

1 Ammonia emission measurements of an intensively grazed pasture

2 Karl Voglmeier^{1,2}, Markus Jocher¹, Christoph Häni³, Christof Ammann¹

3 ¹Climate and Agriculture Group, Agroscope, Zürich, 8046, Switzerland

4 ²Department of Environmental Systems Science, ETH Zurich, Zürich, 8092, Switzerland

5 ³School of Agricultural, Forest and Food Sciences HAFL, Bern University of Applied Sciences, Zollikofen, 3052, Switzerland

6 *Correspondence to:* Karl Voglmeier (karl.voglmeier@agroscope.admin.ch)

7 **Abstract.** The quantification of ammonia (NH₃) emissions is still a challenge and the corresponding emission factor for grazed
8 pastures is uncertain. This study presents NH₃ emission measurements of two pasture systems in western Switzerland over the
9 entire grazing season 2016. During the measurement campaign, each pasture system was grazed by 12 dairy cows in an
10 intensive rotational management. The cow herds on the two pastures differed in the energy to protein balance of the diet. NH₃
11 concentrations were measured upwind and downwind of a grazed sub plot with line integrating open path instruments that
12 were able to retrieve small horizontal concentration differences (< 0.2 μg NH₃ m⁻³). The NH₃ emission fluxes were calculated
13 by applying a backward Lagrangian Stochastic (bLS) dispersion model to the difference of paired concentration measurements
14 and ranged from 0 to 2.5 μg N-NH₃ m⁻² s⁻¹. The fluxes increased steadily during a grazing interval from previous non-
15 significant values to reach maximum emissions at the end of the grazing interval. Afterwards they decreased exponentially to
16 near zero values within 3-5 days. A default emission curve was calculated for each of the two systems and adopted to each
17 rotation in order to account for missing data values and to estimate inflow disturbances due to grazing on upwind paddocks.
18 Dung and cow location were monitored to account for the non-negligible inhomogeneity of cow excreta on the pasture. The
19 average emission (± std. dev. of individual rotation values) per grazing hour was calculated as 0.64 ± 0.11 g N-NH₃ cow⁻¹ h⁻¹
20 for the herd with the N balanced diet (system M) and 1.07 ± 0.06 g N-NH₃ cow⁻¹ h⁻¹ for the herd with the protein rich grass-
21 only diet (system G). Surveys of feed intake, body weight and milk yield of the cow herds were used to estimate the nitrogen
22 (N) excretion by an animal N budget model. Based on that, mean relative emission factors of 6.4 ± 2.0 % and 8.7 ± 2.7 % of
23 the applied urine N were found for the systems M and G, respectively. The results can be used to validate the Swiss national
24 emission inventory and demonstrate the positive effect of a N-balanced diet on pasture NH₃ emission.

25 1 Introduction

26 Agricultural livestock production is the main source of air pollution by ammonia (NH₃) (Bouwman et al., 1997). The largest
27 share of the emissions is usually assigned to the excretions in the barn with subsequent manure storage and spreading (Kupper
28 et al., 2015). The high emissions are largely responsible for the formation of secondary aerosols in the atmosphere through
29 reactions with nitric and sulfuric acids (Nemitz et al., 2009). This can have a significant effect on human health and can also
30 lead to eutrophication and acidification of the environment through deposition (Sutton et al., 2011).

1 Grazing is considered as one efficient mitigation option to reduce NH₃ volatilisation due to the direct infiltration of urine in
2 the soil before urea is degraded to ammonium and NH₃. According to the Swiss inventory model Agrammon (Kupper et al.,
3 2015; see Fig. 4b therein) grazing livestock produces about eight times lower emissions compared to indoor housing (including
4 storage and spreading of manure). Emission inventories usually make use of generalized emission factors that relate emissions
5 to the corresponding source of water soluble nitrogen (urea, ammonium or dissolved NH₃). In the case of grazed pastures the
6 relevant nitrogen (N) source is urine by animal excretion (Petersen et al., 1998). However the pasture emission factor still has
7 a large uncertainty because corresponding NH₃ emission experiments are rare and the available studies reported a large range
8 of emission factors (5 to 25.7 % of excreted urine N; e.g. Jarvis et al., 1989; Bussink, 1992; Laubach et al., 2012, 2013b).
9 Many of the studies used manual applied urine and measured the emissions with chamber or wind tunnel methods. These
10 techniques might lead to questionable results due to the altering of the environment and the high heterogeneity of the emissions
11 (Misselbrook et al., 2005; Sintermann et al., 2012).
12 Volten et al. (2012) introduced a new open path miniDOAS system that measures line integrated NH₃ concentrations with a
13 relatively high temporal resolution. Sintermann et al. (2016) adopted and further developed the system to field applicability
14 and suggested that paired miniDOAS systems in combination with a dispersion model can be used to estimate emissions of a
15 pasture. Bell et al. (2017) estimated the NH₃ emission factor based on miniDOAS concentration measurements in combination
16 with a backward Lagrangian Stochastic (bLS) dispersion model for a 12-d period and demonstrated the applicability of the
17 miniDOAS / bLS combination for grazing systems. However no information on the excreta distribution on the pasture was
18 obtained and retrieved emission factors were based on a standard cow and feeding strategy. The relatively short measurement
19 campaign in May also limited the representativeness of the derived emission factor for a full year. For micrometeorological
20 methods a spatially homogenous source area is usually needed (Munger et al., 2012) which is often not the case on grazed
21 pastures (Draganova et al., 2016). However only very few studies reported on the uncertainty associated with a heterogeneous
22 emission source and those studies usually focused on greenhouse gas emissions (Felber et al., 2015; Peltola et al., 2015).
23 In the present experiment the miniDOAS systems in combination with bLS modelling were applied to determine NH₃
24 emissions of two paired rotational grazing system over a full grazing season. Position monitoring of dung patches with GPS
25 and of cows with a camera system were used to relate the measured emissions to the animal and excreta density. The calculated
26 emission factors were based on actual in situ cow productivity data and feed analyses and were compared to standard emission
27 factors.

28 **2 Material and methods**

29 **2.1 Site description and experimental design**

30 The study site was located in the Pre-Alps of Switzerland at the research farm Agroscope Posieux in the canton of Fribourg
31 (46°46'04"N, 7°06'28"E). The soil is classified as stagnic Anthrosol with a loamy texture (20 % clay, 35 % silt and 45 %
32 sand) and the vegetation consisted mainly of a typical grass clover mixture (10 % to 50 % *Lolium perenne* and 7 % to 40 %

1 *Trifolium repens*) with an increasing clover share during the grazing season. In 2007 the last renovation of the site took place.
2 Since then the site has been used as an intensive pasture for cattle. Averaged over the past years, the average fertilizer
3 application rate was about 120 kg N ha⁻¹ per year, in addition to the excreta of grazing animals. Climate records show an annual
4 average temperature of 8.7 °C and an annual precipitation amount of 1075 mm (MeteoSwiss, 2018). The experiment was
5 conducted at a flat 5.5 ha pasture and the cows were managed in a rotational grazing system (Fig. 1). The whole pasture was
6 divided into two separate systems having different feeding strategies of the cows. The southern system (labeled “G”)
7 represented a full grazing regime without additional feed supplementation. This resulted in a considerable protein surplus for
8 the animals leading to an unnecessary high N excretion. At the northern system (labeled “M”) cows were provided with
9 additional maize silage (roughly 25 % of the total feed dry matter intake) which has a low protein content and resulted in a
10 more demand-adjusted optimized protein content in the diet (Arriaga et al., 2010; Yan et al., 2006) leading to less N excretion.
11 Each of the two pasture systems was divided into 11 paddocks resulting in a full rotation period of about 20 days, depending
12 on the grass growth conditions. The size of the paddocks were adjusted to the different treatments: 1700 m² for the northern
13 M system and 2200 m² for the southern G system. The grazing rotation was synchronous for the two systems and started in
14 the middle of the fields (on paddocks X.11 with X indicating both fields) in westerly direction (until paddock X.16) and then
15 from the middle (X.21) to the eastern side of the field (X.25). Twice a day (around 05:00 – 07:00 and 15:00 – 17:00 LT) the
16 cows were brought to the nearby barn for milking. However, in cases of high air temperatures in August and beginning of
17 September the cows spent a longer period in the barn during daytime (typically 11:00 – 17:00 LT). Due to dry periods during
18 the summer month and subsequent low grass growth additional pasture areas were used for grazing. The herd for each system
19 consisted of 12 dairy cows. The main measurement campaign took place between May and October 2016, and in summary,
20 seven full grazing rotations took place in that period (Table 1). During the measurement campaign, the site was fertilized with
21 ammonium nitrate (28 kg ha⁻¹, end of June) and urea (42 kg ha⁻¹, X.11–X.16 mid of August, X.21–X.25 beginning of
22 September).

23 **2.2 Ammonia emission measurements**

24 **2.2.1 Ammonia concentration**

25 Line-integrated NH₃ concentrations were measured using four miniDOAS systems (Sintermann et al., 2016). These open path
26 instruments make use of the differential optical absorption in the UV range (200 – 230 nm). Two miniDOAS systems (namely
27 MD5 and MD2, naming based on serial number) were installed at system M and two instruments (MD1 and MD6) on system
28 G (Fig. 1a). All instruments were installed at a height of 1.3 m. Each miniDOAS pair (e.g. MD5 and MD2) was separated by
29 a horizontal distance of about 30 m which allowed for concentration measurements upwind and downwind of a subplot of the
30 paddocks in between. The single light path between the sensor and the retroreflector for the individual devices had a length of
31 30 to 35 m. The instruments reported NH₃ concentration at a temporal resolution of one minute. The one minute data were
32 processed to 30-min averages for further processing. Due to the predominant wind directions NE and SW one miniDOAS

1 usually reported upwind concentration C_{Upwind} ($\mu\text{g NH}_3 \text{ m}^{-3}$) and the other one the downwind concentration $C_{Downwind}$ (Fig. 1).
2 This setting allowed for the computation of the horizontal concentration gradient ΔC caused by emissions from the area in
3 between. The reference spectrum (Sintermann et al., 2016) for each miniDOAS was determined during a seven day inter-
4 comparison campaign at the Chaumont, Switzerland ($47^\circ 02' 58'' \text{N}$, $6^\circ 58' 16'' \text{E}$, 1136m, 20-27 July 2016). The site is located
5 30 km north-west of Posieux and is only marginally contaminated by NH_3 and was therefore ideal to compute the reference
6 spectra. The miniDOAS systems were operated in parallel and compared to wet chemical impingers (Häni et al., 2016) in order
7 to retrieve the instrumental offset and absolute concentration.

8 **2.2.2 Turbulence and meteorological parameters**

9 For the characterization of turbulent mixing the three dimensional wind velocity (u , v , w) and air temperature was measured
10 at 10 Hz using an ultrasonic anemometer-thermometer (HS-50, Gill Instruments Ltd., UK, hereafter termed sonic anemometer)
11 mounted on a horizontal arm at 2 m above ground. Each system was equipped with one of those anemometers. The
12 micrometeorological parameters friction velocity (u_* , m s^{-1}), roughness length (z_0 , m) and the Obukhov length (L , m) were
13 computed from the 30 min processed eddy covariance data of the sonic anemometer. Further weather parameters were
14 measured with a standard automated weather station (Campell Scientific Ltd., UK). It used a WXT520 (Vaisala, Vantaa, FL)
15 to measure wind speed, precipitation, temperature and barometric pressure and a pyranometer (CNR1, Kipp&Zonen, Delft,
16 NL) to measure global radiation. The station was installed at system M next to the sonic anemometer.

17 **2.2.3 Data filtering**

18 The raw MD concentrations were filtered based on the level of light reaching the spectrometer. This led to a data loss between
19 about 1 % and 4 % for the different MD. An additional filter was applied to account for conditions with low turbulence by u_*
20 filtering. As the measurement site is located at the Swiss western plateau which is known for low wind speeds especially during
21 the night a u_* threshold of 0.05 m s^{-1} was applied leading to a relative data loss of 26 % and 30 % for system M and G,
22 respectively. Flesch et al. (2014) stated that using a u_* value of 0.05 m s^{-1} can be accepted as the data quality does not increase
23 too much by applying higher u_* values. The wind sectors facing towards the farm buildings north and south of the fields were
24 removed as well due to unwanted advection from the nearby farm buildings (Figs. 1 and 2). Filtering for u_* and wind direction
25 decreased the data by about 44 % and 49 % for system M and G, respectively.

26 **2.2.4 Emission calculation based on dispersion modelling**

27 The emissions were calculated based on inverse dispersion modelling and measurements of NH_3 concentrations upwind and
28 downwind of an emitting source. An open-source version of the bLS model by Häni (2017) (based on Flesch et al., 2004)
29 programmed in the statistical software R (R Core Team, 2016) was used. The first-order bLS model assumed horizontally
30 homogenous and vertically inhomogeneous Gaussian turbulence and used the Monin-Obukhov Similarity Theory to calculate
31 the vertical profiles of wind speed and turbulence. Minor adjustments to the original model (Flesch et al., 2004) are described

1 in Häni et al. (2018). The newly introduced deposition module, which is part of the software package, was not used in this
2 study. The bLS model related the measured 30-min concentration difference ΔC ($\mu\text{g NH}_3 \text{ m}^{-3}$) to the unknown emission rate
3 E ($\mu\text{g NH}_3 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$) of the investigated paddocks (Eq. 1). The coefficient D (s m^{-1}) was determined based on the simulated
4 movement of 25'000 fluid particles released at the location of the concentration sensor line and tracked backwards in time up
5 to a distance of 250 m (extending well beyond the investigated pasture fields). Simulated touchdowns inside the specified
6 source area contribute to the magnitude of D .

$$8 \quad E = \frac{C_{\text{Downwind}} - C_{\text{Upwind}}}{D} \equiv \frac{\Delta C}{D} \quad (1)$$

9
10 The bLS model used wind and turbulence information measured by the sonic anemometer. In order to calculate a concentration
11 footprint for each 30-min period Δt , averaged data of the wind direction, the standard deviations of the wind components, u_*
12 and values representing the surface roughness were used. Additional geometric information of the source area locations and
13 extensions and the position and height of the miniDOAS measurement paths were provided as well. An intrinsic assumption
14 of the bLS model approach is that the model domain has a uniform surface roughness, which is supported by the results of
15 Felber et al. (2015) for the same site, and that the defined emitting area is homogenous concerning its source strength. Thus it
16 is assumed that the monitored pasture paddocks are homogeneously grazed and the urine and dung patches, representing the
17 main NH_3 emission sources, are more or less uniformly (or randomly) distributed on the paddock area.

18 The present inverse dispersion method yields a net NH_3 flux of the investigated paddocks that is in excess of any general
19 background flux (e.g. due to deposition of ambient NH_3 , e.g. Möring et al. (2017)). The resulting flux thus represents the effect
20 (emission) of grazing excreta. However, because the excreta patches only cover a small part of the grazed pasture, the measured
21 net flux may also include some short-range re-deposition of the gross excreta NH_3 emission. A partitioning of these effects is
22 beyond the scope of the present study and would require small-scale spatially resolved measurements (e.g. by enclosures) of
23 patch and non-patch surface areas.

24 **2.2.5 Artificial release experiment**

25 In order to test the used methodology an additional experiment with an artificial gas release was conducted in June/July 2017
26 at the field site next to the sonic anemometer of system M. The source consisted of a grid of 14 critical orifices (100 μm
27 diameter, stainless steel, LenoxLaser, USA) which were installed on ground facing upward with a distance of each other of 2
28 m. The center of the line was connected to a distribution unit which regulated the gas flow with a mass flow controller (red-y
29 smart controller, Voegtlin Instruments, Switzerland). The flow rate, pressure within the grid and the accumulated gas flow was
30 saved to a hard disk within the housing of the distribution unit. A gas mixture with 5 ± 0.1 % NH_3 in 95 % CH_4 (CarbaGas,
31 Switzerland) was used with a release rate of about 3.1 standard L min^{-1} . Two miniDOAS systems (MD2 and MD5) were

1 installed in parallel roughly 6 m north east and south west of the source line to account for the predominant wind directions.
2 Both instruments were installed at a height of about 0.6 m due to the close distance to the artificial source.

3 **2.3 Estimation of N excretion on the pasture**

4 The NH₃ emission flux, quantified as described above, is a pasture area related quantity. In order to allow a comparison of the
5 results of the present study with literature reports and with emission inventory models, emission factors were derived by
6 relating the measured emissions to the urine N input from the cows. As N input to the pasture cannot easily be measured total
7 N and urine N of the excretions of the cows were estimated with a dairy cow nitrogen budget model based on the official Swiss
8 feeding recommendation for dairy cows (Bracher et al., 2011). Input to the model were information concerning the milk yield
9 and N content, the weight of the cows, the calving date, and the crude protein proportional to the N content in the forage (Table
10 2). Milk yield and body weight was measured for each cow on a daily basis whereas data on grass protein was only collected
11 and analyzed eight times between end of April and end of September, but usually close in time to the measurement period.
12 The grass parameters of the systems M and G were averaged for further processing. Crude protein of the maize silage was
13 analyzed three times (beginning of May, mid of July, beginning of September). Missing data were linearly interpolated between
14 the measured values. The N in the excretions were finally calculated as a balance between the N input of the feed, N storage
15 due to body weight gain and N in milk and excreta for each cow and each day of the year. The break-down in urine N and
16 dung N is based on N balance studies (Bracher et al., 2011). Finally, based on the grazing duration the urine N input to the
17 investigated paddocks was computed for each rotation. An associated uncertainty of 15 % was estimated by comparing the N
18 budget model to published results of Swiss N excretion studies (Bretscher, unpublished data).

19 **2.4 Cow and excreta distribution monitoring**

20 The measured concentration difference and thus the derived NH₃ flux is mainly related to the emission of the surface area
21 between the MD sensor paths on each grazing system (according to the main wind directions, Fig. 1). This is only a part of the
22 entire paddock area, which was considered as uniformly emitting area in the bLS calculations (Sect. 2.2.4) and for which the
23 average urine N input was quantified (Sect. 2.3). On a pasture cows can move freely and therefore the urine and dung patches
24 may not be homogeneously distributed on the entire area, which can lead to error prone emission estimates (Auerswald et al.,
25 2010; Bell et al., 2017; Laubach et al., 2013a).

26 In order to assess the spatial distribution of the cow excreta on the paddocks X.11 and X.12 as main emission sources in our
27 experiment, we used two different approaches. The number and position of dung patches was determined with a hand held
28 GPS device within the first 3–5 days after grazing. In addition, the cow position on the pasture was monitored with a day–
29 night digital camera system at a temporal resolution of 10 minutes. The location of the individual cows were manually marked
30 on the displayed pictures in a post processing step. However, the night mode often did not yield useful information and
31 therefore images showing the cow positions during nighttime were very sparse.

1 In order to account for inhomogeneity of the excreta distribution within the investigated paddocks, they were divided as shown
 2 in Fig. 3a. The middle sections between the paired MD sensor paths represent the main source areas of the measured fluxes.
 3 Their excreta density $d_{X.meas}$ was related to the density of the entire paddocks $d_{(X.11+X.12)}$ to determine the excreta density
 4 correction factor k_d :

$$5 \quad k_d = \frac{d_{(X.11+X.12)}}{d_{X.meas}} \quad (2)$$

6 The exemplary dung patch survey in Fig. 3a shows a positive deviation from the average paddock-wide density for both system
 7 M ($k_d = 1.28$) and system G ($k_d = 1.40$). However, dung observations were only available for two rotations for the paddock
 8 M.11, three rotations for G.11 and two rotations for X.12 while daytime cow position observation by camera was available for
 9 the whole measurement campaign for system M, and from rotation three onwards for system G. As cow excreta (mainly in
 10 form of urine) is the main source of NH_3 emissions, missing dung density values were estimated based on a regression analysis
 11 ($R^2 = 0.98$) between parallel surveys of density anomalies for dung patches and cow positions (Fig. 3b).

12 The k_d factors derived from the combined information of the dung patch and the cow position surveys were used to calculate
 13 integral NH_3 emissions E_{int} for each rotation for the two investigated paddocks X.11 and X.12 (with corresponding areas A)
 14 for a time period between start of grazing until end of grazing (EOG):

$$15 \quad E_{int} = \sum_{t=start\ of\ grazing}^{EOG+10\ days} E(t)\Delta t \cdot k_d^{-1} \cdot (A_{X.11} + A_{X.12})$$

16 (3)

17 **3 Results and Discussion**

18 This chapter is organized as follows. The first section (Sect. 3.1) shows the observed NH_3 concentrations during the grazing
 19 campaign, whereas the next sections present and discuss the emission fluxes. Sect. 3.2 describes the measured area-related
 20 fluxes including interference correction and the gap filling leading to cumulative emissions over individual grazing events.
 21 The corresponding emission uncertainty and its sources are discussed in Sect. 3.3. The area related emission were converted
 22 to animal related emissions using cow and dung distribution monitoring results (Sect. 3.4) and further converted to emission
 23 factors related to animal urine N (Sect. 3.5). In the final section of the chapter (Sect. 3.6) the advantages and problems of the
 24 experimental design are highlighted.

26 **3.1 Ammonia concentrations during grazing season**

27 The NH_3 concentration values observed during the entire measurement campaign had a strong temporal and spatial variability.
 28 They were typically in the range of 4-15 $\mu\text{g NH}_3 \text{ m}^{-3}$ with maximum values of about 100 $\mu\text{g NH}_3 \text{ m}^{-3}$. As shown in Fig. 2 the
 29 highest concentrations usually resulted from advection from the nearby farm located in the northern direction of the miniDOAS

1 instruments. This advection is weaker at the southern system G due to the larger distance to the farm. The general concentration
2 pattern is nevertheless very similar for both systems. The highest wind speeds (above 4 m s^{-1}) usually resulted in low NH_3
3 concentrations due to a good mixing of the atmospheric boundary layer with lowest concentrations coming from the south-
4 western direction. The higher background concentration from the north-easterly direction is probably a result of a nearby
5 piggery some 350 m away. During the whole measurement period (beginning of May – mid of October) the MD instruments
6 were online between 62 % (MD 6) and 85 % (MD 2) of the time. Power failure and instrument errors were the main reasons
7 for the partial data loss. The measurement campaign at the Chaumont mountain site (Sect. 2.2.1) led to a data loss for the first
8 three days during rotation four. During rotation one no data of the MD instruments MD1 and MD6 could be acquired due to
9 instrument errors.

10 During the grazing period on the paddocks X.11 and X.12 the NH_3 concentration difference increased (see example for one
11 rotation in Fig. 4) due to increased excreta on the field, mainly in the form of urine. Concentration differences in the range of
12 about $0 - 8 \mu\text{g NH}_3 \text{ m}^{-3}$ for system M and of about $0 - 15 \mu\text{g NH}_3 \text{ m}^{-3}$ for system G were measured. A few hours after grazing
13 the concentration differences started to decrease significantly. Mostly within the first three to five days after the EOG the
14 concentration differences reached values around the accuracy limit of the MD devices (about $0.2 \mu\text{g NH}_3 \text{ m}^{-3}$). Typically for
15 the Swiss western plateau wind speed had a strong diurnal pattern with low wind speeds during nighttime. This often led to a
16 weak mixing in the boundary layer and subsequent high observed concentrations. In order to avoid error prone emission
17 estimates the concentration values were filtered according to Sect. 2.2.3. This led to low data availability for emission
18 calculation especially during nighttime conditions. Precipitation events typically resulted in low concentrations and subsequent
19 low concentration differences.

20 **3.2 Field scale fluxes**

21 The field scale fluxes were determined based on the concentration differences of the paired MD systems and the dispersion
22 coefficient D (see Eq. 1) computed by the bLS model. The emissions typically showed a diurnal emission pattern with highest
23 values occurring between midday and late afternoon, which correlated well with atmospheric driving parameters like air
24 temperature, wind speed and global radiation (Fig. 5, horizontal axis). This emission behaviour can theoretically be explained
25 with higher wind speeds and unstable conditions during daytime leading to a reduction of the aerodynamic resistance at the
26 interface between the atmosphere and the urine patch surface and thus leading to higher emissions. Ammonia fluxes are also
27 based on the thermodynamic equilibrium at this interface leading to higher emissions with increasing temperatures during
28 daytime (Flechar and Sutton, 2013). Beside the diurnal variation, the emissions generally increased during the grazing phase
29 (typical grazing duration: 50-70 hours, Table 1) with a fast subsequent decrease afterwards (Fig. 5a, vertical axis). The
30 observed emission fluxes usually decreased to insignificant values within 3–5 days after EOG. This management related
31 temporal pattern could be parameterised as shown in Fig. 6, where daytime emission values are plotted against the elapsed
32 time since the start / end of the grazing period. The emissions showed an approximately linear increase during the grazing (due
33 to the continuous formation of new excreta patches) and an exponential decay after EOG. The decay or e-folding time of the

1 exponential function was evaluated as 28 and 23 hours (37 % of maximum value at the beginning) for the systems M and G,
2 respectively.

3 Due to quality related data filtering (Sect. 2.2.3) and missing concentration data the emission time series had a considerable
4 share of gaps that needed to be filled in order to calculate cumulative emissions. The following relatively simple gap filling
5 procedure was applied:

6 (i) Gaps shorter than three hours were filled by linear interpolation between available measurements

7 (ii) For longer gaps during daytime, the management related emission curves in Fig. 6 (linear increase during grazing and
8 subsequent exponential decrease) were fitted to the available daytime data of individual grazing phases. This allowed to
9 account for different weather and soil effects between the rotations.

10 (iii) Because of the low amount of available nighttime data, it was not possible to derive and fit individual curves for longer
11 nighttime gaps. Thus it was assumed that the general temporal pattern is similar to daytime conditions (curves in Fig. 6) but
12 with a lower amplitude for nighttime. The corresponding reduction factor (= 0.39) was based on the overall ratio between
13 mean nighttime and daytime emissions during grazing.

14 Due to the limited amount of measured data and the considerable number of possible environmental driving parameters (air
15 temperature, global radiation, wind speed, precipitation, soil / leaf humidity, Fig. 5, also Bell et al., 2017; Häni et al., 2016;
16 Laubach et al., 2013b; Möring et al., 2016) the emissions were not parameterised as a function of these parameter but only as
17 a function of grazing duration and elapsed time since start/end of grazing. Nevertheless, a good agreement was found using a
18 linear increase of emissions during the grazing period and an exponential decrease afterwards.

19 The applied flux measurement approach as described in Section 2.2 assumes a spatially limited emission between the two
20 measurement paths and negligible emission upwind of the system. However, upwind paddocks were grazed while the
21 measurement paddocks were in the emission decay phase. In some cases, depending on wind direction, the emission sources
22 on the upwind paddocks can lead to a greater concentration signal of the inflow compared to the outflow instrument. They
23 interfere with the concentration signals of the paddock(s) of interest and can lead to an underestimation of the true emission.
24 In the strict sense this is a problem of an under-determined systems when fewer concentration detectors are available compared
25 to the emission sources (see also Bell et al., 2017). To estimate the influence of grazed upwind paddocks, a default emission
26 pattern $E_{\text{def}}(t)$ according to the fitted curves in Fig. 6 was used. The effect of each upwind paddock i on the measured
27 concentration difference ΔC in Eq. 1 was calculated from the corresponding bLS dispersion coefficients for both MD systems
28 $D_{i,\text{Upwind}}$ and $D_{i,\text{Downwind}}$.

29

$$30 \Delta C_{\text{corr}} = \sum_i E_{\text{def}}(t_i) \cdot (D_{i,\text{Upwind}} - D_{i,\text{Downwind}}) \quad (4)$$

31

32 This effect was corrected for in the flux calculation (Eq. 1). The resulting measured fluxes during the campaign were within a
33 range of 0 to 2.1 $\mu\text{g N-NH}_3 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ for system M and 0 to 2.3 $\mu\text{g N-NH}_3 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ for system G.

1 The cumulative integral emission E_{int} (Eq. 3) for each system and rotation was calculated based on the gap-filled half-hourly
2 fluxes and the area of the investigated paddocks (see example in Fig. 7). Depending on atmospheric driving parameters (mainly
3 precipitation) about half of the overall emission occurred during the grazing phase. Precipitation events during that time period
4 led to a significant reduction in emissions with subsequent higher emission later on (observable especially during rotations
5 two and the higher fluxes on the 14th of May in Fig. 6). Over the entire grazing season, cumulative emissions for the different
6 rotations were retrieved under variable weather conditions with highest air temperatures recorded during rotation three to
7 rotation six and the highest precipitation amounts occurring at the first three rotations (Table 3). The highest integral emissions
8 occurred usually at the southern paddock and showed a strong temporal variability depending mainly on the grazing duration
9 (Table 1) and N input (Table 3). The emissions during rotation seven on system G showed the largest magnitude of all single
10 rotations and fields. This is also in line with the highest N input to the pasture from cow excreta.

11 **3.3 Uncertainty of emission flux measurements**

12 **3.3.1 Effect of different error sources**

13 The performance of the miniDOAS devices for concentration measurements was optimised by adjusting the offsets among all
14 four instruments during the 7-d inter-calibration at the Chaumont site between rotation 3 and 4. During that period the
15 instruments were running in parallel and the measured concentrations (mostly 0 – 2 $\mu\text{g NH}_3 \text{ m}^{-3}$) were compared to the
16 measurements of wet chemical impingers. It was found that the potential bias between the instruments was below 0.2 $\mu\text{g NH}_3$
17 m^{-3} and was therefore similar to the results by Sintermann et al. (2016).

18 Missing flux data were replaced either by values of the default emission curve (Fig. 6) or by applying a liner interpolation
19 between measurements. The default emission curves were also used to estimate unwanted interferences in the measured
20 concentration differences from emitting upwind paddocks. In order to test the sensitivity of the emission result to uncertainties
21 in the gap filling method and interferences from upwind grazing, we varied the values of the default emission curve to 50 %
22 and 150 % of the default values. The sensitivity towards the exponential decay time of the default emission curve was tested
23 with a systematic increase in the decay time of 50 % (decay_slow) and a reduction of 30 % (decay_fast). We found (Fig. 8)
24 that the relative effect of all simulated errors on the cumulative emissions was generally below 20 % for individual rotations
25 (except for few outliers). The highest impact on the emission results was due to the uncertainty in the gap filling of missing
26 values that predominantly occurred during night. Since the simulated error sources are independent, they were combined to an
27 overall measurement related error of 17 % by Gaussian error propagation.

28 The bLS dispersion modelling is a well-defined approach and was evaluated extensively by Flesch et al. (2005), Harper et al.
29 (2010), and McGinn et al. (2009) who found that the model uncertainty is typically in the order of 20 %. Combining the 20 %
30 uncertainty for the bLS modelling and the 17 % measurement related uncertainty results in total mean systemic uncertainty of
31 26 %.

1 **3.3.2 Artificial gas release**

2 For an exemplary test of the performance of the applied methodology, tracer gas releases were conducted at the same site in
3 the year after the main experiment in June and July 2017. The gas was only released during stationary westerly winds in order
4 to avoid advection from the nearby barn. Table 4 lists the main meteorological and technical aspects of the individual releases
5 and shows the corresponding results. The duration of the releases strongly depended on the observed wind speed and varied
6 therefore significantly.

7 Due to the westerly winds MD 2 detected the upwind concentrations and MD5 the downwind concentrations. All
8 measurements were averaged to 30-min values and the emissions were calculated following Eq. 1 (Fig. 9). In order to check
9 the mass flow controller of the artificial source, the release rate of all single orifices were measured during three releases
10 (release 2, 4 and 5). The observed differences between the summed orifice release rates and the measured mass flow from the
11 gas cylinder varied between -7 and 9 % and an overall average of only 1 ± 8.7 %. The associated uncertainty of the artificial
12 source of 17.4 % was calculated as two times the standard deviation.

13 The quality of the calculated emission for each source experiment is defined as recovery rate which is calculated as the ratio
14 of the measured cumulative emissions of the bLS and the cumulative measured emission from the flow controller (Table 4).
15 Four out of five releases resulted in a recovery rate above 100 % and four release experiments showed a recovery rate between
16 88 and 124 %. Release number one had an exceptional high recovery rate of about 150 %. During that particular release the
17 dynamic pressure within the tubes of the system upstream of the flow controller was higher at the beginning compared to the
18 following ones. Nevertheless, we have no conclusive explanation for this individual result. The overall mean of 111 % and the
19 standard deviation of 18 % was calculated based on all individual half-hourly measurements. As the recovery rates were not
20 significantly different from 100 % we can assume that the inverse dispersion methodology in combination with miniDOAS
21 line sensors is suitable to quantify the NH_3 emission of the pasture experiment.

22 **3.4 Animal related emissions**

23 As the bLS approach assumes a homogenous spatial distribution of emission sources within the investigated paddock, the
24 actual distribution of the cow excreta could have a significant influence on the calculated emissions per animal or per excreta
25 input. The relative density of the emitting urine patches was assumed to be proportional to the observed density of dung patches
26 and/or animal positions as described in Sect. 2.4. Figure 10 shows the correction factor k_d (Eq. 2, 3) of the excreta density in
27 the main measurement section (between the MD instruments) from the mean density of the entire paddock area. In case of a
28 uniform excreta distribution k_d should be 1. However, a considerable heterogeneous distribution was found for the different
29 rotations and paddocks. On the southern pasture (system G) a generally higher excreta density was found between the MD
30 devices in comparison to the averaged field. On the northern pasture (system M) the effect was more variable with negative
31 deviations until rotation 5 and positive deviations towards the end of the grazing season.

1 There is some uncertainty associated to the visual identification (for GPS localisation) of dung patches due to potential double
2 counting or overlooking of dung patches on the paddock, and due to the use of the linear relationship between cow and dung
3 density. But these errors are assumed to behave random-like and are thus relatively small resulting in a combined relative
4 emission uncertainty of about 7 %. This is much smaller compared to the systematic uncertainty of the measured fluxes (Sect.
5 3.3.1). Since there was no cow nor dung monitoring data available for system G during rotation 2, no correction for
6 inhomogeneous excreta density was applied in this case, but a higher uncertainty (25 %) was attributed to the emission based
7 on the variability of the dung density of the other rotations (Fig. 10).

8 In order to calculate the animal related emission and the emission factor for the individual rotations, the derived cumulative
9 emissions were corrected for excreta inhomogeneity (Eq. 3) by applying excreta density ratios k_d shown in Fig. 10 (see also
10 Eq. 2). The measured emissions per cow and grazing hour (h) stayed rather constant with a value of about 0.64 ± 0.11 g N-
11 NH_3 $\text{cow}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ (mean \pm one standard deviation) for system M and about 1.07 ± 0.12 g N- NH_3 $\text{cow}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ for system G (Fig. 11).
12 For comparison, the application of a 10 % standard emission factor for NH_3 (EMEP/EEA, 2016) results in larger mean values
13 and a larger variability (system M: 0.99 ± 0.24 g N- NH_3 $\text{cow}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$; system G: 1.22 ± 0.31 g N- NH_3 $\text{cow}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$).

14 The error bars in Fig. 11 represent the total error of the absolute emissions. This error is predominantly due to systematic
15 effects (Sect. 3.3.1) that are identical (bLS uncertainty) or very similar (gap filling uncertainty) for the two parallel pasture
16 systems. Therefore these systematic errors are not relevant for the comparison of the two systems, for which only the random
17 uncertainty and the instrument bias uncertainty (Fig. 8) have to be considered. The random uncertainty for the seasonal mean
18 was estimated from the variability between rotations. In combination with the bias uncertainty this results in a significant mean
19 difference between the two systems of 0.43 ± 0.13 g N- NH_3 $\text{cow}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$, corresponding to a relative reduction effect of the N-
20 balanced diet compared to the grazing-only diet of 40 %.

22 **3.5 Emission factors for the two pasture systems**

23 The EF values for individual rotations in Table 3 are based on the measured cumulative emissions relative to the urine N
24 deposited (excreted) on the two pasture systems for the different rotations. They range within 4.9 % – 11.1 % for system M
25 and show generally higher values for system G (range 7.2 – 16 %). The highest EF values were observed during the second
26 rotation. They are mainly driven by the low N content of the grass on pasture resulting in low estimated urine N excretion
27 (Table 2). The variation in EF is in contrast to the rather stable measured absolute NH_3 emissions as shown in Fig. 11. This
28 may indicate that the analysed grass samples are not fully representative for the selective grazing intake of the cows. On the
29 other hand, an exceptionally high value of the measured emission is unlikely, because a rainfall event started during the second
30 half of the grazing period and lasted almost two days with a precipitation amount of about 40 mm (data not shown). Typically
31 smaller volatilisation of NH_3 is expected during such weather periods (Sommer and Olesen, 2000). A delayed onset of the
32 emissions was observed as described in Móríng et al. (2016) after the rain event stopped. However, the emissions were small
33 compared to the ones observed during the first grazing day (roughly one third) and were therefore not able to counterbalance
34 the reduced emissions of the second part of the grazing period.

1 The annual average pasture EF and its uncertainty was derived from the overall means of NH₃ emission and urine N input and
2 resulted in 6.4 ± 2.0 % for system M and 8.7 ± 2.7 % for system G. The uncertainty of about 1/3 mainly stem from the
3 systematic errors discussed in Sect. 3.3.1 and 2.4. The found mean EFs are ranked towards the lower end of reported values
4 (5 – 26 % of excreted urine N, e.g. Bussink, 1992; Jarvis et al., 1989; Laubach et al., 2012, 2013b) but are in line with the
5 results (6 – 9 %) of the recent study by Bell et al. (2017). A single emission factor as used in many inventory models (e.g.
6 EMEP/EEA, 2016; Kupper et al., 2015) would not be able to reflect the observed difference of 2.3 % between the two
7 grazing/feeding systems in our experiment. The reduction in EF for system M is not statistically significant but may indicate
8 a nonlinear effect of the N input rate on the NH₃ emission, similar to the findings of the recent literature synthesis study by
9 Jiang et al. (2017) who reported a higher emission factor with increasing fertiliser N application. Thus the optimised N-
10 balanced feeding strategy may decrease the NH₃ emission even more than expected from the reduced urine N excretion.

11 **3.6 Advantages and problems of experimental setup**

12 The present field experiment was optimised to measure the NH₃ emissions of two neighbouring pastures managed in an
13 intensive rotation. The periodic high density of animals (55-70 cows ha⁻¹) and fresh excreta on the grazed paddocks resulted
14 in intermittent high fluxes and allowed to observe the temporal behaviour of the emissions (Fig. 6, Fig. 7). This would not be
15 possible on a continuous grazing system with much larger paddock sizes and accordingly smaller excreta densities and
16 emissions. For continuous grazing on large fields other micrometeorological measurement techniques like the eddy covariance
17 (Ammann et al., 2012) would be preferable. The small paddock sizes in this study also kept the cow excreta heterogeneity on
18 a moderate level, whereas on larger free range grazing areas the animals often gather at the same place (Cowan et al., 2015)
19 leading to a more complicated quantification of the EF. While the distribution of dung patches and cows was monitored by
20 means of visual inspection or evaluation of the camera images, a direct localisation of urine patches was not possible in this
21 way. Sensors for urine patch detection exist, but are either still in development (Kumar et al., 2016), relatively expensive (Quin
22 et al., 2016), or unpractically for field scale experiments (Dodd et al., 2015). Therefore we assumed a similar density
23 distribution of dung and urine patches on the paddock (Auerswald et al., 2010; Luo et al., 2017).

24 The present setup with the parallel pastures and accordingly similar micrometeorological conditions constituted an effective
25 way to analyse the difference between the two systems as the main systematic uncertainty source of the single pasture emissions
26 (bLS, Sect. 3.3.1) were cancelled out. However, subsequent grazing on neighbouring upwind paddocks could produce
27 interferences with the measurements that could be corrected only in an approximate way. Another error source arose due to
28 the strong variability of the measured crude protein in the grass with consequent high variability of the estimated N in the
29 urine. It was not directly measured as automated monitoring techniques for urine N on the pasture are not yet mature enough
30 and still have some limitations regarding the animal welfare (Misselbrook et al., 2016). Manual measurements of the urine N
31 amount were outside of the scope of this project due to the laborious work.

1 **4 Concluding remarks**

2 In a paired field experiment NH₃ emissions on two pasture systems were measured for an entire grazing season under real
3 practice conditions. The herds of the two pastures were kept in an intensive rotational grazing management with different
4 protein to energy ratios resulting in different N excretion rates. The fast rotation with a short but high stocking rate and excreta
5 deposition within the grazed paddock allowed to observe the temporal dynamics of the corresponding NH₃ emission. Maximum
6 emissions were found at the end of each grazing phase on the investigated area. Afterwards an exponential decay of the
7 emissions led to non-significant low values typically within 3-5 days. A diurnal emission pattern with peaks during the
8 afternoon was observed on all rotations.

9 Monitoring of the cow and dung density distribution was essential for a quantitative comparison of the two systems. The
10 emission per cow and grazing hour showed only a very limited variation over the season but a distinct difference (40 %)
11 between the two systems. About half of this difference could be explained by the different urine N excretion rate of the two
12 herds. The resulting average EFs were 6.4 ± 2.0 % and 8.7 ± 2.7 % for the herd with the N balanced diet and the herd with the
13 N surplus in the forage, respectively. Thus the experiment showed the large potential of an optimised feeding strategy to reduce
14 NH₃ emissions. The results can also serve as a validation for the Swiss national emission inventory for NH₃ emissions on
15 pastures. It is recommended for further studies to include the regular analyses of the N content in the urine in order to overcome
16 the associated uncertainties.

17

18 *Data availability.* Data obtained in this study is online available at doi:10.5281/zenodo.1305180 (Voglmeier et al., 2018).

19

20 *Competing interests.* The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

21

22 *Acknowledgements.* We gratefully acknowledge the funding from the Swiss National Science Foundation (Project
23 NICEGRAS, number 155964). Christoph Häni was additionally supported by the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment
24 FOEN (06.9115.P2 I 0094-1922) and Karl Voglmeier by a MICMoR Fellowship through KIT/IMK-IFU. We wish to thank
25 Lukas Eggerschwiler, Robin Giger, Walter Glauser, Harald Menzi, Andreas Mürger and Jens Leifeld for support in the field
26 and helpful discussions. We especially acknowledge the contribution of Harald Menzi in the design and planning of the
27 experiment. We are grateful to Albrecht Neftel for the helpful discussions and advise concerning the MiniDOAS
28 measurements. We thank Daniel Bretscher for the support with the N balance computation of the cows and the discussions of
29 these data.

30

1 **References**

- 2 Ammann, C., Wolff, V., Marx, O., Brümmer, C. and Neftel, A.: Measuring the biosphere-atmosphere exchange of total reactive
3 nitrogen by eddy covariance, *Biogeosciences*, 9(11), 4247–4261, doi:10.5194/bg-9-4247-2012, 2012.
- 4 Arriaga, H., Salcedo, G., Calsamiglia, S. and Merino, P.: Effect of diet manipulation in dairy cow N balance and nitrogen
5 oxides emissions from grasslands in northern Spain, *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, 135(1–2), 132–139,
6 doi:10.1016/j.agee.2009.09.007, 2010.
- 7 Auerswald, K., Mayer, F. and Schnyder, H.: Coupling of spatial and temporal pattern of cattle excreta patches on a low intensity
8 pasture, *Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosystems*, 88(2), 275–288, doi:10.1007/s10705-009-9321-4, 2010.
- 9 Bell, M., Flechard, C., Fauvel, Y., Häni, C., Sintermann, J., Jocher, M., Menzi, H., Hensen, A. and Neftel, A.: Ammonia
10 emissions from a grazed field estimated by miniDOAS measurements and inverse dispersion modelling, *Atmospheric Meas.*
11 *Tech.*, 10(5), 1875–1892, doi:10.5194/amt-10-1875-2017, 2017.
- 12 Bouwman, A. F., Lee, D. S., Asman, W. a. H., Dentener, F. J., Van Der Hoek, K. W. and Olivier, J. G. J.: A global high-
13 resolution emission inventory for ammonia, *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles*, 11(4), 561–587, doi:10.1029/97GB02266, 1997.
- 14 Bracher, A., Schlegel, P., Münger, A., Stoll, W. and Menzi, H.: Möglichkeiten zur Reduktion von Ammoniakemissionen durch
15 Fütterungsmassnahmen beim Rindvieh (Milchkuh), SHL Agroscope Zollikofen Posieux, 2011.
- 16 Bretscher, D.: Background data for Swiss national greenhouse gas inventory, Agroscope, unpublished.
- 17 Bussink, D. W.: Ammonia volatilization from grassland receiving nitrogen fertilizer and rotationally grazed by dairy cattle,
18 *Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosystems*, 33(3), 257–265, 1992.
- 19 Carslaw, D. C. and Ropkins, K.: openair --- an R package for air quality data analysis, *Environ. Model. Softw.*, 27–28, 52–61,
20 2012.
- 21 Cowan, N. J., Norman, P., Famulari, D., Levy, P. E., Reay, D. S. and Skiba, U. M.: Spatial variability and hotspots of soil N₂O
22 fluxes from intensively grazed grassland, *Biogeosciences*, 12(5), 1585–1596, doi:10.5194/bg-12-1585-2015, 2015.
- 23 Dodd, M., Manderson, A., Budding, P., Dowling, S., Ganesh, S. and Hunt, C.: Preliminary evaluation of three methods for
24 detecting urine patches in the field, in *Moving Farm Systems to Improved Attenuation*, p. 8, Fertiliser and Lime Research
25 Centre Palmerston North, NZ., 2015.
- 26 Draganova, I., Yule, I., Stevenson, M. and Betteridge, K.: The effects of temporal and environmental factors on the urination
27 behaviour of dairy cows using tracking and sensor technologies, *Precis. Agric.*, 17(4), 407–420, doi:10.1007/s11119-015-
28 9427-4, 2016.
- 29 EMEP/EEA: Air pollutant emission inventory guidebook - 2016, Technical Report, EEA., 2016.
- 30 Felber, R., Münger, A., Neftel, A. and Ammann, C.: Eddy covariance methane flux measurements over a grazed pasture: effect
31 of cows as moving point sources, *Biogeosciences*, 12(12), 3925–3940, doi:10.5194/bg-12-3925-2015, 2015.
- 32 Flechard, C. R. and Sutton, M. A.: Advances in understanding, models and parameterizations of biosphere-atmosphere
33 ammonia exchange, , 43, 2013.

- 1 Flesch, T. K., Wilson, J. D., Harper, L. A., Crenna, B. P. and Sharpe, R. R.: Deducing Ground-to-Air Emissions from Observed
2 Trace Gas Concentrations: A Field Trial, *J. Appl. Meteorol.*, 43(3), 487–502, doi:10.1175/1520-
3 0450(2004)043<0487:DGEFOT>2.0.CO;2, 2004.
- 4 Flesch, T. K., Wilson, J. D. and Harper, L. A.: Deducing ground-to-air emissions from observed trace gas concentrations: a
5 field trial with wind disturbance, *J. Appl. Meteorol.*, 44(4), 475–484, 2005.
- 6 Flesch, T. K., McGinn, S. M., Chen, D., Wilson, J. D. and Desjardins, R. L.: Data filtering for inverse dispersion emission
7 calculations, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 198–199, 1–6, doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2014.07.010, 2014.
- 8 Häni, C.: bLSmodelR – An atmospheric dispersion model in R. [online] Available from: [http://www.agrammon.ch/
9 documents-to-download/blsmodelr/](http://www.agrammon.ch/documents-to-download/blsmodelr/) (Accessed 24 October 2017), 2017.
- 10 Häni, C., Sintermann, J., Kupper, T., Jocher, M. and Neftel, A.: Ammonia emission after slurry application to grassland in
11 Switzerland, *Atmos. Environ.*, 125, 92–99, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2015.10.069, 2016.
- 12 Häni, C., Flechard, C., Neftel, A., Sintermann, J. and Kupper, T.: Accounting for Field-Scale Dry Deposition in Backward
13 Lagrangian Stochastic Dispersion Modelling of NH₃ Emissions, , doi:10.20944/preprints201803.0026.v1, 2018.
- 14 Harper, L. A., Flesch, T. K., Weaver, K. H. and Wilson, J. D.: The Effect of Biofuel Production on Swine Farm Methane and
15 Ammonia Emissions, *J. Environ. Qual.*, 39(6), 1984–1992, doi:10.2134/jeq2010.0172, 2010.
- 16 Jarvis, S. C., Hatch, D. J. and Roberts, D. H.: The effects of grassland management on nitrogen losses from grazed swards
17 through ammonia volatilization; the relationship to excretal N returns from cattle, *J. Agric. Sci.*, 112(02), 205,
18 doi:10.1017/S0021859600085117, 1989.
- 19 Jiang, Y., Deng, A., Bloszies, S., Huang, S. and Zhang, W.: Nonlinear response of soil ammonia emissions to fertilizer nitrogen,
20 *Biol. Fertil. Soils*, 53(3), 269–274, doi:10.1007/s00374-017-1175-3, 2017.
- 21 Kumar, A., Sharifi, H. and Arif, K. M.: Mobile machine vision development for urine patch detection, pp. 1–6, *IEEE.*, 2016.
- 22 Kupper, T., Bonjour, C. and Menzi, H.: Evolution of farm and manure management and their influence on ammonia emissions
23 from agriculture in Switzerland between 1990 and 2010, *Atmos. Environ.*, 103, 215–221,
24 doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.12.024, 2015.
- 25 Laubach, J., Taghizadeh-Toosi, A., Sherlock, R. R. and Kelliher, F. M.: Measuring and modelling ammonia emissions from a
26 regular pattern of cattle urine patches, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 156, 1–17, doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2011.12.007, 2012.
- 27 Laubach, J., Bai, M., Pinares-Patiño, C. S., Phillips, F. A., Naylor, T. A., Molano, G., Rocha, E. A. C. and Griffith, D. W.:
28 Accuracy of micrometeorological techniques for detecting a change in methane emissions from a herd of cattle, *Agric. For.
29 Meteorol.*, 176, 50–63, 2013a.
- 30 Laubach, J., Taghizadeh-Toosi, A., Gibbs, S. J., Sherlock, R. R., Kelliher, F. M. and Grover, S. P. P.: Ammonia emissions
31 from cattle urine and dung excreted on pasture, *Biogeosciences*, 10(1), 327–338, doi:10.5194/bg-10-327-2013, 2013b.
- 32 Luo, J., Wyatt, J., van der Weerden, T. J., Thomas, S. M., de Klein, C. A. M., Li, Y., Rollo, M., Lindsey, S., Ledgard, S. F.,
33 Li, J., Ding, W., Qin, S., Zhang, N., Bolan, N., Kirkham, M. B., Bai, Z., Ma, L., Zhang, X., Wang, H., Liu, H. and Rys, G.:

1 Potential Hotspot Areas of Nitrous Oxide Emissions From Grazed Pastoral Dairy Farm Systems, in *Advances in Agronomy*,
2 vol. 145, pp. 205–268, Elsevier., 2017.

3 McGinn, S. M., Beauchemin, K. A., Flesch, T. K. and Coates, T.: Performance of a Dispersion Model to Estimate Methane
4 Loss from Cattle in Pens, *J. Environ. Qual.*, 38(5), 1796, doi:10.2134/jeq2008.0531, 2009.

5 MeteoSwiss: Climate normals Fribourg/Posieux, [online] Available from:
6 [www.meteoschweiz.admin.ch/product/output/climate-data/climate-diagrams-normal-values-station-](http://www.meteoschweiz.admin.ch/product/output/climate-data/climate-diagrams-normal-values-station-processing/GRA/climsheet_GRA_np8110_e.pdf)
7 [processing/GRA/climsheet_GRA_np8110_e.pdf](http://www.meteoschweiz.admin.ch/product/output/climate-data/climate-diagrams-normal-values-station-processing/GRA/climsheet_GRA_np8110_e.pdf) (Accessed 31 January 2018), 2018.

8 Misselbrook, T., Fleming, H., Camp, V., Umstatter, C., Duthie, C.-A., Nicoll, L. and Waterhouse, T.: Automated monitoring
9 of urination events from grazing cattle, *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, 230, 191–198, doi:10.1016/j.agee.2016.06.006, 2016.

10 Misselbrook, T. H., Nicholson, F. A. and Chambers, B. J.: Predicting ammonia losses following the application of livestock
11 manure to land, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 96(2), 159–168, doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2004.05.004, 2005.

12 Móríng, A., Vieno, M., Doherty, R. M., Laubach, J., Taghizadeh-Toosi, A. and Sutton, M. A.: A process-based model for
13 ammonia emission from urine patches, *GAG (Generation of Ammonia from Grazing): description and sensitivity analysis*,
14 *Biogeosciences*, 13(6), 1837–1861, doi:10.5194/bg-13-1837-2016, 2016.

15 Móríng, A., Vieno, M., Doherty, R. M., Milford, C., Nemitz, E., Twigg, M. M., Horváth, L. and Sutton, M. A.: Process-based
16 modelling of NH₃ exchange with grazed grasslands, *Biogeosciences*, 14(18), 4161–4193, doi:10.5194/bg-14-4161-2017,
17 2017.

18 Munger, J. W., Loescher, H. W. and Luo, H.: Measurement, Tower, and Site Design Considerations, in *Eddy Covariance: A*
19 *Practical Guide to Measurement and Data Analysis*, edited by M. Aubinet, T. Vesala, and D. Papale, pp. 21–58, Springer
20 Netherlands, Dordrecht., 2012.

21 Nemitz, E., Dorsey, J. R., Flynn, M. J., Gallagher, M. W., Hensen, A., Erismann, J.-W., Owen, S. M., Dämmgen, U. and Sutton,
22 M. A.: Aerosol fluxes and particle growth above managed grassland, *Biogeosciences*, 6(8), 1627–1645, doi:10.5194/bg-6-
23 1627-2009, 2009.

24 Peltola, O., Hensen, A., Beletti Marchesini, L., Helfter, C., Bosveld, F. C., van den Bulk, W. C. M., Haapanala, S., van
25 Huissteden, J., Laurila, T., Lindroth, A., Nemitz, E., Röckmann, T., Vermeulen, A. T. and Mammarella, I.: Studying the spatial
26 variability of methane flux with five eddy covariance towers of varying height, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 214–215(Supplement
27 C), 456–472, doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2015.09.007, 2015.

28 Petersen, S. O., Sommer, S. G., Aaes, O. and Sørensen, K.: Ammonia losses from urine and dung of grazing cattle: effect of
29 N intake, *Atmos. Environ.*, 32(3), 295–300, doi:10.1016/S1352-2310(97)00043-5, 1998.

30 Quin, B., Bates, G. and Bishop, P.: LOCATING AND TREATING FRESH COW URINE PATCHES WITH SPIKEY®; THE
31 PLATFORM FOR PRACTICAL AND COST-EFFECTIVE REDUCTION IN ENVIRONMENTAL N LOSSES, *Integr. Nutr.*
32 *Water Manag. Sustain. FarmingEds LD Currie R Singh Httpflrc Massey Ac Nzpublications Html Occas. Rep.*, (29), 2016.

33 R Core Team: R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna,
34 Austria. [online] Available from: <https://www.R-project.org/>, 2016.

- 1 Sintermann, J., Neftel, A., Ammann, C., Häni, C., Hensen, A., Loubet, B. and Flechard, C. R.: Are ammonia emissions from
2 field-applied slurry substantially over-estimated in European emission inventories?, *Biogeosciences*, 9(5), 1611–1632,
3 doi:10.5194/bg-9-1611-2012, 2012.
- 4 Sintermann, J., Dietrich, K., Häni, C., Bell, M., Jocher, M. and Neftel, A.: A miniDOAS instrument optimised for ammonia
5 field-measurements, *Atmospheric Meas. Tech. Discuss.*, 1–26, doi:10.5194/amt-2015-360, 2016.
- 6 Sommer, S. G. and Olesen, J. E.: Modelling ammonia volatilization from animal slurry applied with trail hoses to cereals,
7 *Atmos. Environ.*, 34(15), 2361–2372, 2000.
- 8 Sutton, M. A., Howard, C. M., Erisman, J. W., Bealey, W. J., Billen, G., Bleeker, A., Bouwman, A. F., Grennfelt, P., van
9 Grinsven, H. and Grizzetti, B.: The challenge to integrate nitrogen science and policies: the European Nitrogen Assessment
10 approach, in *The European Nitrogen Assessment: Sources, Effects and Policy Perspectives*, edited by A. Bleeker, B. Grizzetti,
11 C. M. Howard, G. Billen, H. van Grinsven, J. W. Erisman, M. A. Sutton, and P. Grennfelt, pp. 82–96, Cambridge University
12 Press, Cambridge., 2011.
- 13 Voglmeier, K., Jocher, M., Häni, C. and Ammann, C.: Ammonia emission measurements of an intensively grazed pasture -
14 Dataset., 2018.
- 15 Volten, H., Bergwerff, J. B., Haaima, M., Lolkema, D. E., Berkhout, A. J. C., van der Hoff, G. R., Potma, C. J. M., Wichink
16 Kruit, R. J., van Pul, W. A. J. and Swart, D. P. J.: Two instruments based on differential optical absorption spectroscopy
17 (DOAS) to measure accurate ammonia concentrations in the atmosphere, *Atmos Meas Tech*, 5(2), 413–427, doi:10.5194/amt-
18 5-413-2012, 2012.
- 19 Yan, T., Frost, J. P., Agnew, R. E., Binnie, R. C. and Mayne, C. S.: Relationships among manure nitrogen output and dietary
20 and animal factors in lactating dairy cows, *J. Dairy Sci.*, 89(10), 3981–3991, 2006.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

1 **Table 1: Summary of grazing rotations 2016 on paddocks X.11 and X.12 investigated for NH₃ emissions**

Rotation no.	Start date	Sojourn time	
		on pasture [h]	in barn [h]
1	2016-05-09	44.5	11
2	2016-05-26	46.5	9
3	2016-07-04	37	8.5
4	2016-07-26	51	20.5
5	2016-08-10	29	8
6	2016-09-04	36.5	17
7	2016-09-26	55	13

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1 **Table 2: Measured driving parameters and resulting urine N and feces N of the animal N budget model averaged for the individual**
 2 **rotations and for each herd (system M / G). If only one number is given it corresponds to both herds simultaneously. Rotation 4 is**
 3 **not shown due to missing miniDOAS measurements.**

Rotation	1	2	3	5	6	7
System	M G	M G	M G	M G	M G	M G
Animal weight (kg)	639 635	646 635	636 637	630 630	630 637	633 637
Days since calving	187 199	204 216	182 197	217 218	242 243	258 265
Milk yield (kg cow ⁻¹ d ⁻¹)	26.7 25.3	24.4 23.7	25.0 23.8	23.3 23.3	23.2 20.6	19.2 15.9
Grass crude protein (g kg-DM ⁻¹)	203	147	178	200	218	200
Maize crude protein (g kg-DM ⁻¹)	91 <i>na</i>	91 <i>na</i>	89 <i>na</i>	80 <i>na</i>	72 <i>na</i>	71 <i>na</i>
Urine N (g cow ⁻¹ d ⁻¹)	274 324	135 157	218 269	266 326	295 371	244 317
Feces N (g cow ⁻¹ d ⁻¹)	160 157	146 146	150 152	150 151	153 149	147 142

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

1 **Table 3: Cumulative emission results for paddocks X.11 and X.12 (combined) of the two pasture systems (M / G) during the**
 2 **individual rotations. Corresponding averaged weather parameters and N excretion input to the paddocks are also listed. Rotation 4**
 3 **is not shown due to missing miniDOAS data at the beginning of the rotation.**



Rotation	1	2	3	5	6	7
System	M G	M G	M G	M G	M G	M G
flux data coverage (until 3 days after EOG) [%]	55 <i>na</i>	65 44	34 39	<i>na</i> 30	50 <i>na</i>	51 50
Air temperature [°C]	11.9	14.8	18.9	17.8	18.1	14.4
u* [m s ⁻¹]	0.13	0.15	0.12	0.09	0.11	0.13
Precipitation [mm]	51	75	61	7	33	10
Integral emission [g N-NH ₃]	332 <i>na</i>	349 600	357 496	<i>na</i> 341	277 <i>na</i>	330 726
N excretion total [kg]	9.6 10.7	6.5 7.1	6.8 7.8	5.9 6.9	8.2 9.5	10.8 12.6
N excretion urine [kg]	6.1 7.2	3.1 3.6	4.0 5.0	3.8 4.7	5.4 6.7	6.7 8.7
EF relative to urine N input [%]	5.5 <i>na</i>	11.1 16.4	8.8 10.0	<i>na</i> 7.2	5.1 <i>na</i>	4.9 8.3

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

1 **Table 4: Artificial source characteristics, environmental conditions, measured MD concentrations and recovery rates during the**
 2 **individual gas release experiments. Averaged values during the release periods are shown. For selected parameters, the standard**
 3 **deviation is given as well.**


Release date	09-06-2017	12-06-2017	19-06-2017	27-06-2017	12-07-2017
Parameter					
Release duration [h]	1.5	2.5	3.5	1.5	3.0
Pressure [bar]	5.48±1.15	5.14±0.1	3.57±0.51	5.05±0.07	4.68±0.29
Flowrate [l/min]	3.12 ± 0.08	3.12 ± 0.07	2.59 ± 0.34	3.17 ± 0.04	3.13 ± 0.06
Abs. Emission [g NH ₃]	10.6	17.8	20.7	10.8	21.0
Wind direction [°]	269	272	256	230	240
Friction velocity [m s ⁻¹]	0.18 ± 0.04	0.26 ± 0.03	0.25 ± 0.04	0.26 ± 0.07	0.53 ± 0.05
Air temperature [°C]	20.1	25.6	26.0	24.6	24.1
ΔC [μg NH ₃ m ⁻³]	40.6 ± 10.3	29.5 ± 9.1	14.3 ± 4.9	26.4 ± 7.1	9.4 ± 2.3
Upwind conc. [μg NH ₃ m ⁻³]	2.2 ± 1.9	3.3 ± 2.5	15.3 ± 1.4	6.6 ± 1.7	1.2 ± 0.3
Recovery rate [%]	150 ± 4	124 ± 10	88 ± 9	114 ± 9	112 ± 12

4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22


Figure 1: a) Measurement site with the pastures for the two herds (blue: grass diet with additional maize silage; green: full grazing regime; grey: optional pasture areas) and the division into the paddocks (M.11-M.25, G.11-G.25). Additionally the location of the two sonic anemometers and the four miniDOAS systems (MD1 – MD6, naming based on serial number) are shown. b) Wind distribution for the northern sonic anemometer with the corresponding sector contributions (black dotted circles) for the period May – October 2016. The areas A and B indicate wind sectors from which advection from nearby farm building can occur. The wind distribution was overlaid on a Google Earth image of the experimental area (Map data: Google, DigitalGlobe)



1

2 **Figure 2: The Polar plot shows the averaged NH₃ concentration of the miniDOAS MD5 (top) and MD6 (bottom) depending on wind**
 3 **direction and wind speed (black dotted circles) for the period May – October 2016. The sectors A and B indicate areas with either**
 4 **high NH₃ concentration from farm buildings or otherwise unfavourable wind direction due to the measurement setup. The polar**
 5 **plots were produced using the R software package openair (Carslaw and Ropkins, 2012) and overlaid on a Google Earth image of**
 6 **the experimental area (Map data: Google, DigitalGlobe).**

7



b)

1

2 **Figure 3:** (a) GPS tagged dung positions recorded after grazing rotation 7 overlaid on a Google Earth image of the experimental
 3 area (Map data: Google, DigitalGlobe). The positions of the MD ammonia sensors/paths are indicated by the red dots/dotted lines.
 4 The white lines enclose the main emission measurement area between the sensors. Their dung patch density $d_{x,meas}$ was related to
 5 the average density over the investigated paddocks according to Eq. 2; (b) comparison of k_d values according to Eq. 2 for dung patch
 6 and cow position distributions on system M (blue) and system G (green)

7

8

9

10

11

12


13

14

15

16

17



1

2 **Figure 4: Time series of a) MD concentration measurements (MD2 and MD5) on pasture system M and b) corresponding difference**
 3 **in concentration. The concentration differences during good wind conditions are shown in black colour while the grey colour indicate**
 4 **concentration differences during undesirable weather conditions. c) Time series of u^* and global radiation. The blue dashed line**
 5 **indicate the $0.05 \text{ m s}^{-1} u^*$ threshold. d) Time series of wind direction. Wind direction values overlapping with the preferred wind**
 6 **sector (avoiding sector A and B, Fig. 2) are shown in black colour. The preferred wind sectors are indicated by the red area. e) Time**
 7 **series of air temperature and precipitation. The grey shaded area indicates grazing on the paddocks in between MD2 and MD5.**

8

9

10


11

12

13


14

15



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

Figure 5: a) Measured averaged half hourly fluxes of all rotations of the system M depending on hour of day and elapsed time since grazing on the paddocks in between MD2 and MD5 started. b) Half hourly averaged values of global radiation, wind speed and air temperature measured at system M during May to October 2016.



1

2 **Figure 6: Average temporal pattern of management related NH₃ emission for system M (blue) and system G (green) for daytime**
 3 **conditions. Curves with linear increase from start of grazing until three hours after end of grazing and exponential decrease**
 4 **afterwards were fitted to the 6-hourly averaged values of the measured daytime fluxes. These curves were used as default emission**
 5 **pattern for flux correction and gap filling (see Section 3.2). The vertical bars indicate the standard deviation of averaged half-hourly**
 6 **fluxes. The black vertical line indicates the end of grazing. For better readability the data points for the two systems were slightly**
 7 **shifted horizontally.**

8

9


10

11

12

13

14



1

2 **Figure 7: Measured emission of paddocks M.11 and M.12 (between sensors MD2 and MD5, Fig. 1a) during rotation 1. Missing half-**
 3 **hourly flux data were filled based on either linear interpolation or on the default emission curve (Fig. 6) in order to compute the**
 4 **cumulative emission. For comparison the uncorrected emissions (interference of upwind grazing acc. to Eq. 4 not considered) are**
 5 **also shown. The shaded time intervals indicate grazing on the investigated paddocks.**

6

7

8

9


10

11

12

13

14



1

2 **Figure 8: Sensitivity analysis of various error sources on emission results for individual rotations. Each boxplot shows the resulting**
 3 **relative effect of a potential systematic error. The investigated effects include the over- or underestimation of: the offset in**
 4 **concentration measurements (cyan), exponential decay times of the default emission curves in Fig. 6 (green), magnitude of default**
 5 **emission curves used for upwind source interference correction (red) and for gap filling (blue).**

6


7

8

9

10

11



1

2 **Figure 9: Released (red) and measured (blue) NH₃ emissions during the artificial source experiment 3 on the 19 June 2017. The**
 3 **measured emissions were quantified using the concentration difference of the miniDOAS systems MD2 and MD5 and the**
 4 **corresponding modelled bLS dispersion coefficient. The error bars indicate the uncertainty of the artificial source (Sect. 3.3.2) and**
 5 **from the measured emissions (bLS dispersion modelling, Sect. 3.3).**

6

7

8

9


10

11

12

13

14



1

2 **Figure 10: Correction factor k_d (Eq. 2, 3) of the excreta density for rotations with available emission results (Table 3). For the**
 3 **rotations without dung observations, the corresponding correction factors (hatched bars) were estimated based on a regression**
 4 **analysis between parallel surveys of density anomalies for dung patches and cow positions (Fig. 3b). The error bars show the**
 5 **corresponding uncertainty of estimated k_d values as described in Sect. 3.4.**

6


7

8

9

10

11



1

2 **Figure 11: Emissions per cow and grazing hour for system M and system G. Measured values (thick dots and lines) in comparison**
 3 **to estimated values based on urine N amount from the N balance model and the EMEP standard emission factor for NH₃ (10 %, see**
 4 **EMEP/EEA, 2016). The error bars (2σ) were calculated based on the methodological uncertainty (Sect. 3.3.1) and on excreta density**
 5 **uncertainty of the single rotations (Sect. 3.4).**

6