

# Improving the Terrestrial N Cycle Modeling for A Better Estimation of Agricultural NH<sub>3</sub> Emission Under Sustainable Farming Alternatives

### Ka Ming FUNG (kamingfung@link.cuhk.edu.hk)

Graduate Division of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences Faculty of Science The Chinese University of Hong Kong

Co-authors: Amos Tai (CUHK) Maria Val Martin (Sheffield) Eri Saikawa (Emory) Sam Peters (Emory) Alex Avramov (Emory)







Growing food demand poses a bigger threat to the environment and public health



*Can we secure future food supply without sacrificing the clean air?*

# Intercropping requires less fertilizer to produce the same amount of crops



Intercropping allows crop competition and enhance biological nitrogen fixation



**Relative Fertilizer Usage by Province** 



Assuming all maize and soybean croplands are now adopting maize-soybean intercropping, on average, 42% less fertilizer is needed to maintain maize yield in each cropland

#### Fung et al. (in review)

### National adoption of intercropping also helps safeguard air quality Such reduced fertilization cuts national agricultural NH<sub>3</sub> emission by  $45\%$

**Relative NH<sub>3</sub> Emissions (Maize-Soybean)** 

 $\%$ 



On average, 42% less fertilizer is needed to maintain maize yield on each cropland

### Fung et al. (in review)

## Intercropping could be more economic than the current practice in China Avoided Health Costs =



Reduced Fertilizer = +US\$0.5b



+US\$13b



Additional Machinery & Labor = –US\$6.0b



=

(+93% relative to the current practice)

Net profit = +US\$67b





We will use CESM to evaluate the potential benefits of intercropping under future climate and socioeconomic scenarios



# N-cycle in CESM and the missing pathways



We implement into CLM the "multi-stage"  $NH<sub>3</sub>$ volatilization scheme from DNDC (Li et al., 2012)

$$
\frac{d\left[\text{NH}_{3}\left(\text{g}\right)\right]}{dt} \approx \left[\text{NH}_{4}^{+}\left(\text{soil}\right)\right](1 - f_{\text{ads}})f_{\text{dis}}f_{\text{vol}}\left(\frac{1}{\Delta t}\right)
$$



Fraction of soil  $NH_4^+$  adsorbed is determined by an empirical equation for adsorption:

$$
f_{\text{ads}} = 0.99(7.2733 f_{\text{clay}}^3 - 11.22 f_{\text{clay}}^2 + 5.7198 f_{\text{clay}} + 0.0263)
$$

Fraction of dissociated non-adsorbed  $NH_4$ <sup>+</sup>:  $NH_4^+_{(non-ads)} \rightleftharpoons NH_3_{(aq)} + H^+_{(aq)}$ 



 $50 + T_{\text{soil}}$ 

 $l_{\rm max}$ 

wind speed (m s-

 $f_{\text{vol}} =$ 

 $1 + s$ 



## Comparing with a Chinese  $NH<sub>3</sub>$  emission inventory (Zhang et al, 2018) Fung et al. (in prep.)



Zhang2018 NH $_{\rm 3}$  Emission (fertilizer-induced only)

CLM5 NH<sub>3</sub> Emission (fertilizer-induced only)  $(3.24)$  Tg year<sup>-1</sup> nationwide)





### [CLM5] vs [Zhang2018] F NH3 VOL CROP |  $\beta_1$  = 0.31 | R<sup>2</sup> = 0.37  $0.25$  $0.20$ [CLM5] (Tg)  $0.15$ China  $0.10$ 0.05  $0.00$

[Zhang2018] (Tg)

 $0.15$ 

 $0.20$ 

 $0.25$ 

 $0.10$ 

 $0.05$ 

 $0.00$ 

#### Monthly  $NH<sub>3</sub>$  Emission



# On-going and Future Work

- Possible reasons for the model-inventory differences:
	- $\triangleright$  Absence of the canopy reduction factor
	- ➢ Inconsistent crop maps
	- $\triangleright$  Mismatch in fertilization application rates
	- $\triangleright$  Deviation in prescribed data: soil pH, deposition
- Now: fine-tuning the new  $NH<sub>3</sub>$  schemes against field and satellite measurements
- Maria Val Martin is trying to implement:
	- ➢ Flux exchange between CLM and CAMchem, including emission of  $N_2O$ ,  $NO_x$  &  $NH_3$ and deposition of  $NH_4$ <sup>+</sup>
	- $\triangleright$  Surface dataset of soil pH
- Next: investigating emission scenarios under future climate and their potential feedback mechanisms

#### Comparing with AMoN site measurement

#### CLM5  $NH<sub>3</sub>$  emitted associated with fertilizer Tg grid<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>  $(3.3$  Tg year<sup>-1</sup> nationwide) 0.0747 0.0560 50N 0.0373 45N 0.0187 0.0000 40N 35N  $\mu$ g m $^{-3}$  $30N • 4$  $\overline{3}$  $\overline{2}$ 25N  $-100E$  $-80E$  $-120E$  $\bullet$  1  $\overline{\phantom{0}}$  0



Figure 2. Yearly averaged surface concentrations ( $\mu$ g m<sup>-3</sup>, left vertical color bar) from IDAF, AMoN, EMEP and NNDMN data sets plotted on top of the NH<sub>3</sub> IASI satellite column ( $\times 10^{16}$  molec cm<sup>-2</sup>, right vertical color bar) distribution for 2011 gridded at 0.25° lat  $\times$  0.5° long. Columns and relative error (%, bottom left inset) have been calculated as a weighted mean of all IASI measurements within a cell, following equations described in Van Damme et al. (2014a) (columns with an associated relative above 100 % have been filtered).

# Thank you