

## 1 Supplemental Material

### 2 In-canopy source/sink model

3 Bash et al. (2010) describe a first-order closure model that analytically links the NH<sub>3</sub> sources and  
4 sinks  $S(z)$  within the canopy to the mean concentration profile ( $\partial C/\partial z$ ), momentum absorption by the  
5 canopy drag elements, mixing length ( $L_m$ ), and the friction velocity ( $u_*$ ) just above the height of the  
6 canopy ( $h_c$ ):

$$7 \quad S(z) = \begin{cases} -\frac{u_*}{\text{Pr}} \exp\left[\beta\left(\frac{z-h_c}{L}\right)\right] \left[ L_m \frac{\partial^2 \bar{C}}{\partial z^2} + \beta \frac{\partial \bar{C}}{\partial z} \right]; & z/h_c \leq 1 \\ 0; & z/h_c > 1 \end{cases} \quad (\text{S1})$$

8 The stability corrected log-linear mean wind speed profile was used to scale the wind speed  
9 measured at 2.5 and 3.5 m to the canopy height ( $z = h_c$ ) following Byun (1990)

$$10 \quad \bar{U}(h_c) = \frac{u_*}{k} \left( \ln \left[ \frac{z-d}{z_o} \right] + \psi \left( \frac{z-d}{L} \right) - \psi \left( \frac{z_o}{L} \right) \right) \Bigg|_{z>h_c}, \quad (\text{S2})$$

11 where  $z_o$  is the momentum roughness length,  $d$  is the zero plane displacement (estimated as  $0.1 h_c$  and  
12  $2/3 h_c$  respectively),  $k = 0.4$  is von Karman's constant, and  $\psi$  is the integrated diabatic stability  
13 correction.

14 The in-canopy mean wind speed ( $\bar{U}$ ) profile, turbulent diffusivity for momentum ( $K_t$ ), and  
15 momentum flux ( $\overline{u'w'}$ ) are based on the analytical solution of Inoue (1963) following the  
16 parameterization of Harman and Finnigan (2007):

$$17 \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{U}(z) &= \bar{U}(h_c) \exp\left[ \frac{\beta(z-h_c)}{L_m} \right] \Bigg|_{z<h_c} \\ K_t &= \beta L_m \bar{U}(z) \\ \overline{u'w'} &= -(\beta \bar{U}(z))^2 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S3})$$

18 The mixing length is parameterized following Harman and Finnigan (2007):

$$L_m = \frac{2\beta^3}{C_d a(z) \varphi_m \left( \frac{h_c - d}{L} \right)}, \quad (S4)$$

where  $\beta$  is the dimensionless momentum flux  $\left( u_* / \overline{U} \Big|_{z=h_c} \right)$ ,  $C_d$  is the product of the in-canopy drag coefficient and the sheltering factor,  $a$  is the mean leaf area density estimated from the ratio of the plant area index to the canopy height ( $h_c$ ),  $L$  is the Obukhov length and  $\varphi_m$  is the dimensionless correction factor for stability.

The model was evaluated by comparing sensible heat fluxes estimated by integrating the source-sink profile of the analytical closure model from the soil surface up to the canopy height to measured above- and in-canopy eddy covariance sensible heat flux measurements (N = 323). Comparison of above-canopy fluxes by regression analysis indicated a linear relationship with a slope of 1.05 and intercept of  $-8.30 \times 10^{-3} \text{ } ^\circ\text{C m s}^{-1}$  ( $r^2 = 0.854$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , N = 341); mean normalized bias and error were -21 and 50%, respectively. Comparison of in-canopy measured and modeled fluxes yielded a slope of 0.646 and intercept of  $-1.72 \times 10^{-3} \text{ } ^\circ\text{C m s}^{-1}$  ( $r^2 = 0.632$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , N = 341) with mean normalized bias and error of -49 and 59%, respectively. In-canopy sensible heat fluxes were underestimated during the midday peak, which may result from the model assumption of negligible soil heat storage.

We note that a comparison to sensible heat flux may represent a worst-case measure of performance in comparison to  $\text{NH}_3$ . The vertical gradients of temperature within the canopy are small compared to  $\text{NH}_3$ . Furthermore, model assumptions of: 1) negligible canopy and soil heat storage and 2) that the direction of the flux can be inferred from the mean air temperature gradient are not satisfied during periods of rapid heating and cooling of the soil/canopy system. Comparison of measured and modeled net canopy-scale  $\text{NH}_3$  fluxes showed generally good agreement. Linear regression yielded a slope of 0.882 ( $p < 0.001$ , N = 15), with modeled fluxes slightly higher than measured fluxes, and an intercept that was not statistically different from zero.

## References

Bash, J.O., Walker, J.T., Katul, G.G., Jones, M.R., Robarge, W., Nemitz, E. Robarge, W., 2010, Estimation of in-canopy ammonia sources and sinks in a fertilized *Zea Mays* field, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 44, 1683-1689

- 47 Byun, D.W.: On the analytical solution to the flux-profile relationships for the atmospheric surface layer,  
48 *J. Appl. Meteor.*, 29, 652-657, 1990.
- 49 Harman, I.N., Finnigan, J.J.: A simple unified theory for flow in the canopy and roughness sublayer,  
50 *Boundary Layer Meteorol.*, 123, 339-363, 2007.
- 51 Inoue, E.: On the turbulent structure of air flow within crop canopies. *J. Meteorol. Soc. Japan*, 41, 317-  
52 32, 1963.
- 53