flux for domains 2 and 3, and zero flux for the hotspots near northern Iowa, where the NH<sub>3</sub> distribution can deviate substantially from the other four test cases. The domain-averaged dry deposition flux can be estimated using the regression equation  $y = 0.42x + 0.07$  ( $R^2 = 0.99$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), where  $x$  and  $y$  represent NH<sub>3</sub> emissions and dry deposition flux ( $\text{nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ ), respectively. The slope is unitless and represents the domain-averaged dry deposition characteristics (Figure S7), which are mainly dominated by land surface characteristics and meteorological fields (Wesely, 1989; Wu et al., 2011). We further calculated domain 3 averaged dry deposition velocities for these six cases, and the result was  $0.44 \pm 0.01$  cm/s (ave  $\pm$  SD), with its value almost the same as the slope. This indicates that 42% of emissions within this domain were deposited within the region and that the other 58% was transported out of the region. The intercept 0.07 is close to the dry deposition of Case 5 ( $0.06 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ ) and can be interpreted as the dry deposition without regional emissions, resulting only from the long-distance transport



**Figure 8.** Time series of observed and modeled hourly  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios of Case 8 for each typical month.

from the outermost domain. Using this relation, we estimated  $\text{NH}_3$  NEE to be 58% of gross emissions for November 2017. These results are consistent with our previous flux-gradient estimates, which concluded that dry deposition accounted for about 30–40% of gross emissions, with the remaining 60–70% for  $\text{NH}_3$  NEE (Griffis et al., 2019).


#### 3.4. Annual $\text{NH}_3$ Mixing Ratio Comparisons for 2017

To provide an annual view of  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios and  $\text{NH}_3$  NEE, we extended our analyses from November to other months (February, May, August, and November) in 2017. The WRF-Chem  $\text{NH}_3$  simulations, using the derived NEI 2017 emission inventory, were compared to the tall tower 100-m observations for each month. As shown in Figure 8, the model simulations generally capture the episodic and diurnal variations of the observed  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios with RMSE ( $R^2$ ) of 3.69 ppb (0.36), 2.22 ppb (0.13), and 5.37 ppb (0.49) for May, August, and November 2017, respectively. The WRF-Chem model performed well in capturing the relatively low  $\text{NH}_3$  observations in August and the higher  $\text{NH}_3$  values in November 2017. The observed high  $\text{NH}_3$  episodes in the middle of May were not captured by WRF-Chem. These large emissions were likely driven by synthetic fertilizer application within the region, which is typical for this time period (Griffis et al., 2017). Here, the simulations underestimated the emissions during this period. Previous research has suggested that spring emissions were underestimated by emission inventories such as NEI (Butler et al., 2016; Paulot et al., 2014).

#### 3.5. Net Ecosystem $\text{NH}_3$ Exchange

The study domain provides a unique opportunity to examine strong emission and deposition patterns associated with agricultural lands to the south and west, and forested lands to the northeast and southeast (Figure 1). Based on the tall tower measurement-model comparisons above, the model is able to represent the drivers of  $\text{NH}_3$  for this region, which supports its use to examine broader-scale processes such as regional  $\text{NH}_3$  NEE. To assess regional net  $\text{NH}_3$  sinks/sources in our study domain, we calculated the modeled  $\text{NH}_3$  NEE for different cases. Figure 9a shows that the  $\text{NH}_3$  NEE for 2017 (Case 6) was highly correlated with land surface categories, with positive  $\text{NH}_3$  NEE in agricultural lands and negative in natural ecosystems. In northern Minnesota and Wisconsin we see a distinct transition from net  $\text{NH}_3$  source (over croplands to the south and west) to a net sink (over forested areas to the north and east) related to the change in land use (Figures 9a and 1b and 1c). This spatial distribution of  $\text{NH}_3$  NEE is mainly controlled by the  $\text{NH}_3$  emission and mixing ratio distributions rather than  $V_d$ , where  $V_d$  has much smaller spatial variations (Figure S5).

The WRF-Chem model framework does not yet have a bidirectional  $\text{NH}_3$  flux scheme, which may result in some limitations and uncertainties when simulating the  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios. A few other models have taken bidirectional exchange into account (Bash et al., 2013; Cooter et al., 2012; Pleim et al., 2013; Whaley et al., 2018). Previous work with the CMAQ model suggests that this will lead to a slight overestimation of  $\text{NH}_3$  dry deposition (Lonsdale et al., 2017; Lv et al., 2019), and in some regions (e.g., boreal forests), other modeling platforms have suggested that bidirectional fluxes may locally have a controlling impact on atmospheric ammonia concentrations (Whaley et al., 2018). However, in agricultural regions, such as the U.S. Corn Belt, the reemission of stored  $\text{NH}_3$  can be considered as a minor factor compared to the gross emissions (Griffis



**Figure 9.** (a) Spatial distribution of the  $\text{NH}_3$  net ecosystem exchange for Emission Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR) in November 2017, (b)  $\text{NH}_3$  dry depositions for both forests and crops lands for different November (both 2017 and 2018) case studies, (c) seasonal variations of  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios, (d) dry deposition velocity, (e) dry deposition flux, and (f) its ratios.

**Table 3**  
Mean Dry Deposition ( $\text{nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ ) in Different Land Use (Forests and Crops Are Shown), and  $\text{NH}_3$  Mixing Ratio (ppb) Distributions for Forests Lands

Category	Land use	PFTs (%)	Case 1	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5	Case 6	Case 7	Case 7	Case 7
			201711	201711	201711	201711	201711	201811	201811	201811
			(NEI 2011)	(NEI 2017)	(zeros North Iowa)	(zeros Domain 2-3)	(EDGAR)	(NEI 2011)	(EDGAR)	(NEI 2017)
$\text{NH}_3$ dry deposition	Forests	>70	0.31	0.25	0.26	0.04	0.20	0.25	0.14	0.16
		>80	0.29	0.23	0.24	0.04	0.19	0.23	0.12	0.15
		>90	0.27	0.22	0.22	0.04	0.18	0.21	0.12	0.14
	Crops	>70	1.13	0.89	0.83	0.10	0.76	1.12	0.73	0.84
		>80	1.14	0.90	0.83	0.10	0.77	1.14	0.74	0.85
		>90	1.16	0.92	0.83	0.10	0.78	1.17	0.76	0.87
	Ratios	>70	3.63	3.54	3.20	2.43	3.76	4.56	5.40	5.25
		>80	4.00	3.87	3.48	2.61	4.11	5.07	6.03	5.80
		>90	4.36	4.18	3.73	2.72	4.46	5.53	6.57	6.21
$\text{NH}_3$ (ppb)	Forests	>70	1.51	1.20	1.17	0.21	0.96	1.18	0.66	0.79
		>80	1.41	1.12	1.09	0.20	0.90	1.10	0.61	0.73
		>90	1.30	1.04	1.00	0.20	0.84	1.01	0.57	0.67

Abbreviations: EDGAR: Emission Database for Global Atmospheric Research; NEI: National Emission Inventory.

et al., 2019; Sutton et al., 2013). We note that most of our observation station locations are in regions where cropland is the dominant agricultural land use type (see Figures 1c and 1d). Based on our own simulations for forested areas within our study area, we suggest that the reemission of deposition  $\text{NH}_3$  can be safely ignored considering high use efficiency of nitrogen by plants and that the nitrate deposited in these forested areas can rapidly transport to streams and waters without being biologically transformed (Rose et al., 2015; Sebestyen et al., 2014). Significant atmospheric nitrate deposition has also been observed that dissolved in waters at the forest regions, with high spatial and temporal variations (Sebestyen et al., 2019).

We further examined  $\text{NH}_3$  dry deposition rates,  $\text{NH}_3$  NEE, mixing ratios, and  $V_d$  according to land use based on the November case studies described above (Table 3 and Figure 9b). The simulated  $\text{NH}_3$  dry deposition varied between 0.19 to 0.29  $\text{nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  in forested lands (excluding the Case 5 background case) and 0.77 to 1.15  $\text{nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  on agricultural lands for the various case studies examined in November 2017 (excluding Cases 4 and 5). On average,  $\text{NH}_3$  NEE over agricultural areas was upward (positive to the atmosphere) and accounted for 60.1–64.6% of gross  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions. Conversely, the net exchange over forested areas was downward and was on average 2.8–3.1 times greater in magnitude than the gross emissions for these areas across the three inventories in November 2017. The results indicate that these natural ecosystems were important  $\text{NH}_3$  sinks. Agricultural lands, however, were strong  $\text{NH}_3$  sources with emissions 2.5 to 2.8 times the dry deposition rate. By comparing the November dry deposition in years 2017 and 2018, the deposition slightly increased in agricultural (3%) and largely increased in forested domains (46%) for the warmer November 2017 period (relative to November 2018). Thus, future warmer temperatures have potential to enhance agricultural N losses with dry deposition likely increasing in adjacent forested areas. These enhancements are likely to be of significant concern in the late fall and early winter months where warming temperatures overlap with substantial manure and synthetic nitrogen application to the landscape.

To quantify the transport effect of the northern Iowa  $\text{NH}_3$  animal agriculture hotspot to nonagricultural ecosystems, we calculated the difference in forested  $\text{NH}_3$  dry deposition between Case 4 (with no  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions from northern Iowa) and Case 3 (the derived NEI 2017 case). The resulting difference was less than 1.6% for  $\text{NH}_3$  dry deposition in the forested domain and indicated a relatively minor role of this  $\text{NH}_3$  hotspot in long-distance transport to remote nonagricultural lands. Further, using Case 5 (zero flux for domains 2 and 3) and Case 3, we estimated that  $83 \pm 0.4\%$  of the dry deposition to forested areas in our domain can be traced to agricultural emissions from within the U.S. Corn Belt in November 2017.

The simulated  $\text{NH}_3$  NEE was within the range of values reported previously for a typical coniferous canopy with a  $\text{NH}_3$  NEE flux between  $-64.7$  and  $14.1 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  (Duyzer et al., 1992; Andersen et al., 1993, 1999; Pryor et al., 2001). For instance, our values were smaller than average observations for a coniferous forest ( $1.3 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ ) in southern Indiana (Pryor et al., 2001) and  $0.54 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  at a

Norway spruce forest in Denmark (Andersen et al., 1999). The main differences can be attributed to the atmospheric  $\text{NH}_3$  abundance, as the Indiana and Denmark sites were in close proximity to high density agricultural lands (Table S5). For the Danish site,  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions were approximately  $7.0 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  (data were not reported for the southern Indiana site) and provided an important source for downwind dry deposition. Their gross emissions were much higher than our tall tower estimation of  $1.8\text{--}2.1 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  (Griffis et al., 2019). For our study area, if we assume that forested lands in close proximity to agricultural lands have similar  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios as for agricultural areas, the modeled  $\text{NH}_3$  dry deposition will be on the order of  $1 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ .

Comparing our simulations with forested sites in previous studies, the observed annual average  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios were  $0.54 \pm 0.04$ ,  $0.54 \pm 0.08$ , and  $0.33 \pm 0.11$  ppb at three forest sites in Pennsylvania and New York State. The estimated dry deposition was  $0.45 \pm 0.07$ ,  $0.50 \pm 0.09$ , and  $0.32 \pm 0.16 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  for three different sites, which were also remote from major  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions (Butler et al., 2015). These results are in good agreement with our simulations for forested sites that are also remote (i.e.,  $>100$  km) from agricultural  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions.

We extended these analyses for different seasons of 2017 (Case 8). There is a substantial seasonal variation for  $\text{NH}_3$  dry deposition velocity,  $\text{NH}_3$  dry deposition flux, and atmospheric  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios (Figures 9c–9f). Further, we calculated the  $\text{NH}_3$  NEE for agricultural lands in domain 2, which averaged  $1.60 \pm 0.06 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ . This value is consistent with our tall tower observations that are on the order of  $1.26\text{--}1.47 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  (Griffis et al., 2019). The dry deposition rate to forested lands was on the order of  $0.13 \pm 0.01 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ , and  $\text{NH}_3$  NEE was  $-0.07 \pm 0.01 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ . Note that for these simulations, we applied the derived NEI 2017 inventory without monthly variations. When considering monthly scaling factors 0.73, 1.02, 1.35, and 0.94 for February, May, August, and November, respectively, based on the EDGAR inventory, the simulated  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios were higher for May and August and lower in February. Assuming that the ground-level  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios follow this same monthly scaling, we recalculated the ground-level  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratio and dry deposition as shown in Figures 9c and 9e (i.e., red line designates crop lands).

Based on the AMoN observations and modeled  $V_d$  for  $\text{NH}_3$ , Li et al. (2016) calculated an annual average  $\text{NH}_3$  dry deposition of  $1.27 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  in the Upper Midwest. Our simulations for 2017 indicate that the dry deposition rate was  $0.94 \pm 0.02 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  ( $0.97 \pm 0.02 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  after the monthly scaling recalculation) for agricultural lands, which is in excellent agreement with previous estimates. The ecosystem-dependent critical load (a quantitative value above which significant harmful effects on specified sensitive elements of the environment will occur) for nitrogen is estimated to be  $2.5\text{--}5 \text{ kg N} \cdot \text{ha}^{-1} \cdot \text{year}^{-1}$  (Ellis et al., 2013; Pardo et al., 2011). To estimate the nitrogen load in forested areas within our study domain, we combined our simulated  $\text{NH}_3$  dry deposition ( $0.57 \pm 0.04 \text{ kg N} \cdot \text{ha}^{-1} \cdot \text{year}^{-1}$ ) with the findings by Li et al. (2016), who concluded that dry deposition of  $\text{NH}_3$  contributed 19–65% across the United States. Our calculated total nitrogen deposition was  $0.87\text{--}3.00 \text{ kg N} \cdot \text{ha}^{-1} \cdot \text{year}^{-1}$ , which is on average below the critical load of natural parks.

The seasonal variations in the dry deposition flux are driven by variations in both the deposition velocity and the  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratio distributions. The simulated dry deposition velocity was  $0.34 \pm 0.001$  cm/s (winter) and  $0.37 \pm 0.002$  cm/s (autumn) and increased to  $0.81 \pm 0.005$  cm/s (spring) and  $0.73 \pm 0.00$  cm/s (summer) for crops. The dry deposition velocity was  $0.34 \pm 0.004$  cm/s (winter) and  $0.45 \pm 0.004$  cm/s (autumn) and increased to  $0.55 \pm 0.007$  cm/s (spring) and  $0.48 \pm 0.007$  cm/s (summer) for forested lands. The dry deposition flux ratios in spring and summer were much larger than winter and autumn (Figure 9f), resulting in more  $\text{NH}_3$  deposition to forests in the cold season (Figure 9e). This large difference can be explained by two factors: (1) higher vertical turbulence in the warm season leads to higher PBL height and lower atmospheric  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios near the ground and (2)  $V_d$  in the warm season were higher than during the cold season, so that during the period of crop growth, more  $\text{NH}_3$  was deposited near the emission sources with less subsequent atmospheric transport to northern forested areas. Previous studies also observed elevated dry  $\text{NH}_3$  deposition in winter for the Upper Midwest area (Chen et al., 2014; Li et al., 2016), which was driven by relatively high winter  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions from winter fertilizer application and livestock and combined with a relatively shallow PBL.

#### 4. Conclusions

1. The derived NEI 2017 emission inventory showed better agreement with our tall tower observations than the other emission inventories (NEI 2011 and EDGAR), with mean bias (RMSE) of 0.54 (5.37) ppb and 0.71 (3.22) ppb in November, 2017 and 2018, respectively.
2. The regional temperature sensitivity ( $Q_{10}$ ) of gross  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions was estimated to be 2.5, indicating strong potential for significantly higher emissions under warmer conditions. Future warmer temperatures have potential to enhance agricultural N losses and increase dry deposition in downwind natural ecosystems.
3. Intensive livestock  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions in northern Iowa were found to contribute up to 1.07 ppb of  $\text{NH}_3$  at the tall tower site for November 2017, representing about 17.6% of simulated  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios.
4.  $\text{NH}_3$  mixing ratios in domain 3 frequently exceeded (i.e., 336 hr, 48% of November 2017) the high risk air quality health standard of 5.3 ppb.
5. The domain-averaged  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions showed a linear relationship with dry deposition ( $y = 0.42x + 0.07$ ), where  $x$  and  $y$  indicate  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions and dry deposition ( $\text{nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ ), respectively. This can be interpreted as the regional average dry deposition velocity ( $0.44 \pm 0.01$ ) for  $\text{NH}_3$ , and its intercept represents the dry deposition flux ( $0.06 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ ) resulting from long distance transport;
6. November  $\text{NH}_3$  NEE accounted for 60.1–64.6% of gross  $\text{NH}_3$  emissions for agricultural areas and was 2.8–3.1 times greater in magnitude than the gross emissions for forested areas. The simulated  $\text{NH}_3$  NEE were  $1.60 \pm 0.06 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  for agricultural lands and  $-0.07 \pm 0.02 \text{ nmol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  for forests.

#### Acknowledgments

This research was partially supported by the National Science Foundation (grant 1640337), the U.S. Department of Agriculture National Institute of Food and Agriculture (USDA NIFA grant 2018-67019-27808), USDA Agricultural Research Service, and the Minnesota Supercomputing Institute for Advanced Computational Research. Jeffrey D. Wood acknowledges support from the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Biological and Environmental Research Program, through Oak Ridge National Laboratory's Terrestrial Ecosystem Science Focus Area; ORNL is managed by UT-Battelle, LLC, for the U.S. DOE under contract DE-AC05-00OR22725. We acknowledge use of the National Atmospheric Deposition Program databases. Finally, the observational data presented in this manuscript are available at [www.biometeorology.umn.edu/research/data-archives](http://www.biometeorology.umn.edu/research/data-archives) and ESS-DIVE (Deep Insights for Earth Science Data, <https://data.ess-dive.lbl.gov/view/doi:10.15485/1550921>). The  $\text{NH}_3$  data can also be obtained from our group website <https://www.biometeorology.umn.edu/research/data-archives>. The WRF-Chem model code is available on <https://www2.mmm.ucar.edu/wrf/users/download/>. Finally, the WRF-CHEM setup parameters (namelist) are provided in the supporting information.

#### References

- Ackermann, I. J., Hass, H., Memmesheimer, M., Ebel, A., Binkowski, F. S., & Shankar, U. (1998). Modal aerosol dynamics model for Europe: Development and first applications. *Atmospheric Environment*, *32*(17), 2981–2999. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310\(98\)00006-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310(98)00006-5)
- Andersen, H., Hovmand, M., Hummelshoj, P., & Jensen, N. O. (1993). Measurements of ammonia flux to a spruce stand in Denmark. *Atmospheric Environment*, *27A*, 189–202.
- Andersen, H. V., Hovmand, M. F., Hummelsh, P., & Jensen, N. O. (1999). Measurements of ammonia concentrations, fluxes and dry deposition velocities to a spruce forest 1991–1995. *Atmospheric Environment*, *33*(9), 1367–1383. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310\(98\)00363-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310(98)00363-X)
- Aneja, V. P., Chauhan, J. P., & Walker, J. T. (2000). Characterization of atmospheric ammonia emissions from swine waste storage and treatment lagoons. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *105*(D9), 11,535–11,545. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2000JD900066>
- Bash, J. O., Cooter, E. J., Dennis, R. L., Walker, J. T., & Pleim, J. E. (2013). Evaluation of a regional airquality model with bidirectional  $\text{NH}_3$  exchange coupled to an agroecosystem model. *Biogeosciences*, *10*(3), 1635–1645. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-10-1635-2013>
- Battye, W. H., Bray, C. D., Aneja, V. P., Tong, D., & Lee, P. (2016). Evaluating ammonia ( $\text{NH}_3$ ) predictions in the NOAA National Air Quality Forecast Capability (NAQFC) using in situ aircraft, ground-level, and satellite measurements from the DISCOVER-AQ Colorado campaign. *Atmospheric Environment*, *140*, 342–351. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2016.06.021>
- Butler, T., Vermeylen, F., Lehmann, C. M., Likens, G. E., & Puchalski, M. (2016). Increasing ammonia concentration trends in large regions of the USA derived from the NADP/AMoN network. *Atmospheric Environment*, *146*(3), 132–140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2016.06.033>
- Butler, T., Marino, R., Schwede, D., Howarth, R., Sparks, J., & Sparks, K. (2015). Atmospheric ammonia measurements at low concentration sites in the northeastern USA: Implications for total nitrogen deposition and comparison with CMAQ estimates. *Biogeochemistry*, *122*(2–3), 191–210. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10533-014-0036-5>
- Chen, X., Day, D., Schichtel, B., Malm, W., Matzoll, A. K., Mojica, J., et al. (2014). Seasonal ambient ammonia and ammonium concentrations in a pilot IMPROVE  $\text{NH}_x$  monitoring network in the western United States. *Atmospheric Environment*, *91*, 118–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.03.058>
- Chen, Z., Grif, T. J., Millet, D. B., Wood, J. D., Lee, X., Baker, J. M., et al. (2016). Global biogeochemical cycles. AGU Publication Water Resources Research, 1192–1205. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GB005313>. Received
- Chen, Z., Griffis, T. J., Baker, J. M., Millet, D. B., Wood, J. D., Dlugokencky, E. J., et al. (2018). Source partitioning of methane emissions and its seasonality in the U.S. Midwest. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, *123*, 646–659. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JG004356>
- Chu, K., Peng, Z., Liu, Z., Lei, L., Kou, X., Zhang, Y., et al. (2018). Evaluating the impact of emissions regulations on the emissions reduction during the 2015 China Victory Day parade with an ensemble square root filter. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *123*, 4122–4134. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JD027631>
- Cooter, E. J., Bash, J. O., Benson, V., & Ran, L. (2012). Linking agricultural crop management and air quality models for regional to national-scale nitrogen assessments. *Biogeosciences*, *9*, 4023–4035. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-9-4023-2012>
- Dammers, E., Schaap, M., Haaijma, M., Palm, M., Wichink Kruit, R. J., Volten, H., et al. (2017). Measuring atmospheric ammonia with remote sensing campaign: Part 1—Characterisation of vertical ammonia concentration profile in the centre of The Netherlands. *Atmospheric Environment*, *169*, 97–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2017.08.067>
- Dragosits, U., Theobald, M. R., Place, C. J., Lord, E., Webb, J., Hill, J., et al. (2002). Ammonia emission, deposition and impact assessment at the field scale: A case study of sub-grid spatial variability. *Environmental Pollution*, *117*(1), 147–158. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0269-7491\(01\)00147-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0269-7491(01)00147-6)
- Duyzer, J. H., Verhagen, H. L. M., Weststrate, J. H., & Bosveld, F. C. (1992). Measurement of the dry deposition flux of  $\text{NH}_3$  on to coniferous forest. *Environmental Pollution*, *75*(1), 3–13.

- Ellis, R. A., Jacob, D. J., Sulprizio, M. P., Zhang, L., Holmes, C. D., Schichtel, B. A., et al. (2013). Present and future nitrogen deposition to national parks in the United States: critical load exceedances. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *13*, 9083–9095. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-13-9083-2013>
- Erisman, J. W., Sutton, M. A., Galloway, J., Klimont, Z., & Winiwarter, W. (2008). How a century of ammonia synthesis changed the world. *Nature Geoscience*, *1*(10), 636.
- Ferrara, R. M., Loubet, B., di Tommasi, P., Bertolini, T., Magliulo, V., Cellier, P., et al. (2012). Eddy covariance measurement of ammonia fluxes: Comparison of high frequency correction methodologies. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, *158–159*, 30–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2012.02.001>
- Ferrara, R. M., Carozzi, M., Di Tommasi, P., Nelson, D. D., Fratini, G., Bertolini, T., et al. (2016). Dynamics of ammonia volatilisation measured by eddy covariance during slurry spreading in north Italy. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, *219*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2015.12.002>
- Fu, C., Lee, X., Griffis, T. J., Dlugokencky, E. J., & Andrews, A. E. (2017). Investigation of the N<sub>2</sub>O emission strength in the U. S. Corn Belt. *Atmospheric Research*, *194*(January), 66–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2017.04.027>
- Galloway, J. N., Townsend, A. R., Erisman, J. W., Bekunda, M., Cai, Z., Freney, J. R., et al. (2008). Transformation of the nitrogen cycle: Recent trends, questions, and potential solutions. *Science*, *320*(5878), 889–892. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1136674>
- Griffis, T. J., Baker, J. M., Sargent, S. D., Erickson, M., Corcoran, J., Chen, M., & Billmark, K. (2010). Influence of C4 vegetation on <sup>13</sup>C<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> discrimination and isoforcing in the upper Midwest, United States. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, *24*, GB4006. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009GB003768>
- Griffis, T. J., Hu, C., Baker, J. M., Wood, J. D., Millet, D. B., Erickson, M., et al. (2019). Tall tower ammonia observations and emission estimates in the US Midwest. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, *124*, 3432–3447. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JG005172>
- Griffis, T. J., Lee, X., Baker, J. M., Russelle, M. P., Zhang, X., Venterea, R., & Millet, D. B. (2013). Reconciling the differences between top-down and bottom-up estimates of nitrous oxide emissions for the U.S. Corn Belt. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, *27*, 746–754. <https://doi.org/10.1002/gbc.20066>
- Griffis, T. J., Wood, J. D., Baker, J. M., Lee, X., Xiao, K., Chen, Z., et al. (2016). Investigating the source, transport, and isotope composition of water vapor in the planetary boundary layer. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *16*(8), 5139–5157. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-5139-2016>
- Griffis, T. J., Chen, Z., Baker, J. M., Wood, J. D., Millet, D. B., Lee, X., et al. (2017). Nitrous oxide emissions are enhanced in a warmer and wetter world. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *114*(45), 12,081–12,085. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1704552114>
- Heald, C. L., Collett, J. L. Jr., Lee, T., Benedict, K. B., Schwandner, F. M., Li, Y., et al. (2012). Atmospheric ammonia and particulate inorganic nitrogen over the United States. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *12*(21), 10,295–10,312. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-12-10295-2012>
- Hellsten, S., Dragosits, U., Place, C. J., Vieno, M., Dore, A. J., Misselbrook, T. H., et al. (2008). Modelling the spatial distribution of ammonia emissions in the UK. *Environmental Pollution*, *154*(3), 370–379. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2008.02.017>
- Hensen, A., Loubet, B., Mosquera, J., Bulk, W. C. M. V. D., Erisman, J. W., Dämmgen, U., et al. (2009). Estimation of nh<sub>3</sub> emissions from a naturally ventilated livestock farm using local-scale atmospheric dispersion modelling. *Biogeosciences*, *6*(1), 2847–2860.
- Hu, C., Griffis, T. J., Lee, X., Millet, D. B., Chen, Z., Baker, J. M., & Xiao, K. (2018). Top-down constraints on anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions within an agricultural-urban landscape. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *123*, 4674–4694. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2017JD027881>
- Hu, L., Millet, D. B., Baasandorj, M., Grif, T. J., Turner, P., Helmig, D., et al. (2015). Isoprene emissions and impacts over an ecological transition region in the US Upper Midwest inferred from tall tower measurements. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *120*, 3553–3571. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JD022732>. Received
- Hu, X. M., Klein, P. M., Xue, M., Shapiro, A., & Nallapareddy, A. (2013). Enhanced vertical mixing associated with a nocturnal cold front passage and its impact on near-surface temperature and ozone concentration. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *118*, 2714–2728. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrd.50309>
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (2013). Climate change 2013: The physical science basis, contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kelleghan, D. B., Hayes, E. T., Everard, M., & Curran, T. P. (2019). Science of the total environment mapping ammonia risk on sensitive habitats in Ireland. *Science of the Total Environment*, *649*, 1580–1589. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.08.424>
- Kim, S. Y., Millet, D. B., Hu, L., Mohr, M. J., Griffis, T. J., Wen, D., et al. (2013). Constraints on carbon monoxide emissions based on tall tower measurements in the U.S. upper midwest. *Environmental Science and Technology*, *47*(15), 8316–8324. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es4009486>
- Lebel, P. J., Hoell, J. M., Levine, J. S., & Vay, S. A. (1985). Aircraft measurements of ammonia and nitric acid in the lower troposphere. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *12*(6), 401–404. <https://doi.org/10.1029/GL012i006p00401>
- Li, Y., Schichtel, B. A., Walker, J. T., Schwede, D. B., Chen, X., Lehmann, C. M. B., et al. (2016). Increasing importance of deposition of reduced nitrogen in the United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *113*(21), 5874–5879. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1525736113>
- Li, Y., Thompson, T. M., van Damme, M., Chen, X., Benedict, K. B., Shao, Y., et al. (2017). Temporal and spatial variability of ammonia in urban and agricultural regions of northern Colorado, United States. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *17*(10), 6197–6213. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-6197-2017>
- Lonsdale, C. R., Hegarty, J. D., Cady-Pereira, K. E., Alvarado, M. J., Henze, D. K., Turner, M. D., et al. (2017). Modeling the diurnal variability of agricultural ammonia in Bakersfield, California, during the CalNex campaign. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *17*(4), 2721–2739. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-2721-2017>
- Lv, J., Buerkert, A., Benedict, K. B., Liu, G., Lv, C., & Liu, X. (2019). Comparison of nitrogen deposition across different land use types in agro-pastoral catchments of western china and mongolia. *Atmospheric Environment*, *199*, 313–322.
- Makar, P. A., Gong, W., Hogrefe, C., Zhang, Y., Curci, G., Žabkar, R., et al. (2015). Feedbacks between air pollution and weather. Part 2: Effects on chemistry. *Atmospheric Environment*, *115*, 499–526. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.10.021>
- McGinn, S. M., Flesch, T. K., Crenna, B. P., Beauchemin, K. A., & Coates, T. (2007). Quantifying ammonia emissions from a cattle feedlot using a dispersion model. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, *36*(6), 1585. <https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq2007.0167>
- NADP (2017). Ammonia Monitoring Network (AMoN), National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NRSP-3). 2017. Champaign, IL: NADP Program Office, Illinois State Water Survey, University of Illinois. Retrieved from <http://nadp.sws.uiuc.edu/AMoN/>

- Nelson, A. J., Koloutsou-Vakakis, S., Rood, M. J., Myles, L. T., Lehmann, C., Bernacchi, C., et al. (2017). Agricultural and Forest Meteorology Season-long ammonia flux measurements above fertilized corn in central Illinois, USA, using relaxed eddy accumulation. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, *239*, 202–212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2017.03.010>
- Nelson, A. J., Lichiheb, N., Koloutsou-Vakakis, S., Rood, M. J., Heuer, M., Myles, L. T., et al. (2019). Agricultural and forest meteorology ammonia flux measurements above a corn canopy using relaxed eddy accumulation and a flux gradient system. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, *264*(October 2018), 104–113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2018.10.003>
- Nowak, J. B., Neuman, J. A., Bahreini, R., Middlebrook, A. M., Holloway, J. S., Mckeen, S. A., et al. (2012). Ammonia sources in the California south coast air basin and their impact on ammonium nitrate formation. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *39*(7), 102–114.
- Oleson, K. W., Lawrence, D. M., Gordon, B., Flanner, M. G., Kluzek, E., Peter, J., et al. (2013). Technical description of version 4.5 of the Community Land Model (CLM), NCAR/TN-503+STR NCAR Tech. Note, (July) (266 pp.). <https://doi.org/10.5065/D6RR1W7M>
- Olivier, J. G. J., Bouwman, A. F., Van der Maas, C. W. M., & Berdowski, J. J. M. (1994). Emission Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR). *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, *31*(1-2), 93–106.
- Pardo, L. H., Fenn, M. E., Goodale, C. L., Geiser, L. H., Driscoll, C. T., Allen, E. B., et al. (2011). Effects and empirical critical loads of nitrogen for ecoregions of the united effects of nitrogen deposition and empirical nitrogen critical loads for ecoregions of the United States. *Ecological Applications*, *21*(8), 3049–3082. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9508-1>
- Parker, D., Ham, J., Woodbury, B., Cai, L., Spiels, M., Rhoades, M., et al. (2013). Standardization of flux chamber and wind tunnel flux measurements for quantifying volatile organic compound and ammonia emissions from area sources at animal feeding operations. *Atmospheric Environment*, *66*, 72–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.03.068>
- Paulot, F., Jacob, D. J., Pinder, R. W., Bash, J. O., Travis, K., & Henze, D. K. (2014). Ammonia emissions in the United States, European Union, and China derived by high-resolution inversion of ammonium wet deposition data: Interpretation with a new agricultural emissions inventory (MASAGE\_NH3). *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *119*, 4343–4364. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JD021130>
- Phillips, S. B., Arya, S. P., & Aneja, V. P. (2004). Ammonia flux and dry deposition velocity from near-surface concentration gradient measurements over a grass surface in North Carolina. *Atmospheric Environment*, *38*(21), 3469–3480. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2004.02.054>
- Pleim, J. E., Bash, J. O., Walker, J. T., & Cooter, E. J. (2013). Development and evaluation of an ammonia bidirectional flux parameterization for air quality models. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *118*, 3794–3806.
- Pryor, S. C., Barthelmie, R. J., Sørensen, L. L., & Jensen, B. (2001). Ammonia concentrations and fluxes over a forest in the midwestern USA. *Atmospheric Environment*, *35*(32), 5645–5656. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310\(01\)00259-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310(01)00259-X)
- Puchalski, M. A., Rogers, C. M., Baumgardner, R., Mishoe, K. P., Price, G., Smith, M. J., & Lehmann, C. M. (2015). Environmental Science A statistical comparison of active and passive ammonia measurements collected at Clean Air Status and Trends Network (CASTNET) sites. *Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts*, *17*(2), 358–369. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c4em00531g>
- Puchalski, M. A., Sather, M. E., Walker, J. T., Lehmann, C. M. B., Gay, D. A., Mathew, J., & Robarge, W. P. (2011). Passive ammonia monitoring in the United States: Comparing three different Passive ammonia monitoring in the United States: Comparing three different sampling devices †. *Journal of Environmental Monitoring*, *13*(11), 3156–3167. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c1em10553a>
- Reis, S., Pinder, R. W., Zhang, M., Lijie, G., & Sutton, M. A. (2009). Reactive nitrogen in atmospheric emission inventories. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *9*(19), 7657–7677. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-9-7657-2009>
- Riddick, S., Ward, D., Hess, P., Mahowald, N., Massad, R., & Holland, E. (2016). Estimate of changes in agricultural terrestrial nitrogen pathways and ammonia emissions from 1850 to present in the Community Earth System Model. *Biogeosciences*, *13*(11), 3397. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-13-3397-2016>
- Rose, L. A., Sebestyen, S. D., Elliott, E. M., & Koba, K. (2015). Drivers of atmospheric nitrate processing and export in forested catchments. *Water Resources Research*, *51*, 1333–1352. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014WR015716>
- Schell, B., Ackermann, I. J., Hass, H., Binkowski, F. S., & Ebel, A. (2001). Modeling the formation of secondary organic aerosol within a comprehensive air quality model system. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *106*(D22), 28,275–28,293. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001JD000384>
- Schrader, F., Schaap, M., Zöll, U., Kranenburg, R., & Brümmner, C. (2018). The hidden cost of using low-resolution concentration data in the estimation of NH<sub>3</sub> dry deposition fluxes. *Scientific Reports*, *8*(1), 969. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-18021-6>
- Sebestyen, S. D., Shanley, J. B., Boyer, E. W., Kendall, C., & Doctor, D. H. (2014). Coupled hydrological and biogeochemical processes controlling variability of nitrogen species in streamflow during autumn in an upland forest. *Water Resources Research*, *50*, 1569–1591. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013WR013670>
- Sebestyen, S. D., Ross, D. S., Shanley, J. B., Elliott, E. M., Kendall, C., Campbell, J. L., et al. (2019). Unprocessed atmospheric nitrate in waters of the northern forest region in the U.S. and Canada. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *53*(7), 3620–3633. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.9b01276>
- Shephard, M. W., Cady-Pereira, K. E., Luo, M., Henze, D. K., Pinder, R. W., Walker, J. T., et al. (2011). TES ammonia retrieval strategy and global observations of the spatial and seasonal variability of ammonia. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *11*(20), 10,743–10,763. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-10743-2011>
- Skjøth, C. A., & Geels, C. (2013). The effect of climate and climate change on ammonia emissions in Europe. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *13*(1), 117–128. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-13-117-2013>
- Stevens, C. J. (2019). Nitrogen in the environment. *Science*, *363*(6427), 578–580. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aav8215>
- Stockwell, W. R., Middleton, P., Chang, J. S., & Tang, X. (1990). The second generation regional acid deposition model chemical mechanism for regional air quality modeling. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *95*(D10), 16,343. <https://doi.org/10.1029/JD095iD10p16343>
- Sun, K., Tao, L., Miller, D. J., Zondlo, M. A., Shonkwiler, K. B., Nash, C., & Ham, J. M. (2015). Open-path eddy covariance measurements of ammonia fluxes from a beef cattle feedlot. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, *213*, 193–202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2015.06.007>
- Sutton, M. A., Reis, S., Riddick, S. N., Dragosits, U., Nemitz, E., Theobald, M. R., et al. (2013). Towards a climate-dependent paradigm of ammonia emission and deposition. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, B: Biological Sciences*, *368*(1621). <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2013.0166>
- Tevlin, A. G., Li, Y., Collett, J. L., McDuffie, E. E., Fischer, E. V., & Murphy, J. G. (2017). Tall tower vertical profiles and diurnal trends of ammonia in the Colorado Front Range. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *122*, 12,468–12,487. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JD026534>
- Tuccella, P., Curci, G., Visconti, G., Bessagnet, B., Menut, L., & Park, R. J. (2012). Modeling of gas and aerosol with WRF/Chem over Europe: Evaluation and sensitivity study. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *117*, D03303. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JD016302>

- Warner, J. X., Dickerson, R. R., Wei, Z., Strow, L. L., Wang, Y., & Liang, Q. (2017). Increased atmospheric ammonia over the world's major agricultural areas detected from space. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *44*, 2875–2884. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL072305>
- Wesely, M. L. (1989). Parameterization of surface resistances to gaseous dry deposition in regional-scale numerical models \*. *Atmospheric Environment*, *23*(6), 1293–1304. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0004-6981\(89\)90153-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0004-6981(89)90153-4)
- Whaley, C. H., Makar, P. A., Shephard, M. W., Zhang, L., Zhang, J., Zheng, Q., et al. (2018). Contributions of natural and anthropogenic sources to ambient ammonia in the Athabasca Oil Sands and north-western Canada. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *18*(3), 2011–2034. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-2011-2018>
- Wu, Z., Wang, X., Chen, F., Turnipseed, A. A., Guenther, A. B., Niyogi, D., et al. (2011). Evaluating the calculated dry deposition velocities of reactive nitrogen oxides and ozone from two community models over a temperate deciduous forest. *Atmospheric Environment*, *45*(16), 2663–2674. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.02.063>
- Yang, Y., Liao, W., Wang, X., Liu, C., Xie, Q., Gao, Z., et al. (2016). Quantification of ammonia emissions from dairy and beef feedlots in the Jing-Jin-Ji district, China. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, *232*, 29–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.07.016>
- Yegorova, E. A., Allen, D. J., Loughner, C. P., Pickering, K. E., & Dickerson, R. R. (2011). Characterization of an eastern U. S. severe air pollution episode using WRF/Chem. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *116*, D17306. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010JD015054>
- Yu, F., Nair, A. A., & Luo, G. (2018). Long-term trend of gaseous ammonia over the United States: Modeling and comparison with observations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *123*, 8315–8325. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JD028412>
- Zhang, L., Jacob, D. J., Knipping, E. M., Kumar, N., Munger, J. W., Carouge, C. C., & van Donkelaar, A. (2012). Nitrogen deposition to the United States: Distribution, sources, and processes. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *12*(10), 4539–4554. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-12-4539-2012>
- Zhang, X., Lee, X., Griffis, T. J., Baker, J. M., & Xiao, W. (2014). Estimating regional greenhouse gas fluxes: An uncertainty analysis of planetary boundary layer techniques and bottom-up inventories. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *14*(19), 10,705–10,719. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-14-10705-2014>
- Zhang, X., Wu, Y., Liu, X., Reis, S., Jin, J., Dragosits, U., et al. (2017). Ammonia emissions may be substantially underestimated in China. *Environmental Science and Technology*, *51*(21), 12,089–12,096. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b02171>
- Zhang, Y., Tang, A., Wang, D., Wang, Q., Benedict, K., Zhang, L., & Liu, D. (2018). The vertical variability of ammonia in urban Beijing, China. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *18*(22), 16,385–16,398. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-16385-2018>
- Zhu, L., Henze, D. K., Cady-Pereira, K. E., Shephard, M. W., Luo, M., Pinder, R. W., et al. (2013). Constraining U.S. ammonia emissions using TES remote sensing observations and the GEOS-Chem adjoint model. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *118*, 3355–3368. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrd.50166>
- Zhu, L., Henze, D. K., Bash, J. O., Cady-Pereira, K. E., Shephard, M. W., Luo, M., & Capps, S. L. (2015). Sources and impacts of atmospheric NH<sub>3</sub>: Current understanding and frontiers for modeling, measurements, and remote sensing in North America. *Current Pollution Reports*, *1*(2), 95–116. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40726-015-0010-4>
- Zhu, S., Horne, J. R., Montoya-Aguilera, J., Hinks, M. L., & Nizkorodov, S. A. (2018). Modeling reactive ammonia uptake by secondary organic aerosol in CMAQ: application to the continental US. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *18*(5), 3641–3657.
- Zhu, T., Pattey, E., & Desjardins, R. L. (2000). Relaxed eddy-accumulation technique for measuring ammonia volatilization. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *34*(1), 199–203. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es980928f>