

1

2

Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences

3

Supporting Information for

4

Chesapeake Bay nitrogen fluxes derived from a land-estuarine ocean biogeochemical modeling system: Model description, evaluation and nitrogen budgets

5

6

Yang Feng¹, Marjorie A. M. Friedrichs¹, John Wilkin², Hanqin Tian³, Qichun Yang³, Eileen E. Hofmann⁴, Jerry D. Wiggert⁵ and Raleigh R. Hood⁶

7

8

¹Virginia Institute of Marine Science, College of William and Mary, Gloucester Point, Virginia

9

²Institute of Marine and Coastal Sciences, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey

10

³International Center for Climate and Global Change Research and School of Forestry and Wildlife Sciences, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama

11

12

⁴Center for Coastal Physical Oceanography, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia

13

⁵Department of Marine Science, University of Southern Mississippi, Stennis Space Center, Mississippi

14

⁶Horn Point Laboratory, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science, Cambridge, Maryland

15

16

Contents of this file

18

Model Equations for Biogeochemistry

19

20

21

Additional Supporting Information (Files uploaded separately)

22

23

24

25 **Model Equations for Biogeochemistry**

26 The biogeochemical source/sink equations for the estuarine biogeochemical model state
27 variables that specifically pertain to the nitrogen cycle are described in the below text as well as
28 summarized in Tables A1 and A2. Model function symbols are defined in Table A3, and
29 parameter definitions and values are provided in Table A4 (see appendix in the text).

30

31 **Phytoplankton**

32 Phytoplankton are increased by primary production and decreased by grazing, mortality,
33 aggregation and sinking. Two additional processes, exudation to semi-labile DON and
34 ammonium were added. The exudation to ammonium pool was limited by coupled water column
35 nitrification/denitrification through the low oxygen condition. Changes in phytoplankton due to
36 those biological processes are finally determined as:

$$37 \frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = [1 - \gamma - (f_{NTR} + f_{DNF})\omega] \mu_0 L_I (L_{NO_3} + L_{NH_4}) P - gZ - m_p P - \tau(D_s + P)P - w_p \frac{\partial P}{\partial t} \quad (1)$$

38

39 **Chlorophyll**

40 The sources and sinks of chlorophyll are consistent with those for phytoplankton:

$$41 \frac{\partial [Chl]}{\partial t} = \rho_{[Chl]} [1 - \gamma - (f_{NTR} + f_{DNF})\omega] \mu_0 L_I (L_{NO_3} + L_{NH_4}) [Chl] \\ - g \frac{Z}{P} [Chl] - m_p [Chl] - \tau(D_s + P) [Chl] - w_p \frac{\partial [Chl]}{\partial z} \quad (2)$$

42

43 **Zooplankton, Small and large detritus**

44 The zooplankton source term is the assimilation of phytoplankton. The loss terms represent
45 excretion and mortality. The efficiency of the assimilation is β , and the remainder $(1 - \beta)Z$ is lost
46 to semi-labile DON and ammonium through sloppy feeding and to large detritus by fecal pellet
47 production.

48
$$\frac{\partial Z}{\partial t} = \beta gZ - \left(I_{BM} + I_E \beta \frac{P^2}{K_P + P^2} \right) Z - m_Z Z^2$$
 (3)

49

50 **Small and large detritus**

51 Phytoplankton and zooplankton mortality is transferred into the small and large detritus pools,
 52 respectively. Phytoplankton and small detritus aggregate to large detritus. Following *Druon et al.*
 53 [2010], part of the small and large detritus pools are transferred to semi-labile DON by bacterial
 54 solubilization with an efficiency of δ_N . The remaining detrital material is remineralized. The
 55 remineralization rate is limited by water column nitrification and denitrification processes.

56
$$\frac{\partial D_S}{\partial t} = m_P P - \tau(D_S + P)D_S - [\delta_N + (1 - \delta_N)(f_{NTR} + f_{DNF})]r_{D_S}D_S - w_S \frac{\partial D_S}{\partial Z}$$
 (4)

57
$$\frac{\partial D_L}{\partial t} = (1 - \beta)(1 - \lambda)gZ + m_Z Z^2 + \tau(D_S + P)^2 - [\delta_N + (1 - \delta_N)(f_{NTR} + f_{DNF})]r_{D_L}D_L - w_L \frac{\partial D_L}{\partial Z}$$
 (5)

58

59 **Semi-labile and refractory DON**

60 Semilabile DON may be gained through phytoplankton exudation, sloppy feeding, bacterial
 61 solubilization, and lost through remineralization. The rate of remineralization is limited by
 62 temperature as well as nitrification/denitrification.

63
$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial [DON]_{SL}}{\partial t} = & \gamma \mu_0 L_I (L_{NO_3} + L_{NH_4}) P + (1 - \beta) \lambda \epsilon g Z + \delta_N (r_{D_S} D_S + r_{D_L} D_L) \\ & - r_{[DON]_{SL}} e^{\kappa_{[DON]_{SL}} T} (f_{NTR} + f_{DNF}) [DON]_{SL} \end{aligned}$$
 (6)

64 The refractory DON does not participate directly in the biogeochemical cycling, however it does
 65 affect light attenuation.

66

67 **Nitrate**

68 Nitrate is taken up by phytoplankton during photosynthesis and produced through nitrification. In
 69 addition, nitrate is lost to the atmosphere as nitrogen gas through water column denitrification,
 70 the rate of which is limited by the availability of oxygen. The time rate of change due to
 71 biological process for nitrate is:

$$\frac{\partial [NO_3]}{\partial t} = -\mu_0 L_I L_{NO_3} P - \eta_{DNF} [f_{DNF}, f_{WC}]_{\min} \left\{ (1 - \delta_N) (r_{D_S} D_S + r_{D_L} D_L) + r_{[DON]_{SL}} e^{\kappa_{[DON]_{SL}} T} [DON]_{SL} \right\} + \eta f_{NTR} [NH_4]$$

72 (7)

73

74 Ammonium

75 The sources of ammonium include phytoplankton exudation and sloppy feeding, zooplankton
 76 excretion, and remineralization of small detritus, large detritus and semi-labile organic nitrogen.
 77 The sinks of ammonium include nitrification and uptake by phytoplankton. The time rate of
 78 change due to biological processes for ammonium is:

$$\frac{\partial [NH_4]}{\partial t} = \mu_0 \left[-L_{NH_4} + (f_{NTR} + f_{DNF}) (L_{NO_3} + L_{NH_4}) \omega \right] L_I P + \left[(1 - \beta) \lambda (1 - \varepsilon) g + \left(l_{BM} + l_E \beta \frac{P^2}{K_P + P^2} \right) \right] Z + (f_{NTR} + f_{DNF}) \left\{ (1 - \delta_N) (r_{D_S} D_S + r_{D_L} D_L) + r_{[DON]_{SL}} e^{\kappa_{[DON]_{SL}} T} [DON]_{SL} \right\} - \eta f_{NTR} [NH_4]$$

79 (8)

80

81 Inorganic Suspended Solids

82 Inorganic suspended solids do not participate in the water column biogeochemical cycle,
 83 however they do affect light attenuation. Concentrations of ISS are reduced by sinking and
 84 increased by seabed resuspension.

$$\frac{\partial [ISS]}{\partial t} = -w_{ISS} \frac{\partial [ISS]}{\partial z}$$

85 (9)

86

87 Dissolved Oxygen

88 The oxygen increased or decreased due to the above biological processes with the
89 stoichiometry $\eta_{O_2:NO_3} = 138 : 16$ and $\eta_{O_2:NH_4} = 106 : 16$ when consuming 1 mole of nitrate or
90 ammonium. The phytoplankton exudated semi-labile DOC during photosynthesis. The semi-
91 labile DOC exudation process does not follow the Redfield ratio. *Druon et al.* [2010] describe a
92 carbon excess-based semi-labile DOC exudation process, which is the carbohydrate production
93 over the nutrient-based part. The oxygen produced by the synthesis of carbohydrates (carbon
94 excess uptake) has a one to one molar ratio following the equation: $CO_2 + H_2O + \text{energy} \rightarrow$
95 $(CH_2O) + O_2$. The oxygen uptake from oxidation of DON with a C to N ratio of $\eta_{C:N} = 6.6$,
96 therefore, the oxygen production by this part is $\gamma_C \eta_{C:N} \mu_0 L_I (1 - L_{NH_4} - L_{NO_3}) P$.

97 In addition to the biochemical sources and sinks of oxygen, there is gas exchange
98 across the air-sea interface, which modified the oxygen concentration in the top layer. The air-
99 sea oxygen exchange was calculated as $v k_{O_2} / \Delta z ([O_2]_{sat} - [O_2])$ as in *Fennel et al.* [2013],
100 where $v k_{O_2}$ is the gas exchange coefficient for oxygen, and $[O_2]_{sat}$ is the oxygen saturation
101 calculated from *Garcia and Gordon* [1992].

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial [O_2]}{\partial t} = & +\mu_0 \left[\eta_{O_2:NO_3} L_{NO_3} + \eta_{O_2:NH_4} L_{NH_4} - \eta_{O_2:NH_4} f_{NTR} \omega (L_{NO_3} + L_{NH_4}) \right] L_I P \\
& - \eta_{O_2:NH_4} \left[(1 - \beta) \lambda (1 - \varepsilon) g + \left(l_{BM} + l_E \beta \frac{P^2}{K_P + P^2} \right) \right] Z \\
& - \eta_{O_2:NH_4} f_{NTR} \left\{ (1 - \delta_N) (r_{D_S} D_S + r_{D_L} D_L) + r_{[DON]_{SL}} e^{\kappa_{[DON]_{SL}} T} [DON]_{SL} \right\} \\
& - 2 f_{NTR} n [NH_4] \\
& + \gamma_C \eta_{C:N} \mu_0 L_I (1 - L_{NH_4} - L_{NO_3}) P \\
& + v \frac{K_{O_2}}{\Delta z} ([O_2]_{sat} - [O_2])
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

102

103

104 **Bottom boundary conditions**

105 The fate of organic matter reaching the benthos includes: (1) resuspension; (2) remineralization;
 106 (3) burial. The resuspension of the organic matter is back to the water column as D_S . The
 107 fraction of resuspension is ϕ_1 , which is a function of the bottom stress [*Druon et al.* 2010]:

108 $\phi_1 = \Gamma / \Gamma_c$, where $\Gamma = \sqrt{\tau_{b_x}^2 + \tau_{b_y}^2}$ is the bottom shear stress, $\Gamma_c = 0.05$ Pa is the critical shear
 109 stress [*Xu and Hood, 2006*]. Therefore, the time rate of change of small detritus in the model's
 110 bottom layer is:

$$111 \quad \left. \frac{\partial D_S}{\partial t} \right|_{z=H} = \frac{\phi_1}{\Delta z} F_{TON} \quad (11)$$

112 where $F_{TON} = w_P P|_{z=H} + w_{D_S} D_S|_{z=H} + w_{D_L} D_L|_{z=H}$. The fraction of the buried organic matter is

113 $\phi_2 = 0.092 F_{BC}^{0.5797}$, where a maximum of 75% of carbon burial efficiency is applied [*Druon et al.*

114 2010] and F_{BC} is the flux of total organic carbon in the sediment, which is

115 $\eta_{C:N} w_P P|_{z=H} + \eta_{C_B:N_B} (w_{D_S} D_S|_{z=H} + w_{D_L} D_L|_{z=H})$. $\eta_{C:N} = 106/16$ is the carbon to nitrogen ratio in

116 phytoplankton. $\eta_{C_B:N_B} = 9.3$ is the carbon to nitrogen ratio in bottom small and large detritus.

117 The rest $(1 - \phi_1)(1 - \phi_2)$ is remineralized through coupled nitrification and denitrification processes

118 in the benthos. The regeneration of the organic matter includes the ammonium form and semi-

119 labile DON form, and follows the implementation for sediments below normal oxic waters

120 described in *Fennel et al.* [2006, see their eq. 15]. To account for the observed shift in benthic

121 influx and efflux rates that occurs below hypoxic to anoxic overlying waters [*Rysgaard et al.*,

122 1994], an additional term is included to regulate these benthic regeneration rates in response to

123 the seasonal transition to hypoxic in the overlying waters. i.e., as hypoxia in the overlying water

124 column intensifies, the benthic nitrification-denitrification balance will shift toward the latter.

125

126 The amount of NH_4 regenerated is:

127
$$\left. \frac{\partial [NH_4]}{\partial t} \right|_{z=H} = \eta_{NF/DNF} \frac{(1-\phi_1)(1-\phi_2)}{\Delta z} F_{TON} (1+3L_{BO_2}) \quad (12)$$

128 Where $L_{BO_2} = \frac{f_B(O_2) - f_B(O_2^{max})}{1 - f_B(O_2^{max})}$, $f_B(O_2) = \frac{K_{BO_2}}{O_2|_{z=H} + K_{BO_2}}$, K_{BO_2} is the half-saturation coefficient
 129 for sediment denitrification, and equals 26.5 mmole-O m⁻³.

130

131 The amount of semi-labile DON regenerated is:

132
$$\left. \frac{\partial [DON]_{sl}}{\partial t} \right|_{z=H} = \gamma_{[BDON]_{sl}} \frac{(1-\phi_1)(1-\phi_2)}{\Delta z} F_{TON} (1+3L_{BO_2}) \quad (13)$$

133 Where, $\gamma_{[BDON]_{sl}} = 0.01$ is the fraction of bottom semilabile DON produced through coupled
 134 nitrification and denitrification.

135

136 The oxygen consumption during this process is:

137
$$\left. \frac{\partial [O_2]}{\partial t} \right|_{z=H} = -\eta_{O_2:NF/DNF} \frac{(1-\phi_1)(1-\phi_2)}{\Delta z} F_{TON} (1-L_{BO_2}) \quad (14)$$

138 The terms $\eta_{NF/DNF}$ and $\eta_{O_2:NF/DNF}$ are stoichiometric relations drawn from *Fennel et al.* [2006].

139 The term $\eta_{[BDON]_{sl}}$ is the fraction of bottom semilabile DON produced through coupled nitrification
 140 and denitrification.

141

142 At the bottom, particles that hit the bottom are resuspended when bottom stress exceeds critical

143 shear stress, which is calculated by [Xu and Hood, 2006] $\xi(\Gamma - \Gamma_c)$, where $\xi = 4320 \text{ gm}^{-2}\text{d}^{-1}\text{Pa}^{-1}$

144 ¹ is the resuspension rate.

145